OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

FIRST SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

54-55 VICTORIÆ, 1891.

VOL. XXXII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TENTH DAY OF JULY TO THE TWENTIETH DAY OF AUGUST, INCLUSIVE.

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

1891.

House of Commons Debates.

FIRST SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 21st August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RECKONING OF TIME.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 166) respecting the reckoning of time. He said: The House has been put in possession of the documents relating to the fixing of time, during the present session, and these have been printed by order of Parliament and are in the hands of hon. members. I do not propose at this stage of the session, however, to do more in connection with the Bill that stands on the Order paper than ask leave to introduce it, so that the important subject to which it relates will receive the careful consideration of hon. gentlemen at a time, perhaps, more auspicious than the present for the study of the questions and the examination of papers that have been distributed to Parliament. I may, nevertheless, in moving for leave to introduce this Bill, explain its object and the reason for bringing it to the attention of Parliament. It is well known that in various countries of the world, on this side of the Atlantic as well as the other, railway companies have already adopted this system and have found it an advantage in carrying on the work of railway corporations, such as the movement of trains and traffic. In 1884 there were assembled delegates from twenty-five nations of the world at a conference in Washington, to consider the subject of a common system for the reckoning of time. I may state to the House briefly the resolutions adopted at that conference. These resolutions are incorporated in the preamble of the present Bill. The resolutions are to the effect: 1. That the prime meridian common to all nations should be the meridian passing through the observatory at Greenwich. 2. That the mean solar passage on the anti-prime meridian should be the zero for reckoning time. 3. That there should be a universal measure or standard of time common to all nations; that such universal standard should correspond and be identical with the mean civil day at Greenwich except only with respect to the notation of the hours, which should be in a single series from 0 to 24. The resolutions adopted at that conference have been approved by very many eminent scientific and important bodies of the world. I may mention briefly, as appears in the papers before Parliament, that they have received the approval of the Astronomical Society, the Royal Society, the Imperial Board of Trade, the General Post Office of Great Britain, the Eastern Telegraph Company, the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company, the Eastern and South African Telegraph Company, the Society of Telegraph Engineers, the Trinity House, the Indian Office, the Colonial Office and the Admiralty. So that nothing really need be added to show the very great importance of the subject and the necessity of giving it very great attention. It is proposed that in the computation of time there shall be practically a universal day, and that this shall end at the same moment in this country as does the civil day at Greenwich, differing only in regard to the numbering of the hours. The day is divided, according to the Greenwich day, into halves, and, according to the notation contemplated by this Bill, into what is called the twenty-four hour system, and the numbers will be from 0 to 24. The universal time will be common to all localities, and under the provisions of this Bill the only difference will be as it passes from one meridian to another. There will be this uniformity, that the minutes and seconds will correspond, the hours merely differing as you proceed from east to west, the earth's surface being divided into twenty-four meridians or divisions from east to west, the difference between each being one hour. When it is 10 o'clock at a given point, and you proceed west one section or zone it will be 11 o'clock, the next zone 12 o'clock: the minutes and seconds corresponding, as I have said, the hours only varying according to the zones and divisions. The central line of each zone will be an hour meridian, and the hour meridians will be 15 degrees of latitude apart. They will be numbered in consecutive order towards the west from zero, the anti-prime meridian. I may mention as another reason for allowing the Bill to stand for consideration, that an examination of it will show that one of the first things to be determined is the longitude, and at present the longitude of various points in Canada is not definitely fixed. Under the work at present being undertaken by the British authorities, in connection with the Royal Society of Canada, or at all events by the authorities of McGill College, the longitude of Montreal will be fixed during the present year, and that being done, the longitude of any place in Canada can be determined. I may say that during the present year, in the Imperial Parliament of Germany, the great importance of the subject was referred to by Von Moltke in March last in dealing with a railway Bill before the German Parliament, and arguing in favour of adopting a universal standard of time; that eminent man said:

"Gentlemen, science desires much more than we do. She is not content with a German unity of time or with that of Middle Europe, but she is desirous of obtaining a world time based upon the meridian of Greenwich, and certainly with full right from her standpoint and with the end she has in view." * * * *

"I believe it will assist the movement if the Parliament declares itself in sympathy with a principle which in America, in England, in Sweden, in Denmark and Switzerland and in South Germany has already obtained acceptance."

In concluding the explanations of the object of this Bill, I may say that in order that it shall not be forced upon any section of the country, and in order that it shall have that consideration which is necessary to its successful operation, it is proposed in the last clause that the Act shall not come into operation in any province until the Legislature of that province has adopted a similar Bill, and, therefore, all complicated questions of jurisdiction are avoided, and the question as to whether, in reference to contracts or any other subject, this Parliament has power to deal with the subject will not arise. Even if the Act becomes operative, it cannot go into effect without the consent of the Legislature.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE CENSUS.

Mr. CASEY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, no doubt the hon. Postmaster General will remember the information he promised yesterday to give us to-day.

Mr. HAGGART. I made enquiries from the department to-day, and I learned that Mr. Johnson, the head of the bureau, has been obliged to leave, on account of a death in his family. The officer informs me that on Wednesday, at latest, you will have the full returns.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Wednesday of next week?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, next week.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) Before we pass to the Orders of the Day, I wish to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to a despatch published in the London *Times* of August 10th, stating that on August 8th I had admitted somewhere having received $3,000 from a firm of public contractors under accusation before this Parliament. This despatch is signed by the Reuter Agency. I am glad to be able to say that it is absolutely untruthful, and, I will add, intentionally untruthful, for its author—if my information is correct—was present on the occasion referred to. The incident was brought about by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, when the hon. member thought fit to put to Mr. McGreevy a question in which the witness was asked if I had not received $3,000 from him——

Mr. SPEAKER. Have these proceedings of the Committee been reported to the House?

Mr. TARTE. I am referring to a question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to call the attention of the hon. member to the fact, that if a paper has published something in reference to him that did not occur in this House, I think it is not a question of privilege.

Mr. TARTE. Am I to understand that I am not allowed to refer to a telegram published in the London *Times*?

Mr. SPEAKER. Unless it has reference to something that occurred in this House.

Mr. TARTE. I am alluding to a false statement published against me.

Mr. SPEAKER. Only the statement of a newspaper respecting the proceedings of the House is a question of privilege.

Mr. CASEY. As I understand, Sir, the hon. gentleman refers to a matter which has been published against him, and which affects his honour and standing as a member.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. member has a right, as every member in this House has always exercised, to mention what he thinks of a certain passage in the newspapers received here. When Mr. Speaker told the hon. gentleman that he was out of order, it was not the London *Times* he had in his hands, but he was reading from the printed minutes of a committee which has yet to report to the House. I do not think he can be prevented from vindicating his own position or repudiating an article in a newspaper, but he has no right to read from proceedings of a committee that has not reported to the House.

Mr. TARTE. I was speaking in French, but I did not read a line of what took place before any committee. Of course, Sir, I am perfectly willing to abide by your decision. What I was saying in French is this, and I will say it in French again. (Translation.) I am referring to a despatch published in the London *Times* in connection with what took place before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I have the London *Times* in my hand, and I believe I have a right to refer to it. This despatch is untruthful, and as it has been said that I had somewhere admitted having received a sum of money from contractors under accusation before this House, I say that whoever stated anything or wrote anywhere, near or far, any such a thing, has stated an absolute untruth.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the House and the Government to a matter of considerable importance in connection with the Committee on Public Accounts. It has been known for some time that differences of opinion arose in that committee as to its powers and functions, and as to the scope of the investigation into the Public Accounts committed to that Committee during the session. So great, indeed, were the differences that existed, that on one or two occasions the time of the Committee was taken up in a discussion on the powers and functions of the Committee, much to the detriment of the enquiry which was submitted. This difficulty became so serious that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)——

Mr. TUPPER. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman in order in referring to difficulties that occurred in the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. SPEAKER. My hon. friend may ask a question of the Government in reference to some matter of public interest, but he cannot go on with the discussion or make a speech.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is impossible to state the facts unless I give the history.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. If the hon. member is going to discuss something that occurred in the Committee, it is out of order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am not going to discuss the matter; it is merely for the purpose of asking a question of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has got to put the question direct. I have already pointed out the inconvenience of discussions at this stage of the proceedings of the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I quite agree with you. I wish to ask the Minister of Justice if he has officially handed over to the Chairman of that Committee and to the members of the Government who attended that Committee, a copy of the resolution passed by the House on motion of the member for South Oxford, so that in future our meetings will be given to the conduct of the investigation?

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to refer, as a matter of personal explanation, to a statement made in the *Globe*: and I will take care that I shall not be out of order. The *Globe* quotes this statement, referring to me:

"I find in the Auditor General's Report for 1887—he was only three months a member of Parliament that fiscal year—he got $968.83; in 1885 he got $5,440.75; in 1889, $6,400.98; in 1890, $6,818.43; or in all for the three months to the end of 1890—or from the time he was elected, he got $19,598.99, besides his indemnity as a member of Parliament. To overcome his liability under the Independence of Parliament Act, he forms the Regina *Leader* into a joint stock company immediately after being elected. He divides it into 4,000 shares at $5 each, takes 2,000 shares himself and pays up $1,000. One or two others take a share or two apiece and pay in a trifle. This relieves him from his liability under the Independence of Parliament Act. If this is not boodling and fooling his constituents, then I am no judge."

And the *Globe* comments:

"What has Mr. Davin to say? Mr. Perley seems to be his mortal enemy, and is, therefore, not a good witness against him in ordinary matters; but there are the figures from the official reports."

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have received no money whatever since I have been elected. I have to say this, that since I have been elected a member of Parliament, one word in regard to my private business, or one word in regard to any business of a commercial character with which I am connected, I have never spoken to a Minister, or a Deputy Minister. I have never sought to use my political position one iota to help myself. I have to say this, that the statement that I have in any way contravened the Independence of Parliament Act is untrue; and I have to say that the suggestion that there is any boodling is utterly false; and if any gentleman thinks that I have in any way contravened the Independence of Parliament Act, there are yet two or three weeks of this session, and I should be very glad, if he thought it necessary, to have me summoned before any of the committees and take my evidence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Move to refer it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections at once.

Mr. DAVIN. The statement is made in a ribald, lying, scoundrelly letter emanating from Senator Perley.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that it is not permissible to speak in disrespectful terms of a member of the other branch of the Legislature.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that an elevation of such a character should have been made to that Senate,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DAVIN—as it reflects indelible disgrace to Canada and all connected with it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. It must be remembered that when an hon. member is called to order he must sit down, and afterwards rise to explain if he chooses.

The Orders of the Day having been called,

Mr. CASEY. Do I understand that such language, having been used, is to remain on record without retraction, or what is the ruling of the Chair in regard to it?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have already pointed out to the hon. member that he must not speak disrespectfully of a member of the other branch of this Legislature, and he must, I think, withdraw the words he has applied to a Senator.

Mr. DAVIN. Then I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the parliamentary thing is to say that the hon. gentleman is a truthful and honourable man, and a credit to the Senate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must point out to the hon. member that a retraction must be full and complete; it must not be qualified. When a member is guilty of having used unparliamentary language and is asked to retract it, he must retract it fully.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I need hardly say that it is always my desire to comply with the rules of Parliament and with your ruling, and I, therefore, as you direct me, withdraw those unparliamentary words, as they are unparliamentary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And use them elsewhere.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee o Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What amount are you taking?

Mr. FOSTER. A fifth.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second time.

CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Marine Hospitals..... ..... $34,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would the Minister of Marine tell us how much of this vote for Marine Hospitals is recouped to us? What is the exact drain on the Treasury from this source?

Mr. TUPPER. There has always been an amount more than the taxes provided for, but latterly it has been getting better. Last year we received $6,000 more than we spent, and, of course, the Marine Hospital at Quebec made quite a difference. The expenditure up to the present has been altogether, for the years mentioned, $910,000, against $894,000 received.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So that practically at present the vote for the Marine Hospitals is met by the receipts.

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Steamboat Inspection..... $23,400

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do you account for this increase in the vote for steamboat inspection?

Mr. TUPPER. It is to provide for the appointment of two additional officers to the present staff, one in Ontario and one in the Maritime Provinces. There is only one inspector in the Maritime Provinces now, and we find that the present staff is not able to do the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do the receipts from this source compare with the expenditure?

Mr. TUPPER. We have expended $319,000 since 1870 and we have received from dues on shipping $295,000. Last year we expended $1,000 more than we received, but we have increased the rate from six cents to eight cents, and under the power given to the Governor in Council to fix the rate as high as ten cents, we hope to meet this deficit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not disposed to raise any objection either to the proceedings of the department or to the mode they propose to make both ends meet, but there are one or two points on which I would like information. In the first place, some persons have complained to me that in the case of small pleasure yachts in certain localities this Act has been captiously enforced; that they were compelled to have certificated engineers, which meant considerable expense, and was of mighty little protection to the public at large, inasmuch as these yachts are private affairs. Do the department require everybody who runs a steam launch to pass an examination before the inspector?

Mr. TUPPER. I remember a case such as the hon. gentleman has mentioned, which occurred very recently, and in which I thought it was very hard to enforce the Act; but, on a careful examination of the whole question, it was perhaps better in the interests of the public that the rule should be adhered to. Under the Steamboat Inspection Act, I have no discretion to make an exception in any case. Certain exceptional cases have been set before me, in which I would have been very willing, had I the power, to meet the requests made to me. In England no exception is made in the case of any boat carrying passengers; but in Canada we passed an Act recently which fixed the limit for the very purpose to which the hon. gentleman has referred. The only case in which we can depart from the rigid rule is that of steam yachts of three tons used exclusively for pleasure or for private purposes. The cases in which I have been unable to make an exception are cases in which the tonnage was larger, and the hon. gentleman will see the danger I would run in departing from the letter of this Act. Everything would be well, if no accident occurred; but if, after I had taken the responsibility of giving a permit, there should be an accident with loss of life, the hon. gentleman can easily understand the awkward position in which the head of the department who assumed that authority would be placed. And even had I given permits in those cases in which the Act did not allow them, the penalties could have been collected; my permit would not have been worth the paper on which it was written. There is always a difficulty in arriving at the exact tonnage that could be excepted, but that was the resolution of the Board of Steamboat Inspectors, after careful enquiry.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, no blame can possibly attach to the Minister for adhering to the law. As the law stands he must administer it; but though I am not going to suggest his adding to the legislation of this session, I do think it is a little too grandmotherly for us to meddle with very small private steam launches. The number of these is increasing pretty rapidly, and I think discretionary power might be given to the Minister to a considerably higher limit than three tons: I am hardly prepared to suggest a limit. Of course, where passengers are carried, I shall support the department in taking the fullest precautions; but in the case of purely pleasure boats which carry no passengers, I think that if boats under twenty tons like to blow themselves up, we might let them do it without detriment to the public interest.

Mr. TUPPER. Vessels of three tons are exempt altogether; but I forgot to say to the hon. gentleman that we are able to give permits to another class:

"The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, upon the report of the inspector of boilers and machinery, in whose district the steamboat is to run, may grant a permit to a fourth class engineer or other applicant, sufficiently qualified by his knowledge of steam machinery and his experience as engineer, authorizing him to act as engineer on a steamboat carrying passengers, and not exceeding twenty tons gross tonnage."

That is a discretion which we have; and in the case which I think the hon. gentleman has in mind, my difficulty was not that we could not meet the case, but that the vessel desired to come without any permit and without any inspection from a district distant from Ottawa, and I was confined by the terms of this Act to action only on the report of an inspector.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman can consider whether further relaxation can be given. There is another point of much greater public importance to which I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention. I think the Act makes sufficient provision, but I do not think the authorities enforce it at all; that is, with reference to the very dangerous overcrowding, which, to my personal knowledge constantly takes place on steamers carrying excursions in the summer season. I have seen steamers going out of our lake ports so crowded that if the smallest accident had occurred, several hundred human lives would in all probability have been lost; and I know that the life-saving apparatus on board was wholly and utterly inadequate. I am aware that restrictions are laid down, but I am also aware that in the case of these excursions they are constantly and systematically evaded. I do not know whether the Customs authorities are supposed

to look after these matters, or the officers of the Marine Department; but I do know as a matter of fact that great and unnecessary danger is run. I do not know whether any very great disasters have occurred in Canada, but the hon. gentleman knows that in other countries there has been great loss of human life on such excursions.

Mr. TUPPER. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and I have taken the most rigorous measures to enforce the provisions of the Act against overcrowding. The hon. gentleman will see, on glancing at the last report of the department, that we have undertaken not only to enforce the Act, but to prosecute every case of overcrowding brought to our notice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many prosecutions have taken place?

Mr. TUPPER. There are quite a number in progress now, and on page 45 the hon. gentleman will see a report of quite an amount of litigation in these cases. The officers of the Marine Department are required to enforce the Act, and the Customs officers have power to refuse clearance to vessels violating the provisions of the Act. For some years the law was not enforced, but distressing accidents caused the matter to be brought up, and for the last two years we have prosecuted every case brought to our attention, and I have given my officers instructions to enforce the law very strictly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I see that in nearly every instance the magistrates dismissed the case.

Mr. TUPPER. That is a difficulty we meet with in connection with a good deal of the legislation of this Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman meets that difficulty, and I think it is worth his while to consider in another session whether he could not introduce some legislation enabling him to carry out the law more effectively, so that technical objections should not be allowed to interfere with its operation, in cases where boats carry more passengers than the law entitles them to carry, or undertake to carry passengers in the absence of those things which the law prescribes they should have for the protection of passengers. The safety of the passengers ought to be of paramount importance, and I think a few good wholesome fines on steamboats who violate the law in this respect would have a good effect.

Fisheries—Salaries, &c., Nova Scotia..$23,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was a little misunderstanding on the part of some of my hon. friends. They thought that all that we were going to do was to pass the five per cent. of the items.

Mr. TUPPER. I am quite willing to agree that latitude will be allowed in the Supplementary Estimates to go back to these items.

Mr. FRASER. Is the west branch of the East River still under the operation of the Fishery Act?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. My information is that the west branch of the East River was exempted from the operation of the Fishery Act some years ago.

Mr. TUPPER. Your information is wrong. There is no river in the County of Pictou exempted.

Mr. FRASER. I put a question on the Paper about the dismissal of Mr. Torey, fishery overseer in Guysborough, and the appointment of a man in his place, and I asked what were the reasons?

Mr. TUPPER. It was his duty as fishery officer and Customs officer to enforce the Fishery Act, particularly with regard to foreign vessels. This officer permitted an American fishing vessel, not having a license under the *modus vivendi*, to enter his port, obtain supplies, sell her cargo, and generally act as a trading vessel or as one of our own ships. He was an old officer, who had been employed at one time in command of one of our cruisers, and he knew the provisions of the law. Yet he allowed this vessel to go on the payment of a fine of $800, although the penalty was confiscation. The case being of that serious nature, it was impossible to retain him any longer. The explanation of the facts showed that he was not fit to be retained in his position. The whole transaction was hurried, the vessel was off before his report reached the department, and although the vessel had been detained by him for open violation of the Customs and Fisheries Acts, she was permitted to depart on the payment of a fine of $800, utterly disproportionate to the value of the vessel and against the law which imposes the penalty of confiscation.

Mr. FRASER. So far as Mr. Torey is concerned, I wish to bring the matter before the Committee. Mr. Torey has been an official in the County of Guysborough for over twenty years, and I am safe in saying that so far as ability and knowledge of the fishery law are concerned, and the performance of his duties both as a fishery and a Customs officer, no man in the Province of Nova Scotia has carried out the duties of his office better, if as well. Now, the seizure spoken of occurred last year, and Mr. Torey has written fully to the department about the matter. It was impossible for him to do anything more than he did. He took the $800, which was all he could get at the time, and, not having a force sufficient to detain the vessel, he had to take that $800 or allow the vessel to get away. That took place in 1890 and nothing was said in reference to it until after the general election. Mr. Torey has been in office for twenty years as chief collector of Customs for the county and has been in charge of the fisheries there. He had always performed his duty to the full satisfaction of the Government. He was not only a good official, but all his lifetime he was an ardent supporter of the Government. He ran for the county two or three times in the interest of the Government when it was a forlorn hope. As far as his relations with the people of the county were concerned, no one suggested that he was not an efficient officer, and nothing was said about this matter of the seizure.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Torey's attention was called to the matter and he made explanations. I have the correspondence here. Here is a letter dated Guysborough, June 28, 1890, as follows:—

"SIR,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23rd instant, fyle 1691-90, in reference to my report of the schooner *Abbie M. Deering*. In reply, I beg to say that the seizure was made principally for violation of the Customs law although no doubt the offence was a violation of the Fisheries Act. I dealt with the seizure under the Customs law, and when the amount of $800 was

paid to cover the fines that the several parties were liable for under that law I acted on the impression it was my duty to set the vessel free. If I have done wrong by so doing it was from the want of not knowing better. I may further say that I am of the opinion that the whole amount was not paid by the master or owners of the vessel, but was made up by ten parties concerned in the transaction: the money was paid to me by the Messrs. Whiteman, who were also interested in the matter."

That was in reply to the following from the department:—

"Referring to your report of the seizure of the schooner *Abbie M. Deering* for infraction of the fisheries laws and regulations, I have to point out that you appeared to have released the vessel on a deposit of $800. The penalty is confiscation; the law admits of no compromise or of anything less than the value of the vessel being deposited. I am desired by the hon. the Minister of Customs to ask upon what authority you accepted a deposit of anything less than the value of the vessel, or released the vessel, without instructions or authority either from this department or from the Department of Fisheries?"

The explanation which Mr. Torey had given was as follows:—

"On the evening of the 22nd instant I received a telegram from a party at Canso informing me that the United States fishing schooner *Abbie M. Deering* of Gloucester, Jeremiah Gordon, master, had landed fish during the previous night and would sail the next day. I at once telegraphed word to Mr. Young and directed him to seize the vessel and I would go down on the following day, which I did, and after making further enquiry I found that the vessel was from the banks, had no license and that the charge was correct and could be sustained. I then proceeded on board, saw the captain and other parties concerned in the transaction, and they admitted the charge and stated there had been landed 4,6 0 lbs. codfish and a quantity of halibut, and had taken on board about 4 tons ice, and wished to have the violation arranged forthwith so that the vessel could proceed on her voyage. I made them the offer that they could do either, namely, let the law take its course or pay a fine of eight hundred dollars for the violation committed upon the Customs Act, the Treaty of 1818 and the laws in connection therewith, with the addition of whatever expenses were incurred in the matter. They accepted the offer and yesterday paid the money, namely, fine, $800, expenses, $25, and I released the vessel. This arrangement was made with the understanding that there was to be no further proceedings taken on either side in this case beyond the privilege of the owners appealing to the Minister's generosity for a reduction of the amount of fine if he thought proper to do so."

That report is dated the 25th April, 1890, and is the report which was put in by Mr. Torey previous to the letter I have read. This officer claims that in accepting $800 he acted in the best interest of the department. He says that at that time it would have been impossible for him to make this seizure because he had not the requisite power that he could call out at this place, and therefore he could not do any more than he did; but nothing further was said. The fine was paid and accepted and was returned to the Government. As a matter of course, Mr. Torey thought the thing was ended. Here was an officer who had been employed for twenty years and had been performing the duties of his office in a manner which gave entire satisfaction to the best people in the county. He was a man who was so vigilant and so energetic that he allowed no opportunity to pass without seeing the law carried out. In fact he had made many enemies on account of the vigilance with which he looked after smugglers and others, and saw that the law was put into operation. Yet he gets no notice in regard to this until after the election. I have said that Mr. Torey was a supporter of the Government, and he is so now. As far as an official could act, no man could be a stronger supporter of the Government than he was. Indeed it was claimed by the opponents of the present Government in the county, that he was so strong a Government supporter as to merit condemnation as an official. His house was the place of all others in the county where the supporters of the Government met, and he did all he could, consistently with his office, and, as his opponents claimed, more than he should for the Government. But, when the election took place last year, he did not see his way clear to vote for the Government candidate and he remained at home. I cannot understand why it was only after the election that this was considered a sufficient cause for his dismissal as a fishery officer. The truth of the matter was that Mr. Torey, having done this, his whilom Conservative friends thought that he was not a man who could be left any longer in office. His opposition was not against the present Government or their policy, his opposition was of a personal character, and just because he did not vote, the Government dismissed him. Now, I claim that when an officer has served them well for over twenty years he ought not to have been treated in this manner. Mr. Torey is not an old man, he is still able to do the work; I venture to say that he is better able to perform the duties of overseer of fisheries and collector of Customs, than any man in the county; I venture to say he knows more about the fisheries of the country and the laws relating to the fisheries, and can give better information to the Government, than any man in the county. Now, even provided the contention of the Government was correct, provided even that he did violate the statute, he did it not wilfully, but he thought he was acting in the best interests of the country. But I want to call attention to another matter in connection with it. It was not until this spring, some time in May, that he received a notice that he was dismissed. In May he wrote a letter to the department, complaining of the harshness of his dismissal after twenty years service to the best of his ability, and asking to be informed of the reason of his dismissal. The department returned answer that there were two reasons, the one on account of his conduct in the seizuze of the United States fishing vessel, and the other on account of his advanced age. I submit that his advanced age was no reason. Mr. Torey is not so old as to be unable to perform his duty. That was in May last, and between the autumn of the previous year and that time, there was nothing said to him about his contemplated dismissal; and I venture to say that only for the fact that Mr. Torey did not see fit at the last election to vote for the Government—and it was a personal matter—he would not have been disturbed, there would not have been a thought of dismissing him. If action had been taken immediately upon what the Government claim to have been a violation of the law with regard to the seizure, I could understand it, for we all know that the Government deal with these matters very summarily. Everybody knows that when Mr. Ross committed a violation of the law he was not allowed six or eight months to think over it, he was dismissed almost immediately.

Mr. TUPPER. No.

Mr. FRASER. How long was he kept in?

Mr. TUPPER. Over a month.

Mr. FRASER. Exactly, but the seizure was first made in April, 1890, and the notification of

his dismissal comes to him on the 26th of May, or some time early in May, 1891. Here is the whole secret. There was no thought of removing him, and I venture to say that if Mr. Torey had taken his usual course and had supported the Government candidate, as in previous elections, we would not have heard a word said about his dismissal, and about this hatching of an excuse for dismissing him. Mr. Ross was dismissed at a month's notice, because no election was pending, but Mr. Torey was kept on. There is a general impression in the county amongst both Tories and Liberals, that Mr. Torey's head was cut off on account of his declining to vote. More than that, one of the largest petitions ever presented to the Government in favour of any one, signed by over a thousand men on both sides of politics in the County of Guysborough, including some of the strongest supporters of the Government in the county, was sent to the department about Mr. Torey. But Mr. Torey being a little inclined towards independence just about the time of the election, his past services all went for nothing, his past services to the Government were thought nothing of, and it was concluded that a blow must be struck at him to learn him and to learn all others that if they dared, when an election came on, to refrain from voting, they must understand that the law will be put into operation. Now, if Mr. Torey was an officer who had neglected his duty, there might be some excuse for his dismissal, but even if there had been a violation of the law I claim that he, as an officer who had been twenty years in the service and done his duty to the satisfaction of the Government, ought to have been treated with more consideration. Everybody in the county will tell you that he did his duty so far as he was concerned, and likewise in aiding others and doing what he could to stop smuggling, doing all that he could in the interest of the Government, and I say there ought to have been some consideration shown to an officer of that character. Is a man to be dismissed for one violation of the law? When I consider the further fact that he had grown old in that office, being now over 60 years of age, I think the conduct of the Government was reprehensible in dismissing him. I am not a political friend of Mr. Torey, he does not happen to be a supporter of mine, he did not vote for my party, and I do not think he ever once voted for the Liberal party in that county. His whole influence and the influence of his family were opposed to the party with which I am connected. But that makes no difference; I would claim for him the same rights that I would claim for a supporter of mine. I am bound to say that, although Mr. Torey was opposed to me, he was a good officer, and I claim that the Government ought not to have acted as they did towards that man. Why need his alleged offence go so long unpunished? Why not deal with it at once, if it was such a flagrant violation of the law? Why keep him on without saying a word to him about it? But an occasion arose when the Government, finding that Mr. Torey was independent and would not vote for the Government candidate, decided to dismiss him. Now, here let me say that so far as his knowledge is concerned in comparison with the man that was appointed in his place, it was like the knowledge of the Minister of Marine as compared with the knowledge of his youngest child. He knows just as much more about fisheries than the man the Government appointed as the Minister of Marine knows more than his infant child. I do not say that the new officer is not a respectable man; but he was a small huckster in the village, he knew nothing about anything except selling a few goods. Mr. Torey had been in the service for over twenty years, and had been a commandant of Government vessels. There is nothing in that service that Mr. Torey does not know. There is not an inch of the county that he does not know. He himself supervised all the officers of the Government in the county; indeed he was the Government in that county, he was the whole Government in the county. He collected their Customs, and looked after their fisheries, and everything of that kind. I say that the Government have done a wrong to a man who has been in the Civil Service for twenty years, and no complaint has ever been found against him. Mr. Torey is up as early as any man in that county. I have known him to leave before daylight to perform his duty. But he is declared to be an old man now, and so he must be laid aside. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that both things are joined together. The Government were conscious that they could not dismiss him for the first reason, and so they found a second reason. The first reason was not sufficient, and, therefore, for the first time, they bring up his age against him. They say: You are getting too old; the Governor General is told that you are too old. I suppose the Governor General thought that he was a decrepit old man like some of the officers we see about the departments, sunning themselves on the lawn, and not able to move about, and consequently the Governor General thought it was in the interest of the service that he should be dismissed. I venture to say, if all the facts in regard to that seizure were brought before the Governor General and Mr. Torey's explanation was considered, the Governor General would not have dismissed him for that cause. It is a serious matter for all officials if they are to be treated in this way. I shall be very glad to hear what explanation can be given. Technically there was a violation of the law by the official, but I hold that there is no official of Mr. Torey's age in the Dominion who has performed his duties so well for twenty years and made so few mistakes. No one indeed, ever heard that he made a mistake before, and yet for that one mistake, and he claimed it was impossible for him to do otherwise, he is removed. If he had not accepted $800 as a fine the vessel would have gone out to sea, and at Canso there were many American vessels which might have taken the part of the vessel in question, and accordingly, in my opinion, Mr. Torey acted wisely. Where could he obtain men to make an arrest? The people were not in sympathy with action in the direction of arresting the vessel after this offer of $800 was made. It was not a case where the captain declared he would resist the law and get away. But when the people found the vessel had offered $800 for the violation of the law, they were in sympathy with it, and it was a question whether the officer should accept the amount or let the vessel go without punishment. That explanation was satisfactory to the Government at the time; and hence their silence, until Mr. Torey failed to come out and vote at the last election. I am simply claiming for him what I would claim for any official. I have nothing to gain from this matter; Mr. Torey

is no political friend of mine, nor of my friends; he has no claim on me or any Liberal in the county. He has acted faithfully in his position for many years, and for this one act one of the best officials has been removed. I am sorry, for the sake of the service and for Mr. Torey personally, that this should have been done, and I regret that the Government, after keeping silence so long, found it necessary after the election was over, by the action of my late opponent, to initiate this action. The Government did not do this of their own motion, but my late opponent, seeing that Mr. Torey did not give him his individual support and refrained from voting, brought pressure on the Government to obtain his removal. I assert before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that if my late opponent had not brought pressure to bear, the Government would not have taken this action in regard to Mr. Torey. I regard this action—I am not speaking in Mr. Torrey's interest but in the interests of the officials—as a great wrong committed on a good officer, a wrong which will be resented by many of the best friends of the Government; and though I might be presumed to wish that the Government should go on causing men to feel aggrieved, yet I am bound to say in regard to Mr. Torey that I expect no favour from him or any of his friends, but I am simply speaking of a good official and faithful servant who, I think, has been unfairly dealt with.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has taken an extraordinary position in this case. It seems we have done a great wrong to a Conservative, a party man, from whom he expects no favours, who, he says, is a supporter of the Government and whose name is "Torey." It so happens that another of the cases to which the hon. gentleman alluded was that of Mr. Ross, a case not so extreme as this, in my judgment, nor of such a serious character. I believe Mr. Ross, though at one time a Liberal, yet at the time the Government took action against him was a supporter of the Government and in sympathy with it. I may say at the outset to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who seems to know far more than anyone as to the reasons which prompted the Government, that, speaking for myself and for the Government—because it was by my action and that of the Minister of Customs that the step was taken in connection with Mr. Torey—I do not think he is acquainted with the facts. The hon. gentleman says Mr. Torey is still a Conservative. I did not know, and I did not enquire how he voted at the last election, and I never would have known so much about his political faith and actions at the last election had he not written to me since this action was taken by the Government in connection with his office. That was the first intimation I had of this gentleman's conduct in the last election; it was a long letter, in which he went fully into the reasons for not supporting Mr. Ogden. Much as the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) thinks he knows about the case, he has not studied it with that care which was necessary from the papers which he held in his hand. The cause of the action of the Government occurred long ago, and the burden of the hon. gentleman's argument was that it was not wrong to dismiss him, but if you had to dismiss him, you should not have permitted him to remain in office from April of last year to May of this year. So, instead of doing the officer the great injustice the hon. gentleman contends, the Government have given him a year, which they should not have given him according to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman will not allow even extenuating circumstances to be pleaded on the part of this officer, that he was old in years; but he insists that he was a vigorous, vigilant and intelligent officer, thoroughly posted in his duties and able to carry them out efficiently. If that states correctly the conduct of that officer, he is without any excuse. The only conclusion from the argument would be that in superannuating that officer the Government had acted wrongly, and he should have been instantly dismissed. The hon. gentleman's statement of the facts is incorrect, and he could not support it by the papers he had before him. He seeks to lead the House to believe that this officer acted with great discretion and within his power as a Customs officer; that he found himself in this position: there was a violation of the Customs Act and a violation of the Fisheries Act, and with great discretion he extracted the highest penalty known under the Customs laws, because he felt it was impossible for him to do any more or go any further. If the statement be correct that this action was taken under the Customs law, this officer showed he had power to exact the highest penalty offered to him, and he did so. But the hon. gentleman took another turn, and, forgetting that statement, he said in effect he arrested him for an offence under the Fisheries Act, which he well knows to be a violation under that Act in the most important points connected with the fisheries and our contention in regard to them, and he attempted to do nothing. The hon. gentleman must bear in mind that that was an afterthought of Overseer Torey, and it places his position in a worse light. For this reason he sent in a formal report on the arrest and detention of the vessel for an offence against the Customs law; but he sent in a report stating exactly what he did:

"That he arrested this ship, to the value of $10,000, for an infraction of the revenue laws of the Dominion, for having, while in the harbour of Canso, on the night of 21st April, 1890, discharged and sold a portion of her cargo, namely, fresh and salted fish, and did also take on board ice and other fishing supplies, not having obtained a license or permission to do so."

Then he goes on to state all the particulars, stating succinctly that it was not only for a violation of the Custom and fishery laws generally, but pointing out in particular the laws that had been violated. For that offence against the fishery laws he knew the penalty was confiscation, and that the Act of Parliament gave no discretion for any less penalty. He had before him the case of Collector Ross that was discussed in this House last year, where some hon. gentlemen opposite complained of undue severity on the part of the Government. He knew that the answer of the Government had been: that, while the punishment was severe, it was necessary in the most emphatic manner possible to mark disapproval of an officer acting without authority in permitting a violation of the Fisheries Act, contrary to the terms of the Treaty of 1818, and that any other conduct on the part of the Government and any toleration of that irregularity on the part of the officers on our coast would injure our position in any international arrangements on every future occasion when the fishery

treaties were to be considered, and when we insisted that these were not only our rights, but that we had maintained them, and permitted no exception to be made nor waiver to occur. He had all of that before him, yet he hastened to allow that vessel to depart on making a settlement, and he insinuates a personal reason for that conduct. He does not give as a reason want of force to carry the law into effect, but that the amount was made up by people of the locality. This popular officer, for whom a thousand on both sides of politics, as the hon. gentleman said, made representations to the Government to stay their hand and leave him in office; this popular officer no doubt obtained some of that popularity from the fact that in the discharge of his duties he considered all these circumstances on the part of his neighbours and the people of that locality. He has put forward several excuses, and each of these excuses makes the offence more serious than it appeared to be at first sight. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) complains bitterly that we did not dismiss him last year, but the facts in reference to the delay are these: The moment this office heard that he had, without any reference to the department, even by telegram, allowed this ship to go on the imposition of a penalty for the infraction of the Customs law, and no imposition of any penalty for the violation of the Fisheries Act, the department set about obtaining the full facts. The two departments whose officer obtained these full facts just about the time that the Cabinet breaks up in the summer, and the Council was not in a position to fully consider the case until later on. The hon. gentleman knows that the fishing season being over, there was no necessity, so far as the point to which I have alluded was concerned, for any quicker action to be taken. The main thing was that we did take action soon enough to prevent that officer holding that responsible position before the fishing season opened, and care was taken that we were in a position to say, that we have not waived our rights under the Treaty of 1818 in this respect; that there was no case where we allowed any officer to use a discretion of that kind and permit a vessel to come in contrary to the provisions of that treaty and of our Act, and that wherever it was the case, that officer was dismissed or his services dispensed with before the succeeding fishing season. Our position would be weakened and impaired greatly in connection with this subject, if we tolerated such loose conduct on the part of an officer of the department. The hon. gentleman will see, therefore, that the case of the Government has been most fair, that we laid down the principle in the case of Mr. Ross and we carried out the same principle in the case of an old supporter of the Government; a life-long supporter of the Government, as the hon. gentleman says, and a man who is yet in hearty sympathy with the policy of the Government, according to the hon. gentleman. The pretension which the hon. gentleman set up that this was done because it was desired to give his defeated opponent an office, is preposterous. That is entirely wrong. There is no foundation in fact for that, except the opinion which Mr. Torey has entertained, and which he has expressed in a letter addressed to myself. This matter did not sleep, as the hon. gentleman says; it could not have been considered until the full facts were obtained. Mr. Torey was told the impropriety of his conduct, and had every reason to believe, if he was half so intelligent as the hon. gentleman says he was, that his conduct was under consideration and that his case was not finally dealt with. Mr. Torey is an old man, he was long in the service, he had been a good officer, he had been in his earliest years a vigorous officer, he never sent such an excuse as that, he had not the power to enforce the laws over which he was appointed officer and guardian, and his age was considered, his past services were considered, and he was treated as Mr. Ross was treated in being given the benefit of the Superannuation Act. I mentioned before to the hon. gentleman, that this officer knew that an offence was committed against the Fisheries Act as well as against the Customs Act, and he stated so succintly. He never said that it was on account of his weakness, or on account of insufficient force that he acted as he did, but his own excuse, before he was dismissed, was as follows:—

"I beg to say that the seizure was made principally for a violation of the Customs laws, although no doubt the offence was also a violation of the Fisheries Act."

That was incorrect. But he said:

"I dealt with the seizure under the Customs law, and when the amount of $800 was paid to cover the fine that the several parties were liable for under that law, I got under the impression that it was my duty to set the vessel free."

The hon. gentleman knows that that excuse is inconsistent with the statement he gives to-day, to the effect that his reason for letting her free was that he had not force to detain her. The officer himself says:

"I set her free because I believed it was my duty to do so."

The excuse of the officer, I venture to say, if understood in the light it now presents, would have caused the officer to have been dealt with in a different way, and the argument of the hon. gentleman goes to show that the only mistake was, in giving this officer the benefit of the Superannuation Act. An officer who will report to the Government that his act was under the fisheries law and not under the Customs law; an officer who was in the service of the Fisheries Department for twenty years, the commander of a cutter, knowing that the punishment for violation of the Fishery Act in that regard was confiscation, and who writes in reference to the seizure of the vessel for the violation of that law, that he thought all he could impose was a fine of $800, and then after action was taken on that report, states that the reason he did not hold the vessel for confiscation was that he had insufficient force,—an officer who did all that was in the service a sufficiently long time. He puts forward an excuse on the 28th of June, and now he puts in the hon. gentleman's hands a statement that he had not a sufficient force to detain the vessel. On the 28th of June, a year ago, he says: "If I have done wrong, it was for the want of knowing better," and then he gives the excuse which I mentioned before, that the amount of the fine had been made up by the people of the locality. I know that has no relevancy at all; it is for the purpose of showing that he had exercised a discretion not vested in him, and had taken into consideration those mitigating circumstances, but not in the slightest way connected with the commission of the offence or with the offenders. Now, the hon. gentleman must remember, and the House should be informed, that

this case also came up before the authorities of the United States; that is, the consul of the United States made representations in reference to it; and, therefore, the case was one in which the conduct of this Government had to be carried on with the greatest care, and the greatest regularity had to be shown in our dealings with the various vessels, not only the vessel in the case of Collector Ross, but in this case itself, which had come to the knowledge of the United States authorities. Now, there is a letter of recent date; I do not see it attached to this return——

Mr. FRASER. I may say that the Minister gave me those letters as being all the letters I asked for.

Mr. TUPPER. I say I do not observe here a letter sent to the department by this officer, in which he puts forward an additional excuse inconsistent with his first report. That is in April, 1890. The hon. gentleman obtained these papers from the Customs Department; but I have some other papers, which the hon. gentleman can see, and they will show the House that this officer has turned and twisted in regard to this matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand that the alleged infraction of the law took place in April, 1890?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes, in April of last year, and the case was not considered when the report was obtained. When the full facts were obtained, we had reached the end of June of that year, and Parliament not being in session, the Council was not full when the question came up, and it stood over for consideration when the Council should be full; because we had before us, not merely the case of this overseer, the collector of Customs, but an international question that concerned our enforcement of this Act in reference to the fishing vessels of the United States, and we had the communication of the consul of the United States touching the subject. In consequence of its importance it stood over, and, as I explained before, the delay that occurred afterwards when the Council was ready to deal with the subject, at a time when the fishing had ceased, and the foreign fishing vessels were not on our coasts; but the action was taken soon enough in the public interest, previous to the fishing season, when the officer would have to enforce the Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When was he dismissed?

Mr. TUPPER. He was superannuated in May of this year. But the case which the hon. gentleman made out to-day, and the facts that occurred subsequently when he varied entirely his defence, and stated that it was from inability and want of assistance that he did not enforce the Fishery Act, show that there would have been, if these facts had been known, a case of absolute dismissal, instead of the treatment that was accorded to him.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to have all the correspondence.

Mr. BOWELL. I gave the hon. gentleman all the documents I had, and I am sure the hon. Minister of Marine will give him all that he has.

Mr. FRASER. I may say that the letter in which he gives the excuse that he was unable to make the seizure is dated previous to the letter which was read by the hon. Minister of Marine.

Mr. TUPPER. No: read the letter. The hon. gentleman will find that he is misinformed.

Mr. FRASER. The letter from which the hon. gentleman read was dated 28th June, 1890.

Mr. TUPPER. The letter I read was dated in April.

Mr. FRASER. It was in the letter of April, 1891, that he gives the excuse that he could not. I admit all that; but I submit that the Minister makes a very poor case when he says that this man was dismissed because the Government could not deny the matter. The official was continued in office, and the offence was not considered so serious by the Government up to that time. But my opponent said publicly on the streets after the election, that he would be dismissed.

Mr. TUPPER. I am not responsible for that.

Mr. FRASER. I am only showing that the force which was brought to bear on the Government was a force from without and not from within. My opponent said that openly, and he afterwards rejoiced that he was able to carry that threat into effect.

Mr. TUPPER. If that was done, it was without my knowledge.

Mr. FRASER. I wish to have the opportunity of dealing with this matter further, when I get the rest of the correspondence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What became of the fine?

Mr. TUPPER. It went to the Receiver General.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 151) respecting the Ontario Express and Transportation Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House again proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Fisheries—Salaries, &c., P.E.I..... $4,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was not in the House when these items were passed in the Committee of Supply, and I have only a question to ask my hon. friend opposite. It is with reference to Morell River in Prince Edward Island, which is the best fishing rivers in the Island. Formerly very large quantities of the finest trout were caught in it, and efforts have been made by private individuals to preserve many portions of it. Formerly, also, salmon were caught there in large numbers, but of late years, owing to the abominable habit of netting, the river has ceased, to a very large extent, to be a good fishing river, though the sportsmen on the Island have made constant efforts to stop that practice. I think it was two years ago that the department, having already one or two local inspectors, appointed a third gentleman as guardian, Mr. Dowse. He was a resident of Charlottetown: and I find no fault with the appointment, because he had a good deal of knowledge of the fish in that river, had spent much time fishing there, and was

well acquainted with the plans adopted by the poachers to net the river. He was appointed additional guardian, and, I understand, devoted a portion of one summer to protecting the river. Are there any outstanding claims of his against the department, or has the department settled with him, as there was a good deal of talk about this before the Fish and Game Society?

Mr. TUPPER. I will take a note of the question and find out.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Fish and Game Protection Society of the Island some time ago entered into correspondence with the hon. gentleman's department, and, with the laudable object of preserving that river, offered to pay the salary of a proper inspector if the Government would make the appointment, the society to name the man to be appointed. The department, however, refused. I do not understand why they refused. It may not be consistent with the policy of the department to make an appointment and allow a private game society to pay the salary; but so anxious were the society to have a proper man appointed, who would actually and not nominally alone protect the river, that they were perfectly willing to pay the salary if the department would make the appointment. The consequence of the refusal of the department is, that the river is being netted year after year, for want of proper guardians. That is a crying pity, because most excellent sport can be had there and magnificent fish. Some very stern measures will have to be taken to teach the poachers that their offence is not a slight one. They have the idea that netting the river and taking out baskets full of the finest fish is not an offence at all, and if an officer goes to arrest them they look upon him as an intruder, and call upon their neighbours to assist them and protect them when they are violating the law. There is a very strong effort going to be made by the Fish and Game Society to protect that as well as other rivers, and I hope my hon. friend will lend them his official aid in that. I would like to know whether it is true, as is stated, that the department has refused to nominate a man there, though the Fish and Game Society offered to pay his salary.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). The Morel is one of the most important rivers in Prince Edward Island, especially for trout fishing, and I think it is important that the department should protect that river. The fishery wardens in the past have, perhaps, not been properly situated, but I hope the new departure which is being taken by the Minister will have a good effect, and that this fishery, which is a very important one, will be better looked after. There is no doubt that the river is being fished and netted year after year, and to some extent the law is being set at defiance. I understand that the Minister is now going to place wardens on these rivers, and pay them for the time they are actually employed in looking after the stream. If those wardens are judiciously placed I think that will have a very good effect in preventing the netting which has been going on for years past, and I hope the Minister will give it his serious attention next year when the fishing season sets in, and will see that this river, which is the most valuable river we have in the province for trout fishing, will be properly protected.

Mr. TUPPER. I am in thorough accord with the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, as to the importance of giving better protection to the important streams in the different provinces. My difficulty in connection with the Fish and Game Club, who communicated with me, was that at the time I was not in the position which I am now, in regard to the re-organization of the fishery service. The hon. gentlemen very well know that in Prince Edward Island and in Nova Scotia we had a very large number of exceedingly useless officers, who had grown up under the old system prior to Confederation, where a man got a two-penny half-penny salary of $10, $20 and $30 a year. These officers increased in number, and the result was, that while we spent a considerable sum of money on that system, none of these men would take any trouble to enforce the Act, for the simple reason that their salary was nominal and the dangers they ran were exceedingly great, incurring the enmity of neighbours and troubles of all kinds in enforcing what were often unpopular regulations. Now, in such a scheme as is proposed we can co-operate very cordially with the clubs—that is, we can, under proper provisions, resort to the system which the clubs have adopted in regard to the rivers in New Brunswick, where they have their guardians and pay them a fair day's wage for a fair day's work, and they have the opportunity of watching them themselves, and of dispensing with them when they do not perform their duty. During the important seasons, when the fish are running, and so on, it is proposed to adopt that system, and we have been proceeding in that direction gradually in the different districts in Nova Scotia, and now we have reached the Island and intend to do away with the warden system, and appoint from time to time temporary officers, who will be guardians under the overseers, all being under the general supervision of the inspector. I do not remember exactly the issue of the correspondence to which the hon. gentleman refers. It has not been the universal rule to refuse the nomination of a club regularly made, and especially when they pay the salary. On the contrary, we have often clothed the officers of private lessees with the powers of fishery officers, but I suppose the chief difficulty here was that we had no appropriation to meet the cost of the officer, though that hardly meets the case the hon. gentleman refers to, because he says the club offered to pay the salary. I do not know what the objection was. We did to a certain extent co-operate with these people last year, and this year we have to some extent met their wishes. Our chief difficulty was that we were cramped under the old system. We have now taken a different line and the subject has been touched upon in the two last reports of the department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would point out the needlessness of appointing a local man to do this work. He cannot do it. If his neighbour's sons are netting trout, and he attempts to arrest them, he makes a life-long enemy of his next door neighbour. He will not do that, and therefore the necessities require the appointment of a good, energetic, active man, not living in the locality, who could protect the whole river easily enough. I know the appointment of Mr. Dowse a year ago would have been satisfactory if he had been clothed with the proper authority. If you appoint local

men, they cannot arrest their next door neighbours and their children, and haul them before a magistrate. The odium is too great, and therefore an outsider should be appointed.

Fish-breeding..... $263,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not going to enter into a discussion of the very large and important question which is presented to the House here in the vote which we are now asked to concur in. The department, so far, have adhered to their policy of attempting to promote the fisheries by the establishment of fish-breeding establishments: and I suppose that at the present time there is hardly sufficient information before the House to enable it to form any positive opinion upon the utility of this expenditure. I am not going to quote isolated opinions on this, although we have some opinions which are entitled to weight, and which go to show that we are spending ten times as much money as we get returns for. I wish rather to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to one specific point in connection with this vote, and that is the lobster fisheries in the Maritime Provinces. These are very important fisheries. The amount of money they yield and bring into the country every year, the number of men to whom they give employment, and who are engaged in these fisheries, are of themselves sufficient evidence of their great importance. The hon. Minister knows well that year after year there has been a constant struggle going on between the department and this trade for the closing of the lobster fisheries, and to agree upon some plan which will promote and improve the lobster grounds, and against those who are determined to fish them out at all hazards and at all seasons. Now, a great difference of opinion exists. The hon. gentleman appointed a commission some years ago, and I must say the commission presented a report which did not seem to me to be fruitful of very much thought, nor to be productive of very much good: but the result of it all was that the hon. gentleman determined—and, I think, correctly, from the judgment I could form—to shorten the time, not to lease the grounds, as it was once intended to do, to individuals, but to allow them to fish as they had been fishing, but still to form a close season, and to allow them to fish for a very short period, I think from the 1st of May to the middle of July—I speak now with reference to the Island. The results went to show that that was an eminently wise position, and I will challenge contradiction to the fact that after the close season had been in operation for two years the results were very highly satisfactory, and the lobsters have increased so greatly that some gentlemen who had thought of removing their factories to Newfoundland and other places determined to continue the fishery in Prince Edward Island. There was every promise, therefore, of a reasonable and fair catch for the present and for future years, and I think the best men engaged in the fishery, although they entertain, many of them, different ideas about it, have all come to the conclusion, after the experience of one or two seasons, that the policy of shortening the time for catching lobsters solved the whole question; at any rate, it solved it to such an extent that the grounds were improving, the quantity caught was enormously increased, and there did not seem to be any reason why, if that was adhered to, we should not have for many years to come, perhaps for all time to come, a continuance of that rich and productive industry. Now, for some reason or other, owing to some pressure, I do not know what, the hon. gentleman reversed his policy this year, and when that close-season had expired, on the 15th of July, I suppose on the application of a number of packers, he extended the time further. What was the result? The result is, that the grounds are being fished out again, and next year the results will be very much worse, of course, than they are this. On the one hand, he has paid out large sums of money to breed lobsters, and on the other hand he has extended the time during which they can be caught, and has left the lobster fisheries to be depleted. I will read to him a letter which I received from the owner of the large lobster factories the other day on this subject, and it shows, I think, the opinion of, by long odds, a majority of the lobster packers—I do not mean to say in number; I do not mean to say that a large number of smaller lobster packers would not desire to extend the time for a month, or six weeks, or two months; they would keep it open as long as they can catch fish, whether the fish is in a proper condition to catch or not. But I say the better class of the fishermen desire that this fishery should be conserved and protected, and do not desire to see the extension of time. I think the policy adopted by the department this year was a ruinous policy. The hon. gentleman is educating the lobster packers up to the belief that no rule or order passed by the department will resist the application of political influence. Now, I want him to explain, to-night, why it was that the season was extended when it worked so well the year previous. The letter to which I refer reads as follows:—

"The Marine and Fisheries Department are playing the mischief with our Island lobster fisheries. For your information, in case you may use it in debate, I will state the position. About six or seven years ago they wisely shortened the lobster fishing season from the 1st of May to the 16th of July. The waters of the Gulf had been fished out previously by allowing lobsters to be caught pretty much all the open season, and they had become so scarce that nearly all the small factories had to close and the large ones were hardly making both ends meet. There has been a marked improvement since, and for the last three years it has been a paying business. In addition to shortening the season, the regulations as to size and spawn fish have been very stringent, and the factories have been watched, fines, &c., inflicted. Of course, most of the factories thought the regulations were too stringent, but I am not going to enter upon that question now. They were all pretty generally agreed upon this point, namely, that with a view of preserving the industry the open season was long enough. Some few of the large factories would have preferred the season shortened to the 1st of July. This year, without rhyme or reason, the Minister extended the season to the 1st of August. Mr. Prowse, I, and some other large packers, close on the 15th of July. We considered the extension of time destructive of the business, and would not take advantage of it, but small packers have been fishing straight along up to the 12th instant, and have not been molested. The worst feature in the extension of time is that a large proportion of spawn lobsters come on the grounds about the middle of July, and the fish are also not in a good condition for canning, as it is the shell-casting season. Curiously enough, the Government have an artificial herring establishment on Pictou Island, and are at the same time allowing the ova-bearing lobsters to be destroyed by the thousands by giving the extension of time."

I cannot put the matter as tersely and as lucidly as I think my correspondent has put it. He has very great experience in this business, extending over a great many years, has a very large number of factories, and an enormous amount of capital invested; and having read his letter, I submit his

remarks for the consideration of the Minister and ask for an explanation.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I would like to ask the Minister if this amount includes a sum for extending the hatchery for lobsters as well as other fish. I was going to say that that is the most important feature of the whole lobster fisheries just now, and I think it is a branch of business to which the Minister should give his attention. From correspondence I have had last year from Newfoundland on this question, I think, if my memory serves me right, that the lobster hatchery there met with wonderful success, and that something like 480,000,000 of young lobsters were put into the water that had been hatched by a very simple process. Now, if that is a fact, and if the hatchery that has been started in Pictou County this year has met with the success that I hear it has had, I think that contains the whole solution of the lobster business, and that if we can successfully hatch out lobsters in the way it is said they are doing in these hatcheries it will do away with any necessity of making stringent laws with respect to the protection of the fisheries further than shortening the season. The shortening of the season is ample and sufficient for the protection of the business. What I supposed the Minister had in view was the late season this year at which the fishery commenced and the serious storms that had occurred during the season, when he made the mistake of extending the season this year until 1st August. With respect to the fishing in our county, I can safely say that the fishermen as a whole were well pleased with the usual season they have been having of late years, and it would have been better had the season ended at the usual time. With respect to the size of the lobsters, I think that matter should be left very much to the fishermen themselves. All that is necessary, in order to preserve that valuable branch of the business, is to restrict the season to the time allowed for several years past. If that is done, the business will look after itself. In King's County those who prosecute the fishery have not been greedy about an extension of the season at any time, and they would always be perfectly satisfied and willing, if there was no law to restrict, to close at the period named, if not before, and in some cases they have closed before, but at all events they would be quite satisfied to close at the time set down by the department. I believe the fishery will be maintained and even improved by the short season, without imposing any further restrictions on the fishermen. That fact is to be seen established in the improvement of the fishery in our county, where the short season has been adhered to, and where the fishery is improving year after year. I hope the Minister will give his earnest attention to the lobster hatcheries, and if the process is as simple as I am given to understand it is, he will see it is introduced in every section, not only of Prince Edward Island, but of the lower provinces, where lobster fishing is carried on, and that the immense quantities of ova that are now destroyed and go into the boilers—for these lobsters will be taken as long as lobster factories are in existence—will be utilized. If the hatchery system can be carried out as regards lobsters we will be able to return to the sea more lobsters than are taken from it, and thus keep up the supply from a source that is now lost sight of. I hope the Minister will give this subject his close attention, and establish lobster hatcheries wherever they are required.

Mr. TUPPER. This subject is a very important one to the Maritime Provinces, and it is very gratifying to the Department of Fisheries to find there is an entire change on the part of the lobster packers in reference to the regulations which have been enforced, in the report of the Lobster Commission to which the hon. gentleman has referred. The chief feature of the report was the radical change which was recommended in regard to the open season. At one time the lobster packer took lobsters both in spring and fall, the close season varying nearly every year in the middle or summer months. That was a condition of affairs that was confusing and, certainly, not as it should have been. I have, with a great deal of difficulty, endeavoured to enforce this close season, notwithstanding the opposition of packers in almost every district. It shows how impossible it is to please everybody, when this year the extension given has aroused considerable displeasure among the packers of Prince Edward Island, or a certain number of them. But I may say, in explanation, that a large number of packers communicated with me, protesting against this extension, after the season had been extended, and they "let the cat out of the bag," by saying, not merely that it was against the interest of the fishing to make the extension, but that great anxiety was felt as to its effect on the price of the catch, and they mentioned in their telegram to me that an extension would lower the price of the lobsters already caught. Whatever was their chief consideration, the question is still before us as to maintaining rigidly this close season, which, in Prince Edward Island, ends 15th July. I can tell the House that the extension proposed in the Island and a part of New Brunswick was made under certain misapprehension, and to that extent is a reflection perhaps on my department. It is better to state how that extension came about. There were very strong representations from Cape Breton Island made to the department, setting out that there had been exceptional storms and an enormous number of traps had been carried away, that fishing had been interrupted during a large portion of the season, that the lobsters were in splendid condition, and that a short extension of time would not this year be injurious to the lobster fishing. That was during the early portion of this session. I gave directions to ascertain from our own officers how far those representations were correct. There was not much opportunity for careful enquiry, for this reason: that the request from the different districts had been received towards the end of the regular season, and the decision of the department was required to be very quickly made, in order that there might be no interregnum or lapse between the regular season and the beginning of the next. The representations were verified as regards Cape Breton. My directions were that when the circumstances were similar, when the condition of the fish was good, when there had been a great loss of traps, accordingly a smaller catch proportionately, similar treatment should be accorded to the different districts, so that the department would not be in the position of doing for one district what it would not do for another. There was a misapprehension, and

instructions went out, before I had the opportunity to correct them, extending the season not merely there, but in Prince Edward Island, and in one of the New Brunswick districts. There was considerable complaint from many persons interested in New Brunswick. All these facts went to show that the salvation of the lobster fishery had been brought about by the regulations prohibiting the fall fishing. I agree that it is most dangerous for the department to grant an extension of time, but the circumstances as regard the Cape Breton fisheries brought to my attention were exceedingly strong, the lobsters there being in an exceptional condition as to size and quantity, and the fishery having been interrupted many weeks of the season. In many of the districts, unlike other districts on the southern part of Nova Scotia, they cannot take the lobsters until the ice is gone, and the season on the Island is for that reason very much limited indeed. It is true that the packers protested, but, under all the circumstances, the inspector is of opinion that an extension for ten days might with safety be granted, that is, with safety to the interest of the fishery, and the extension was accordingly granted in these districts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Some of them fished up to the 12th August.

Mr. TUPPER. Of course, it is one of these many cases in which we have had tremendous difficulty, and one would require almost an army of men to stop that illegal packing; but the hon. gentleman will find on enquiry that it was not done by the regular packers. Hitherto the boiling of the lobsters had been left to the men who had possessed themselves of a certain amount of capital, and built factories, but the fishermen find that during this close season they can with very little expense boil the lobsters and pack them, and just as in the case of illicit stills against the Inland Revenue, all along the coast of Nova Scotia we have had a great deal of difficulty in breaking up that illegal business, which is a new difficulty in the experience of the department. I am not surprised that on the Island there has been that experience, although not on such a large scale. Between the last season and the one before there has been a great deal of difference in this, because during the last two seasons we have enforced the law so rigorously that the department has been sharply taken to task on many occasions for alleged hardship upon a class of very poor men, and the hon. gentleman knows that it is unfortunately true that those men who do enter that business are oftentimes strengthened by the excuse of the poverty of themselves and families. Now, with reference to the question of lobster hatcheries. I saw that in the sister colony of Newfoundland Mr. Neilson, whom the Government of that country very wisely employed a year or two ago, had met with great success in the hatching out of the lobster, and seeing the desperate condition that we were on the eve of in the Maritime Provinces in regard to that important business, we sent Mr. Wilmot there, and he came back and reported that there was no great difficulty in hatching out the eggs of the lobster; that it was very closely allied to the system of hatching out the ordinary fish eggs, and he selected a suitable spot in the County of Pictou, at Caribou, just across from the Island, in the Northumberland Straits.

Mr. FORBES. Might I ask the hon. gentleman where else these hatcheries will be placed?

Mr. TUPPER. We have every reason to believe that this will be a success, for although this hatchery was only built in the middle of the season, we were able to deposit 6,000,000 of young lobsters in the Northumberland Straits, and nearly all of these eggs would in the ordinary course have gone with the other lobsters to the hatcheries and been destroyed. If this is a success, as we have every reason to believe it will be, the policy of the Government will be to extend the hatcheries at proper distances through the Maritime Provinces. The present hatchery is situated in one of the most important lobster districts in the province, as will be seen by a reference to the number of factories along that shore, and the site is one from which a large district can be served. The hon. gentleman knows that the lobster travels very quickly and moves over a very large territory, so that the hatchery there will extend over a large area. It is also proposed at small expense to adopt these floating incubators, and some of the factories have taken them up, and under the supervision of Commander Gordon they have commenced hatching out the eggs from them. One of the hon. gentlemen who spoke upon this subject, and who is most familiar with the whole question, says that he does not sympathize with the regulation about the size of the lobsters caught. I think that objection will soon be removed on the island. It was a most serious matter, because the lobsters had diminished so much in size that the enforcement of that regulation meant, as was alleged, the prohibition of the fishery, but the inspector on the Island maintained that the regulation was necessary, and it would be unwise to depart from the principles laid down in this matter in the regulations of other countries. In Newfoundland, where a great deal of attention is paid to this subject, Mr. Neilson considers that regulation as most essential, and the regulation as to the sizes is larger there, and the lobsters, perhaps, may be larger, too. Experts, outside of the business, and not concerned in the moneyed part of it, are practically unanimous that a regulation size should be laid down, so that we have not been able to depart from that; but, as the hon. gentleman knows, it is most extraordinary what some packers will do on occasions. We have found them taking lobsters under 4 inches in length, and every one can see what a fraud it is to put an article like that upon the market, and the bad name it gives to the Canadian lobster, as well as the injury done to the fishery by the destruction in these young lobsters of millions of lobsters, which, if it were allowed to reach a mature age, would have gone to increase the fishery.

Mr. PERRY. I am very glad that a discussion has taken place with respect to the lobster fisheries of the lower provinces. I am not opposed to honest, fair and square regulations for the protection of these fisheries. I believe they require to be protected. But I am opposed to a vacillating policy of having one set of regulations this year and another set next year; I am opposed to having one policy for a certain class of people and another policy for another class of people. We know that it is dangerous to place so much power in the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It makes

him liable to be led away at the instance of political friends, and perhaps to cause loss and damage to political enemies. I know that in my own county two or three years ago several parties were fined for catching and packing lobsters undersized. Every Liberal was fined, but every Conservative, without exception, got free. One man's case was carried to the Supreme Court and he got free. Another man, who ran an election in the interest of the Conservative Government of the province, also got free; he was fined $100, but the fine was never collected. These things are not correct. I am informed that on the south side of the Island friends of the Government are still fishing lobsters. The Minister told us the other day that he had applied the pruning knife all the way round, and had now no fishery wardens. The result is, that he has no person to look after the lobster fisheries. It is not fair that the people on the north side of the Island have to submit to the regulations of the department, while their friends on the south side are fishing lobsters out of season. About the 15th of July the lobster fishing is over, but the Minister thought proper, at the suggestion of some political friends, I suppose, to extend the time to the 1st of August. The fishermen on the north side took up their traps; but on the south side, which from the west point of the Island down to Summerside is a lobster fishing ground, I am told by trustworthy people fishing is still going on. Does the Minister know nothing about this? Has he no person there to protect the fisheries? What is the use of his passing regulations if he does not take proper means to carry them out? There ought to be a fixed time for these traps to be taken up. If it is to be the 15th of July, let it be so; and if it is to be 1st of August, let it be so. It is wrong to have one regulation one year and another regulation another year. The Minister may be tempted by the prayers of his friends, or they may tell him that if he does not do this, that, or the other, they will put him out at the next election. We know that these influences are brought to bear in some cases; and a rule or regulation which is made by a Minister to accommodate an individual is likely to be against the interest of the great majority of the people engaged in these fisheries. These regulations ought to be more uniform than they are; and I would advise the Minister to make enquiries to-morrow as to the people who are still using the fishing grounds. I can name the parties; I know who they are, and I know they are friends of the Government. But by the time the red tape is put into operation and a message is sent to Prince Edward Island, I suppose these people will have made a snug little fortune, by being left free to fish for a month or six weeks longer than the people on the north side of the Island. It is not fair. The hon. gentleman told us the other day, in answer to my hon. friend from Queen's, that we have no more fishery wardens, and that the protection of the fisheries is to be left to some person specially appointed for the purpose. I would like to know whether anyone has been appointed to protect the fisheries of Prince Edward Island. Who is to protect the inland fisheries, the fisheries in the rivers and brooks, where the hon. gentleman expects to plant a lot of small fish? I do not know. I am sure he is not going to have the steamer *Stanley* or any other ship run up the brooks to see who are breaking the laws or the regulations of the department there. Those fishery wardens cost only about $30 a year, and there are not a great many of them about the Island. The Island is a small patch of land; but the fisheries around its shores are very valuable and worth protecting; the Minister knows that there are no fish caught about the coasts of the Maritime Provinces as good as those caught on the north side of Prince Edward Island. They are worth protecting. I know fishermen on the north side of the Island who have thousands of dollars invested in this industry, and who employ a great many men, who consume more dutiable articles perhaps than men following any other occupation. They have to buy their clothing, their flour, their molasses—I will not say their sugar, because my hon. friend would tell me they are getting it free, though I do not believe it. They are large contributors to the revenue of the country, and they are aiding in developing the resources of the country. Those people ought not to be trampled down by the arbitrary rules of the department; and the sooner my hon. friend the Minister of Fisheries makes uniform laws and regulations the better. Now, this year he has extended the time fifteen days. Does the hon. gentleman intend to do the same next year? He will not say so. I suppose if the Grits next year ask him to do it he will not, but if he is asked by the Conservatives no doubt he will. That has been my experience, and I believe the experience of every gentleman connected with the business. I am not opposed to having rules and regulations, but I am opposed to having one rule for one party and another rule for another.

Mr. FORBES. Before this item is concurred in I would like to give my approval to the remarks of the last speaker. I am a bitter opponent of the vacillating policy followed for the last few years by the Minister of Marine. It is absolutely necessary, in the interests of those who have invested their money in factories around the shore, that they should know when and for how long they require to engage their men. There may be occasions when, on the northern coast of Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island, it may be necessary to extend this season, but along the south shore I cannot see that it is very necessary to extend it beyond the regular stated period fixed by Order in Council.

Mr. TUPPER. There was no extension this year.

Mr. FORBES. I admit that, but we never know when there is going to be one. What jurisdiction has the department over the fisheries of Anticosti?

Mr. TUPPER. The same as over other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. gentleman's policy in extending the time there I rather approve of, because the snow there sets in earlier in the fall and extends very late the next year. I have known it to be well up in June before the fishermen could get clear of the ice and make any headway. I would also ask the hon. gentleman if he can give us any definitive proposal as to the extension of this lobster hatchery business?

Mr. TUPPER. Nothing further than what I said, that until we have some experience—and we will have that this year—we cannot state how much money we will ask Parliament to sanction next year.

Mr. FORBES. Does the hon. gentleman intend confining his attempts to the County of Pictou entirely?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes; at present.

Mr. FORBES. I would submit, with all deference, that is hardly fair to the enterprise.

Mr. TUPPER. I know the locality will not please the hon. gentleman, but the principle is this: We have started with one hatchery, and it would be certainly unwise to experiment with more than one.

Mr. FORBES. I should imagine the best locality would be where the lobsters are either being depleted, as regards number or size, or where there are a large number of factories. On the south shore of Nova Scotia we have from ten to fifteen factories alone.

Mr. TUPPER. If the scheme is a success, the Government will be disposed to ask Parliament to extend the system into different districts where the lobster fishing is pursued. It has been started, and six million lobsters have been hatched out this season.

Mr. FORBES. Does the department intend locating the incubators around the shore?

Mr. TUPPER. The idea is to have the co-operation of the lobster factories. There will be very little trouble; as long as they take the supervision we will supply the incubator at very small cost. It is a flat box, and these will be given to the factories, which will take charge of them.

Mr. FORBES. Another thing is the enormous cost of the steamers and vessels mentioned in these estimates. It is put down as $100,000 for these few schooners and a couple of steamers. I submit that is an extravagant figure for the small service they perform.

Mr. TUPPER. You must not leave out the steamers.

Mr. FORBES. There are only one or two.

Mr. TUPPER. There are four. There is the *Dream*——

Mr. FORBES. She is a dream, as far as we are concerned, for we never see her around our section.

Mr. TUPPER. You do not require her.

Mr. FORBES. Positively the reverse. American fishermen have been known to come well within the three-mile limit and drop their purse-seines.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is hardly fair. He quarrels with the amount of money required to support a certain number of vessels, and then he desires us to have more vessels.

Mr. FORBES. What I object to is, that the amount is extravagantly used.

Mr. TUPPER. Prove it.

Mr. FORBES. I will give an instance. In the localities where these watch-dogs are required they are never found when the enemy is approaching. The whole coast can be protected if the Government will take the matter in hand. The vessels are kept on the inland waters and further up the Gulf of St. Lawrence, instead of being kept on the south shore, where the American fishermen can speedily approach from the outside limits. When the guard boats are not around they slip into the Canadian waters in broad daylight, and in open view of our fishermen. I have no desire to cut down the service, but in view of the insufficient return given for this expenditure I think there must be a leak somewhere. There are not so many seizures made as formerly, and the law is not so vigorously enforced. The fishermen rightly own the inshore fisheries and are opposed to any illegal and unjust interference. No doubt, that is due to a desire on the part of the Government not to irritate the Americans: still, if on payment of the paltry amount of $1.50 the American fishermen get almost equal privileges to our own, except as regards catching within the three-mile limit, our fisheries should be more carefully protected.

Mr. BOWERS. I have no complaint to find, as my hon. friend from Queen's has, with regard to the protection service. In St. Mary's Bay and the Bay of Fundy last fall, when the mackerel were in, the steamer *Dream* came over and did good work in keeping the American schooners out of the bay. I have nothing to find fault with in that respect. I would say to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that I do not think this rule in regard to lobster fishing should be a cast-iron rule. I think that, in our counties of Digby, Annapolis, Yarmouth, and along there, there should be an extension of fifteen days in the time for catching lobsters, and that is not only my opinion, but the attention of the Minister of Marine has been called to it, I think, by Lieutenant Gordon in his report on that subject. It must be remembered that in the Bay of Fundy we have no weather permitting lobster traps to be set much before the middle of May, and in some places before the 1st of June. And sometimes in the month of May violent gales of wind set in, whereby most of the traps are lost. The lobsters caught in traps in the Baie des Chaleurs are canned, but ours are shipped alive to the American market, and in July they rise in price to 8 cents and 10 cents apiece, when our fishermen have been getting only 3½ cents to 5 cents apiece in the earlier part of the season. If they could fish for this fifteen days longer, the pecuniary profit to them during the first fifteen days of July would be as much as the profit during the whole month of June, and it would make no difference in the price of the factory lobsters, because there are only one or two factories in our county, and they can only catch the small lobsters ranging from 9 inches to 10½ inches. I hope the Minister will not make the size for saving any smaller than it is now. I think our fishermen as a general rule would like to have the size 10½ inches, as it is on the coast of Maine, and that all under that size should be thrown overboard. This they regard as all the protection that is needed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that among the vessels employed for the protection of the fishery is a vessel of the name of *Dream*, as to which I should like to have some information. If I am correctly informed, she is a steamer of 25 tons or 29 tons—I am not sure which—and a rental is paid for her of $3,600 a year. She is rented, I believe, from a Mr. Thorne, who occupies the onerous position of President of the Conservative Association down there somewhere.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; he is a first-rate man.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And from what I hear it is stated that:

"The *Dream* is fit only for service on St. John River above the falls—absolutely useless in the Bay of Fundy in winter, in even moderately rough weather. One of our 10-ton Irishman-rigged fishing boats, handled by a Grand Mananer——"

Whatever that may be—

—" would drown the *Dream* ten times in ten hours at any season."

I am not capable of forming an opinion as to what the Grand Mananer's craft might do; but, if this vessel is only about 29 or 30 tons, and if she is not fit to keep the Bay of Fundy in rough weather, even admitting that Mr. Thorne is a valuable friend of the Government, it seems that $3,600 a year is a dear figure to pay for her. These are the facts as they have been stated to me. I understand that the *Dream* is employed sometimes for other services, which, I suppose, are useful to the Dominion. I see, among other things, that it is stated that the *Dream*, a day or two before the 15th August, was utilized to carry a certain George J. Clarke to Grand Manan and the Islands to obtain Conservative names to be added to the list. I should like to know something about the *Dream*. It is clear that this *Dream* is a reality and not a vision, as for several years $3,600 a year rent has been paid for her, and I should be glad to hear the views of the Minister as to the services she can render. A craft of that size is certainly not fit to encounter very rough weather in the Bay of Fundy or elsewhere.

Mr. TUPPER. The *Dream* is not a large vessel, but she has performed very important work, and performed it well, since 1887, and the charter that the hon. gentleman alludes to includes not merely the ship itself but the keeping of her in repair by the owner. The repairs on these ships form a very expensive item, as I know by the ships owned by the department, and a very large sum has been spent by the owner, Mr. Thorne, from whom we chartered that boat. I think this boat cost originally $16,000. She was built for pleasure purposes originally, and it was thought she would suit the purposes of the department in 1887; and she is not required, for the purposes for which she was first got—guarding and protecting the herring fisheries of the bay—to stand out in very bad weather, but she is employed from one end of the year to the other at $300 a month. The only trouble we have experienced is when it is necessary to send her across the Bay of Fundy—for instance, to St. Mary's Bay, in Digby County. With a bad sea it would be difficult for the *Dream* to make that trip. That was not the original purpose for which she was obtained, nor was she secured to patrol those waters. With reference to Mr. Clarke's trip, I am responsible for that. I asked that gentleman to give me some advice in reference to the organization of the fisheries in that district in which he lives, and I authorized him to go to Grand Manan on the *Dream*. In reference to the obtaining of names for the voters' list, that is something I did not hear of until the hon. gentleman mentioned it; but I asked Mr. Clarke to go there and make enquiries for me in reference to the fisheries, and he asked if he could go on the ship. The commander of the ship would have no authority to allow anyone on her without permission given by the responsible head of the department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman stated that she cost $16,000.

Mr. TUPPER. I am not sure. I am only speaking from recollection.

Mr. GILLMOR. I hardly think the *Dream* would cost $16,000. I have represented Charlotte County for thirty years, and I think I could have given my friend any information he required, without his having to go to the expense of sending Mr. Clarke to my county in the steamboat.

Mr. TUPPER. I might have asked the hon. gentleman to go away, but probably he would have preferred to stay here and vote.

Mr. GILLMOR. It would not have been at all necessary for me to go away in order to give the hon. gentleman the information. With regard to the *Dream*, there has been various opinions. It is my impression that the *Dream* is very well fitted for a large part of the service in the Bay of Fundy in the inner bays. She is a very nice little vessel. I do not know about the charter, whether it is very high or not, but I should think it was a pretty good price.

Mr. TUPPER. It would be high without the provision for keeping her in repair.

Mr. GILLMOR. All owners of vessels keep them in repair. I think the *Dream* is a very convenient and nice little vessel, and as far as I know she has rendered very good service. I would like to enquire of the Minister about those boats that were seized—have they been given up?

Mr. TUPPER. They have been given up.

Mr. GILLMOR. I am very glad they have been given up. I was very sorry they were seized. There is a dividing line there which is not marked off in any way, and they have always been in the habit of fishing close to that line. Now, with regard to protecting the fisheries, I hope the time is not far distant when our relations with our friends across the border will be such that we will not need to be watching when these vessels go across a certain line. I do not believe it is at all necessary for the protection of the fisheries. Two months ago we had a discussion here about the fisheries, and about the habits of the fish, and my friends from Nova Scotia concluded that the process of fishing was depleting the whole Atlantic fisheries, and that the herrings were all exhausted. What is the result now? Only a few weeks, and the herrings are as plentiful as ever. I am informed that you can get a hogshead of herrings now, five barrels of these small herrings, of which they make sardines, for $2. The mackerel are coming in, and yet only a few weeks ago we were told that the process of fishing had destroyed the fish. It is quite impossible for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to make rules that will satisfy everybody; he cannot make them to satisfy the few gentlemen that are here representing those constituencies. The fact is, that very little is known with regard to these artificial processes of breeding lobsters and salmon, and I think myself that it is money thrown away. I think that the natural, old-fashioned way of multiplying the fish and every thing else is the best way. You cannot make much of these artificial processes of incubating lobsters and other fish. I do not think that much good can come from money expended in that way. I know that the Minister of Marine is very anxious to make a record for himself with regard to protecting the fisheries, and I approve of it. Now, in these days

we see rich gentlemen and societies trying to preserve the rivers for themselves to fish in for sport; I do not approve of that at all. In this country I would like to see the streams and the rivers open to all the people, so that they can go out and catch a salmon or catch a trout whenever they want to. I do not want to see the rivers locked up by a few wealthy men, and all the rest of the people prevented from catching a mess of trout, because these fresh-water fish do not come into the market. Latterly this new system of things has sprung up, so that rich men own streams, and companies are formed who own streams, and the Local Governments control them—the Dominion Government control them, or protect them at any rate, and give them the young fish to stock these rivers, while the people have got to stand aside and look on and see the rich man enjoy the sport. The masses of the people do not go there for sport; they go to get fish for food purposes, and they are prevented by this new custom that has sprung up. With regard to the protection of fisheries, I think a great deal too much effort has been put forth in that direction. I do not believe that the fisheries are going to be depleted; I do not believe it is in the power of people to exhaust the fish in the ocean. They increase so rapid that it is impossible to exhaust the herring especially, and, as I said before, the herring are the food for all the other fish in the sea. Members here talk frequently about the water becoming polluted in the Atlantic Ocean. How are you going to pollute the waters in the Atlantic Ocean? Why, the natural scavengers that are in the ocean eat up all the offal and the dead fish before they get to the bottom. There are all kinds of fish in the ocean, and they eat all sorts of food, and the offal does not go to make the water impure or to kill the fish. It is all a myth, all a sham, and all a humbug.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to call attention to the *Dream*, which has been referred to by my hon. friend. She is in the service of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and Mr. Thorne, the gentleman in whose name she is leased for the Fishery Department, I think, ought to be exonorated from personally appropriating to himself the very large and enormous profits which he derives from leasing this boat. He receives $3,600 a year, and I have been told by a gentleman, within the last three weeks, that if she was not under charter to the hon. gentleman she would at once be sold.

Mr. TUPPER. No; we asked him if he wanted to sell it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Thorne is a shrewd business man, and would not sell what is giving him $3,600 a year. I want to call attention to the fact that $3,600 a year does not, by any means, represent what that little toy costs this country. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Auditor General's Report he will find that the total cost of the boat is $8,240. In addition to paying $3,600 for the charter to W. H. Thorne we pay about $4,640 for running this little boat—say a total cost of $8,240. I would advise the Minister to buy him out or give up the charter. It is very well to have a joke over this matter, but it is rather too serious. I have been told by some gentlemen from St. John that one year's charter is more than the value of the whole boat, and if that is so, this is, on a small scale, a small outrage. Now, I want to say one word respecting the remarks make by the hon. member for Prince County (Mr. Perry). He states that the extension of the time for lobster fishing, which was extended beyond the 15th of July to the first of August, has been taken advantage of by these people, and that they are actually fishing up to this moment. Now, that is unfair in the interest of these lobster packers, and it is unfair to the general public besides. The hon. gentleman spoke of a representation made by a certain number of lobster packers against these people being allowed to continue to fish beyond the proper season, on the ground that it would impair and lower the value of the fish.

Mr. TUPPER. Their telegram mentioned that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not wonder at it; I do not wonder at their protesting. I want to point out to the hon. gentleman that the fish caught at this season—and I am speaking now with reference to the Prince Edward Island shores, of which I know something from the lobster packers—the fish caught at this season of the year are of a very inferior quality. The lobster is not a fit fish in August to be caught and packed, and the result is that the quality of the fish put on the market is so much inferior to the first-class fish we catch during the proper season the value of the catch is more or less affected. I have no doubt that is one of the reasons why the packers object to that being done. I do not place as much confidence in the rules of the department with respect to the size of the fish as I do with respect to the time during which the fishing should continue. How do the larger packers fish? A gentleman has a large factory and considerable money invested in it. He employs men in his neighbourhood, from 10 to 100, who go out in their own boats and catch the lobsters and bring them in. Very often they have a few lobsters under size. But I say it is not to the interests of the large packers to catch small-sized lobsters.

Mr. TUPPER. In one case we took 300 under 4 inches at a factory just as they were being packed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That statement is an important one. I assert, however, that it is not their interest to do it, but they cannot help it. The men go and catch the lobsters and take some small ones; and it is prejudicial to the owners of the factories to be constantly harassed by officers going to the factories to look at the size of the fish. This would not be necessary if the lobster packers understood that the department was determined that there should be a close season, and that on a particular day the factories should close down. But the lobster packers only laugh about the matter, and they do not believe there is a close season. They are fishing to the detriment of the industry and to the destruction of the quality of our fish in the markets to which they are sent. I know of nothing calculated to impair the high reputation which Prince Edward Island fish bear in the markets of the world than to permit those men to fish at this improper time, and send improperly-canned fish abroad to compete with the splendid fish we take and can at the proper season. Lobster packers should understand that the department mean business, and that when the time is up no political influence would be allowed to prevail to extend the season up to the middle of August, as it is now. I fear very great injury will be done, and

the statements which my hon. friend made are not only confirmed by observations which I have made myself, but they are even worse.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not think the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Perry) is well informed; but in order to meet the chief point which he made, that there was favouritism, I can assure him that if he will give me the information he mentioned, when he said that people had violated the laws, I will see that everybody is prosecuted, and that will test the question whether there is favouritism, or that it is done, as he intimates, with the sanction of the Fisheries Department. I undertake that if he will supply me with specific information, which he says he has, of violations of the lobster regulations in Prince County or anywhere else, I will place it in the department and proceedings will be taken.

Mr. PERRY. It is not my business to give information to the department, but it is the duty of the department to find it out.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman said he had important information, and he should let the department have it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose that, when a member representing the county states that he has information that a number of packers are fishing illegally, the Minister will telegraph the inspector that such representations have been made in the House and insist on the inspector taking means to stop it.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is worth while spending a little time discussing this item under consideration, and to offer that criticism it deserves. It appears that the steamer *Dream* is rented at an amount yearly that represents almost her entire cost, $3,600. When we note the fact that we spent last year $8,240 in keeping Mr. Thorne dancing round with a little boat professedly protecting the fisheries, it is the duty of the Opposition to closely criticize the item and ferret out the reason why that man is favoured—for it must be a favour—in this way.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the amount?

Mr. McMULLEN. $8,240 was the entire expense of the boat. It is so stated in C—127 of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. TUPPER. That covers more than twelve months. The exact amount for the year is $787.88.

Mr. McMULLEN. We will call it $8,000.

Mr. FOSTER. We will not say that $8,000 were paid to Mr. Thorne, because it would not be true.

Mr. McMULLEN. We will call it that amount as expense for operating the boat.

Mr. FOSTER. $8,000 were not paid to Mr. Thorne to keep him dancing round for fisheries protection.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is true he got his rent, and all that was necessary in connection with running the boat down to the wages from the Dominion treasury. In that way there was, between rent and expenses, the sum of $8,000 expended last year.

Mr. FOSTER. He does not touch a cent of it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Am I to believe the Auditor General's Report or the Minister? I prefer taking the Auditor General's Report, for my experience is that I am more likely thereby to reach the truth than by taking the statement of any hon. gentleman across the House.

Mr. FOSTER. You would not like to censure any one?

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not consider I am censuring anyone, and I am only stating what I, in my experience, believe to be the truth. It is quite clear that that money has been spent on that boat. It has been stated by my hon. friend, and no doubt correctly, that the value of the boat is, perhaps, $3,600, or a year's rent. What position does this favoured individual occupy in St. John? I have heard it stated that he is president of the Conservative Association of that city. Perhaps that explains the whole matter. If that is the position, and if, in order to keep that association in a flourishing condition, it is desirable to spend on a boat of that kind the sum of money we annually expend on it, that fact may explain the whole thing. The owner, certainly, was not dreaming when he rented the *Dream* for a certain amount: he was wide awake. The Government must have been dreaming when they allowed themselves to accept a contract for running a small boat for $3,600 a year, professedly for the protection of the fisheries, and furnishing everything for the purpose of running it. Items of this kind should be dispensed with; we should agree to cut off such expenditures. There is no necessity for them, and whenever we strike a matter of this kind it is usual to find in it some political reason. It is done for a political purpose, for the purpose of keeping some person in a condition so that he can render very valuable services to hon. gentlemen opposite. I say if there is a reason of that kind the country has no right to pay for a little boat carrying 25 or 30 tons, $3,600 a year and paying a lot of money outside. It cannot be a very large vessel, for I see an anchor was rented for it at $4 a year. It must be a small institution when an anchor of that kind was quite sufficient to keep her in her place. It is quite clear in the face of the statements that have been made, that there is something wrong about this thing, and the Minister should not be deluded by a dream of this kind into spending so much money.

Mr. FOSTER. I would be sorry to see a statement of that kind go on *Hansard* and be a matter of record, in the shape in which it was placed before the House. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) says that he prefers taking the Auditor General's Report to the word of the Minister. That is a mere matter of taste; but I should imagine other gentlemen on the other side of the House would be somewhat anxious to keep within the lines of what was really true and in accordance with the facts. It is a fact that the *Dream* is rented, and that the rent which is paid to the owners—not the owner, but the owners—of the boat is $300 per month, and if my hon. friend had stated that he would have stated the truth.

Mr. TUPPER. That includes repairs.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that rental includes repairs. It is to be borne in mind by the Committee, that when a sum of $300 per month is paid for that vessel, it means that the owners keep her in perfect repair year in and year out. That is true, but when my hon. friend, for whatever purpose,

goes a little further and says that the Government find it convenient to pay a Mr. Thorne who is the head of the Liberal-Conservative Association in St. John, $8,000 a year out of the public funds, in order to keep him dancing around on fishery protection service, then my hon. friend goes entirely beyond the record of what is true. The Government pays, as I said before, $300 per month, and it has had that vessel now for a little over three years, during which time the owners have kept that vessel in perfect repair. If my hon. friend thinks that a bonanza has been realized on that by the owners he is very much mistaken indeed, for during that time, to my own certain knowledge, very large and heavy repairs have been put upon the vessel, and I doubt if the owners have realized very much more than a fair percentage on the money that she cost during the three years she has been in the service. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) is quite wrong. He leaps to conclusions, from wrong information given mainly by the member from Queen's (Mr. Davies), whose information is generally in that direction, that she is owned entirely by Mr. Thorne. Now, it may be news to my hon. friend from Queen's, but I would be willing to enlighten him so far as that goes, that Mr. Thorne is not the sole owner of that vessel. I am not sure whether he owns any part of the vessel now or not; he may, but the owner of the vessel, the man who is chiefly interested in her, has been, up to a very late period at least, a very strong right arm supporter of the party to which my hon. friend belongs. This gentleman is a gentleman, and a thorough gentleman, even though he has been a Liberal and a very strong Liberal: he has not been considering that he has been pampered and petted by the small amount he got from the Government for the rental of a boat of which he was the largest owner. So far as the economy of the boat itself is concerned, I may be a little interested in that, because I think I was Minister of Marine when this boat was chartered. I think I first chartered the boat. I did so because of economical considerations. We, at that time, had some steamers; we had the *Acadia*, a large steamer for the fishery service specially; she was a costly steamer and one which patrolled the whole coast. We then took schooners for which we paid a monthly rental, and we had to put a much larger crew upon these. The expenses were heavy, and the rapidity and facility with which they went over the ground is nothing compared with the steamer; so that, in looking over the case I took this little vessel and put her on the Bay of Fundy around the coast of Charlotte; and the purpose was simply at that time, as my hon. friend said, that that vessel was to be for the protection of Charlotte and St. John county fisheries in the Bay of Fundy. It was not supposed that she should patrol any portion of the coast of Nova Scotia. She has done that service for which she was intended, and I know my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) will say that she has done that service well. She has been very well fitted indeed for that, and if you take the three years she has been on that service, I am quite sure that you could not have done it in any more economical way; even though it may seem at first sight that $300 per month is quite a large rental for a steamer. I believe that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has now arranged for the purchase or building of a larger steamer, which shall not only carry on that service, but will be able at any time to cross the bay and to patrol a certain portion of the Nova Scotia coast. I think that is a good method. That vessel would be strong and would be able to do both these services, but it will be found when that is done, and when the cost of the steamer, the extra cost of handling, and the cost of repairs is taken into account, that the service will of course be much more costly than it is under the present arrangement. I rose chiefly to correct what I thought was more than mere misapprehension, because I informed my hon. friend that the $8,000 was not paid to this gentleman, and even though Mr. Thorne has committed the mortal sin of being a president of the Liberal-Conservative Association, yet I should think he demands fair treatment at the hands of this House.

Mr. PERRY. Does the hon. gentleman——

An hon. MEMBER. Already spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER. We must understand that this discussion should not be conducted as if the House were in Committee of the Whole on Estimates, unless an understanding of that kind is arrived at. Otherwise the discussion would be interminable.

Mr. DEVLIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything on the subject yet, and I think I may be permitted to offer a remark. I find in looking over the accounts in connection with the steamer *Dream*, that there is an item on page C—127 of the Auditor General's Report, "Hardware, $53.13." I contend that if the proprietors of the boat are supposed to keep it in perfect order, that item, at all events, should have been found in their own private accounts, and not in the account of the Auditor General. Then again, lower down, there is another item, "Rubber, $15.20," which shows that all the expense is not borne by the owners.

Immigration—Salaries of agents and employés..... $24,125

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to make some remarks with regard to the extravagance that appears to characterize the expenditure of many of these agencies. I really think it is time the Government should institute a thorough investigation into the expenditures of the agencies both in Canada and in Great Britain. At the Toronto agency, for instance, we find that an enormous amount of money is paid out every year, and whether it is closely and carefully criticized by the Government or not I cannot say. In the Auditor General's Report I find that there are 16 tons of coal——

Mr. SPEAKER. I would direct the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that we have not come to that item yet.

Salaries, agents, Europe..... $5,900

Mr. McMULLEN. Now, I wish to say that in Belfast I see that Mr. Merrick is paid a salary of $1,000, and a *per diem* allowance amounting to $1,460 a year, and travelling expenses of $17.05. In addition, there are some other expenses which run up to a very large sum. There is also an assistant who is paid $436 and travelling expenses. Now, I think that when Sir Charles Tupper is in London a thorough investigation should be made into the expenditures of the agencies in Great Britain. I think we should have some report as to the necessity of allowing to the Liverpool agent,

for instance, travelling allowances largely in excess of his salary. I am sure that Sir Charles Tupper with his staff in London must do a good deal of the immigration business there, and it should not be necessary to travel in that direction. I think we should investigate these travelling expenses. It is quite clear they are excessive. This thing of allowing a *per diem* allowance for travelling expenses without this House knowing where the parties travel to, or whether they travel at all, is wrong. If these men are allowed to make their own bills and demand what they like for travelling expenses, the better way is to double their salaries. I think several of these items deserve investigation.

Quarantine, Charlottetown, P.E.I..... $1,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is the medical man at Charlottetown now?

Mr. HAGGART. Dr. Conroy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When was he appointed?

Mr. HAGGART. About a year ago.

Tracadie Lazaretto..... $4,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What report has been made as to the extent to which this horrible disease may have increased? I observe that a small increase is asked for, and I would like to know whether any outside cases have come to light within the last year, or whether you have succeeded in isolating these unfortunate people?

Mr. HAGGART. There has been a decrease in the number of patients from 40 to 18. There are no outside cases known to the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By death, I presume?

Mr. HAGGART. By death.

Monuments for battle-fields of Canada. $2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What kind of monuments, æsthetically speaking, are we going to have?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I submitted to the Historical Society a plan I had drawn, without any expense, in my own department, and the society asked me to allow the matter to stand so that we might discuss the possibility of adding to the grant in order to obtain a monument more deserving the occasion. That is the reason the matter has been kept in abeyance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to encourage any unnecessary expenditure. There may be some question as to the expediency of the thing at all; but if you do it at all, it ought to be done in a decent, respectable fashion. It should not be done in a way that will make us a laughing-stock, especially when it is to be so close to the American frontier. Some of the designs I have heard of struck me as so ambitious, that if carried out at the figure named they would be a very curious testimony to Canadian valour and Canadian taste.

Mr. FLINT. Previous to the observations of my hon. friend from South Oxford, the same idea was passing through my mind. It would be a great mistake on the part of the Government to make an appropriation which would not provide us with a monument of respectable appearance. If the object is a worthy one, as I have an idea that it is, it would be just as well for the Government not to be in a hurry, and if they have a design drawn up in accordance with the views of the Historical Society and persons of artistic ability, Parliament would readily concur in voting a larger amount. I might however say, in connection with this whole subject of militia expenditure——

Mr. SPEAKER. This is not an item of militia expenditure.

Mr. FLINT. It is under the general head of militia.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is one resolution dealing with monuments for the battle-fields of Canada and nothing else.

Mr. FLINT. As it is not likely this subject will come before the House again——

Mr. SPEAKER. I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the rule. These items must be taken as they are called, and no general discussion can be entered upon.

Mr. FLINT. On this subject I desire to concur most heartily in the remarks made by the hon. member for South Oxford. I think the Government might take into consideration the desirability of having a monument something worthy of the place, the occasion, and the people.

Railways and Canals, construction.... $50,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this a part of what we are having to pay for having exchanged Onderdonk for Charlebois?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the arbitrators' costs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It will prove a costly construction, if that is the case.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not a part of the award, but the expenses of the arbitration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the total fees as ascertained so far?

Mr. BOWELL. This is to provide funds to pay for the unsettled land claims, land appraisers' salaries, salaries and expenses of the arbitrators, their secretary, counsel, engineers, witnesses, stenographers, printing, &c. There are, I may inform the House, some twenty or thirty land claims still unsettled for land appropriated at the commencement of the building of the road, principally about Yale on the Fraser River and below that. I may also state that it was only to-day that, in looking into this question, we found it necessary, owing to the disputes which have arisen as to the value of the land by the appraised, and the parties owning the land refusing to accept the awards, to place the whole matter in the Exchequer Court, and Judge Burbidge, I believe, intends some time this fall to go to British Columbia principally for the purpose of settling these claims finally.

Prince Edward Island Railway..... $45,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) At an early period of the session, I made some remarks when the late Sir John Macdonald was alive and was the Minister of Railways, with reference to the rails upon the Prince Edward Island road, and I desire to repeat them in presence of the acting Minister. The road was built in 1873 as a narrow gauge road, and since then they have commenced relaying a portion of the road with steel rails. They have relaid the portion between Charlottetown and Summerside, 40 miles.

Mr. BOWELL. It has never been widened, has it?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No. And from Charlottetown eastward for 12 or 14 miles and a little westward of Summerside, making 60 miles out of 115. The original rails remain over the greater portion of the road. They have run this as economically as possible, and have actually taken the rails out of the sidings and put them on the main road in lieu of the worn-out rails there.

Mr. BOWELL. They are old iron rails?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, laid in 1873, and they have lived already more than the life of an ordinary rail. They have actually cut off the bad part of the end of some of the rails and brought the rails together. A short time ago I took a trip over the road and entered into conversation with many of the conductors and section-men and others on the road with a view of informing myself as to its condition, and I learned that there was a prevailing impression that, unless these rails were removed and steel rails substituted for them, there would in the near future be a serious accident, that it could not be avoided, that the rails were worn-out and had almost carried the last car they could carry, and every day the men were expecting that an accident would happen. In fact there have been some accidents, though happily not attended with tragic results.

Mr. BOWELL. From that cause?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In one case it was certainly from that cause. I saw the chief engineer and told him the reports I had had on this subject, and that I was afraid, from the serious manner in which this information was conveyed to me, and judging the weight to be attached to it from the manner in which it was imparted, that unless he did something very soon he would be liable to hear of a serious accident, probably involving the loss of life. He affected to treat the matter lightly. He said these section-men were in the habit of making up that kind of story in order to get a better class of rails; but, from the manner in which they told me this, I am satisfied that it is essential for the safety of the lives of the passengers on that road that these old rails, which were very light at the first—as the chief engineer will tell you, for he was the contractor for the road—should be removed, as they are absolutely unfit for use. I think the hon. gentleman should see, if it is possible, that the remaining portion of the road should be relaid with steel rails.

Mr. BOWELL. I will call the attention of the chief engineer to the statement the hon. gentleman has made and to the importance of having an immediate report upon the state of the road in order to prevent the accidents which he fears may occur.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I called attention at a previous stage of the session to the fact that, while I made these statements, the department had been officially informed by the superintendent that the condition of the road was excellent. I said I had gone over the road and I believed that to be true as to the general condition of the road, but that, if it embraced the rails, it would be misleading the department, and that the chief engineer should be asked to report upon the subject.

Mr. BOWELL. One would scarcely conceive it possible that the chief superintendent would report the road in an excellent condition if the rails were not fit to be run upon.

Expenses connected with the drill and training of the Militia..... $250,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt the Minister of Militia received all imaginable varieties of counsel last night, but every hon. gentleman who spoke, I think, agreed that whether I had been a little too severe on these camps of instruction in alleging that, practically, they only gave five or six days' instruction, there was very little doubt that, in so far as the rural battalions were concerned, the time for drill, spread, as it was, over intervals of two years, was far too short to be of practical service. Now, the hon. Minister, in the few remarks he made, admitted that it was true, but he did not appear to have considered any practical plan for amending that fault. All he said was that if he had plenty of money at his disposal he would give longer instruction, and keep them out for 15 or 16 days if he could. Now, I have some doubts whether we can afford to spend more money, although we might use it better. After all, a million and a-quarter here, and seven or eight hundred thousand in the North-West, is a large proportion of our available resources—altogether about two millions a year, not to speak of the expenses of headquarters here—about two hundred thousand dollars, I dare say. As I say, two million dollars is a large proportion of our available funds at the disposal of the Finance Minister, which, as everybody knows, are vastly less than the nominal funds, owing to the immense amount of our fixed charges. The question, I think, will resolve itself into this: Whether this million and a-quarter could not be better expended. Now, without desiring to speak authoritatively on this subject, in particular in the presence of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison), I really think that the Government ought to consider one, or two, or three plans—either they ought to reduce the number of the militia to such strength as would enable the force, such as it is, to be kept in a state of reasonable efficiency by passing, as has been done in other countries, successive terms of three or five years, or whatever time the men choose to serve. Or they might adopt another plan which has a good deal to recommend it, they might insist on the commissioned and non-commissioned officers being drilled and kept in a state of reasonable efficiency every year, even if it was not found practicable to summon all the men of the rural battalions. I think we might also, without detriment to the service, make a pretty decided division between the city corps and the rural battalions; they could be treated, without detriment to the militia service, in a different way. There is no doubt that these city corps are very desirable to maintain for many reasons, wholly apart from the question of our being called upon to fight for our lives and our country against our neighbours to the south of us. There is no doubt that when you have large cities in which there is apt to be an element developed more or less dangerous, it is in the interest of the cities in particular, and of the country in general, that in these large places a tolerable military force should be, in case of emergency, at the disposal of the civil authorities, and both here and elsewhere good results have arisen from that precaution. I do think that the Minis-

ter, on his own showing, stands confessed as not believing in the efficiency of the system as now administered. As I understand, we are now attempting to maintain a force of about 40,000 men.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 37,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now, I recognize the political difficulty which stands in the Minister's way, if he attempts to reduce this force. That is no doubt a practical difficulty, although it ought not to exist in dealing with military matters. But, be our force large or small, it should be made efficient. With respect to what I said about camps, I am well aware that there are camps and camps. I am well aware there are some camps in which a creditable exhibit is made on the part of our volunteer soldiers; but there are other camps of which that cannot be said, and in which, unless I have been most grievously misinformed, the public money used to maintain them, is nearly altogether wasted. As far as instruction in marksmanship and rifle shooting is concerned, I need not tell the Minister, and I need not tell anyone who has witnessed the performance of our volunteers, that it is impossible to give it in the space of time at our disposal; and now-a-days, although, as I have said, I venture any remarks on military subjects with deference, I have no doubt that the efficiency of any such force depends in a very large degree on the skill in the use of the rifle obtained by the individual soldier, and that is tending to be the case more and more. I raised the question in a tentative fashion last night, and I think the Government—they can do it now—should seriously consider whether they will not adopt some one or other alternative systems, if they see fit to come down and demand more money, if the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Militia can make it up between them. If, as I rather suspect, the hon. gentleman has to make the most of the money at his disposal now, then I think it is high time for him to consider what course he will adopt: whether he will enlarge the vote at his disposal by reducing some of these other estimates, although they may be good in their way, and reduce the vote for some of the fixed forces; or whether he will reduce the number of the militia corps to such a point that he can get fair instruction for all; or whether he will try the plan of keeping the skeleton organization of non-commissioned or commissioned officers in a high state of efficiency. I am not prepared to say off-hand which would prove the best in the end, but the present system is pre-eminently unsatisfactory, and some effort should be made to get more value for our money than we do under the present system.

Mr, DENISON. I am glad the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has somewhat modified the remarks he made last night. Knowing the great interest he always takes in militia matters, I was rather surprised to find him pitching into the camps as he did. But the hon. gentleman has qualified his criticism to-day by saying there are "camps and camps," and in that he is no doubt correct. I have not attended the camp at Kingston, but I have almost every year attended the camp at Niagara, and I can testify strongly to the good effect it has on that portion of the militia force of Canada. I might say with respect to the remark made that the day going to camp and the day returning from camp are wasted is hardly correct. It must be remembered that it is part of an officer's duty to know how to entrain and detrain his men. A further part of his work is to instruct his men how to pitch their tents, and this is part of the work on the first day. This is a most important part of his duty, and the men learn to do it quickly by practice. The same remark applies to the task of striking tents, which is also part of their duty. After a few days' practice it is astonishing how the men improve, and do the work rapidly and efficiently that was at first so difficult. Altogether, the duties in camp, even for the short time we have at disposal, have a most valuable effect on the men. Personally I should like to see the time increased to 16 or 20 days; but before we endeavour to secure a longer time, we must have all the militia drilled. For myself I am strongly opposed to having the force reduced; in fact my idea has always been that the force should be increased. Where there are localities which desire to raise battalions or companies the Government should authorize them to do so, because we cannot hope to have too large an organization, for if we have trouble, as was referred to the other night by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), with our neighbours to the south, we could not have too large a force. It would be necessary, then, to have a large number of trained officers, and that was the reason I suggested the other day that if we could engraft on the present scheme some such system as we had before, it would be advantageous to us to have those men in our midst. No doubt some men would go into the schools for the purpose of getting the $50. Even so; those going through the schools would acquire a taste for military matters and take an interest in the force and join our battalions, and repay the amount of money that might be expended in that way. Further, those men who would enter the force for the $50 would not leave Canada, and they would possess the knowledge, and in case of trouble they would come into the ranks and do good service. I think the whole force should be drilled. Every session I have pressed on the attention of the Minister of Militia and the House the desirability of drilling the rural corps as well as the city corps. The rural corps, as a matter of fact, have not the same advantages as city corps possess. The city corps, having drill halls, can turn out at night and drill with very little loss to themselves, while the rural corps are unable to drill at night on account of the companies being scattered, and the distance the men are from company headquarters. The rural corps, therefore, require to be concentrated in camps and drilled every year more than the city corps, not that I am saying but what they should all drill. I hope next year the Minister of Militia will press the subject on his colleagues and secure the granting of a sufficient sum to drill the whole militia. Possibly he may be able to curtail some of the expenditure on the staff. I know our late Premier frequently said we had too large a staff. It seems a large sum to spend out of $1,225,000 nearly $1,000,000 on staff and paraphernalia, if I may use the term, while only $250,000 really goes to pay the drilling of the militia. By an additional grant of $150,000 we could obtain much benefit to the force, and that sum, added to $1,250,000, is not a large sum, while it would do a great deal to further the interests of the militia and enable all the corps to drill.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have only a few words to say in addition to what has been said by the hon.

member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison). Like the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) I happen to be a layman, and in discussing these matters I take advantage of the advice of the hon. member for West Toronto and other military men who happen to be in the House. I can tell that hon. gentleman that, in so far as I have been able to collect opinions, the consensus of opinion of those who have followed the progress and development of our force from year to year, is that we should have annual drill for the whole force, whatever that force may be. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the expensive staff. Ever since I have been Minister I have viewed the matter from the same standpoint as he views it, and, following that course, I have reduced the expenses of the staff by upwards of $11,000 per annum. I consider it is not necessary to have an expensive staff; but when the hon. gentleman speaks of the greatest portion of the money voted going to the staff, I am unable to agree with him.

Mr. DENISON. I meant the permanent schools and all.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not call the permanent schools part of the staff. I call the permanent schools training schools, which permit our officers to qualify by receiving certificates to obtain commissions. I consider that for the amount of money we have expended on the force, Canada can be proud indeed of the force as it now stands. I should like to have more days' drill than we have at present, but I believe that, if we have twelve days' drill annually, with the aptitude of Canadians for military training, we will have a force that will be unequalled for the purpose we require it in this country, more for protection at home than for offensive purposes——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be no use for that purpose.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON,—but merely as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has indicated, for use in great centres where it may be necessary at a moment's notice to call out an organized military force. I consider that we have a force that really we would not have paid too much for the service which they would be called upon to render. Whenever they have been called upon they have done their duty in a manner that Canada can be proud of, and I think that if Parliament in its liberality, and my hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Finance who is always prepared to accede to any fair proposition, agrees to add to the present vote for drill purposes, $175,000 next year, that would permit us to drill the whole force, the rural and city battalions, and I think it would be an immense benefit to Canada. These are the views I entertain, and I believe I am expressing the views also of all those who have taken an interest in the force and have looked into the question.

Mr. DICKEY. I would like to ask the Minister if it would not be possible in Nova Scotia, where the railways are owned chiefly by the Government, to furnish free passes over the railways to those going to the annual shooting competition. It would not cost the Government anything directly, and I think that the House would be willing that the Government railway should be put to that use, if such arrangements could be made so as to prevent fraud and imposition, by confining the passes to those going to the competition.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In uniform?

Mr. DICKEY. Yes, in uniform. I think it would be a great boon to the men themselves. It would increase the attendance, show an interest on the part of the Government in these competitions, and it would do a great service without costing the country anything. I hope that the hon. Minister of Militia will consult with the Minister of Railways, and see if an arrangement of that sort cannot be come to.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have been asked by several of the officers of the companies in Prince Edward Island to urge upon the military authorities the absolute necessity for permitting these rural battalions to drill at local headquarters instead of going into camp. The statements made to me were that the men from rural districts would not go to camp, and that the companies, under the present system, are dwindling to nothing. I am not personally in a position to know whether these representations meet the approval of the higher authorities or not, but they come to me from a number of the captains of the several companies.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I shall submit the matter to the Major General Commanding for consideration.

Mr. PATTERSON (Colchester). I wish to draw the attention of the Committee for a moment to a matter which has been referred to by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), that is, in relation to militiamen in the Province of Nova Scotia getting passes over the Government railways to the provincial shooting matches. There appears to be a very strange anomaly in reference to this matter in connection with the militiamen of the Province of Nova Scotia. The militiamen of the City of Halifax can get to the Bedford shooting range for practice, and on all occasions that they appear in the railway depot in Halifax they are taken over the Intercolonial Railway free of charge, for even ordinary practice, while the militiaman in the County of Colchester, where we have some crack shots, cannot get to the annual match at Bedford without putting his hands in his pockets and paying his railway fare to and from Bedford station. That is a matter that should receive some attention. The other day I brought the matter to the notice of the Minister of Railways, and he referred me very coolly to the Minister of Militia, and there the matter seems to stand. In the meantime the provincial match has gone on and the competitors from the Counties of Colchester, Cumberland and Pictou have had, on the 18th of this month, to pay their way to the Bedford provincial match and back again. It does seem a strange thing that while that is the practice with the rural militiamen, that the militiamen from the City of Halifax can go not only to the provincial match, but to their ordinary practice, free of charge. I do think this is a matter which should receive some attention from the Minister of Militia.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am quite in accord with the remarks which were made last evening by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and others, and I am also in accord with my respected friend from Toronto West (Mr. Denison) with regard to increased drill. It is called annual drill,

but very often we find that rural corps are not ordered to camp the second year, and the drill becomes biennial. Frequently, some of the corps are not found in camp for three, or four, and, perhaps five years. Last year I heard one hon. gentleman say that his regiment had not been out for six years. I feel satisfied that we should have annual drill and that a period of twelve days is quite short enough. Remarks were made last evening that we had only ten days of drill, that two days were lost in marching in and out of camp, but I contend that these two days are profitably employed. The soldiers are taught the drill of marching on board the train, and of pitching and striking their tents, and whilst they are in camp for the ten days, they are actively employed from early morn until dewy eve, up to ten o'clock at night. There is no time lost, and when they return, as I know from experience of the last camp, the men were so well drilled that they felt they were quite equal, and I felt myself that they were all but equal, to regularly trained soldiers. When we find that two years elapse before they are brought into camp again, many of these men are so wanting or non-possessed of the drill they had learned, that they are as awkward as if they had never been put through drill before. I quite agree with the remarks of one of the gentlemen who spoke last night with regard to the training of children and young men in the common day schools. I feel that a very great deal of the time that now is occupied by children at physical exercise, known as recess, could be profitably employed in the training of these children to a knowledge of military drill, such as position, marching, facings, formation of sections, sub-divisions, and, I may say, ordinary company drill. They could be taught this within the building, or outside, weather permitting, for say, fifteen or twenty minutes each day, and thus form a miniature army, physically beneficial and practically most essential, as it would place the children in that position that they would move along with an easy and graceful carriage and with a martial-like, soldierly-bearing that would show its effects in after years. We would feel that these youths, receiving military instruction in that way, both theory and practice being imparted to them, would not be unmindful of that tuition or knowledge when they grew up; and as soldiers going into camp or in ordinary drill, would be more apt to receive instruction from their superior officers than if they had never received any in the schools. I strongly urge that some measure be taken whereby training may be given in that way at the day schools. Thus we should have a nucleus at all times for the regular army, and recruits could, with very little instruction or training, be placed in a position to be ready for active service. I urge strongly, I repeat, that instead of having biennial drill, we should have annual drill of not less than twelve days.

Mr. FLINT. A few minutes ago, while another item was under consideration, I intended to make some remarks on the general subject of the expenditure on the militia service. We have had several interesting discussions in this House, participated in largely by gentlemen connected with the military force; and, as one who knows scarcely anything of the technicalities of this question, I listened with a great deal of interest, and I may add instruction, to those discussions. We are aware, however, that there is a tendency among specialists of all kinds to get gradually into their mind a strong prepossession in favour of their particular hobby; and I am afraid that, in connection with the present organization of the forces in Canada, there is a strong tendency among military officers, a natural tendency, no doubt, to look almost entirely on one side of this important subject. I am glad, however, that the Government has been able hitherto to resist the strong pressure put upon them by the militia officers, accompanied with a great deal of earnestness, ability, and I believe patriotism, to extend the operations of the Militia Department and to add to the expenditures in connection with the militia force. It is gratifying to know that this year there is on the whole a decrease in the estimates for militia purposes. Though knowing what I do, and after hearing these discussions, I would not advocate any further reduction in the militia estimates, yet I would say as a layman, that I believe that on the part of a large number of the people of this country who do not sympathize with the militia officers on this subject, there is and will be a strong feeling of opposition to any further increase in our militia expenditure. I will not go into any of the details dwelt upon by several of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, as to how best to administer the very generous fund which Parliament has placed at the disposal of the department. This fund has increased quite rapidly, From 1874 to 1879 it was on the average in the neighbourhood of $790,000; and we all know that in the discussion of the financial affairs of the country during that period, the Administration of that day were severely criticized for the slight increase which they made from time to time in the militia expenditure.

Mr. DENISON. It is very little more than it was at Confederation.

Mr. FLINT. A certain amount of increase is almost inevitable in consequence of the development of the country; but that expenditure, large as it was and criticized as it was, continued to increase during the next period. It increased on the average something over $50,000 per annum; and at the present time we are spending on the average about $1,250,000 a year. Now, I think the Militia Department—and I tender the advice with all deference to the opinion of the militia officers and the specialists in that department—will do well to make their arrangements with regard to perfecting the efficiency of the department, with reference to the view that it is very inadvisable to ask for any appreciable increase in the appropriation. There has been a great deal of discussion, and of a valuable character, in regard to annual drill or biennial drill; and I must say that I have been very much impressed in favour of an annual drill. But I think that some means must be employed by which a smaller number of men may be drilled annually; and a saving must be effected in some other direction in order to keep the appropriation within the present figure. I think the arguments for annual drill are almost unanswerable; and as a layman I would only say, from what I have learned in this discussion and from other sources, that, in my opinion, which I think is concurred in by a great many persons who do not profess to be technically informed on military matters, the true policy of

this country is in the direction of educating and training efficient officers and drill masters. I think that with a small trained force, smaller even than what we have at the present time, and with officers capable of taking recruits and drilling them, the best interests of the country will be served. This discussion on military matters must have reference to difficulties of some kind in which we may possibly be involved in the future. It cannot be contended that, owing to popular outbreaks in certain localities, from the peculiar circumstances in those localities, the Dominion of Canada is, in the course of the future, likely to become involved in any very large military operations. The only nation with which we are at all likely to come into collision is of course the nation to the south of us; and I think, speaking in the least moderate manner of our population and resources and abilities, it is quite idle for this Dominion to pretend that we are spending money with any idea of being able to cope with that populous and wealthy nation.

Mr. DENISON. I quite disagree with you.

Mr. FLINT. I think the military idea in Canada should be discouraged rather than encouraged. While I agree that a military organization, with skeleton regiments and an efficient staff, together with military schools, and, possibly, the annual drill of a small number of men, with the view of making drill-masters and officers, ought to be the true policy of the Administration, there ought not to be any idea entertained that the people of the country will be disposed, without stronger reasons than have hitherto been given, to place at the disposal of the Government any larger sums for these purposes than are now voted by Parliament. I think, however, from the discussions which have already taken place in this House, and the further ideas that will be placed at the disposal of the Minister of Militia by experts, that it is within the bounds of possibility that greater efficiency will be secured, even with the funds already at his disposal, than we have at the present time. I desire to express my high appreciation of the Militia Department, and with regard to the small local corps with which I am acquainted, I desire to say that I believe they have in the main received such encouragement from the Government as has contributed very much to their efficiency; and I am gratified, as a private citizen, to notice the compliments paid that small force by those who have visited our neighbourhood, from time to time, to inspect them. I will heartily concur in any legislation to bring about greater efficiency, providing it does not involve any considerable increase in the general expenditure.

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to say a few words in answer to the remarks of my hon. friend the member for Colchester, with reference to the granting of passes to volunteers from Halifax to Bedford over the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman, on behalf of his constituents, the volunteers who are in the habit of attending the annual shooting matches at that place, applied for passes on the grounds he has stated. I made enquiry of the department, and was informed that passes were not granted upon any authority from headquarters. No doubt my hon. friend has been informed differently, but it is certainly without the knowledge of the authorities here that these men were allowed free passage. However, I will make still further enquiry into the matter. I may say that I fully concur in the remarks made by that hon. gentleman and others, that if the permission to travel free were given to any portion of the volunteers of Nova Scotia, it ought to be extended to all the others. My hon. friend said that I coolly referred him to the Minister of Militia. I know there had been correspondence between the Department of Railways and Canals and the Militia Department on this subject; and as far back as the time when Sir Charles Tupper had charge of the Railway Department he, at the instance of the Minister of Militia, reduced the rates, and the matter stands in that position at present. With reference to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Cumberland, and others, that the road should be placed at the disposal of all volunteers and militiamen travelling over it, that is a matter which would require very serious consideration. It is very well to say that because it is a government railway, it costs nothing; but the same argument would apply with the same force to the carrying of the mails. You might as well say that there is no necessity for charging the Post Office Department for carrying the mails, because that is only taking out of one pocket and putting in the other. I do not see why the Militia Department should not pay the fares of the volunteers when they are carried over our railway, as well the Postmaster General for the carriage of postal matter; but if that system were adopted, my hon. colleague would have to ask for a larger appropriation, and I have no doubt, if the generosity of his colleagues would lead them to give it to him, he would willingly spend it. If, however, he were called on to pay the passages of those volunteers who live along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, I do not see how he could refuse to pay for those who travel over the Grand Trunk Railway and other railways in other parts of the Dominion. This is a matter which must receive the attention of the department, as regards applying the one rule to all volunteers whether they live in Halifax or in other sections. Before sitting down, I desire to dissent *in toto* from the remarks of the hon. member for Yarmouth. I have no sympathy with the sentiment he expressed. If there is any logic in his reasoning, I cannot understand how it is he advocates the expenditure of one cent on the militia. To be consistent, he should oppose the expenditure of a dollar on the force. If his idea is correct, that in case of any difficulty with the country to the south of us, against which powerful and wealthy nation, he says, it is absurd to suppose that we could do anything, then we ought not to spend anything. But, Sir, the militia of Canada in the past have proved that they are quite capable of defending their homes and hearths; and I believe that if, unfortunately, which I trust may never occur, they should ever be called upon to do what their forefathers did, they will be quite prepared to defend their homes against any invader. It is not logical for gentlemen to stand up in this House and urge expenditure to perfect our militiamen, and then, in the same breath, tell us that no possible good can result therefrom. I am not prepared, if the hon. gentleman is, in case we are threatened, no matter from what part of the world, to throw up the sponge and cry *peccavi*. I do not think that is the spirit which actuates the people of Canada, and

I hope the views entertained by the hon. gentleman are not shared by any other member of this House.

Mr. BARRON. I wish to impress upon the hon. Minister the importance of having annual drill. That matter has been pressed by many members, and I am sure the hon. Minister will be glad to see that its desirability is so generally agreed upon. I was much impressed by the remark of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), last night, when he said that the increase to the country of expenditure would not amount to more than 10 or 15 cents per head. If that be so, let us have the annual drill. In my part of the country the volunteer system is suffering very seriously. I know in particular of one officer, a gentleman who stands very high in the volunteer force, who has said to me that he will have to leave the force unless the system of annual drill is introduced, because he finds that when he has to assemble his men for drill under the biennial system, he has to look for entirely new men, and it is impossible to keep up his corps, which is a cavalry corps. I hope that a little more attention will be given the rural battalions, and that the hon. Minister's care will not continue to be monopolized by the city battalions.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have only a word to say in answer to the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) who, I must admit, has been very fair in his criticism of the manner in which the department has been administered. I should like him to compare what we have at present to provide for with what we had to provide for in 1874. In 1874 we had only two batteries, and now we have all the other training schools which must be provided for. I think, under the present system, if the hon. gentleman looks into the matter with his critical mind, he will find that, for the surplus of money we are expending to-day, we have a system which is much more complete and which contributes more to the efficiency of the force than that which we had in 1874. We were then only beginning it, and we have been progressing in that respect, as we have been progressing in other branches in Canada. We have been trying to make it more complete, and we believe that, from what we had expended and are expending to-day, we have a system which is satisfactory in its results.

Royal Military College of Canada..... $77,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Last night this item was touched about half past one, and there was no possibility of discussing it to any purpose at that hour, so I let it alone, on the understanding that, if a discussion were wanted, it might be had to-night. I have some questions to put to the hon. gentleman in regard to this matter. I would be glad to know, in the first place, what the number of the graduating class was last year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have not that information here, and I would be speaking merely from memory; but I can produce the list of the graduates at any time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. From recollection, what do you suppose to be the number of the graduating class of this year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I should not like to speak from memory. Although the hon. gentleman's recollection and mine may differ, I think we discussed this matter for two hours last night, and I had my officers here then.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Allusions were made to it last night, but no information was given, as you will see from the Debates.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I know several allusions were made to it, but no allusion was made to the number of graduates. However, I can produce the list of those whose names were submitted to Council, and who came out at the last examination, without any trouble. I think it was between 22 and 25, but I would not be certain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the number of those who passed the matriculation examination this year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would not like to state that from memory. That is not information which I had in my book, but information which comes into the department, but I can produce it at any time. I think the number was about 10 or 16, but I would not be sure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is about one-half the number or thereabouts that the college was expected to receive. The hon. gentleman knows that the annual matriculating class should be 24 or a little more.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, the late Government were responsible for instituting the college, but it was our intention, as announced at the time, that, in addition to the four commissions which are given by the Imperial authorities to the graduates in each class, at least half-a-dozen of those who are most proficient should be given a chance of entering the Canadian Civil Service in connection either with the public works, or the mounted police, or the military service, or some other department for which they would be suited, and I have always felt that, practically, an injustice was done, if the college was to be continued at all, in not carrying out that project; and I believe also that it would have been very greatly to the benefit of the people of Canada if a considerable number of those graduates had been employed in connection with Canadian public works. That has been done in other countries. I think that has been done in connection with West Point to the profit of the American service, and I am perfectly certain that these men, most of whom are receiving an education which fits them more or less for the position of civil engineers, would be useful public servants, and that their employment would probably have tended to maintain a higher standard of honour in the Department of Public Works than has prevailed, as unfortunately we know to our cost. I think it is not too late even now. I have repeated that request to the Ministers time and time again. Since 1879, I think not a year has elapsed when I have not urged the expediency of offering a certain number of posts in the Civil Service to the most deserving of those graduates, not with the desire to benefit them, but because I think they would form that class of engineers which it would be most desirable to have in our public service. I am bound to say that the present Minister of Militia has endeavoured, on several occasions, when he was allowed to have his way, to give posts to the

graduates of the Military College, but nothing has been done in a regular or systematic fashion, and, if that college is to be maintained, I think it would be very desirable that that should be done. I intimated last night what I now repeat, that I have reason to fear that the discipline and the general efficiency of that institution is not being maintained at as high a standard as it used to be, and I add this now for the consideration of the Minister and of the Government. There is no doubt they were actuated by a laudable desire to save the public chest when they raised the annual charge from I think $100 or $150 to $350 or $400; but the hon. gentleman will observe that, by raising the fee to the present rate, there is no doubt that he has practically converted this college into an institution where only the better class, or rather I should say the wealthier class, are likely to send their sons. In former times, and when the admission fee was as low as I mentioned, the choice for matriculants was much wider. It was a sort of prize in those days, and, as the entrance was determined by open competition, a much larger field, so to speak, was drawn upon for the persons who were admitted; and it is within my own knowledge that some of the most distinguished graduates who have left that college were the sons of farmers and men in comparatively poor circumstances, who certainly could not get admitted now. There is no doubt, as I have said, that, although the object of the Government may have been very good in desiring to save the public treasury, the practical effect has been to narrow the field of admission to a very considerable degree. As to the management, that I shall leave to the hon. gentleman to investigate. As to the question of the best mode of utilizing these young men's services for the benefit of Canada, I respectfully submit that it is eminently desirable, particularly in view of the fact that an immense number of them do not remain in Canada but are now employed to my certain knowledge in the United States, that an effort should be made to retain a certain number of them for the benefit of our public service. I think that these four commissions in the Imperial service should be supplemented by a moderate number—I do not suggest more than half a dozen—of posts in the public service of Canada being given as a right to the most distinguished of the graduates. There ought to be a graduating class varying from 20 to to 24 every year, and we ought to have, as well as the Imperial service, the pick of these men for our public service. That is all I desire to say upon the subject.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I wish the hon. gentleman to recollect that I have been speaking merely from memory, and I would not wish to be tied down to the numbers I have given to-night, but on Monday I can place on the Table the list of those who matriculated and of those who passed the final examination this year. As to the management, I can tell the hon. gentleman—and he no doubt may know it as well as I do—that the most brilliant class we have ever had in the Royal Military College has come out this year under the present management. The cadets who have left our college to seek in life the career for which their training has fitted them, have left under the most brilliant auspices. Now, Sir, it would not be right, I think, for us, after the great advantages which are conferred by the Royal Military College upon those who are trained within its walls, to say that because a man comes from that college, every position in the public service and in the force should be open to him. I stated last night that I believe it to be a correct principle to give Government commissions to cadets and to members of the force who distinguished themselves by past services which Canada cannot forget. I look upon the Royal Military College as an institution of which Canada may well be proud, but I do not think we should forget the services of the militia force of the country who have for years been fighting the battles of the country single-handed, and under disadvantages which the cadets have not known. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine has got cadets in his department; I have cadets in my department, and there are cadets in the different departments of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many in all?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there are six in the Government departments alone. In my department I have Mr. White, a cadet who carried honours in the Royal Military College, and who occupies a very prominent and responsible position. Now, the hon. gentleman has spoken of those who, after leaving the college, have gone over to the States or to other countries. I can tell him that they have not ceased to remain strong Canadians, even after they have left this country. In 1885, when the troubles broke out in the North-West, I received telegrams from every cadet, some of them occupying prominent positions and receiving high salaries, tendering their services to Canada. Now, Sir, I claim that the Royal Military College is an institution of which Canada can be proud; I know that my hon. friend from South Oxford views it in that light. I believe that every day we are gradually doing more and more for the cadets in that institution, but to say that we should set aside all others who have not been trained in that institution, but who are deserving of consideration at our hands, I think would be going too far. I venture to suggest that it would not be to the advantage of the college itself, because the public might consider that we were training up these young men as a privileged class, whereas in our country we have no privileged classes. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I hope to lay upon the Table, when we meet again, a list of the cadets who have been matriculated and graduated.

Resolutions concurred in.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 24th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LT.-COLONEL WM. HERCHMER.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Has the hon. the Minister of Justice received the letter referred to in the following communication, to wit:—

"MACLEOD, ALTA., 6th August, 1891.

"COL. AMYOT, M.P.,
"Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR.—I see by *Hansard* of 27th July that, during the debate on Mr. Davin's motion asking for an enquiry into Commissioner Herchmer's conduct, you read from a letter published in *L'Etendard*, and translated into the Macleod *Gazette*, in which it was stated that Col. Herchmer said to Inspector Starnes that all Frenchmen were b——ds, sons of b——s, and sons of w——s. I also see that Sir John Thompson remarked that 'of course no officer could remain in the service of the Government an hour who has used such language as the hon. member has read from that paper.'

"He then goes on to say that 'I did not understand Col. Herchmer had ever been charged with using that language. I understood that the charge had applied to another officer of the same name, who, not only emphatically denies it, but tenders his oath in denying it. As to Col. Herchmer, although I understand that the charge was not made against him, he is ready to testify under oath before any tribunal that he never used such language.'

"Sir John Thompson has evidently confused *Mr.* L. W. Herchmer, Commissioner, with *Lt.-Col.* Wm. Herchmer, Assistant Commissioner. I have written by this mail to Sir John Thompson, distinctly charging Lt.-Col. Wm. Herchmer, Assistant Commissioner N.W.M.P., with having made use of such language to Inspector Starnes at this post. I have also offered to prove it by five witnesses who were there.

"I have also stated to him that Col. Herchmer admitted to Mr. Fred. White that he used that language, giving as his excuse that he was drunk at the time.

"Mr. Fred White is in full possession of the facts in connection with the matter.

"Now that Sir John Thompson has stated that an officer who made use of that language could not remain in the service of the Government an hour, and that the proof that Col. Herchmer did make use of it is at hand, there is only one course open to the Government.

"I mentioned to Sir John Thompson that I was writing to you.

"Although I mark this envelope 'Private' I give you leave, as I gave Sir John Thompson, to make whatever use of it you may see fit.

"Yours truly,
"C. E. D. WOOD.
"Editor, Macleod *Gazette*."

Do the Government intend to take any action in the matter? What action do they intend to take?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have received the letter referred to in that letter, from the editor of the Macleod *Gazette*, making that charge. It is not correct, as stated by him, that I confused L. W. Herchmer, Commissioner, with Lieut.-Col. W. Herchmer. On the contrary, I insisted that, on the charge being made in the House as it was against the Commissioner, confusion had been made by the gentleman making the charge, or by the newspaper from which he read, and I stated then: that the charge was not true as far as the Commissioner was concerned, and had been very emphatically denied by the Assistant Commissioner, who stated that he was prepared to deny it upon oath. As soon as I received the letter from the editor of the Macleod *Gazette*, which is referred to in the letter on the Notice paper, I sent his letter to the First Minister who has charge of the Mounted Police, and he immediately caused the officer referred to, Mr. Herchmer, the Assistant Commissioner, to be called on to answer the charge. Mr. Herchmer's answer is an emphatic denial of the truth of the statement. He says that in relation to certain officers of one of the battalions from Quebec, he made use of very strong language, in consequence of insults and outrages which he alleges were perpetrated on him and his family by them; that he made no such allusions to the French Canadian race, or people, or officers as a whole class, and that in relation to that language he apologized immediately to a representative of the Province of Quebec who was present, and that his apology was accepted. But, in consequence of the explicitness of the charge, and the offer to prove it, the First Minister has directed that that matter shall be investigated with other matters relating to the Mounted Police, when the investigation takes place next fall.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND TUNNEL.

Mr. WELSH (for Mr. DAVIES, P.E.I.) asked, Does the Government intend to take during the present summer any, and what, action with respect to the report made by Sir Douglass Fox on the proposed tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland? Is it proposed that any further surveys or borings should be made or had with respect to such tunnel, or any other and what steps taken to obtain accurate data upon which reliable estimates of the cost could be based?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government does not intend during the present summer to take any further action with respect to the report made by Sir Douglass Fox on the proposed tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, other than to consider it. The matter referred to in the second part of the question is also under the consideration of the Government.

CARRIAGE OF MAILS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, 1. Who has the contract for carrying the mails between Ashcroft and Barkerville, and Ashcroft, Clinton and Lillooet, in British Columbia? If the contract is held by a corporation, what are the names of the directors and corporation? 2. What amount is paid for the service under the respective contracts? 3. The service given and the distance travelled? 4. Was the contract let by tender? 5. Was the lowest tender accepted? 6. When does the contract expire?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. The British Columbia Express Company. The names of the directors are not known. 2. There is only one contract for these services. The rate of payment was $24,000 from 1st of July, 1888, to the 30th June, 1890, and $23,500 for the rest of the term, which ends on the 30th of June, 1892. 3. Tri-weekly each way between Ashcroft Station and Clinton, a distance of thirty-two miles. Weekly each way between Clinton and Barkerville, a distance of two hundred and fifty miles. Weekly between Clinton and Lillooet, a distance of forty-seven miles. 4. The contract was let by tender. 5. The lowest tender was accepted. 6. The contract expires on the 30th June, 1892.

THE *KEEWATIN*.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. MULOCK) asked, Was a vessel know as the *Keewatin* in the service of the Government at any time since the 30th June, 1889? If so, what was the nature of such service and what was paid for the use of the vessel?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Police Patrol boat *Keewatin* was built at Selkirk in winter of 1888-89 for Government of Keewatin; received and paid for in spring of 1889 by Government; has been in service in

1889, 1890; and this year wherever required to prevent introduction of intoxicants, transport North-West Mounted Police and patrol in suspected waters, and is now out upon such service under orders of Inspector Bégin. Nothing was paid for use of *Keewatin*, which was built for and is the property of Government.

THE REGINA *LEADER*.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. TRACY) asked, What is the total amount paid by the Government to the Regina *Leader* for printing and advertising since 1886?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. From 1st July, 1886, to 30th June, 1890, several sums of money, the detail of which may be found in the Auditor General's Reports. Of the total paid, $1,488.19 was for advertising, and $515 passed through the books of the Printing Department here. The balance was certified and settled at Regina. Since 30th June, 1890, $315.76 for advertising, and $75.25 for printing, have been passed by the Printing Bureau.

WOOD SUPPLY FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Has Mr. John Heney the contract for supplying wood for heating the Public Buildings in Ottawa? If so, when did he first receive it, and was it by public tender? How long did the contract run? Has it since been renewed, and how often? If so, was it by public tender, and at what price per cord?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. John Heney has the contract for supplying wood for heating the Public Buildings at Ottawa. Mr. Heney was first awarded the contract for wood supply, after a call for tenders, on the 27th October, 1868, for three years. This contract was subsequently continued to him to the 21st December, 1872, when tenders were again called, and he was awarded the contract. On the 20th October, 1874, a contract was again entered into with him for one, two or three years. In March, 1879, a contract was again made with him. The contracts of 1868, 1872, 1874, and 1879 were awarded after a call for public tenders. The agreements of 1871 and 1878 were extensions of one year, authorized by Orders in Council. On the 10th March, 1881, the wood contract was awarded to W. McCaffrey, after public tenders: and by Order in Council of 17th December, 1883, this contract was continued until 1885, when new tenders were called for. Tenders were called for on the 11th March, 1885, for supply of firewood for three years for Public Buildings, Ottawa. J. M. Quinn was the lowest tenderer, and got the contract at $4.95 for rock maple, and $4.75 for mixed hardwood. On the 11th May, 1885, an Order in Council was passed allowing Quinn to transfer his contract to Heney, Heney to carry out the contract at the rates stated in Quinn's tender. The contract ran from the 1st September, 1885, to the 1st September, 1888. It has been renewed twice by Order in Council—on 7th December, 1886, for three years, from 1st September, 1888, to 1st September, 1891, and on the 24th April, 1891, for three years from 1st September, 1891, to 1st September, 1894, at the rates of Quinn's tender, namely, $4.95 for rock maple and $4.75 for mixed hardwood.

Mr. DEWDNEY.

EXPENSES FOR CABLEGRAMS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, What is the total amount paid by the Dominion Government since 1886, on account of cablegrams sent through Reuter's Agency? Was any money paid on account of such cablegrams during the last fiscal year, or since the 30th June last?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am unable to give the hon. gentleman any information at present as to the first part of the question. I believe some small expenditures were made in that way some years ago, but they were not distinguished in the accounts from the other telegrams. As to the second part of his question, I may tell him that the amount paid on account of such telegrams during the last fiscal year was $89.84, and that since the 30th of June, the sum of $33.56 has been paid.

BREAKWATER AT MIMINIGASH, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Have the Department of Public Works received, at any time between the 1st day of June, 1891, and this date, a petition from the fishermen and others of Little Miminigash, P.E.I., praying for a breakwater at that place? If so, is it the intention of the Government to grant the prayer of petitioners?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Such a petition was received on the 2nd of June. It is still before the Government, undisposed of.

RIDEAU CANAL RESERVE LOTS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, How many lots, on the Rideau Canal reserve surrounding the basin, are occupied as piling ground by Mr. John Heney? How long has he occupied them, and what rent per lot does he pay yearly?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Heney occupies lots numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, part of 7, part of 8, 9, and part of 10, all on the west side of the canal. These lots were in possession of the Montreal & Ottawa Forwarding Company prior to January, 1886, when that company surrendered their lease. I have no reliable information as to the length of time that he has occupied them, but I believe about 25 years. He pays no rent to the Department of Interior.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Have any of the Ordnance lots on the Rideau Canal reserve surrounding the basin been transferred to the Department of Public Works? If so, how many, when and why? By whom are they now used, for what purpose, and what rent is received for them?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Lots 15 and 16 on the west side of the canal reserve, and also the land lying between lots 16 and the Sappers Bridge, were transferred to the Public Works Department by Order in Council of the 13th December, 1886, for the purpose of erecting a Custom-house and an examining warehouse thereon. These lands are now vested in the Department of Public Works for the purpose of providing additional Custom-house and examining warehouse accommodation if found necessary, and of course no rent is paid, therefore, by that department.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, What is the total rent per year received from tenants on Ordnance

land on the Rideau Canal reserve surrounding the basin?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The amount is $1,167.25.

ROYAL COMMISSIONS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, How many Royal Commissions have been issued since Confederation? For what purposes were they issued? What subjects did they enquire into? What was the date of issue in each case? What was the cost of each and the total cost of all, including printing?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think this information should be called for by an Address, as it will take a long time to collect the papers from the various departments.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If you will allow this to go as a notice of an Address, I would like to add the names of the commissioners in each case.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am to-day sending notice to the different departments where these commissions have been issued, and I will give the information as soon as it comes.

MILITARY COLLEGE AT KINGSTON.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. AMYOT) asked, How many cadets have attended the Military College at Kingston since its foundation and received their diploma? What has been the total cost of the college to the Dominion since its foundation? How much does it cost the Dominion yearly to maintain the college? How many pupils of the college were granted their diploma during the scholastic year 1890-91?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 309 cadets have attended the Royal Military College at Kingston, since its foundation, and 175 have received their diplomas. The total net cost of the college to the Dominion since its formation is $768,197.48. The average annual net cost of the college is $48,012. Eighteen cadets of the college were granted their diplomas in the year 1890-91.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on an account of certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th of June, 1892, the sum of $10,387,689.17 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 167) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 129) to amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DEWDNEY. The second clause was allowed to stand for two purposes: one, in order that the schedule might be prepared, and also, I think, with reference to the application made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) regarding the police. Instead of repealing the whole of section 2, I would ask that only a portion be repealed. I propose to leave that portion which says that the members of the Assembly shall receive $500, as it is. With regard to the schedules, it is proposed to give the Assembly twenty-six members instead of, as heretofore, twenty-two members and three experts. That will carry out the proposition of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Davis) by adding two to Alberta, one to the Saskatchewan and one to Assiniboia, which will make the total number twenty-six. I have laid on the Table a plan showing the division of districts proposed under this Bill; and as I informed the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), we have to provide for an election which takes place in the course of a month or two, it will be for Parliament to say whether, in the future, the division of districts should be left to the Assembly. I think there would be no objection to that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think in the future it ought to be left to the Assembly.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We ought to decide the number of members.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The number may be indefinitely enlarged, and we have to pay them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If they had only a fixed amount of money appropriated, the more they multiplied the members, the less they would get.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Act says they shall get so much each. I think it right to allow them to alter the boundaries of the districts.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Do I understand the Minister of Justice to say that the Assembly will be allowed to alter the boundaries at any time?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is what is proposed.

Mr. CHARLTON. This Bill provides for a Legislature of 26 members. Is there any provision for a future increase?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; that is what we were discussing, and I was urging that that should be kept in the hands of this Parliament to arrange from time to time, so that the number should be definite, but that we should give them power to alter the boundaries of the electoral districts.

On section 10,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am astonished that the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) does not suggest some other name instead of Moose Jaw. That is the translation of an Indian name, and I am sure that it must grate harshly upon the exquisitely fine ear of the hon. gentleman. I will suggest that it be called Davin's Jaw.

Mr. DAVIN. The name is taken from a stream called the Moose Jaw. I believe it is the translation of an Indian word, but it is very appropriate, because the stream forms an outlet very like that of a moose jaw. But I object to Davin's Jaw for this reason—that we intend to have mills on the

Moose Jaw, and if we have Davin's Jaw, probably some Mills would be afraid to go there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. gentleman will be content as long as the mills go after they are there.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to call the attention of the Government to a matter I raised in committee the other day, and it is a subject I dealt with on a motion for the first reading of the Bill to amend the Dominion Lands Act. It has relation to the clause that limits section 13. The Bill reads :

"7. Section thirteen of the Act is hereby repealed, and the following is substituted therefor :—
"13. The Legislative Assembly shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, or of any other Act of the Parliament of Canada in force in the Territories, have power to make ordinances for the Government of the Territories in relation to the classes of subjects next hereinafter mentioned."

Sub-section 6 has reference to the incorporation of companies for territorial objects, with the following exceptions : "railway, tramway, steamboat, canal, transportation, telegraph, and telephone and irrigation companies." I called the attention of the Government to this, as I thought it was unwise to limit the power of the Legislative Assembly in regard to railway or tramway, and other such companies, and, if I may refer to what I said on the motion for the first reading of the Dominion Lands Act, I may say that I pointed out that the United States was accustomed to give grants of lands for railway purposes to these territories and I instanced especially Minnesota. An hon. gentleman who is always well informed on railway matters, and who is especially well informed on matters connected with the United States, questioned the accuracy of the statement. Now, Sir, as a matter of fact the Territory of Minnesota obtained grants of lands from Congress to the extent of 4,051,140 acres for the purpose of giving lands to railways, and the advantage that has accrued to them is very great, because Minnesota derives a large revenue at the present time from a certain percentage which that State is entitled to on the net profit. I do not intend to move in this matter, but I call the attention of the Government to it, that perhaps we err on the side of not giving more power to the Legislative Assembly. I do not see that it would be any harm to give it the power to incorporate railways, tramways and irrigation companies. I call the attention of the Government to it because they may have to deal with the territories at some future session, and I think it would be well to consider whether the power to incorporate small railway companies should not be given to the Assembly ; and whether it would not be well, also, to do what was done in the case of Minnesota, and place at their disposal a certain amount of land which they could give to the railways.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means (18th inst.) concurred in and referred to Committee on Bill (No. 116) to further amend the Inland Revenue Act.

Bill considered in Committee, and reported.

Mr. DAVIN.

BEET-ROOT SUGAR BOUNTY.

Resolution reported from Committee of the Whole (17th inst.) respecting the payment of a bounty to the producers of raw beet sugar produced in Canada, concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 168) to encourage the production of beet-root sugar.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Bill (No. 163) to amend the General Inspection Act, was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. COSTIGAN. After a great deal of care and consideration, very high grades have been fixed for the inspection of grain grown in our country, especially in the North-West and Manitoba, which were justified by the character of the wheat generally grown there, taking the average crops. It is very important that the grades so fixed shall have a permanent character and not be changed from time to time, according to the growth of any particular year. The grades fixed may be higher than those fixed in Chicago. We have one grade not fixed there at all, called Extra No. 1 hard wheat. It occurs sometimes, from causes over which we have no control, that a large portion of the crop may not come up to the general average ; and if inspected according to the standard fixed, a large portion of grain would range very low indeed. Application is then made at once to lower our grade ; and we have thought it better to maintain the standard fixed, to be known as the official standard of the country, but to meet the requirements of a special season when, owing to drouth and other causes, the crop would not come up to such an average, samples may be selected of that particular season's growth and grades fixed, to be known as commercial grades, giving a commercial value, and the grains would go on the market in that way, the official standard remaining untouched.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose this legislation is required by the boards of trade of the North-West ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes ; and generally by every one interested in the crop there.

Mr. SPEAKER. The difficulty may arise that in establishing a grade for a special year, you may lower the general standard of the wheat grown. It seems to me, unless there is a general demand for this Bill, it is not the kind of legislation we should pass.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose the best rule, under all circumstances, is to follow the advice of those interested. I would not venture my judgment against that of the boards of trade of Winnipeg and the other towns in the North-West, who are best competent to give an opinion.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I would inform the leader of the Opposition that this change is made at the request, not only of the board of trade of Winnipeg, but of the boards of trade of all the other towns of Manitoba and the North-

West. Mr. Bell, the secretary of the Winnipeg Board of Trade and also of the grain exchange at that place, came down here a short time ago asking on behalf of those boards for this special grading. I do not profess to understand the question myself, but, as the leader of the Opposition has said, I suppose the boards of trade are best qualified to deal with it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose the object of fixing standards for grain is to obtain a standard by which you can compare the grain of the North-West with grain all over the world, where it is grown for the market. If you fix a special grade, then it seems to me it does not mean anything. I cannot see what purpose it is intended to serve. If, for instance, the wheat is unripe, or frozen, or affected in some particular way so that you cannot classify it as under first, or second, or any other grade, I suppose it would be sufficiently designated by mentioning its defect, but I do not see how you are going to classify it so that it will be to any advantage to the agriculturist or to any other interested in it as an article of merchandise.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I may say that I am influenced specially in this matter by the opinions of those who ought to know about the requirements of that country, the boards of trade. We have our grades established so high, that in special years a very large proportion of the crop would be rejected according to those grades. We have either to make an exception and leave the high standards untouched and permanent, making this exceptional ruling for a special crop, or we have to lower the general grades which Parliament has established, which would have a very bad effect.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You would not have to come down in the standard.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes: because these grades are fixed at the request of the North-West people themselves in order to meet the average crop of that country, which is an excellent crop, as hon. gentlemen know, in quality, in weight, in colour, and everything of that kind. Parliament has made the grades higher in the North-West than they are in Chicago. Now, if we do not agree to the suggestion in this respect, not to give the official character of inspection to this kind of grain, but to make this a commercial grade for a special purpose and only for that one season, you will have to abandon the high grades under all circumstances.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why should you touch the grades if you fix the standard according to the quality of the crop? If this does not come up to that standard it is not the less an article of merchandise, but is of an inferior quality, which the purchaser is able to judge for himself. You do not help him in the least by undertaking to fix an artificial grade which he cannot compare with anything else. He must see the grain itself before he can judge.

Mr. CHARLTON. We are not likely to have the grading of wheat in the great markets of the world affected by the views of the boards of trade of Winnipeg and the little towns in the North-West. Wheat is graded in Chicago, in New York, in Liverpool and the other markets of the world, and the grading is established there, and it is absurd to suppose that you can establish a standard which is fluctuating and goes up and down according to circumstances. If you have a crop of frosted wheat one year and very little No. 1 hard, you are proposing to make special standards for that year. That is a perfect absurdity. The wheat has to be sold in the markets of the world on the established grade in those markets, and you cannot make any grading in the North-West which will mitigate the results of not having your wheat up to the standards of the corn markets of the world. You may adopt the ordinary standards of grading, and I think the adoption of any other rule will beget mischievous consequences.

Mr. TROW. I think any rule adopted by Parliament for the grading of wheat in the North-West has a tendency to an imposition on the settlers and is altogether in favour of the buyers, who take advantage of those who sell on account of the grading.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is like a scheme to make a fiat dollar serve the purpose of a coin. I think the Minister of Inland Revenue had better let the usages of the world apply to the North-West, and I believe he will find it will be to the advantage of that country.

Mr. DAVIN. I think my hon. friends are entirely mistaken as to the way in which this clause would operate. Last year we had a good crop in the North-West, and we had a large amount of very peculiar wheat. It had not filled out in consequence of the absence of June rains, and some of the buyers at first graded it as if it was frosted wheat. They graded it low. By-and-bye, it went over to England, and there it was found to be of the very first quality, but it was only late in the season that anything like a proper price was given for this wheat. If we had had this legislation then, that wheat could have been graded specially in the way provided for in this clause. Nearly every year we have wheat in the North-West that should be thus specially graded, and I know that in my constituency there is a strong desire to have such legislation as this passed.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this is very dangerous legislation. I would like to know if the Boards of Trade of Toronto and Montreal and other places throughout this Dominion have been consulted in relation to this matter. We are not here to legislate simply in the interests of Manitoba and the North-West or what they may conceive to be their interests, but we are legislating here in the interests of the whole Dominion. This grain which may be marked No. 1 of this Dominion under an enactment passed here, may grade very much lower when it is placed on the commercial boards in Toronto, Montreal and other points, and I think it is going to militate against the success of the North-West rather than in its favour to pass this provision. I agree with the member for Perth (Mr. Trow) that the members of the boards of trade and those who deal in wheat in the North-West will take the advantages which this Bill will give them in securing from the producers their wheat at perhaps a less price than they otherwise would do.

Mr. COSTIGAN. He did not say that.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). It will operate the other way.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot see how that can be. Why should we introduce legislation affecting only the North-West? I should like to know if

there is any legislation in the United States affecting Dakota and Minnesota alone.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) ought to support this Bill. He says the system, so far, has been in favour of the buyer and to the detriment of the seller. Here is a case where a large proportion of the crop, as stated by the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) does not come up to the standard, and the farmer is at the mercy of the buyer because his wheat will not grade at the standard. But for this exceptional circumstance we propose that the seller shall not be at the mercy of the buyer, and that the wheat which will not come under the higher grades shall have a special classification for that one year. The hon. gentleman says we ought not to legislate for the North-West specially, but the hon. gentlemen representing that section of the country all say they desire this legislation. It has been pressed upon my notice, and has passed the Senate, and now comes here. There has been no objection to it from any quarter.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to get an answer to my question. I asked the hon. gentleman if the proposition had been submitted to, or recommended by, the Boards of Trade of Montreal and Toronto; or has there been special legislation of this kind with regard to the North-Western States?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know anything about the legislation of the North-Western States.

Mr. McMULLEN. With regard to the Boards of Trade of Montreal and Toronto?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know that they expressed any opinion on the subject.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says they did not obtain a proper price for their grain, although it was perfectly good and was of excellent quality, but it had been injured by the summer drought; that is, the wheat had matured, but it was shrunk. Well, under the existing provisions that grain would be graded as sound wheat, but it would not be graded as first-class wheat; certainly it would not rank along with wheat that was immature and had suffered from frost. If it were graded it would simply show the incompetence of those who had graded wheat in the North-West, it would not show anything else; it would not show that something novel and special was required. The statement of the hon. gentleman only shows that the work is imperfectly done under the law as it is, not that further legislation is needed. I am at a loss to understand why you undertake to make special grades. What is the object? Surely, if there is a certain year when grain is frosted, when it is not matured, there ought to be a grade for that, and whenever a need occurs, whenever that sort of wheat is put upon the market, there should be a standard by which it might be tried. The hon. gentleman proposes by this legislation to create a special grade for a particular year, by which you could not compare the wheat that was put upon the market under that grade with any grain elsewhere; there will be no possibility of doing that. Certainly in this matter the law must adjust itself to circumstances, not circumstances to the law. You are obliged to apply the same rules in Canada that are applied in the United States, that are applied in Russia. You cannot make a different rule, because when the grain goes to the markets of Europe where it is required for consumption, it will be judged by the standard that exists there; and you cannot make any standard that will be of any value, because it will only enable unscrupulous buyers to take advantage of the agricultural population that have such grain for sale.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is entirely in the interest of the agriculturists, and against unscrupulous buyers.

Mr. CHARLTON. How would the Minister of Inland Revenue look upon a proposition arbitrarily changing the grading of sugar under the present arrangement of the Dutch standard, and making an exceptional grade of sugar applicable to a certain province? It would be a piece of absurdity, yet it would be exactly on the same line as this proposed legislation. Here is the article of wheat which is known in all the markets of the world by certain qualities, certain grades, and it is impossible to change that when it reaches the ultimate market; and if you interfere with that grading in Manitoba, or the grading that will be applied to wheat in England, you are simply working mischievous consequences, and will do nobody any good. The idea of making special legislation in this matter applicable to one province, is, in my opinion, a wrong principle altogether. You might just as well introduce in one province a different standard of weights and measures instead of having it uniform throughout the Dominion. I think we had better retrace the steps we have taken here, and conclude that the grading of wheat, which is customary in the markets of the world, we cannot interfere with in this House. We cannot make of frosted wheat in Manitoba a No. 1 wheat, we cannot make No. 2 wheat No. 1 wheat, we cannot by legislation change the quality of wheat, we cannot change the grading that wheat will receive when it goes into the markets of the world, and consequently we had better let the matter alone.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I do not think some of the hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this question understand the real scope of this Bill. There is no intention of having frozen wheat called No. 1 hard—that is not thought of for a moment. The fact is that in certain years in the North-West a part of the crop has been caught by frost, or has deteriorated in value in other ways. In the past that wheat has been graded just as this Act proposes that wheat now shall be graded, that is to say, it is known as No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3, with the word "commercial" added. It is not understood by anyone there that "No. 1 commercial" means "No. 1 hard." The only object in asking for this legislation now is that, whereas in the past these grades known as commercial grades have been well known to the trade there. The inspector has felt uncertain as to whether he was justified in issuing certificates grading the wheat according to these commercial grades. If these grades are not established, this wheat has to be left ungraded altogether, and the consequence is that the farmer, whom hon. gentlemen opposite are so anxious to protect, is the very one who suffers, because instead of having his wheat graded, he is obliged to sell it by sample, which is very much to the advantange of the buyer. As long as

the wheat is sold by sample it is impossible for the farmer, or for the man who buys from the farmer, and wishes to export it, to get it stored in any elevator. His wheat, if stored, can only be taken in by the car load and cannot be dumped into the large bins in which they store graded wheat, and the consequence is that he has practically to send on a car load of wheat as soon as purchased to whatever point it is destined for, having first sent the sample ahead, and in that way the farmer is very much at the mercy of the purchaser; whereas if these commercial grades were established, which are understood by the trade just as well as No. 1 or No. 2 hard, this would not be the case and the seller would obtain a fair price. The only change that is made now is to recognize the certificates which are already given by the inspectors appointed by the Government. The western boards of trade are very much interested in this, they are not interested in seeing the farmer cheated; they are interested in getting a fair price for the wheat purchased in that country, but they think, and apparently with unanimity, that the interest of the country would be better served by having this legislation passed. I have no doubt at all that those hon. gentlemen who have taken different views are perfectly honest in their opposition to the measure, and believe that it will injure the country, or will cause confusion in the grading of wheat. But I am of opinion that the members of boards of trade there, who have considered this matter very carefully for several years past, are quite as competent, and perhaps even a little more competent, to judge of this measure than either the gentlemen who have spoken or myself, or perhaps any other member of the House. I would simply submit that this legislation has not been proposed without being asked for, and asked for by those most deeply interested in the matter.

Mr. TROW. These grades in question are only known to the buyers. A farmer in Manitoba or the North-West knows nothing about them, and is only guided by the decision of the buyer. The buyer has, therefore, an opportunity to impose on the seller, because the farmer is not prepared to say as to how his grain should be rated, whether as No. 1, 2, or 3, and, of course, the buyer can impose on him by saying that his wheat is not No. 1 as he supposed, but No. 2, and the farmer will thus only receive the price of No. 2. Under other circumstances the farmer would be able to compare his wheat with that of his neighbour and draw a comparison of the value of his products.

Mr. McMULLEN. I regret that the Minister of Inland Revenue has not submitted this Bill to the different boards of trade of the Dominion, especially as this legislation is of a peculiar character, affecting only Manitoba and the North-West. I do not challenge the statements of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald). For my part, I would be very reluctant to stand in the way of any legislation of interest to the farmers of the North-West as well as other sections of the country; but, at the same time, we should, in passing legislation of this kind, see that we are not jeopardizing any interests of the Dominion. I hold that, under this Bill, Manitoba No. 1 may be graded either as commercial No. 1 or as standard No. 1. How is a man who buys flour to know, when he sees it stated to be Manitoba No. 1, whether it is No. 1 hard or No. 1 commercial? He may thus purchase flour of second class quality instead of No. 1 hard. This legislation will have a very serious effect on the manner in which flour is bought and sold. No. 1 Manitoba hard brings the highest price of any flour in Ontario. Suppose that a miller in the North-West finds, that by the passage of this Act, he can place on the Ontario market a large quantity of flour ground from No. 1 commercial wheat, how is the buyer going to know whether the wheat is of that quality or of No. 1 hard? Such legislation gives an improper advantage to the millers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If this Bill is going to improve the condition of farmers, I should like to ask the Minister if they have petitioned in its favour? Farmers understand their business, and if the Bill is in favour of their interests, petitions will have been sent in its favour. Boards of trade do not usually look after the interests of the farmers as much as people imagine. A few years ago on matters affecting the farmers of the North-West they petitioned very numerously. If they have petitioned in this case, the petition will be in charge of the Minister, and we shall be glad if he will let us know the facts.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think it necessary that the statements of every member should be backed up by petitions. No one asked the hon. gentleman during his speeches this session whether he had petitions behind him backing up the statements he made. The hon. gentleman has already heard that the people of the North-West desire this legislation, and that the boards of trade in all the towns and cities of the North-West desire it. He might also take it for granted that the statements made by members from that part of the country fairly represent the views of the farmers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why does the Minister bring forward the fact that the board of trade wished the legislation, when he finds fault with me for asking if petitions have been received from farmers? Why did he complain of my question?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not complain.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, you certainly have been complaining.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman must address the Chair.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I had almost lost sight of the Chair, because I was looking at a Minister who is very much bigger than the Chairman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the Minister propose to adopt any provision to prevent flour manufactured from No. 1 or 2 commercial grade being confounded with No. 1 and 2 regular standard, and what are the regulations he proposes, because this Bill is a declaration to all the world that Manitoba and the North-West produce frozen wheat?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If there were any danger of that happening which the hon. gentleman suggests, I would be prepared to adopt safeguards. I do not, however, think there is any such danger. If flour is produced from frozen or unripe wheat the inspection must be faulty if it should not be classified according to the grade to which it belongs. No classification is given to the wheat ground, but to the flour produced, and if the flour is No. 1 it is

so graded, irrespective of the wheat from which it is manufactured.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

WEIGHERS OF GRAIN.

Bill (No. 164) to make further provisions respecting Weighers of Grain was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COSTIGAN. This Bill provides for only an unimportant change, and I believe there will not be much discussion on it. As the law now stands, the boards of trade have power given them by this Parliament to issue licenses, after examination, to qualified persons authorizing them to weigh. They have petitioned now that at the most important points of shipping, weighers might be appointed by the Government on their recommendation, and this Bill provides that, in certain cases where it is deemed advisable, on the petition of the board of trade for the locality, the Government can appoint a nominee of the board of trade. The Bill further states that the inspector or assistant inspector, on the recommendation of the board of trade, would be eligible for that position.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 162) to correct a clerical error in the Act 53 Vic., chap. 81, respecting the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Sir John Thompson.)

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS.

On the Order, receiving Report of Committee of Whole on a certain proposed resolution (30th July) respecting the expediency of amending the Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies,

Mr. DEWDNEY moved:

That the said resolution be amended by striking out all the words after the word "railway" in the fifth line to the end of the resolution, and inserting the following words instead thereof: "from the town of Calgary, in the District of Alberta, in the North-West Territories, to a point in or near Township twenty-nine, Range twenty-three, west of the 4th Meridian, a distance of about fifty-five miles."

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the line been surveyed, and is the distance accurately known?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; the line has been located.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there some portion of it built?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; no portion of it has been built?

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask, also, what is the character of the land along that railway? It appears to me that we are giving away very large tracts of lands in the North-West to railway companies. At the time of the inception of the scheme for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we were assured by the late First Minister, and by other Ministers, that by this year we should have received not less than $70,000,000 from that country from all sources to recoup this Dominion for the money it has expended on that road. Ever since, however, we have been giving the Government power to donate enormous tracts of lands to all the railway companies that choose to apply for them. I do not know the character of these lands. They may be good farming or ranching or coal lands; and if so, it seems to me that the prospect of opening up such a country to traffic ought to be a sufficient inducement to any railway company to construct a line 55 miles long through a comparatively level country, without asking us for a grant of 6,400 acres per mile. I think a return should be brought down giving us some idea of the quantity of land we have given away in this manner, and the quantity that we still have available for settlers. Will all the grants that we have given to colonization companies, ranching companies and railway companies, it appears to me that the land which was intended to recoup us for the enourmous sums which we have spent for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway is dwindling down to very small proportions, and that the country will find that the resources upon which we have been depending to relieve this Dominion of the burdens it has undertaken, have been frittered away. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) appears to be tickled at the remarks I am making. As one of the representatives of the North-West, he seems to be delighted that it is getting all it wants, while the poor taxpayers of the other parts of the Dominion have to pay the piper. That has been our experience in the past, and it is likely to continue so. I consider it my duty to raise this objection, whatever others may do.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is an old line, which has had this land subsidy for two or three years, and this resolution is only to transfer the subsidy from a line from Cheadle station to a line from Calgary.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is always difficult to profit by the experience of anybody else; everybody generally has to learn from his own experience. If we could profit by the experience of the United States in subsidizing railways with land grants, it would be a very good thing for us. The United States have gone through the same experience as we are going through, but on a larger scale. A large portion of the public domain of the United States has been granted to railway corporations; and that experience has demonstrated that at least two-thirds of those land grants were useless, because the railways for which they were given would have been built without them. We are following in the same course. We have not the same kind of lobbying at Ottawa which used to prevail at Washington; but we have something nearly akin to it. We have the chartering of railway companies, formed not for the purpose of building railways, or with any intention on the part of the corporators to put their own money into them, but only for the purpose of getting a charter and a land grant so that they can trade on them and sell them to other parties who may be willing to build the road. If we adopted the policy in this country of waiting until the actual *bonâ fide* railway constructer wished to build a railway, we would no doubt save to this country vast areas of land, and would secure for this country just as good and rapid railway developments as we will under the present arrangement. I believe we are utterly reckless in frittering away that great heritage of

the people and of the future, the public lands of the North-West. I believe we are not doing our duty to the present or to the future. We are not acting with common sense and prudence in this matter, but recklessly; and Parliament is lending itself to furthering the purposes of mere speculators and schemers. I do not know that I have anything to say in regard to this particular Bill, but I believe we should exercise the greatest caution in this matter. We have gone too fast and too far, and there is great force in what the hon. member for Wellington said. We are squandering the inheritance of the people. We are giving away the lands of the North-West; we are giving these lands away in blocks that would almost constitute a principality and a kingdom, and we require to act more slowly in this matter. The country, when it needs railway accommodation, will get it. The idea of projecting lines away in the wilderness, hundreds of miles, and giving large land grants, and then waiting for the construction of these lines until some degree of settlement renders them necessary, and allowing the companies that first obtain the charters to part with their charters to men who will actually build the road, is acting in anticipation of the wants of the country and on a principle entirely foreign to those of judicious business operations.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. Minister will tell us how much of the land appropriation to which the Canadian Pacific Railway is entitled has already been taken up, and how much yet remains to be expropriated from the Crown domain?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think last year I gave the exact information as to how the Canadian Pacific Railway land grant stood. It is now in the same position, except that the balance of their land has to be selected by the 1st January, 1892. They had up to last year selected, I think, nearly ten million acres on the main line proper, but they have given us no notification of any other lands selected in what is known as the northern reserve.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How much have they still to select?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Between seven million and eight million acres. They have had inspections made during the past eighteen months and have to make their final selection by the end of this year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is there anything to prevent their making selections within the very limits you now propose to grant by this Bill to another company?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They cannot do so, as that land has not been reserved for them to make a selection from. A special reserve is laid out from which they have to choose their land, and they cannot take outside these limits.

Resolution reported.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 169) further to amend the Act 52 Victoria, Chapter 4, to authorize the granting of subsidies in land to certain railway companies.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Would it be possible for the hon. Minister, at the next stage of the Bill, to give us an idea of the amount of lands held by railway companies in the North-West and Manitoba?

Mr. DEWDNEY. If I had known that this Bill was coming up to-day, I would have had that statement on the Table. There is another land subsidy to be granted, and I will then give the statement.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Not only to railways, but to colonization companies.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There will be very little there; but I will get that, too.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSPECTION OF SHIPS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 149) respecting the inspection of ships.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TUPPER. Section 7 stood in order that I might draft a section, if advisable, to carry out the suggestion made to exempt from the operation of the Bill vessels classed in the different bureaus or registers. It was shown that these vessels had to undergo very rigid inspection in order to attain their class, and it did not seem necessary that most of the clauses should apply to them. I propose to go back to section 3, and add to the exempting clause the following:—

This Act shall not apply to ships classed in Lloyds' register of British and foreign shipping, or ships classed in any other corporation or association for the survey and register of ships, approved by the Governor in Council, provided that if any ship ceased to be classed as aforesaid, it shall be subject to the clauses of this Act.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would that apply to inland waters?

Mr. TUPPER. To any part of Canada. There are three bureaus: Lloyds, the Bureau Veritas, and the American Record; and in not mentioning any other than Lloyds I am following the lines of British legislation, notably in the case of the Load Line Act. No doubt the British Parliament considered it was not well to recognize in the same manner foreign organizations, and besides, new registers may spring into existence.

On section 7,

Mr. WELSH. There is a Government inspector of machinery and a Government inspector of steamships. I see this allows any port warden to go on board a steamer and inspect it.

Mr. TUPPER. He has that power now in regard to steamboats. This has reference to sailing vessels. I want to add a section to this Bill. As originally drafted, the Bill did not contain one of the most important subjects that I wished to deal with in sufficiently explicit language, and the Committee will remember, no doubt, that a number of petitions were presented to this House in reference to the unsafe tackle used in loading and unloading ships, in consequence of which many accidents have occurred. Some very distressing ones occurred last summer and the year before, and lives have been lost. The labour associations in Canada have been very anxious that there should be some legislation dealing with that subject. Consequently, I propose to add the following as section 8 of the Bill:—

Every inspector may at any time visit any ship, whether registered in Canada or elsewhere, and whether propelled wholly or in part by steam, and inspect and examine the tackle, machinery or apparatus used for the loading or unloading thereof, and if he considers such tackle, machinery or apparatus defective so as to be dangerous to life, he shall report thereon to the Minister

who may order that such tackle, machinery or apparatus shall not be used until permitted by the Minister, and any tackle, machinery or apparatus used in violation of such order shall be liable to forfeiture and seizure by the chief officer of Customs at any port, and may thereupon be sold in the same way and under like provisions as goods liable to forfeiture for non-payment of Customs duties, and the owner of the ship shall incur a penalty of $100, and such ship shall be liable for the same.

The phraseology of the clause is similar to that in reference to the carrying out of the provisions regarding other unsafe features of a ship, and it is quite consistent with the principle of the legislation that we should treat it as quite as important for the safety of life that the tackle used in the loading and unloading of a ship shall be in proper order as anything else.

Mr. WELSH. I think it is very necessary that an inspection should be made of all the gear used in discharging ships, and I notice that the Government inspector of hulls, when he goes through our ships, is very particular to see that all the gear belonging to the ships is in perfect order: but, as he only makes a yearly inspection, it may be that coasters and other vessels visiting the piers occasionally may have defective gear. This penalty is very strong—seizure, and a penalty, and so on. I think the inspector should order its removal and renewal, and if that is not done within 48 hours, then he might confiscate and put what fine you like upon it; but if I say that a rope is worn out and fresh ropes and fresh blocks must be obtained and they must be replaced within 24 hours, that may be all right, but it is too severe and too arbitrary to allow anyone to go on board and confiscate at once. You might give them 24 hours' notice or 12 hours' notice: but it is going too far to give the inspector absolute power to condemn a thing of which he may not be as good a judge as the master.

Mr. TUPPER. The officer in none of these cases deals in that summary manner the hon. gentleman deprecates. The officer has no authority to order these things to be done, but he has to report fully to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who may order it. The whole thing is based on the idea that there shall be no sudden action, but that there shall be careful enquiry.

Mr. WELSH. Then I think there is too much red tape about that. An inspector, if he is a competent man, should be able to deal with that himself. I know, if I were appointed inspector and went on board a ship, and I saw the gear was old and ought to be condemned, I would have it taken out.

Mr. TUPPER. But if I had you for an inspector I would not mind that being the law. But the trouble is that the ship-owners, and this House almost unanimously in committee, agreed that we should not clothe any man with such arbitrary authority, and the hon. gentleman will see the danger that, although one inspector might carry out those instructions very well and faithfully, the shipping interest itself is of such a character that it is proper we should proceed with great caution, and in the inception of this legislation it was deemed advisable that reference should be made to the Minister; and I may tell the hon. gentleman that it does not mean so much the individual who occupies that position for the time being, as it does the nautical advisers of that department who examine the reasons before any action is taken against a ship-owner which may mean the imposition of a penalty. It is in the interest of the ship-owner that the system is adopted which the hon. gentleman terms "red tape," rather than the clothing of any one officer at a port with power which he might exercise in an arbitrary way.

Mr. WELSH. Do I understand the Minister to say that when an inspector goes on board a ship and sees unfit gear in use and condemns it, the captain of the ship must stop using that at once?

Mr. TUPPER. No.

Mr. WELSH. Then, what is the good of it? You may have a dozen men killed between the time he inspects it and the time the Minister gives his decision on it.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see in other clauses in reference to the safety of life, that the responsibility is cast on the owner. But in reference to the imposition of a fine because the owner will not do what he is told by the inspector, on reflection the hon. gentleman would be the first to complain if we did not provide that the complaint should be fully investigated.

Mr. WELSH. I do not understand it yet. I know that under the English Inspection Act, there is a Board of Trade inspector appointed at every port in Great Britain, and that inspector is at liberty to go on board any ship in the port. If he finds anything that needs to be renewed, he condemns it, he lays a complaint at the Custom-house and the ship has to be detained. The thing is done at once. There is something about this I do not fully understand. I quite agree with the principle of the Bill, that for the safety of life and the protection of property, you need to compel every ship-owner to have good and proper gear for the discharging and loading, the hauling and mooring of a ship. But I cannot understand that when an inspector goes on board and says: This gearing is deficient, these blocks and these ropes are worn out and are not fit to be used and are dangerous to life and property—I cannot understand that the inspector has no right to compel them to be renewed at once, but that he has instead first to report to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and in the meantime half a dozen men may be killed and the ship may get to sea.

Mr. TUPPER. In nine cases out of ten the repairs would be done at once.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there is a good deal of force in what my hon. friend says. I do not see what is to be gained by reporting to the Minister. If there is a competent officer appointed upon whom the Minister relies for his judgment and whom he consults, why should not that officer decide directly that the ship must be repaired before it leaves port; otherwise, as my hon. friend says, she may be across the Atlantic before the Minister is heard from, and so no useful purpose is served by this regulation.

Mr. TUPPER. We find that our experience under the Steamboat Inspection Act, which Act this Bill follows, has been most satisfactory, and it prevents the possibility of arbitrary or hasty action on the part of the officers; there is no analogy between the circumstances in our ports and the circumstances in English ports, for the reason that they always have first-class competent men for inspectors. We have some good men, it is true. In the Steamboat Inspection Act that is the proce-

dure that is followed—the officer takes direct authority. When a *bonâ fide* case is brought to the notice of the captains they are only too glad to take action at once. In the Steamboat Inspection Act, final action is not taken, nor is there a risk of penalty incurred, until the action of the department is known on report of the inspector.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The interest of the party regulates him.

Mr. WELSH. The Minister is very candid ; he says in some ports they have got efficient men, but he cannot say the same in all the ports. I quite agree with him. Now, suppose an ignorant and incompetent inspector goes on board a ship and condemns a perfectly good material, what appeal has the owner or master of that ship for redress for the injury that is done him by the inspector condemning good material?

Mr. TUPPER. The same as the owner of a steamboat has ; when the inspector orders certain things to be done, the owner has an appeal to the department.

Mr. WELSH. A sailing vessel is quite different from a steam vessel. I quite agree that in the steamboat inspection you have got good men, and you can depend on them. I have had a good deal to do with these men for the last twenty or thirty years and there are some of them upon whose judgment I can always depend. But what are you going to do with sailing vessels? The steamboat inspector does not inspect sailing vessels, and the Minister admits that some of his inspectors for sailing vessels are incompetent. One of them may go on board who does not know a good piece of rope from a bad piece, and he causes annoyance to the owner of the ship. I think it is very dangerous to have an incompetent inspector, and you ought to provide a real remedy so that if the inspector condemns a good material, he shall be liable for the damage, and the ship-owner may have some redress against the officer who has done him the wrong.

Mr. TUPPER. If an inspector does that, we will turn him out.

Committee rose ; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 15,

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it intended that this Act shall be brought into operation in one part of the Dominion and not in the other?

Mr. TUPPER. The object of this clause is that the Act shall not become law the moment it is approved, but a proclamation shall be issued which will have the effect of giving notice to parties interested.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Public Buildings, Nova Scotia.....$ 10,000

Mr. LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. FOSTER. The first item is for Dominion public buildings. It is a vote for $1,500 to be used in effecting such repairs and improvements in Dominion buildings at Halifax as shall be recommended by the chief architect, with a view to keeping such buildings in proper order and in general repair. The amount is for general repairs on the large buildings.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then there has been no recommendation made by the chief architect yet. It is singular.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it is singular. All these large buildings require every year to have some repairs made to them. This estimate is for the amount of money required for the Halifax public buildings for the current year. It is for repairs and not for new buildings.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the amount expended on this building last year?

Mr. FOSTER. $1,507.68. We have, besides, the examining warehouse and the post office, and the total expenditure on all of these, last year, was $3,934. In the Dominion building, the postmaster's office was fitted up and painted, glass doors were put up ; the post office inspector's office was cleaned, painted and furnished, and oil cloth and screens provided for the Inland Revenue office. The walls and ceiling of the office of the assistant Receiver General were cleaned and tinted and the woodwork painted, and there were screens, and carpets, and book cases, and furniture supplied. My hon. friend will see it is for that kind of repairs.

Mr. McMULLEN. The money was expended on those repairs last year, and it should not be necessary to repeat them this year. Is this money to be expended for draining, or roofing, or what else? The inside of the building appears to have been well attended to last year ; and can the Minister tell us if this money will be spent on the outside this year?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will easily understand that these buildings require some repairs every year.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can understand pretty well that it requires a considerable sum annually to keep these buildings in repair : but while it is quite right that Parliament should be asked to provide for these necessary expenditures, it is well that we should criticize them and see how the money goes. We are anxious to assist the Government all we can in economising, and we want to place you in a position to say to those who spend the money that a strict account shall be given for every dollar. It is well that economy should be practised, and that we should see that none of the money is squandered.

Mr. FOSTER. That is so.

Mr. CHARLTON. We heard no explanation as to the vote for Sydney post office and the Halifax immigrant building.

Mr. FOSTER. The vote of $1,000 for the Sydney (South) post office is required to complete the contract now under construction according to the estimate of the chief architect. A vote of

$2,500 is required by the chief architect for carrying out indispensable improvements which are urgently required for the reception and accommodation of the large number of immigrants who arrive at the port of Halifax. There is also the cost of the fitting up of the office for a direct cable connection, and providing for incandescent lights and furniture. The appropriation of $5,000 for the Dartmouth post office is mainly intended for the purpose of purchasing a site for the projected post office at Dartmouth, and the starting of building operations in 1891-92. This is a revote.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the revenue from that post office?

Mr. FOSTER. Postal revenue, $1,725; money orders issued and paid, $14,000; savings banks deposit, $7,791, for year ending 30th June, 1890.

Mr. CHARLTON. How much is the estimated cost of the post office, including the site?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not that information here.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the population of Dartmouth?

Mr. FOSTER. It must be four or five thousand.

Mr. CHARLTON. This system of building post offices in little country towns, such as in the county town of the County of Haldimand, with a population of five or six hundred, has been carried altogether too far. I question very much the propriety of the policy pursued by the Government in building post offices in those small country towns, where a building suitable for the purpose could be rented at less than one-third the interest on the money expended in erecting those public buildings. In the United States the building of post offices is restricted to large cities and in cities of 10,000 or 15,000 inhabitants, the department is restricted as to the rent which should be paid for the office, so that these large expenditures are not incurred in that country. We should take into account that this is a young country, that the burdens of our people are now excessive, that our debt is three times greater *per capita* than that of our neighbours of the United States, and we ought to begin to get into a line of economy in expenditure. There is certainly no feature of economy that we might practise more readily than to do away with these large and unnecessary expenditures for public buildings, except where they are absolutely necessary. I have no doubt that this is one case amongst dozens of others, where a building suitable for the post office could be obtained for perhaps $200 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think you could do that in a town of this size.

Mr. WATSON. What is the system pursued by the Government in erecting post offices in the different towns. According to the statement of the Minister the revenue for this office is only $1,700 a year, and yet the Government will not build a post office in towns where the revenue runs from $4,000 to $6,000 a year. I believe that the question of revenue should have a great deal to do with the erection of those buildings. I remember recently that when an application was made to the Postmaster General for a post office, the first thing taken into consideration was the revenue. Now, there ought certainly to be some rule laid down that a place would be entitled to a post office after the revenues reach a certain amount; but it is absurd to erect a post office at a place where the revenue is only $1,600 a year, while other places yielding $5,000 or $6,000 of revenue are left without a post office.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A resolution was carried through this House last year declaring that the expenditure for public works should be made in those places which yielded the largest revenue, other things being equal; but, according to the appearance of these estimates, I do not think that rule is being carried out. For instance, I do not see any appropriation for the erection of a post office at Woodstock, which is a very much larger place, and yields a very much larger postal and Customs revenue, than many of those places where buildings are being erected.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that this vote for Dartmouth post office is a revote. The subject was thoroughly discussed last year. With reference to the revenue, that does not always show the importance of a place, so far as postal accommodation is concerned. For instance, Dartmouth lies pretty close to Halifax, being separated from it just by water and its postal revenue, I should imagine, is largely reduced on that account, because, many letters written by the people of Dartmouth are posted at Halifax, while the delivery is at Dartmouth. Therefore, the accommodation required is very much more than the amount of postal revenue would show. I quite admit what my hon. friend says with regard to the town of Woodstock. It is large and important, and I have no doubt, that in due process of time it will receive consideration.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But that is not the rule laid down.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the revenue of Sydney, where you are building a post office?

Mr. FOSTER. The postal revenue is $2,900, the money orders issued $57,000, and the Customs duties about $10,000.

Mr. CASEY. Following the remarks of my hon. friend from Bothwell, I must point out another instance in which the principle involved in the resolution adopted last session should be followed. I think I have called the attention of the Government five or six times at least to the claims of an important town in my own riding, Ridgetown, a place of some four thousand people, about midway between St. Thomas and Chatham, about forty miles from either, and serving a very large and populous country. It is an outport of Customs now, and is a much larger place than many in which Custom-houses and post offices have been erected. The postal revenue of Ridgetown is $3,600, larger than that of either Dartmouth or Sydney, where the Government are erecting post office buildings. Under these circumstances, if the resolution of last session is to mean anything, that these public buildings shall be distributed according to the needs of the locality and not according to the political complexion of the constituency, I claim that Ridgetown ought to have a post office; and I hope that the Government will see their way to give it serious consideration. I cannot promise them of course that the representative of that riding, who-

ever he may be, will give them his support in the future; but they will be only doing an act of justice to the old, settled, populous and wealthy district served by this very important town.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to get an answer to my question. I would like to ask the Government on what principle they are erecting a post office where the revenue is only $1,700 while the town in which I live, which produced a revenue of $17,053 last year, is not to get one?

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me that the rule followed by the Government in the past has been to erect a post office in whatever constituency would give the Government candidate a majority of the votes.

Mr. FOSTER. No, you are quite wrong.

Mr. McMULLEN. In my section of the country they do not consider it necessary to bait their hook with a post office; but it appears that they cannot catch the Tories in the Maritime Provinces without baiting their hook with a post office or something of that kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite true, Mr. Chairman; we have had too many instances of it. We have witnessed in this House during the last eight or nine years the fact that the Government offered to build a post office in any constituency which they thought they could carry by doing so. I would like to ask the hon. Finance Minister what other reason he can give for building a post office at Dartmouth or at Sydney, and leaving towns in Ontario, yielding a revenue of $7,000 or $8,000 a year, without one. In the town in which I live, yielding $4,000 a year, there is no intention of building a post office. We have had a disgraceful instance of this kind of weakness in the past. In the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick they have to bait their hook with post offices, but our Ontario Tories will swallow the bare hook. They will even go Tory without a post office. We have had discussions on this subject for a number of years past, and every year it comes up afresh. Post offices have been built where there is no more necessity for them than there is for a fifth wheel to a coach, but though we have pointed this out over and over again, the abuse has gone on just the same, and the Government deserve very severe criticism on items of this kind. We are now asked for a revote, and this is the time to choke off this thing. The principle should be laid down that whenever the receipts of a post office reach a certain point, and then only, shall a post office be erected at any particular place, if there is none there already. At every election we have had the Minister of Public Works going around peddling post offices in exchange for constituencies, and in each case the estimated cost has been largely exceeded. This very Napanee post office, which we were told would not cost over $25,000, has cost $52,000. We cannot say whether there is any McGreevyism in the matter or not, for we have not time to investigate all the jobs that are perpetually coming up, furnishing *primâ facie* evidence for investigation. If the hon. Minister will turn up the estimate given the House by Sir Hector Langevin, when he controlled the Department of Public Works, he will find that he asked our consent to to the expenditure on the ground that this Napanee building would not cost over $25,000. How his estimate has been borne out is shown by the fact that it has cost $52,000. The same with every post office we have erected. Some particular thing was required to be done which has given rise to extras, and the result is that the House has been asked to double its vote. And not only is that the case with post offices, but there is not a single railway scheme which has been subsidized by the Government which has not cost 50 per cent. more than the original subsidy, and in some cases 100 per cent. more. Take every railway that has come before us, and what is the result? One year one sum is asked, another year an additional vote is required, the following year there is a further demand, and in the end we have to pay double the original estimate. It is the same way with dredging, and graving docks, and every other public work. Look, for instance, at the graving docks at Kingston, and Esquimalt, and elsewhere, all of which have cost double the amount originally contemplated. If any man, starting his career in commercial life, could not make a closer estimate of his expenditure he would soon find himself hopelessly sunk in insolvency. Yet we are supposed to have the best men employed in the departments to do our work. We pay them high salaries, and ought to have the best engineers, overseers, and deputy heads; and, no doubt, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, we have the best Ministers the country can produce. No doubt hon. gentlemen opposite imagine that their hats cover the best brains in the Dominion. But if the men we employ cannot estimate closer the cost of our public works than they have done in the past it is time we shipped the whole of them, and see if we cannot secure a more competent body. Every post office built for the past eight or ten years, since I have been here, has cost double the original estimate. After the building is up, another move has to be made to get the inside finished, then it has to be painted, and there are a hundred and one additions to be made, so that although the contract does not exceed the stipulated sum, the extras very often exceed the contract price. According to the evidence brought out before the Public Accounts Committee and the other committees, these extras cost as much as the original contracts. It would be only right that we should drop this revote, and I would move that it be struck out of the Estimates as unnecessary; and that we should incur no further expenditure of this kind until such time as the Government can decide as to what the revenue of any place is before undertaking to erect a post office.

Mr. FOSTER. What would you suggest as the minimum revenue?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will leave the hon. gentleman to think that matter over, for I am sure he would not avail himself of my assistance. If I were to offer my services to the Government, they probably would not accept them; and I do not desire to cast, I was going to say, pearls before swine.

Mr. FOSTER. Swine get into perils enough.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would suggest to the hon. Finance Minister that he should accept my resolution and wipe out this item. It is high time that we should put a stop to this expenditure on post offices, and not incur any new responsibilities until the Government decide that the revenue must first

reach a certain figure, let it be $7,000 or $8,000 or $10,000, before erecting a building. But when we go on building post offices in places where there is only $1,000 revenue and in others where there is only $2,800 revenue, we are acting unjustly to those places which give a larger revenue and have not the necessary accommodation.

Mr. ALLISON. With regard to the Napanee post office, the hon. Minister informed me, in answer to a question I put to him, that the estimated price was $25,000, and that it had cost over $48,000. There must have been, therefore, $20,000 extra. I find in the Public Accounts, in connection with this building, one item charged for sharpening mechanics' tools. Is it customary for the Government, when they let a contract, to keep the tools in order? If so, that item is in order; if not, it certainly should not have been allowed. Again, I find an item for steps outside the building to reach the letter box. These are three little wooden steps, about 3½ feet long each, and mechanics say they could not have cost over $3. Yet we find a charge of $57 for these three little steps. If, Sir, you will examine the whole of that building, you will find that all the extras, for which we are charged $20,000, could not have possibly cost over $5,000. I think there is excess in this matter; I think the charges made are not reasonable. Whether the Government are to blame or are not, I am not going to say, but certainly some one is to blame, and the country has to pay.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I suppose we may assume that these estimates are a legacy left to the present Administration by what we may fairly call the late Administration, and that the present Administration may feel bound to carry them out. But I for one feel bound to say that this sort of expenditure which has been going on for a very long time is one of those things in which I trust the present Administration will make a very decided reform. The country must necessarily enter upon some degree of economy in its expenditure, and I do not think there can be a more desirable way to adopt than by putting a stop to these buildings, especially in places where everyone knows they are given simply for political favours. I for one am determined, as far as my vote goes, that I will not support any more of such grants as have been passed during the last few years. We are bound to curtail our expenditure. There are many things in regard to which we should not curtail it, if we can avoid it, but we can curtail in this sort of expenditure which has been too much indulged in during the last few years, and I tell the Government plainly that I will not support them in this class of expenditure, which we must put an end to if we are sincere in desiring to effect economy in the public expenditure. When the country had lots of money, when we had an overflowing treasury and a large surplus, a little extravagance might possibly be pardoned and many public buildings might reasonably be erected, although everyone knows that the expenditure in that direction was carried to lengths which were not justifiable. At present, under a totally changed condition of things, having struck off a large portion of our revenue, having, as the Minister has said, placed ourselves in a position where we must economize, let us economize in these expenditures which are certainly not necessary in the public interest. Besides that, I do not propose to vote for the expenditure of any large sums of money until I know who is to have the expenditure of them, and who is to be responsible for the expenditure of that money. That is the view which I intend to take of these questions, and the action which I shall take will be based on those considerations.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Last session, we carried a resolution laying down a general principle with which the Government concurred. It seems to me, judging by the Estimates which are before us, that there has been a departure from the spirit of that resolution and that there is a necessity to go further. I think this House will be wanting in its duty to the country if it separated without formally stating that expenditures should not take place on public buildings where less than a certain amount of revenue is collected. We ought clearly to affirm this principle, and we ought to take away from the Administration a discretionary power which enables them to expend money in places where a small amount of revenue is collected, while places where a large amount of revenue is collected are entirely overlooked, simply because, as far as it is possible to judge, those places are represented by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I think there is a great deal of force, looking at the expenditures that have taken place for post offices and other public buildings, in the observation made by my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that these offices have been peddled out by the Public Works Department and bestowed upon constituencies that would return supporters of the Administration. That is a most improper condition of things, and yet, when you look at the expenditure that has taken place, you can come to no other conclusion. When you find the County of Kent represented by a supporter of the Administration, there is a public building erected, there is a large sum of money expended for dredging, that was no improvement, but led to serious damage to property, and imposed a serious charge upon the public revenue. Then again, in the constituency of West Middlesex, which was represented on the floor of this House for some time by a member of the Opposition, an appeal is made by a supporter of the Administration who promises to have a post office erected at Strathroy if the electors support the Government candidate. A supporter of the Government is returned, the property is purchased, and the post office is erected, while other places four times the size and with ten times the revenue of Strathroy are left without the erection of any public building, but an inferior one is rented and considered adequate for the public service at those places. There is my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He has had a large expenditure on public buildings in his county. I am told that in the town of Pictou there is a very large public building and that the inhabitants of that town have under serious consideration the propriety of abandoning their own houses and moving into that public building to live.

Mr. TUPPER. Allow me to inform the hon. gentleman that that building was constructed by Mr. Mackenzie.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman knows that his town has not grown. It has grown

backwards. This building is quite large enough to contain the inhabitants, and the hon. gentleman can furnish them with fuel and light probably without any cost to the parties. I understand also that the hon. gentleman has promised another public building in that town, that this one is not adequate for the needs of that place, and so another is to be erected. The hon. gentleman can say whether that is so or not.

Mr. TUPPER. I have promised no public building in the town of Pictou.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And none is to be erected there?

Mr. TUPPER. I hope there will be one soon.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And what is it to be?

Mr. TUPPER. I hope that every public building required by the necessities of the county will be supplied by the Government; but I never, either privately or publicly, promised any public building there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose the hon. gentleman said one was needed?

Mr. TUPPER. I think one is needed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course the people would take that to mean that the hon. gentleman intended to carry out what he said, and, of course, he will act up to his convictions.

Mr. TUPPER. We will see when the time comes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No doubt he will act up to his views of what is needed there.

Mr. TUPPER. What item is the hon. gentleman discussing? We are not asking for a vote for the County of Pictou.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We are discussing the general principle.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is out of order.

Mr. TUPPER. What is the item?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is the item just now, because he has laid down a proposition and has stated that the expenditure of a large sum of money is necessary there, and I am calling attention to the fact that the Government, in the Estimates before us, have departed from the principle they affirmed last session, that those places which are the most populous, those places were the largest amount of public business is done and the largest amount of revenue is collected, are the places where public buildings should first be erected for the accommodation of the public and to meet the requirements of the public, and that that is not the rule indicated in these Estimates, and is not the rule which the hon. gentleman has affirmed, as far as his own constituency is concerned.

Mr. STAIRS. I think the item for the Dartmouth post office is one that should pass. If hon. gentlemen knew the condition of the post office at Dartmouth for many years past, they would have no hesitation in voting this item. Dartmouth is an important place and has an important country surrounding it, and the people there have been very much inconvenienced for many years because the public building there has not given sufficient accommodation for the needs of the town. I think the hon. member for Bothwell gave a very unhappy instance when he referred to the construction of a public building in the town of Pictou, a building which as has been stated by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), was constructed by the Mackenzie Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Which building do you mean?

Mr. STAIRS. I mean the only public building in Pictou, the Custom-house.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have a return in my hand showing that that building was erected in 1872.

Mr. STAIRS. I saw the vote the other day myself.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You had better get up your figures.

Mr. STAIRS. In reading over the *Hansard* debates not long ago I discovered that the item referred to for Pictou, was voted under the Mackenzie Government, and a discussion took place upon the construction of the Custom-house.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has made a statement which is not borne out by the books, and I wish him to retract.

Mr. STAIRS. I have nothing to retract. I said I saw the discussion in the *Hansard* on the item for a public building in Pictou, at the time the Mackenzie Government was in power. If that vote was initiated in 1872, according to the doctrine which hon. gentlemen opposite have enunciated to-night, the Mackenzie Government ought to have dropped that item. It has been said by the hon. member for Bothwell that the present Government has been in the habit of constructing public buildings in towns which returned members supporting this Administration. Now, I am quite confident that last year the late member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), advocated the construction of a public building in the town of Dartmouth, and at that time he expected that the County of Halifax was going to return a member to oppose this Administration; I feel confident that at that time he thought he was going to be returned himself. Now, that there may be no mistake in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite as to the need of a public building in Dartmouth, I will read what was said in the last session of Parliament by Mr. Jones. This discussion took place upon the vote for public buildings in Nova Scotia, when Mr. Jones was reported to have said:

"I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the claims of Dartmouth for a post office. It is a place of 6,000 or 7,000 people, and which gives a revenue of nearly $1,700. The building that the post office is in, is in a wretched condition. Considering the size of the place, the people are entitled to a respectable building."

When the hon. member for Bothwell stated that public buildings were constructed only for constituencies represented by supporters of the Administration, he was mistaken, and I think he will acknowledge that in this instance, at any rate, he was not correct. My hon. colleague from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) also advocated the claims of Dartmouth to public buildings, in a very strong manner. But what was said by the ex-member, Mr. Jones, I think answers all the criticisms that have been put forth this evening against the vote for the construction of public buildings in the town of Dartmouth.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have no doubt that a great many other towns about the size of Dartmouth are exactly in the same condition that the

junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) represents Dartmouth to be in, that is, in a very unsatisfactory state, and very anxious for a public building. Any town can feel anxious for a public building when it wants a few thousand dollars expended in it. But the question is whether the town of Dartmouth is entitled to a public building, whether a place like Dartmouth, that gives a postal revenue of only $1,700 a year, should receive a post office, while a city like Woodstock, returning a revenue of $15,000 a year, should receive none; or whether a little town like Cayuga, in the county represented by my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague), yielding a revenue of $1,400, should receive a post office, and the City of Woodstock should receive none; or whether a little country village like Hagarsville, with five or six hundred inhabitants, should receive a port of entry, and some place ten times its size in a Reform constituency should receive none. The whole business of the appropriation for public buildings has been handled by this Government purely for party purposes. If a town happens to be in a riding where the expenditure of money can influence the result of an election in that riding, public money will be lavished upon it; but if a town is not in a riding where the Government can hope to carry the election, it makes no difference what may be the claims of that town, how great the revenue it returns, how strong may be its claims upon grounds of public interest, it will get no buildings. We need a rule in regard to this matter, we need to establish a minimum amount of population and revenue that will entitle a town to a public building; we need to name a figure below which no town whether in a Reform riding or in a Conservative riding, shall receive a public building. It is my opinion that no town should be entitled to have a post office erected at the expense of the Government that shows a revenue of less than $8,000; but here is the town of Dartmouth, with a revenue of only $1,700, and the town of Cayuga with only $1,400, the latter with a public building and the former to have one. It is the height of absurdity to expend public money for the erection of post offices in towns like these. And I wish to express my entire concurrence with the remarks made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), remarks that do that hon. gentleman a great deal of credit, when he says this kind of business has gone far enough. I think that the business of handling appropriations for public buildings for the purpose of producing political effect, is played out, and should cease henceforth, for it is the basest and worst form of bribery that can be indulged in. A member that spends a few thousand in a riding is infinitely less worthy of blame than a Government that spends millions of dollars for the purpose of buying ridings right and left over the whole Dominion. This vote for a little village like Dartmouth cannot be defended, and I second the motion of the hon. member for North Wellington that the item be dropped. And when we come to other votes of the same nature we will move that they be dropped also. I propose that we turn over a new leaf. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who is very virtuous in discharging subordinates against whom improper practices have been proven, should be virtuous enough to drop this improper expenditure also, and then we will have a little better state of things inaugurated in the matter of expenditures on public works.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to call attention to the fact that a year or two ago we laid down the principle in this House that public buildings were only to be constructed where the public interest demanded it, and that thereafter political considerations should not govern and control the Government in the selection of sites of where public buildings were to be placed. One would suppose that when the Government accepted that resolution, they would endeavour to conform to it, but it appears to me that they have got worse instead of better. They have allowed public interest to go to the winds, and have allowed political considerations to govern them in the use of the country's fund to erect public buildings. From the very hour that resolution was carried, with the sanction and the approval of the Government, almost every public building they have constructed since has been constructed for political reasons only. Take, for instance, towns where we have no public buildings in Ontario. Look at the public interests in those towns, look at the public considerations that demand that those towns should receive public buildings, and see them all passed over; while smaller towns, deserving well in their way, receive more consideration than other towns of much greater importance. Take, for instance, Woodstock. The total revenue is over $15,000, but there is not a public building erected there. Take Sarnia, with a postal revenue of $5,000; no public building there. Sarnia is in the County of Lambton, which is represented by my hon. friend, Mr. Lister. Woodstock is in the county of South Oxford. Bowmanville has a postal revenue of $4,745, Oshawa $5,433, Whitby $4,233, Waterloo $4,264, Listowel $4,129, Owen Sound $9,626, Kincardine $4,735, Ingersoll $8,556. Ingersoll is represented by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and although it has a revenue of over $8,500, yet it has no building, while, forsooth, we have before us an item for a town where the postal revenue is only $1,700 or $1,800, and the Government has the audacity to come to Parliament and ask for this vote to Dartmouth, while it passes over towns of the importance I have named. We are paying dearly for the support the Government receive from the two members from that county. It is time the people should wake up. If politics are to govern the Government on every occasion, and if the public interests are to be sacrificed for party ends, it is time we knew it. I wonder where the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) is. I saw that he had been in Montreal and Quebec. Why does he not come back and attend to his work here? Why does he not go to Toronto harbour and examine it? Why does he not confine his operations nearer home? Why does he go to Montreal and Quebec to find fraudulent practices, when right under his own eyes he may see the most gigantic frauds that have ever been perpetrated? I believe in British fair-play and British practice, and I deprecate these practices as being disgraceful to the old flag. Dishonesty in the selection of sites, and dishonesty in public buildings, trails the old flag in the dust. Hon. gentlemen opposite who uphold the old flag at election times forget it when they are putting up public buildings.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a question of order. I think we should try to get along with business,

and we will not do so unless we keep to the question in hand. I am quite sure we must have considerable latitude, but the hon. gentleman is going far beyond the point of a liberal allowance.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the point is well taken, and the hon. gentleman should not allow any latitude. He has given us the revenue of a post office as $2,900 when it was only $290, and now he will not allow any latitude to me, and I must keep to the item. He will not allow me to say a word about the member for Centre Toronto or as to why he went down to Quebec.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And there was a terrible state of things there. It did not matter about our railway subsidies—he never went there about them——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Two million dollars were stolen at the Quebec works. Now I am ruled out of order in speaking of his conduct.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Order. If the hon. gentleman wants to go into a debate on thieving and boodling he had better fight it out now. Let him move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I should not wonder if the Minister of the Interior will have had enough before we are done with him, and we have not done with him yet. He will not desire any further investigations before we are through with him. Coming back to the item, I think members of the House should waken up to a consideration of the fact that the public money of the country should be expended in the interests of the people. The money is not to be spent by boodlers, or for boodlers, or in the interests of any Government sustained by boodlers or boodledom. The public interests and the public interests alone should dictate the expenditure of public money.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I think we shall never get through the Estimates if speeches are made on the whole policy of the Government on every item. There is a motion before the Committee moved by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that the item for the Dartmouth public building be struck out. I should like hon. gentlemen to stick as closely as possible to the item we are discussing and not ramble about.

Mr. CASEY. It is quite in order in discussing any item to point out it is part of a wrong policy on the part of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. CASEY. I am speaking to a point of order. The Deputy Speaker has raised a point of order, and I am speaking to it. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) was entirely in order in discussing the policy of the Government as applied to this particular item, as to whether this expenditure of money was corrupt or not. If the hon. gentleman thought the expenditure was corrupt and that the item should be dropped, he was distinctly in order. I do not think it is proper for the Deputy Speaker to interrupt a member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has no right to discuss the authority of the chair.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I call order. The point of order has been decided. I said the hon. gentleman had not the right on this item to speak about Toronto and Quebec scandals and refer to the member for Centre Toronto. It is out of order, and I will not allow it.

Mr. CASEY. I call attention to the fact that my hon. friend was speaking distinctly within the bounds of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FORBES. I should like to say a few words to justify the expenditures in the Maritime Provinces, one of which is the Dartmouth post office. The expenditure asked is a revote, which has already been discussed by Parliament. While there is no regular principle laid down on which money is expended on public buildings, there have been in the past a number of cases in Nova Scotia where money has been spent on public buildings. Among these several were proper and deserved. There are other counties in which no expenditure was made but which are just as much deserving. Exception may be taken in certain cases, when a rule has been laid down that a certain revenue shall be obtained from the county before a public building is erected; but in this particular instance the item is a revote, and there is no reason why the expenditure should not be made in accordance with a previous resolution of the House. If we look at the returns in the blue-book we will find that Annapolis has a public building, with a postal revenue of $2,300; the total amount of money orders issued, $24,000; total amount of orders paid, $19,000. Dartmouth has a postal revenue of $1,700; money orders issued, $9,000; paid, $4,000. Both of these towns have public buildings erected at the expense of the country, and there was no limit laid down as to what amount of revenue should be derived from any localities before the buildings were erected. Liverpool, the shire town of the County of Queen's, has a post office revenue of $1,850, total amount of money orders issued $30,700, total amount of money orders paid $18,600; and if the amount of money handled in the post office at Dartmouth is a criterion to go by, the town of Liverpool is much more entitled to a public building than either of these towns I have mentioned. I will not do otherwise than support this appropriation, although the Government have given us no information upon which we can decide as to whether they are doing right or wrong, further than the fact that we have two Conservative members representing that county in this House. During the last session of Parliament we had the honour of having one of the best Liberal members from Nova Scotia representing that county, and he supported that vote for Dartmouth post office of $5,000. I must say, however, that the Government should lay down some basis upon which they would erect these public buildings in towns and cities, and even though this constituency were represented by two Liberal members I would not protest against this, although the Government are departing from the golden rule which should be observed in this House. I rose to ask the attention of the Government to Liverpool, in the County of Queen's, and I have shown them that we are more entitled to the consideration of the Government for public

buildings than either Dartmouth or Annapolis. I am quite willing to support a rule which shall be established by this Parliament that a revenue from a district must reach a certain sum before a public building is erected. When I look at the Province of Ontario I see that the appropriation for 1890-91 was $271,775, and the total amount of that which the House is now asked to revote is $138,000. The appropriation for the Province of Nova Scotia is $33,000, and the amount the House is asked to revote is only $10,000, or much less than one-fifth of that total. Now one-fifth of the appropriation voted for Ontario, which is asked to be revoted here would only be $71,000, whereas Ontario has got $138,000. The population of Ontario is 2,000,000 and the population of Nova Scotia is 450,000, so that upon that basis of the population we should be entitled to one-fifth of the public moneys that are voted to the Province of Ontario; yet Nova Scotia only gets $10,000 for public buildings this year, while $138,000 goes to Ontario, or very nearly fourteen times as much as the Province of Nova Scotia is getting. I know of no other basis upon which to compare the several amounts that are being voted out of the public funds than that. If there were a more equitable basis, such as the amount of revenue derived, established, I would be prepared to support it, and while the members from Ontario are perfectly right in condemning the reckless expenditure of money in counties that have supported the Government, still I think that the Government have some spark of fair-play and justice left in them, and it is to that spark of fair-play alone that I appeal to them for justice for my own constituency and for the Province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot allow the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Forbes) to go without reply. If he will turn up the expenditures in Nova Scotia he will find that within the last ten years this Dominion has spent over $8,000,000 directly in the construction of railways in Nova Scotia, while in the Province of Ontario they have only spent $1,950,000. We have been pouring money into the lap of the Province of Nova Scotia, subsidizing railways, and building them entirely at the cost of the people of this Dominion. Do the people of Nova Scotia, in the municipalities and towns contribute a bonus to the construction of the roads? They have not put a dollar into them, and yet the whole Dominion has spent $8,000,000 on these railways, while not $2,000,000 have been spent in Ontario. I give this to my hon. friend (Mr. Forbes) as an offshoot for his argument about public buildings. I notice that in the town of Dartmouth the gross receipts of the post office are $1,725; number of money orders issued, 754; total amount of money orders issued, $9,112-30; total commission received, $80.04; total amount of money orders, $4,919; compensation paid to postmaster, $28.11.

Mr. FOSTER. You must be wrong about the money orders.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am reading from the Postmaster General's report. Sometimes he is wrong, but the report is right.

Mr. FOSTER. I think you are reading it wrong.

Mr. McMULLEN. Let us compare that with the post offices in the County of Wellington. In my own town, Mount Forest, the gross revenue of the post office is $3,902.88; number of money orders issued, 2,428; amount of money orders, $29,884.74; total commission received, $215.93; total amount of money orders paid, $17,089.45; compensation paid to postmaster: money orders, $84.83; salary, $1,040. You will find that this is a very much larger business than is done in Dartmouth. In the Harriston post office, in Wellington County, the revenue is $3,092.68; number of money orders issued, $1,212; total amount of money orders issued, $13,884.88; amount of money orders paid, $7,744.84; salary of postmaster, $920. Both of these places exceed very largely the business done in the Dartmouth post office. I say it is time that some principle should be laid down upon which public buildings are going to be erected. If you are going to lay down the principle that the gross revenue of the town shall reach $8,000 or $10,000 before you erect a public building, well and good, but some principle should be laid down. Look, for instance, at what you did when you built a post office in St. Jérôme, a town in the constituency of the hon. Secretary of State, where the entire receipts were only about $2,000 annually, while places like Woodstock in Ontario, with a revenue of $12,000 or $15,000 a year, are left without a post office. I say that the policy adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite in the past has been humiliating, and it is time that the House should pronounce upon it. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Tupper) tried to show that it was under the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, that the building in Pictou was erected.

Mr. TUPPER. So it was.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was not. You are entirely in error; the vote was taken for that building in 1872.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Mackenzie built it in 1874.

Mr. McMULLEN. At all events it was not under the Mackenzie Government that the Pictou Branch Railway was built, simply in order to find a seat for my hon. friend to make him a Minister of the Crown. The country was asked to spend nearly half a million dollars in building two lines of the same railway to the same point, for the purpose of keeping my hon. friend in Parliament. In Pictou there were built two lines belonging to the same railway, the Intercolonial, and it has cost this item to make the hon. gentleman a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Minister stated that this Custom-house at Pictou was built in 1874. I have a return, which was brought down to the House by the Government of which he is a member, which says that the Pictou Custom-house cost $27,000, and that it was begun in 1872-73. Now, will you take it back?

Mr. TUPPER. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the chief ground on which Mr. Carmichael asked the electors of Pictou to return him as a pure Reformer and a supporter of Mr. Blake in 1882, was stated on the hustings on nomination day in the town of Pictou, to be because the Government of Mr. Mackenzie had built the Custom-house in that town. I repeated that statement here, and hon. gentlemen opposite say it is false.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would just like to say that if Mr. Carmichael had stated that Mr.

Mackenzie's Government had built a marine hospital there where it was very much needed, he would have been quite right.

Mr. TUPPER. The marine hospital was not built in Mr. Mackenzie's time. It was built in the time of a Conservative Administration.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No; the hon. gentleman is just as far away from the truth as before. When he takes up figures with me, he had better get the books, because he is all wrong. The marine hospital at Pictou was built in the year 1874-75, according to this return. You may falsify the returns, and justify your words.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman must not say that the Government falsify the returns.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would not say that for the world. It is the Minister of Marine who says so. He says this return is false; he says the Mackenzie Government did not build the marine hospital. I have no personal knowledge of the matter, but I take the figures, and if the Minister of Marine says they are false, you should ask him to apologize.

Mr. TUPPER. The marine hospital was not built till 1878.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do think that this discussion is about as profitless, useless and unedifying as it possibly could be. We are discussing estimates which we may fairly assume the Government have taken up as those of their predecessors, so far as these few items are concerned; and to go on bandying charges about expenditures one against another is not the way to keep to the discussion of the item before us. I think that the vote under consideration is comparatively an unimportant one, but I wish the Government to lay done some rule by which these expenditures shall be regulated. Then we shall not have these discussions, and the Government will not lie under the imputation of making grants simply for partisan purposes. If they will lay down a rule which will be fair and impartial, and adhere to it, we shall save all this crimination and recrimination and the time of the House, and the Government will have the credit of acting for the public advantage. I hope, therefore, that this discussion will come to an end, and that the Government will come to a resolution that in future all expenditures of this kind shall be governed by some rule that will appeal to the common sense of the House and the country.

Mr. WATSON. I asked a question half an hour ago which I think is a proper one, and to which I expect to get an answer before this item passes. In the last session of the last Parliament a rule was laid down by Parliament, and accepted by the hon. gentlemen who are now in power, and we are entitled to some explanation from them as to why they have changed their opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. It is just because we have not changed opinion that we ask for this vote. My hon. friend was here at the last session of Parliament, and he heard his colleague, who is held up to-night as one of the ablest Liberal members who sat in this House, make an earnest plea for a public building in Dartmouth. He knows as well as all of us who sit about these boards, that the Government last year put in the Estimates an item for this building when that constituency was represented by the Hon. Mr. Jones, who is not now here, as well as by my hon. friend who sits behind me; and I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite would ask us to repudiate that promise which we held out to the people of Dartmouth, or expect that when we commenced to vote what was necessary to erect a public building there, we should go back on our promise. I know that hon. gentlemen opposite have strictly criticized us for not going on rapidly enough with the expenditure of votes put in the Estimates, and not fulfilling the promises which these votes held out. My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) may ask the House to repudiate its action of last year, which was based upon a presentment of the case made by his colleague who sat in the very seat he now occupies; but we have not changed our mind, and, therefore, we ask this vote, and we believe that the House will grant it on this representation of the case. With reference to the rule laid down. I was earnestly and honestly anxious for information, and knowing the large breadth of mind of my hon. friend from North Wellington, I asked him the question as to what he would fix as the minimum revenue to justify the erection of a post office, and I did not ask the question in any captious way. There was a resolution passed by this House, last session, and we are acting in the direction of that resolution. The Government have had under consideration different classes of postal and public buildings, which they propose to grade according to the requirements of the different places to avoid what I think have been extravagances in the past, in the shape of very large expenditures for public buildings at places which were not very important, expenditures which were larger than we intended them to be when the votes were first started. I hope that the Government will take measures, as they are determined to do, that such extravagances or excrescences, as they may be termed, will not again obtrude themselves on the policy of the Government. So far as this item is concerned, I think it ought to be passed, and no member of this House, if he considers all the circumstances of the case, would wish us to repudiate it.

Mr. BOWERS. I do not think we should always look at the postal income of a place to decide whether it needs a post office or not. Take, for instance, the county I have the honour to represent. The office of the shire town of Digby produces an income of $2,100, but that does not give a correct idea of the business done there. It is a large centre for distributing mail, it receives and sends almost daily from and to St. John; it has another mail every day from Halifax; it has one by way of Annapolis, still another by way of the Western Counties Railway; also one coming in from Bear River, and a daily mail coming from Westport and Digby Neck. It also receives mails from Culloden, Marshalltown and many other places, making it a very large distributing centre. There are also mails to be made up and sent to each of these places. The income, I again repeat, is not evidence of the amount of business done, nor can one judge from that the requirements necessary. Now, Digby has a very poor post office, one in which there is hardly room for a person to turn round. I called the attention of the Government to this and was told that no one had asked for better accommodation; but the place really needs better

postal facilities and I hope the Government will take its claims into consideration.

Mr. BORDEN. I understood the hon. Finance Minister to say that this vote should be passed because it had been proposed last session and the people of Dartmouth had been led to expect they would get a post office, and it would be tantamount to breaking faith with them did we not pass this vote. I hope the Government has laid that down as a principle by which they will be guided hereafter; and in this connection I would point out that in the year 1886 they voted a sum to build a post office in the town of Lunenburg. In the following year, however, it happened that that county which, in 1886, was represented by a friend of the Administration, returned an opponent of the Administration, and the vote disappeared.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The money was spent in the purchase of a site.

Mr. BORDEN. Well, the post office was not built.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will be.

Mr. BORDEN. Well, I will give a case more in point. In the town of Kentville there was a vote in 1886 for a post office, about equal to the present vote, but that vote disappeared if I remember rightly, in 1887, when I was elected. Now, I am glad to know that the Government have laid down the principle that once a vote has been passed in this House, they feel under an obligation to expend it in carrying out the work for which it was intended to provide, and I trust that the Government will redeem the pledge they have made to this particular town. Knowing the disappointment which my people have felt, I can sympathize with the people of Dartmouth, and propose to vote in favour of this item, being anxious to do as I would be done by.

Chatham post office, Custom house, &c... $7,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the total cost of that? I thought we had spent a good deal of money there.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a new thing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely, there was a post office there before.

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing has been spent there. There is a vote for $1,500, 1890-91. Nothing was expended up to the 31st of December, 1890.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is a building there erected at the expense of the Government, as a Custom-house.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a very disreputable building, built about fifteen years or more ago, but it has fallen out of repair, and has been an eyesore to the people for a number of years. The time has now come when a building commensurate with the the requirements of Chatham should be erected.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How came it to acquire the character the hon. gentleman had given it?

Mr. FOSTER. The rats got into it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What did this disreputable building cost in the first instance?

Mr. FOSTER. It was not so disreputable at first as it became afterwards.

Mr. BOWERS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was under the management of the Government it became disreputable.

Mr. FOSTER. It came out damaged during the regime from 1874 to 1879.

Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, Quebec... $20,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this wanted for?

Mr. FOSTER. For new and improved disinfecting appliances. There is a steam disinfecting apparatus, upright boiler and mountings. All of this disinfecting apparatus is of a new and improved character, and for the purpose of disinfecting vessels.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Could it be applied to the departments that require purification?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it could be applied for the purposes for which it is intended.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does it cost altogether?

Mr. FOSTER. The apparatus itself cost $11,750; connections for the same, $1,800; exhaust and vacuum pumps, $2,470; wind-mill pump in Grosse Isle, $1,460. Then there is ground floor pumping and galvanized iron works which make up the balance.

Mr. WATSON. Who manufactured this apparatus?

Mr. FOSTER. It is to be put in, I do not know where it is to be got.

Lachine post office, &c.—to complete... $7,000

Mr. WATSON. What is the total cost of this post office?

Mr. FOSTER. There was voted in 1889 $2,500; in 1890, $6,000; in 1891, $8,000; and the vote asked for is $7,000, but of the votes preceding this year only $7,000 have been expended, and this vote is to complete the works let by contract in connection with the new post office at Lachine.

Mr. MILL (Bothwell). What is the revenue?

Mr. FOSTER. The postal revenue collected is $800; money orders paid, $8,465; saving banks deposits, $8,258. That is the place where the postal revenue is not in proportion with the needs of the post office, which occupies in that respect a position like Dartmouth.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The revenue is $430, according to the Auditor General.

Mr. WATSON. Were there any plans provided for the building when the contract was let? When a contract is asked for the erection of a building, it should complete the building.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course the contract should be completed at the contract price, but often the expenditure is divided over two years. The site is purchased and the contract is let and partly completed, and the next year the vote is taken to complete it. My hon. friend will notice that is very common in our votes.

Mr. WATSON. Too common.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In explaining the first vote, the Minister takes care to explain that this is towards the cost, but is not expected to complete it. As far as I can see here, the total cost will be about $18,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. And the revenue is $759.

Mr. FOSTER. The revenue is no indication.

Mr. WATSON. Taking this post office as an example, I should like to know what was asked for in the first place, were plans made for the post office, was a site purchased, and were tenders asked for the whole building? We have great reason to believe that these extras and revotes are not all applied to the public building.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it is all supplied to the public building. The land cost $2,000. That was covered by the first year's vote of $2,500. That was about the amount expended that year, $2,000. Then, in 1890-91, $14,000 was voted, but of that only about $5,000 was expended up to December, 1890, so there would be a lapsed vote there, and, as I said, the total cost is about $18,000.

Mr. WATSON. What means were adopted in this case? Were tenders asked for the completion of the building?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, tenders were called for.

Mr. WATSON. What was the price tendered for the completion of this building according to the original plan?

Mr. FOSTER. The contract amount was $7,950. That, of course, was for the building itself. Then the site cost $2,000, making $10,000 in round numbers. Then the other expenditure is for furniture and fittings, heating apparatus, fencing and sidewalks, the architect and incidental expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do they run up to $8,000?

Mr. FOSTER. The contract was $7,950. Up to the 31st December, 1890, $7,911 was spent, of which $2,200 was for site and expenses of site. The balance due on contract on 1st January, 1891, was $4,000. That would make about $1,000 more than the original contract price. It would appear from that that there must have been some extras amounting to about that sum.

Mr. WATSON. It appears to take about $8,000 for furnishing and completing that building.

Mr. FOSTER. No, about $6,000. The estimate for furnishing and fittings, including lock-boxes—which, of course, are never included in the contract—was $3,000; heating with stoves, $300; fencing and sidewalks, $1,000; architect, $500; incidentals, $730; and a sum for the clerk of works. Those made up the difference.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You said $18,000 was the cost.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. What rent did you pay there for the post office?

Mr. FOSTER. What rent was paid?

Mr. GIROUARD. I do not know.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then I can tell you. The rent you paid for that post office was $50 a year. The receipts last year amounted to $759.93. The amount of money orders issued was $5,623, on which the total commissions received were $55; the total amount of money orders paid was $2,452; the compensation to the postmaster on money orders was $17.74. The salary of the postmaster was $580, and you paid a rent of $50, and now you are going to spend $18,000 to erect a post office in that place.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we ought to have some definite explanation—explanation in considerable detail—as to why it is that at Lachine it is necessary to spend $18,000 for a post office. According to my hon. friend's statement the revenue is about $700 and the rent formerly paid was $50 a a year. I cannot for the life of me understand why Lachine, which is very close to Montreal, and, therefore, cannot be to any extent a distributing office, whatever else it may be, should require the expenditure of $18,000 for a post office, unless it be to gratify some political end or other for the benefit of my hon. friend who represents the county. I think the hon. gentleman is bound to give the House some detailed explanation of the causes which justify such a large expenditure at Lachine, bearing in mind the total revenue we collect there.

Mr. GIROUARD. When the hon. gentleman says that Lachine is not a distributing point, he makes a great mistake. There are many manufacturers at Lachine, and it is an important commercial centre. The construction of this post office has been asked for by the inhabitants, and by the manufacturers in particular. I believe the ground cost $2,500, and the contract has been given out for ten or eleven thousand. I have had nothing to do with the construction of the building since the contract was given out. The population of Lachine is about 5,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is clear that this is a wholly unjustifiable expenditure. The interest on $18,000 is far in excess of the amount collected, to say nothing about the cost of maintaining such a post office, such as the lighting, the heating, and all other like items of expense that will fall upon the treasury. It seems to me there can be no justification whatever for such an expenditure in such a place. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) says that there is a very large amount of business done in Lachine, that it is a manufacturing centre; but if that were so, there ought to be an advantage to the revenue, yet the revenue is under $800 a year, and is three or four hundred a year less than the interest upon the money that is required to erect that building, to say nothing of the cost of keeping it up. If such a rule were applied generally, the revenues of this country would be wholly unequal to the demands upon them. This is a monstrous expenditure; there is no ground upon which it can be justified to the public. It is perfectly clear that the expenditure has not been made in the public interest, and not made so as to serve the requirements of the locality merely as a post office centre. In all places where the amount of revenue is so small, a building can be rented at far less expense to the public treasury than one can be erected. This system of putting up post offices where there is but a small amount of revenue collected at an enormous expense to the public treasury, is wholly without justification. I would like to know how the expenditure can be made in face of the declaration of this House last year when we expressly declared, without a dissenting voice, that the expenditure on public buildings should be undertaken in those localities where there was the largest population, the largest revenue, and the largest amount of public business.

Mr. GIROUARD. I think the hon. gentleman does not realize the postal business of Lachine, when he considers the amount of revenue. The hon. gentleman must remember that Lachine is at a distance of about nine miles from Montreal, and a great many firms in Montreal do business in Lachine; they buy their stamps in Montreal and send their letters through the post office of Lachine; consequently, the necessity of having a large building became apparent. It was impossible to do without a building of considerable dimensions. The revenue is not to be considered in this case, because the most of it goes into the Montreal post office.

Mr. SCRIVER. The hon. gentleman evidently is not familliar with the methods of collecting the revenue in the post offices. He has just given a reason why the revenue for Lachine should be more than it is, because the revenue is counted on the stamps on the letters that are actually posted.

Mr. GIROUARD. I beg your pardon.

Mr. SCRIVER. Oh, yes; I have been postmaster myself, and I know that the revenue is calculated on stamps of letters actually posted.

Mr. FRASER. No man can be blamed for trying to get all he can for his county. In my county there is a post office doing three or four times as much business as Lachine, but we have no public building; indeed we have not a single public building in the whole county, because the county, since 1867, has sent to this House an opponent of the present Government, with the exception of four years. That is the reason why we never got a public building. The fact that a Lachine merchant buys his stamps in Montreal and posts his letters in Lachine, would evidently swell the revenue of Lachine, and yet we are told that Lachine only returns a revenue of $700. Now, in our town, that does three times as much business, we would be very thankful to have a post office costing $3,000 or $4,000. I am sure there must be some other influence than the public interest, which induces the Government to spend $18,000 in a town where the sale of stamps only amounts to $50. Is this money to be expended for the purpose of beautifying Lachine? I maintain that the Government should have one official public building in every county for the purpose of a Custom-house and post office. The county I represent is worse off than most counties. In the neighbouring county there is a public building in Pictou, and another one in New Glasgow, costing $40,000 or $50,000. I do not object to that, but I would like to see more equality shown in this distribution of public buildings. In my county there are over 20,000 people, and we have not a single ublic building. I think the Government should lay down some rule to guide them, instead of listening to the clamour either of members or of a locality who may get up a petition for a public building. Let the Government look into the circumstances of each case and expend the money in the public interest only. No business man in Canada would think of spending $18,000 on a post office in a town where there is only $700 revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman no explanation to give? I asked the hon. gentleman if there is any special reasons for this vote. Is Lachine one of those points at which there is really such an amount of extra work over and above the receipts indicated in his report, as would enable him, on his responsibility, to justify this expenditure?

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman I may say that the statement of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) is strictly correct. Lachine has a population of about 5,000. The returns do not at all show the amount of business done in Lachine. The amount of revenue is calculated upon the sale of stamps, and the sale of stamps in Lachine does not at all represent the amount of postal revenue. The hon. gentleman from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) is entirely mistaken, although he was a postmaster. Sometimes there is a calculation made at the end of the year for the purpose of correcting the returns, because sometimes some postmasters buy their stamps at places where a great number of stamps are sold, and they are distributed otherwise than through the post office, and they have been trying to collect revenue on those stamps. I can easily understand that in Lachine, a place of 5,000 inhabitants, there must be a large income from inland revenue. I do not think there is any Customs collections there—but it must do a business far in excess of the amount mentioned in the returns, and most of the inhabitants must get their postal matter from Montreal. The money from stamps would not appear in the return.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is in no respect a distributing office.

Mr. HAGGART. The amount appearing from distribution is $54. It is a place where from its population, if it were in Ontario, the receipts would show about $7,000. In Quebec perhaps it would not be so large; but $759 does not represent the large business which is done in postal matter at Lachine.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would you not credit the letters that come to that post office?

Mr. HAGGART. We base the salary on the sale of postage stamps.

Mr. GIROUARD. The time to take exception to this item was when it first appeared two or three years ago. No objection was, however, raised to it on the part of anyone; I did not find it necessary to raise my voice in its favour. A petition was sent in the usual course to the Post Office Department, and its prayer was granted. There never was any question raised in regard to it. I am surprised that any one familiar with Lachine, which is an important summer resort, and which is a manufacturing centre also, should question the propriety of building a post office at a cost of $18,000. There is no other public building in the place.

Mr. KAULBACH. I can satisfy the agitated and apparently dissatisfied minds of hon. gentlemen opposite when I inform them that I represent a county which is one of the most populous in the province, and I can say with truth that I represent a town which is one of the most enterprising in Nova Scotia, a town with something like a population of 5,000 and a county with a population of 40,000. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) said that the county he represented had a population of 20,000, and I forget the population he said of the town. But when he contrasts the county he represents with

my county he will see and be satisfied that the Government made no distinction on political grounds, and more particularly when I tell him that I have made appeals time and again for a public building for Lunenburg, he should be satisfied that his county has been fairly dealt with. I have asked the Government for a post office almost every year I have been here since 1878, and I have not got one yet. I hope, however, the Government will receive my request favourably, and that it will not be long before I obtain a structure for Lunenburg quite equal to any of those erected in neighbouring towns.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) was surprised that hon. members should object at this late date to a public building for Lachine. It should, however, be remembered that the original vote was for $14,000, it has since been increased to $18,000. It is to this increase we particularly object. If we knew the precise amount the building would cost the system would not be so objectionable, but we do not know on any vote that the Government will not apply next year for an additional sum to complete. The postmaster at this important office receives a salary of $580—probably that is all to which he is entitled—and the revenue of the post office should be taken into consideration when money is appropriated. The revenue of the office was $759 last year, and the other official revenues must be very small. Only 332 money orders were issued, for a total amount of $5,623. Compare that with Portage la Prairie in my own county, where the postal revenue was $7,351, number of orders issued, 2,169, for the amount of $38,263. It is not fair to erect a post office costing $18,000 at Lachine when there is another town, where the population is larger, where more business is done, and where the receipts are about ten times as large, and yet it has no public building. I am not saying that all the small towns should have a post office built—I do not think they should—but buildings should not be erected unless the returns will pay interest on the investment. The practice followed is that first a vote is taken for $5,000, then a vote for $20,000 to complete. Very often the money is spent before it is actually voted by Parliament, the expenditure being met by a Governor General's warrant. I have no doubt but that this money is spent for political purposes, and I have good reason to believe that the extras and the amount voted above the contract sum are the result of crookedness, and are probably not spent on the legitimate work itself. We find in this post office that the contract was for $10,000 and $3,000 were to be spent for lock-boxes. How many boxes will be put in for that sum? We want to know on what principle the money is spent in letting the original contract and also the payments of extra amounts to complete the work.

Mr. SCRIVER. The hon. Postmaster General will surely not contend that the business of a rural post office is shown by the amount of stamps sold. A great many stamps are sold that are never used in the post office, for the people use them to make remittances. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that the salary of the postmaster is based on the return from letters which actually pass through the office. The only way of ascertaining the business done is from the number of stamps passing through the office, and not from the stamps sold.

Mr. HAGGART. The return is only taken twice a year, and each six months the salary is calculated.

Mr. SCRIVER. It is for the purpose of calculating the actual business done in the office and calculating the salary of the postmaster.

Mr. MASSON. I think that each, from his own standpoint, is strictly correct. The hon. gentleman from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) says that the basis on which the salary of the rural postmasters is computed, is by counting the number of letters mailed. That would not be the actual revenue obtained at the office, but the Postmaster General's returns would not take in a fictitious revenue; they would take the actual revenue. Therefore the return we have before us in which the $750 is set down, is the actual sale of postage stamps at that office which is the actual revenue at the office, but the postmaster's reports, on which his salary is based, shows the number of letters mailed, which, as I understand, is averaged once or twice a year, or sometimes once or twice in two years.

Laprairie Post Office..... $10,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. I see the revenue from this post office is $439, and an expenditure of $10,000 is going to be made. I do not see how the Government can justify this. I do not see why the Minister of Justice does not rise in his might to protest against this. I do not see how he expects to retain the character he came into the House with, if he allows such an expenditure as this. I have been looking at the items we have been going over in the Province of Quebec, and in all these little places where we are going to expend money, I find that the election of the member is contested. This, perhaps, may be the reason why these post offices are being built, because if their friends get out, they think perhaps a judicious expenditure of this money would help to elect them. I think that is the reason why the public money is expended here and there in places where it is not demanded in the public interest. Although the Government have never stated as much, yet it is the only reason which they can possibly give for a thing so utterly indefensible as this vote here.

Mr. FOSTER. I find that Laprairie is also one of the list of legacies. I find that in 1889 a vote was taken for a post office in the town of Laprairie, and in 1890, $2,000 was voted; but as there were some difficulties about the site neither of these sums was expended. In 1891, $5,000 was voted, and now I see that a site has been granted by the town council of Laprairie, and this vote is for the building of the post office.

Mr. LAURIER. Has the site been donated, or is it to be?

Mr. FOSTER. The site has been given by the town council. This building I have no doubt will be made to square with the importance of the place; it is not proposed to put up an expensive building.

Mr. BAIN. Could it not be made to square with the grant that was promised to the county of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) and which was left out of the Estimates?

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is well that we should give to the House, and to the country through the House, the facts about the post office at Laprairie on which it is proposed to expend $10,000. The receipts from the Laprairie post office amounted last year to $439.32; number of money orders issued at that place, 205 only; total amount of money orders issued, $3,268.31; total commission received from the public, $25.11; total amount of money orders paid, $1,208.69; commission paid to the postmaster on money orders, $9.35; salary of the postmaster, $230, and we paid no rent at all for the post office. There is not a sufficient sum collected at that post office that would bring it within the limit that would enable the postmaster to grant any rent at all for the place, so that we have now a free post office which costs us nothing: we have a postmaster at a salary of $230 a year, and yet we are going to build a post office in that place for $10,000. I think this is one of the most ridiculous propositions that has ever yet been submitted to the House. There are at least three or four hundred places in the Dominion that have four times the post office revenue that Laprairie has. This is one of the post offices that will certainly come within the meaning of the views expressed by my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). There is not a dollar spent yet, the site has not been bought, the revenue of the post office is $450 a year, the salary of the postmaster is $230, and we have a post office rent free at present.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must not put it as a ground why we should not go on and complete the building for which an appropriation has already been voted, simply because we have not to buy a site. It ought to be in the favour of the building that the site has been donated, and that we did not have to buy it. Now, on the promise held forth by the vote which has appeared for three years in the Estimates and is a result of negotiations with the people, I find that authority was granted by an Order in Council to accept the site offered by the town council of Laprairie for the erection of a public building. The site is cadastral lot 134, depth 76 feet, frontage 84 feet, on the west side of St. Joseph, opposite St. Mary Street, the principal thoroughfare of the town. The land measures 50 feet in front by a full depth of 76 feet, and the municipal authorities bind themselves to retain the remainder of the lot free of buildings or other objectionable obstructions for all time to come.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What was the date of the Order in Council?

Mr. FOSTER. 1889.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And nothing has been done since. Mr. Doyon was elected and he did not support the Government. Was that the reason why the building was not begun before?

Mr. FOSTER. It certainly was not.

Mr. LAURIER. What was it?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it was because the preliminaries were not arranged.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Has the Government adopted the rule, that when a small village donates a site worth from $25 to $50 they will bind themselves to erect a post office on it; for if they have done that, I fancy that they can get lots of sites throughout the country. This Government ought to adopt some honest system of dealing with the public money in connection with the expenditure for public buildings. I can understand very well that there has been no honesty in their dealings with the public money, or in the services they have rendered to the public in years past with regard to the erection of public buildings. I contend, and I think the official records of this House will show, that public buildings have been erected for the purpose of furthering the interests of the Government. In every province throughout this country public buildings have been erected in places where they do the most good to the Government and its supporters. The Government have followed out the plan, which they adopted years ago, of supporting their supporters whenever they had an opportunity. I say that there has been a gross injustice done to the public in this regard, that money has been squandered where it was unnecessary it should be spent at all in the public interest, and that this system of erecting public buildings has been reduced to a science as being a bribe to the electors in a constituency to induce them to support Government candidates. Now, this case is just one in point, because money was voted in 1889 which the Government did not expend because that county was represented by a Liberal; but the moment it is represented by a Conservative the Government see the necessity of expending the money, because the corporation has presented them with a valuable lot, on which there are to be no unseemly structures erected for all time to come, as guaranteed by the pledge of the town council. The moment the Government come into possession of this lot, they must erect this public building, and they erect it in the interests of the gentleman who represents that constituency in this House. I honestly believe that that is the reason the Government are expending money in all these towns and villages, not because the public service requires these buildings to be erected, but because they are required in the interest of the Government. That is the plain truth, and no member or supporter of the Government can deny it. This little town of Laprairie, which has a postal revenue of only $439, is to have a post office, while large and important towns in the Province of Ontario are neglected. Take, for instance, the town of Paris, which is in South Brant, adjoining my riding. That town has been an important town for years. Last year its gross postal revenue was $3,661.66; the number of money orders, 1,470; the total value of money orders issued, $13,241.82; the total commission received from the public, $116.88; the total amount of money orders paid, $10,007.54; the commission paid to the postmaster on money order business, $39.30; the compensation paid to the postmaster on savings' bank business, $43.08; the salary of the postmaster, $1,300; forwarding allowance, $80; and allowance for fuel, light and rent, $200. Now, compare that with Laprairie, and see whether any justice has been meted out to the town of Paris in regard to the erection of public buildings. I have heard the hon. member for South Brant bring this matter under the attention of the Government a number of years when the Estimates were under consideration, and the Government have paid no attention to him. Perhaps the town of Paris has not donated a town lot for a post office; but, by-the-bye, I do remember a de-

putation coming down here two years ago, and if I mistake not, offering the Government a lot if they would erect a post office. Then, we have the excuse made by the Finance Minister that because this Order in Council was passed and the money was unexpended for a number of years, and because they have now the offer of a lot, they must erect a post office there. Is it not possible to repeal an Order in Council, or is it not possible for this House to declare that an Order in Council shall not go into effect? I say this is one of the grossest instances of squandering the public money for the purpose of furthering the interests of the Government candidate than can be found. The members of the Government ought to be ashamed to stand up in their places and support a vote of $10,000 for the erection of a post office in a place like Laprairie, when the town of Woodstock, which might be a city if it chose to apply for a charter, and which does an immense business, is neglected. The total gross postal revenue of Woodstock last year was $15,432; the number of money orders issued was 4,835; the total amount of money orders issued, $47,364.59; and the total amount of money orders paid, $91,384.39. And yet the Government pretend that they are acting justly and fairly by the people of this country and that they are expending the public money in the interest of the public. How can they find any justification for this conduct? I contend that there is no justification for it; and this is a fair sample of the way in which the public money of this country has been squandered by this Government ever since they came into power, for the purpose of advancing their interests and the interests of their supporters.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to show the hon. gentleman how easy it is for him to arrive at wrong conclusions. He tried to impress on the House, with the view of supporting his general argument, that here was a case in which a certain amount of money had been voted, and that although a site had been offered nearly three years ago, and an Order in Council had passed, no attempt had been made to expend the vote already given, because the county was represented by an opponent of the Government; and now, when a turn has taken place, and it is represented by a supporter of the Government, the proposition is made to expend it. The facts will show how entirely wrong my hon. friend is in his conclusion, and I am sure he will acknowledge the error of his conclusion when he knows the facts. The facts are, that three years ago, a vote of $5,000 was put in the Estimates, that three years ago an offer was made by the municipality to furnish a site, and that an Order in Council was passed accepting the site. But a difficulty arose, I am informed by the deputy, in this way: The municipality had no right to give away property which belonged to it, and the Government had to resort to expropriation, and the expropriation proceedings terminated about only two or three months ago. So that although there was the willingness of the municipality to give the site, it was not able to do so, and these expropriation proceedings had to go forward, and it was impossible to expend the vote. The fact, however, that all the preliminary proceedings were taken when the county was not represented by a supporter of the Government, is almost fatal to my hon. friend's contention in general, and certainly fatal in this instance.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Will the hon. Minister explain why buildings have not been erected in Woodstock and Paris?

Mr. FOSTER. Wait until you see what you will see.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How is it that the municipality cannot make a gift of the property to the Government and that the Government requires to expropriate?

Mr. FOSTER. I leave that to the law lecturer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is the hon. gentleman's duty to give the information. How are you going to get possession of the property after expropriation?

Mr. FOSTER. Cannot the municipality pay the expropriation price?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They cannot give away any portion of their property or their funds.

Mr. FOSTER. Can they not buy it?

Mr. WATSON. What is the property worth

Mr. FOSTER. Between $750 and $1,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman asks can they not buy it? Would it not be their property if they bought it?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot help the facts; they are there.

Mr. LAURIER. The municipal laws of Quebec will not allow a municipality to part with a property of this kind for the building of a post office; and I confess I do not understand how these proceedings in expropriation took place. At whose instance did they take place? Was it at the instance of the Government? Did they expropriate land in the village of Laprairie to provide a site?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me a curious way of proceeding.

Mr. FOSTER. They have curious laws down there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This seems a curious way of beating the devil around the stump. If, under the law, the municipality cannot give away this property, I do not see how the Government obtained possession of it.

Mr. FOSTER. The Dominion Government paid $5 as a compensation, so that it was not a gift.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the municipality paid the balance?

Mr. FOSTER. They do not give it away when they sell it for $5.

Mr. LAURIER. If there was an expropriation at the instance of the Government, the hon. Minister of Justice ought to know something about it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. However, all that is wholly apart from the real vital question which is this: What justification have you for spending $10,000, whether you get a site worth $50 or $500 or $700, for the erection of a post office in a village where the total revenue is only $400? That is a job of the very worst kind. It cannot be justified; there is no possibility of justifying it on any argument so far advanced by the hon. Minister of Finance or anybody on that side. It is

entirely indefensible. The building inevitably will cost us for ever $400 per year interest on the capital, and we will have to keep it up, we will have to provide for the heating of it, and more or less for the caretaker and the salaries of the officials, and fuel and light, and the net result will be that, on a revenue of $400, or thereabouts, we will have an annual expenditure of $1,000. We are not told that Laprairie is a distributing point, or that there are huge manufactories there which indirectly supply a large revenue to the post office, but simply that there was an offer made to give a piece of land worth on an average, about seven or eight per cent. of the total amount asked for now.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have just discovered one of the causes. This pledge was made at the time when a local election was about to take place, and that election was carried by reason of this promise. The people were assured they would get a post office erected there if they elected the Conservative candidate, Dr. Brisson, and I believe he was elected.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). He was defeated.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, he ought to be defeated. I am very glad he was. The promise was made, it was a diabolical promise, and may not have succeeded; but, at all events a grant was made in obedience to that, and the work was not gone on with, probably because Dr. Brisson was defeated. He was defeated, and then the Government did not go on with work, but held it in abeyance until the last election, when they said, we will go on with this work if you will elect a supporter of the Government. What a contemptible position for the Dominion to be in.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the population of Laprairie, and what is the estimated cost of maintaining this building annually, including light, fuel and the caretaker?

Mr. CURRAN. There are 1,800 in the village and 2,200 in the parish.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is that all the postal revenue derived from that number, and is that the excuse given for erecting a post office there, that there is that number of people in the place? There is something wrong. Take that back; I fancy that is an outrage.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course, in all these cases where you propose to erect public buildings, you take into consideration the question of revenue and the cost of maintaining a building of that kind. What is the estimated cost of maintenance?

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry the hon. member for Bothwell has so little confidence in the calculations made by the hon. member for South Oxford, who just now gave the Committee what he thought would be the expenditure per year. There would be a percentage on the total outlay, if you want to take into account the interest on capital cost. In a small building of this kind, I do not think the cost of caretaking would be very much, as the postmaster will take care of the building himself. Whatever repairs are necessary will have to be made. The light and fuel for a small building is not a very large item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the postmaster's salary?

Mr. FOSTER. He has a salary anyway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will find the sum total will come altogether to $1,000 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Bothwell seemed to doubt that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wanted to know the estimate, because I suppose you make an estimate in all these cases.

Mr. BARRON. One of the reasons the Finance Minister gave for the construction of the post office is the fact that a lot was donated to the Government, or, as he afterwards put it, was expropriated by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. That is only half the reason. The other was that a vote was given which called for that expenditure.

Mr. BARRON. I think a vote should be given in several places in my riding.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us dispose of this first.

Mr. BARRON. I want to show by comparison how unfair it is to spend $10,000 in a place containing 1,800 inhabitants where the revenue is only $400, while the same justice is not meted out to other places in Ontario. Take, for instance, Fenelon Falls. The population there is about 1,800, the same as Laprairie; but the population who get their letters from that post office, including the village of Fenelon Falls, would be about 300 or 400 more. The revenue in Fenelon Falls is $1,864.56. I will make an offer to the Minister of Finance. If he will undertake to put up a post office there, to cost $10,000, he will have a corner lot, the very best lot perpaps in the village of Fenelon Falls.

Mr. FOSTER. A lot of what?

Mr. BARRON. Of land. But, of course, North Victoria does not happen to return a supporter of the Government, and I suppose that is the reason why they will not have the same justice meted out to them.

Mr. FOSTER. I will note that offer.

Mr. BARRON. Take the village of Bobcaygeon, in the riding of South Victoria. We should have some justice done to it too. There the revenue is $1,562.26. But no, Ontario, for some reason or other, is not to have the same justice done it as some of the villages in the Province of Quebec. Take again my riding. I could give the Finance Minister a list of perhaps half a dozen villages, each of which has a larger revenue than Laprairie, and many of them a larger population. Take the village of Kinmount, which has a gross postal revenue of $890. Take the village of Minden, which has a postal revenue of $800.44. Woodville has a much larger revenue, and yet no one ever dreams that the sum of $10,000, or anything like it, should be spent in putting up a post office there. The thing is a transparent fraud on the face of it and should not be permitted.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to give the House a little idea of how this goes on. I have in my hand a return to an Order of the House brought down this session showing the amount of money deposited in the several post office savings banks throughout the Dominion. In Laprairie the total deposit in the post office savings bank was $3,022. In Woodstock, it was $86,972; in Yorkville, it was $106,916. Yet in neither of these two places is there a post office,

while there is to be one in Laprairie. There are three different towns in my own riding in which the deposits are $36,000, $40,000 and $30,000 respectively, without post office buildings, while one is to be given to Laprairie with its magnificent deposit of $3,022.

Mr. WATSON. I would ask the Minister if this is a growing town and likely to increase the revenue?

Mr. CURRAN. Laprairie is one of the progressive places in the Province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CURRAN. It affords me very great pleasure to give occasion for so much hilarity to my hon. friend, but I say that in the last year or two Laprairie has taken a very decided step in advance. It is now in communication with many points that it had not been in communication with before. A new channel has been completed there which facilitates navigation, and when the new wharf is completed, which it is not yet, there is no doubt that a great deal of business will be done. I have in my hand Lovell's business directory for the Province of Quebec for 1890-91, and from that it appears that the population of the village is 1,800, and of the parish 2,200. There is a railway apart from what was there before, which has just been completed, and places Laprairie in connection with Rome, Watertown and Massena Springs.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh.

Mr. CURRAN. What is the matter with the hon. gentleman? I think he should get some of his colleagues in the medical profession to attend to him. He is hysterical. In addition to that, this village has lately been supplied with a fire engine, hook and ladders. They have built a new aqueduct, which is of great service. They are now putting down the pipes in connection with it. The pressure is very powerful. They have steam and air pressure which bring the water 1,350 feet from the St. Lawrence River. There is a telegraph office there also. Montreal is only nine miles distant and St. John's 18 miles, and the place is giving evidence of marked prosperity. I know myself that very large numbers of families are now making Laprairie a summer resort. Quite a number of people from Montreal and the vicinity have purchased lots there and intend to make it their home for the summer months, and no doubt many will remain there altogether, as the means of access to the city are becoming greater every day. I find here that the British North America Insurance Company, the Citizens' Insurance Company, the Commercial Union Insurance Company, the Northern Insurance Company, the Queen's Insurance Company and the Royal Canadian Insurance Company, all have offices in that place at the present time.

Mr. WATSON. What is the amount of business done?

Mr. CURRAN. This authority does not give that, or I would furnish it to the hon. gentleman; but I know personally that at the present moment Laprairie is a place where there is a very marked improvement, and I am satisfied that the amount now asked to be voted is an expenditure in the proper direction, and that Laprairie will give a very good account of itself in the near future as one of the most progressive places near Montreal.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the hon. gentleman has made an omission. He has recited all they have got in Laprairie, but he has neglected to say if they have a wind-mill. Does the hon. gentleman intend to take up his abode in that place?

Mr. CURRAN. If the hon. gentleman goes over there they will have one.

Mr. GUAY. I would like to ask the Postmaster General whether the salary of one of the postmasters in the town of Lévis has been increased from $420 to $520, and the rent of his office from $60 to $80 since the 1st July; and also whether the salary of the postmaster of Notre Dame de Lévis, also in the town of Lévis, has been raised from $300 to $420, and the allowance for an office to $60 from the 1st July, and if so, for what reason?

Mr. HAGGART. I am very sorry I have not the information here at present; but, if the hon. gentleman will send me a note, I will get the information.

Mr. GUAY. I am informed that the department has raised the salaries of these two gentlemen, and I know for what reason. It is because the business has increased greatly in these two post offices, and, if the little town of Laprairie has a right to a post office, I think the town of Lévis, which has a population of between 8,000 and 9,000 people and is in communication with three important railways—the Intercolonial Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Quebec Central—has a right to have a post office. This is not the first time I have risen to beg the Government to grant not a favour but a privilege which the city of Lévis has a right to have. The ex-Minister of Public Works promised me several times that he would come to a decision on the subject very soon; but is is stated that during the recess he has said that, as long as the electors of Lévis returned an opponent of the present Government, they would never have a post office in their city. I may assure the hon. gentlemen that if they wait until they have a good Tory member from that town there will never be a post office there, though it has a right to have one. The town of Lévis is the fourth city in the Province of Quebec by its population and its importance, and, therefore, I think it is the duty of the Government to accede to my just request.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have just looked over the list of the towns or the villages in my county where the amount of revenue collected by the Postal Department is greatly in excess of those two last items we have been discussing. In the village of Wallaceburg the amount of revenue from the postal service was $2,831; in Dresden, $2,278; in Bothwell, $1,770; in Thamesville, $1,536. Any one of these villages has nearly four times the amount of revenue derived from the post office that the village of Laprairie has. It is perfectly obvious that the Government are not paying the slightest attention to the rule which was laid down last year. It seems to me that appropriations in this way cannot be permitted to go on, and the House will be greatly wanting in its duty if, at a later stage of these proceedings, the vote is not questioned and the opinion of the House taken upon the course of the Government.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for Centre Montreal (Mr. Curran) has taken the trouble to read out of some document that one would suppose to be an advertisement of town lots for sale in Laprairie. I have made enquiries, and I find that the total number of people in business in Laprairie is ten, with three hotels, and a population of 1,800. The population of Laprairie is decreasing, and we have reason to believe that it will continue to decrease; still, we are asked to vote $10,000 for a post office in that village. We are also told that the people are about to have a fire engine, and they are laying down some pipes. Well, it appears to me that some persons are laying pipes for somebody, when we have the Government voting $10,000 for a post office in Laprairie. We are asked for $10,000 this year, but if the same system is followed in the construction of this post office that has prevailed in the public works generally, we shall be asked next year for two or three thousand dollars more in order to complete this building. If the information I have is correct, I have some reason to doubt the statement that a lot of land in Laprairie is worth $700. If that town is such as is described it cannot possibly be worth more than $150 to $200, and I have my information from gentlemen who are well acquainted with the town. I certainly think we should not vote this money. The Minister does not seem to be so well fortified with reasons in this case as he has been in some others. All that has been expended on this building so far is $5, which, we are informed, is to secure this lot. In the Province of Manitoba we can find a dozen places that are more entitled to a post office than Laprairie, because they are rapidly increasing in population, and in two or three years we expect they will have double the population of Laprairie. I am informed that Laprairie has been going back for the last 20 years, so far as railway communication is concerned. One of the first railways built in Quebec was built from Laprairie to St. Johns, and that road has been taken up. I say it is unfair and unjust to expend so much money in so small a town, that is decreasing in population, when there are so many other towns and villages more populous, and with a growing population, much more entitled to an expenditure of public money than this—I won't say miserable little town, because it appears likely to become a summer resort; but outside of that, there is no excuse at all for this vote.

Montreal post office—Electric lighting, extensions, alterations, &c..... $1,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to understand what the present arrangement is with respect to the electric lighting of the Montreal post office? I want to know what we are paying, and from whom we obtain the electric light used in the Montreal post office, and what time the contract has to run?

Mr. FOSTER. I find that the contract was entered into on 22nd October, 1885, with the Montreal *Gazette* Company, which offered to supply the electric current necessary for lighting 150 lamps of 16-candle power in the Montreal post office by means of the Edison incandescent system, for a period of five years, all necessary fittings, &c., to be furnished by the Government, the lights to be distributed all over the building, the contractor not to be liable for any damages which might be caused by temporary accidental stoppage of power, but he is to defray, at his own expense, the cost of lighting by gas or otherwise during such temporary deprivation of the electric light. The authority was granted by Order in Council and the contract was to run from July, 1888, to October, 1890. The rate to be paid for 237 lamps was to be $16 per lamp, instead of $18.33, and the number found to be necessary was only 150.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That seems to me a very high rate. That contract was out last year. What is the arrangement now?

Mr. FOSTER. That contract seems to have been out on the 23rd of October, 1890, and it has been renewed for three years at the same rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Judging from what I have known in similar cases, it appears to me this is a very improvident contract. I want to know whether tenders were applied for for that contract, or whether it was given without tender by the Government to the Montreal *Gazette* office? I saw no tenders and heard of none.

Mr. FOSTER. At the time the contract was entered into there was only one electric light company in Montreal. Since then other companies have sprung up, and the rates have been reduced.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have there been any tenders applied for?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it looks like a very great job for the purpose of benefiting the Montreal *Gazette* Company. I have reason to believe that had tenders been applied for a large reduction would have been gained for the public service. This plan of giving to such a corporation as the Montreal *Gazette* Company, a known supporter of the Government and a corporation which figures for many thousands of dollars a year in the Auditor General's Report, such a contract, is nothing more than a gross bribe to that corporation, and the renewal of it for a term of years, under the circumstances, is utterly and entirely at variance with every sound principle that can be imagined in carrying on our expenditures for public buildings. Even if there was an excuse, which I very much doubt, for making that bargain in 1885, it looks exceedingly like a gross piece of corruption to have renewed it without tender under the circumstances.

Mr. FOSTER. As the hon. gentleman will see, if there was only one electric lighting company in Montreal, the only thing to do was to make an arrangement with that company, if it were decided to have electric lighting. So, as regards the contract in 1885, the gravamen of the charge falls to the ground. The hon. gentleman has then to show that the amount paid now to this company is in excess of what should be paid. If that was not too great a charge at the time, and if, after three or six companies had become established, and the supply by this company had been satisfactory, the company had, to a certain extent, a right to be considered.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. If its work was satisfactory, and if the lighting was done at a fair price and not an exorbitant price—and the hon. gentleman has not shown that it was an exorbitant price—I do not see anything wrong in the transaction. But if the hon. gentleman can show that the price paid to the

company was a great deal more than it should have been, then there was ground for a charge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was your bounden duty to take all reasonable precautions by asking tenders, and ascertaining if you could not get the work done for a less sum. Evidently not the slightest pains were taken to do so. This has been made a means of giving a large sum per annum to the *Gazette* Company in return for political services rendered. I have no doubt, from information I have received, that if tenders had been asked for in Montreal a very considerable saving on these rates would have been obtained. I am told that no tenders were applied for, and that parties were expecting to be asked to tender; but it was done without giving any notice to the companies in the city to apply. It seems to be about as gross a piece of jobbery as we have yet heard, although it is not to the same amount as a good many others.

Mr. WATSON. What number of lights are kept burning all night, and what is the average number of hours for the 237 lights?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know the number of hours, and the payment is so much per light.

Mr. WATSON. They do not cost the *Gazette* anything when they are not burning.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The contract should be laid on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to have the contract brought down. I find here a summary of the report of the chief architect, in which he says:

"The present arrangement is considered to be a reasonable one, more especially as since the original agreement was entered into the lighting time of the lamps has increased several hours per night. Many of the additional lamps are required for the greater part of the 24 hours."

Mr. WATSON. That is what I want to find out.

Mr. HAGGART. It is only an average of 4½ cents per light per night.

Mr. WATSON. It is a very high rate, when you put 237 lamps in a building. I question very much whether some are lighted at all any time during the year. When the Minister says he had a right to renew the contract because the company had done the work before, I say the Government have no right to do so, for the Government had paid for putting in the lights. There are two or three companies running the incandescent light in Montreal, and 4½ cents per lamp per night is a very high rate. It should be furnished as regards that number in a building of that description for three-quarters of a cent per hour, and I am satisfied these lamps will not average seven hours per night.

Mr. HAGGART. Some are burning 24 hours.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Outside of the cost of lighting the post office and of this contract, consideration should be given to the principle of letting this contract without asking public tenders. I received a letter from Montreal within the last few days calling my attention to this matter, and saying it should be thoroughly investigated by the House, because it was no doubt a huge job got up for the benefit of the contractors. I was informed by the party who wrote to me that at the time the contract was given to the *Gazette* there were two or three electric lighting companies in the city which should have had an opportunity to compete, and even the city postmaster did not know the office was to be lighted by electricity until workmen entered the building for the purpose of arranging the lights, and then the contract had been made with the *Gazette* proprietors. In matters of this kind public competition should be solicited, and everyone should be put on the same footing. The Montreal *Gazette* is not an electric lighting company, but is in the newspaper business, and why should that company be preferred to the companies regularly engaged in the business? I contend that the public should have been notified that tenders were required for lighting the post office, and if, when that had been done, the *Gazette* was found to have sent in the lowest tender, they would have had a right to the contract. But so long as there were other electric light companies doing business in Montreal, it was an underhanded piece of business to give the contract to a party not regularly engaged in the trade, and without soliciting tenders from others. There can be no justification for it whatever. Even without considering the question of price, and even if the Montreal *Gazette* offer was less than it could have been done by other companies, there was an injustice done to the public in not having competition and in not having offers from others. If a contract is to be let under open competition those in the business will put down the price to the lowest notch in order to get the work. If the Minister of Finance was going to have some work of this kind done for himself he would not select a private company not engaged in the business, but he would go to the regular electric companies and ask them the price of lighting the building and invite competition. He is trustee for the public, he is doing business for the public, and he ought to guard the interests of the public the same as he would guard his own interests. I venture to say that there is not a man sitting on the Government benches to-day, who would let a contract for lighting buildings of his own in such way as this contract was let. I consider it was a gross injustice to the public to give this contract at first, and further it was an injustice to renew the contract without giving the competing companies an opportunity to tender. This matter was discussed in the House some years ago, and the Minister must have known that the Government did wrong in letting the contract without asking for public competition. Therefore I say that they cannot justify this expenditure. I do not know whether this amount is excessive or not. I care not whether it is excessive or not; but I say that the principle is wrong and that the Government cannot justify it.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has allowed his enthusiasm to run away with him in his use of adjectives, and he characterizes this first as a job, and afterwards he declares it is a huge job. It cannot be a huge job, for the amount itself is very small, and I notice that in the talk of hon. gentlemen opposite none of them have attempted to show that this price is large. He asks what would one do if he had a building of his own to light? If there was only one electric light company in the city where I had a building to light, I should go to that electric light company, and that was exactly

what was done in this case. If that work had been well done for three or four years, and if good satisfaction had been given, and it was done as cheaply as any other, I certainly would renew the contract with the person who was lighting my building. I find that is exactly what is done in this case, because there is a condition in the contract which makes it imperative for this company to furnish the light as cheaply as any other company would offer to do it for; or if they do not the contract is cancelled.

Mr. BARRON. Have you found that out?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How have you found out that they do it as cheaply as others?

Mr. FOSTER. Every company doing business in the city of Montreal is no doubt anxious for business, and none of these companies has ever offered to do it cheaper.

Mr. BARRON. Has the Government tried to find out?

Mr. FOSTER. I have asked the deputy to make enquiries as to the cost of electric lighting here and in other places, so as to bring that information down at the same time as the contract.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a mere evasion of the question. The hon. gentleman does not state that notice was sent out to these companies when this previous contract expired on the 22nd October last. I have reason to believe that the hon. Minister is misinformed when he states that when this contract was originally entered into, there were no other electric companies in Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. That is my information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am informed to the contrary. I am informed that there were electric light companies in Montreal at the time, and that these companies would have been too happy to have competed with the Montreal *Gazette* Company for the lighting of the post office if they had known. I am also informed that no notification whatever was given when this contract expired on the 22nd October last, that no steps whatever were taken by the department or by anybody in the public service to ascertain whether these companies would do the work cheaper or not. Now, if the hon. gentleman is able to contradict the information given to me on this head, if he is able to prove that notifications were sent to these other companies known to be doing business in Montreal and asking them to tender, there would be some force in his argument. It is quite clear that the Montreal *Gazette*, which is known to be a thick and thin supporter of the Government, has been allowed to retain a contract of nearly $4,000 a year without public competition. That is the state of the case and it is not creditable to the Government.

Mr. WATSON. It can be easily understood by anyone in this House acquainted with electric lighting, that it might be very easy for the *Gazette* people to give light to the Government for $16 per year per lamp, but it might not be so easy for any outsider who is not friendly to the Government. If the Government had asked for tenders for lighting at so much per hour per night per lamp, they would have paid for what they got. I am satisfied that these lights in the building at Montreal are not burning the average number of hours which has been spoken of by the Postmaster General. I venture to say that they will not average four hours a night. As a comparison I may say that in the town in which I live, where we have to burn wood or coal, the electric light is furnished at three-quarters of a cent per hour for a sixteen-candle lamp, while I am satisfied that they are getting one cent per hour in Montreal where they buy coal for about half the price it costs us in Manitoba. I certainly think there is quite a little job there. I say that the Government should advertise for tenders and get it at so much per hour, metre measurement.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Many of these lamps are burning all day.

Mr. WATSON. It must be a very badly lighted building if the lamps have to burn all day. The Custom house closes at four o'clock in the afternoon, and I venture to say that these lamps do not burn on an average four hours a day. I am a little surprised that the *Gazette* Company have power under their charter to undertake the lighting of any buildings outside of their own, but I suppose they have that power, or these other companies in Montreal would have objected to it long ago. It is only just to the public and to the other companies which are engaged in the regular business of electric lighting, that they should have an opportunity of tendering for the furnishing of this light.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). I think the comparison made by my hon. friend for Marquette (Mr. Watson) between the Montreal post office and the post office at Portage la Prairie is a little out of place. When he says that these lights only burn for four hours a day, he does not seem to know that they work in the Montreal post office for twenty-four hours a day, and that the building must be illuminated the whole night, because the mails are coming in from every quarter, and being assorted for distribution, from the beginning of the day to the end.

Mr. WATSON. I spoke of a comparison in rates. I was not speaking of the number of hours at all. I said that the light was furnished with us at three-quarters of a cent per lamp per hour.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). How did you make out four hours?

Mr. WATSON. The number of hours does not matter. The longer number of hours the lamps burn the cheaper the light ought be obtained per hour. I said that the Government ought to get their light on the same principle as any business man would get it, and pay so much per sixteen-candle power lamp per hour.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the Finance Minister ought at least to explain how this company were bound to furnish the light as cheaply as any other company, and how he ascertained that they were furnishing it as cheaply as any other company would furnish it. The hon. member for South Oxford asked him to explain that, but he has failed to do so. If he is in possession of the facts it is easy for him to explain. I think if he were in possession of the facts he would have explained it before now.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say to my hon. friend that I did not make that statement, that the *Gazette*

Company were furnishing the light as cheaply as any other company would furnish it. I said that the hon. gentleman had not proved that it was an exorbitant price. I also stated that there is a clause in the contract, and in the Order in Council as well, by which the contract was extended, that the *Gazette* Company was to give its light as cheaply as any other company would offer to put it in for.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How do you know they are doing it?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose they are. I did not state that they were, and nobody on the opposite side has said that they are not.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You have not given the other companies a chance to say whether they would or not.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. Finance Minister tried to make the point that the country was losing nothing, because there was in the agreement with the Montreal *Gazette* Company a clause that they would supply the light as cheaply as anybody else. When he was asked: How do you know? he began to say that the other companies would find it out, and try to get the contract. In answer to that, we asked how do the other companies know about it? Here is a secret contract made with the Montreal *Gazette* Company, and the other companies have not a chance to tender, and know nothing about it. The transaction is, as my hon. friend has said, a huge fraud, not applying the word huge to the amount involved, but to the character of the transaction, which undoubtedly cannot be defended, because contracts of this kind should be let by tender, and this has not been done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On another ground this contract is one of the most objectionable imaginable. No Government ought to make a contract with a company in which they put a clause permitting that company to retain the contract on condition that they will perform it as cheaply as anyone else. To do that is practically to prevent any other company tendering, because, according to the statements made by the hon. gentlemen, they could not get the contract unless they would go so low that the Montreal *Gazette* Company would throw it up in disgust, which it is not likely they would do. So that that practically cuts off all competition, even if the companies knew of the matter.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Though I am not a lawyer, I understand that ignorance can be successfully pleaded against prosecution in many cases. In the matter under discussion, I venture to say that the hon. gentlemen who have been throwing observations across the floor of the House have not sufficiently acquainted themselves with the facts of the case before making these observations. It has been contended that the contract made with the Montreal *Gazette* Company—of the details of which I confess I am ignorant, because they were made without my knowledge—should have been made in 1885, when tenders were first called for. What are the facts? The post office had been lighted by the Montreal Gas Company at a cost of between $3,000 and $4,000 a year. A contract was made with the *Gazette* Company——

Mr. CURRAN. In the adjoining building.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In the adjoining building, as my hon. friend says, but that is immaterial. At what cost was that contract made? At a less cost per light than the Montreal Gas Company had got at a time when no other building was in a position to light the post office: and the country saved, not a considerable, but a modicum of money on that contract. It ran for four or five years, at the end of which time it was renewed, and why? Because I presume the work of lighting the post office had been done satisfactorily to the Public Works Department of this country. It was lighted under a very much less rate than it was under the original contract, because competition had sprung up in the meantime. I am not concealing that fact for one moment. It was lighted at as low a rate as any other building in Montreal at that time. So that so far as the public interest is concerned, there has been not only no loss of money in consequence of the contract, but a saving to the country. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has talked about a price of three-quarters of a cent per light per hour as being the rate charged in his western country. That amounts to five and a quarter cents per week, or something like $30 or thereabouts per lamp per year.

Mr. WATSON. It depends on how long you burn them.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). This contract is $16 per lamp per year, which is one-half the price the hon. gentleman speaks of, and these lights are burning pretty much the year round, at least in some parts of the building.

Mr. WATSON. What average do the lights burn per night?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not know. I should think 12 hours at least. If you knew the locality of the building you would know that along St. François Xavier Street, and on Fortification Lane, it is utterly impossible to light one-half of that building by sunlight; you must have either gas lamps or electrical lamps burning the year round to light the building, so much is it obscured from the sun. However, the principal reason why I rose to-night—because, I confess I am not acquainted with the details of this transaction, which is not part of my business in connection with the *Gazette*—is that I want to repel a charge of the hon. member for South Oxford—and I do it without any kind of reservation at all—that this contract has anything whatever to do with the character of the editorial articles or the opinions of the *Gazette* newspaper. I have known the hon. gentleman to make the same charge in his own county against the Conservative press of Canada. I repel it on behalf of the Conservative press. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman might just as well make a similar charge against the *Globe* newspaper; he might as well say that forthwith, because that paper occasionally receives an advertisement from the Ontario Government, it is therefore under the hand and under the influence of Mr. Mowat, the leader of that Government, and that its principles are made and governed by the small pittance it receives from the local treasury. I might just as well charge against the *Globe* that its politics are governed by the pittance it receives from Mr. Mowat, as the hon. gentleman charges that the politics of the *Gazette* are governed by the pit-

tance it receives from Ottawa. For whatever work the Montreal *Gazette* has done for this Government it has received a fair charge and no more; and its political opinions and course have never been influenced one iota by reason of its business connection with the Government at Ottawa. If the hon. gentleman ventures to say otherwise I challenge him to the proof. I say again that the *Gazette* is as independent of this Government as the *Globe* newspaper or any other newspaper supporting hon. gentlemen opposite is independent of any Local Government. It is my proud boast, as connected with the *Gazette* newspaper, that my opinions have never been influenced by the business relations that paper may have had with this Government, whether those relations be large or small, because I believe this, and I do believe it sincerely, that for whatever money we have received from the Government we have rendered value, and nothing less or nothing more. We have never received from this or any other Government anything more than was fair and just, and the political opinions of the paper have never been influenced in any degree by its business relations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The pittance which the hon. gentleman's paper received last year was $669.17 for advertising and $5,252.53 for printing. Now, that is a very considerable deal less, on an average, than has been received by the *Gazette* for the last twelve years. During that time, if a true account were taken, I believe it would be found that that paper received close on $100,000 of public money, in one shape or another. For my part, although I do not suppose the hon. gentleman himself may have been influenced by it, I have not the slightest doubt that the *Gazette* has been very largely influenced in the course it has pursued with regard to public matters throughout this country by the amount of Government patronage it has received during the last twelve years. I have not the faintest doubt of that, and I have not the faintest doubt the same holds true of the majority of the other papers which have been participators in the plunder like the *Gazette*. I have not the slightest doubt that what is true of the Montreal *Gazette* is equally true of the London *Free Press*, the Moncton papers, and the St. John and Halifax papers, which, like it, have been sharers in the plunder.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I have too high an opinion of the hon. member for South Oxford to assume, for one moment, that he believes what he has stated. Why, Sir, look at his argument. He declares that the Montreal *Gazette* during this last year has received less money than it did during the preceding five or ten years. I ask him, in all candor, has the Montreal *Gazette* been a less staunch supporter of the Conservative policy this past year than it was ever before?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Has it been a less strong supporter of the Government than before? If it has not, and he cannot say it has not, how in heaven's name have the payments made by this Government to that paper been used to influence it in its support of the Government here. Why, his whole argument tends to show the utter fallacy of the pretension he makes before this House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think $6,000 is a goodly amount.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not know that the hon. member for South Oxford is exactly right in saying that the *Gazette* was influenced in its editorial opinions by this money; but I am satisfied if the *Gazette* was not influenced in that regard, the payment of the money was a substantial aid to the *Gazette*. There is no doubt about that; and if the *Gazette* received substantial aid, there is no reason why it should not go on in its old course of justifying and supporting the Government. This is just another indication of the manner in which public expenditures have been made by the Government. They have made it a principle to support their supporters on every occasion. They have supported them by building railways in constituencies where railways were not required in the public interests, and by building public buildings where the public necessities did not demand them. They have expended the public money in paying large sums to newspapers for printing and advertising ever since I have been a member of this House, and in doing that they have been supporting their supporters. The Montreal *Gazette* has always been a supporter of the Conservative party, and I suppose will continue to be so, no matter what amount of pay they may get from the public crib; but there is one thing I must say with regard to the hon. member for Cardwell's statement, that the Government have always received fair work for a fair price from the *Gazette* company. I cannot allow that statement to go without contradiction, because I proved in the Public Accounts Committee some years ago that the *Gazette* was paid in some cases fourteen times the amount the public contractors charged.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is a slander which has been sent abroad throughout the country and has never been proved.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I established that beyond doubt before the Public Accounts Committee and before this House. I established beyond doubt that, in some cases, the *Gazette* was paid fourteen times the value of work done.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Fourteen times the value for work they did in comparison with the prices the public contractors would have done the same work for. The *Gazette* got, in some cases, over $22,000 a year for public printing of various kinds and advertising, and in this respect I think the Government has supported its supporter very well for a number of years. I do not blame the Montreal *Gazette* for being desirous to maintain in office the present Government, as naturally enough the *Gazette* desires to reciprocate the favours it receives and assist the Government which assists them. It is the same with my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He has been feeding liberally at the public crib for years. He has been getting from $5,000 to $7,000 a year for patronage to the Regina *Leader*.

The CHAIRMAN. Order. We are on the item of the Montreal post office, and the hon. gentleman knows he is out of order.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There is some light in Regina, even when the bard is not here. In referring to him, I admit I was out of order, but I think I have a perfect right to refer to the Montreal *Gazette*, and, as I have said, that paper

has been liberally supported by the Government. I do not say its opinions have been influenced by that support; but, to any ordinary individual, that support would probably have some weight in influencing the opinions of parties receiving such large sums from this or any other Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am not going to speak against this item, and I think hon. gentlemen, if they knew what I was going to say, would give me a little better attention.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It seems to be the function of the Montreal *Gazette* to shed light, and it is in keeping with that function that it should light up the Montreal post office.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That item is carried.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I say it is not carried. I had the floor before you said it was carried, and I say it is not carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item was carried before the hon. gentleman got up.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. CASEY. I heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) address you before you said "carried."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item is carried, but I have no objection that the hon. gentleman should speak.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; chair.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I see, in looking at the Montreal *Gazette* of to-day, that it is not only shedding its light on Montreal, but it has invaded Spencer Wood——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN,—it has invaded Spencer Wood, and is giving its light to the Lieutenant Governor there as to what is his duty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We pay that paper for light, and it is but shedding its light out of the funds the Dominion Government give to it. There were $3,000,000 squandered at Quebec by the Dominion Government—did the Montreal *Gazette* ever say a word about that?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Millions of money have been squandered. Did the *Gazette* say anything about it?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No; but it does now what no paper should do under a limited monarchy, it seeks to give light to the Lieutenant Governor as to what action he should take.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to correct a statement made by the hon member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I understood him to say that the *Gazette* had received $6,000. I find that last year the *Gazette* received $12,528.43, besides the amount for the electric light, $4,000, making a total of $16,528.43.

Rivière du Loup post office, Custom house, &c.—to complete..... $11,200

Mr. CASEY. What are the details of that?

Mr. FOSTER. This is to provide for the completion of the new post office building at Rivière du Loup. The total expenditure up to the 31st December was $9,227. The total cost of the building is to be $23,000.

Mr. CASEY. What is the population?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is there a protest in this riding?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). There is a protest in this House against you.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice that there is. We can follow this. Wherever there is a protest there is a grant.

Mr. FOSTER. The population is about 4,000.

Mr. CASEY. What are the revenues?

Mr. FOSTER. The postal revenue is $2,500. The money orders issued amount to $19,000. The savings bank deposits are $6,700.

Mr. CASEY. This is also a much smaller place than the one to which I called attention earlier in the evening. If it is necessary to have a protest in a county before a grant for public buildings can be made, and if I had known that in time, there would have been no difficulty in getting up a protest in my county if any one would furnish the security. We will see about that at the next election.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. WATSON. Will this complete this post office?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This has been carried.

Mr. WATSON. I was on my feet asking a question of the Finance Minister before you said "carried."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Chairman has waited until time has been given for everybody to speak, and then I say "carried."

Mr. WATSON. The Chair has no right to say how long an item should take in discussion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Chairman has a right to say "carried" when members have spoken.

Mr. CASEY. The invariable rule is for the Chairman to see if anyone desires to speak before he says "carried."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. How long is he to wait—five minutes?

Mr. CASEY. When you have been there longer——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have been here long enough.

Mr. CASEY. When you have had a little more experience of your present position you will know better.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. This is not the time to discuss this matter.

Mr. CASEY. It is not the custom for the Chair to cry "carried" directly the last speaker sits down. There must be a decent opportunity given for other hon. members to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. If the hon. gentleman would not think he can give lessons to everybody, it would be better.

Mr. CASEY. You want lessons, and you will get them.

Mr. WATSON. I asked a question of the Finance Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. I was going to give you the information, but you were quarrelling with the Chairman.

Mr. WATSON. It was the Chairman who was quarrelling with the members.

St. Henri Post Office, &c..... $7,500

Mr. HYMAN. What is the population?

Mr. CASEY. Where is St. Henri?

Mr. FOSTER. In Hochelaga County.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who is the member for that county?

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). There is no protest there.

Mr. WATSON. What is the revenue of this post office?

Mr. FOSTER. The postal revenue is $1,700.

Mr. LANDERKIN. According to the Postmaster General's Report, it was $1,667.74. However, the hon. gentleman is nearer to the mark than usual.

Mr. HYMAN. Is this the total vote, or is another to follow?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A vote was taken last year for $8,000. What is the total cost?

Mr. FOSTER. There was a vote of $4,000 in 1890, and that was for the site. That has been purchased, and nothing else has been expended up to the 31st December, 1890. This is now for going on with the work.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This will cost about $25,000 to collect $1,667.

Mr. O'BRIEN. As to sites for these post offices, in this case I understand the Dominion Government are paying for the site, while in Orillia, the town in which I live, the municipality is obliged to buy the site. Why, in one case, does the Dominion Government pay for the site, while in the other the municipality has to find the site?

Mr. FOSTER. I see that the amount of the contract is $7,770; the site cost $3,500, and this $7,500 is for proceeding with the work. The building will have a frontage of 43 feet 6 inches by 333 feet 6 inches, two stories, front walls of stone, rear walls of brick, and the roof of wood; the ground floor for the post office, and the first floor for Customhouse apartments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So far as I can make out, the hon. gentleman must be under some misapprehension as to the cost. He says $4,000 were voted in 1889-90, $8,000 were voted in the year which has just passed, and we are asked for $7,500 more.

Mr. FOSTER. But of the $8,000 voted last year none of it was expended. A part of that will lapse. The contract and the cost of site both together amount to $11,700. Then come the fittings for the buildings, and the incidental expenses. The whole estimate is $19,000.

Mr. BARRON. The Finance Minister has not yet answered the question asked by the hon. member for Muskoka, with regard to the difference between this case and the case of Orillia.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a difference in the two. We did not have to buy the site for Laprairie. We cannot compel a municipality to give a site. A post office is a Government building, and very often the locality offers a site, and then the Government is very glad to accept it, and we will be still more glad if the example sometimes given will induce others to do the same.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This is a most extraordinary doctrine, that if a municipality offers a site, they will take it, but if the municipality does not offer a site they will buy it. Why should Orillia provide a site at her own expense, when the Government buys a site in a town like St. Henri, which has far less claim for a post office?

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). The hon. gentleman speaks as if St. Henri was a small town: it has a population of 15,000. The accommodation at the post office has been so bad that people have had actually to go to the Montreal post office to be accommodated. It has been held in a little room about 10 feet square. St. Henri is about two miles from Montreal, and is a suburb fast increasing in population. It is a centre of distribution. There are many small post offices around Montreal which are to be served by the St. Henri post office. So I do not see why it should not be provided with a post office, unless it is because it is in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that the amount of money deposited in the post office savings bank was $330.31. In three towns in my riding there is an average of $30,000 deposited in the post office savings bank, and not one of them has a post office. The entire receipts of St. Henri post office last year amounted to $1,667.94; number of money orders, 241; total amount of money orders issued during the year, $3,110; total commission received from the public, $32; compensation to the postmaster on money orders throughout the year, $8.23; salary paid him, $528; and for the room the hon. gentleman has referred to we have been paying $60 rent; and in a place like that we are asked to contribute $19,000 to build a post office. This is even worse than the other cases; I cannot pronounce it anything else than a barefaced fraud. I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen opposite can ask the Committee to consent to such absurd nonsense.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). I shall make it my duty to inform my Liberal friends in St. Henri how they are treated by the Liberal Opposition in Parliament.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We have been discussing at some length the electric light item; this is the Rielite item. The hon. member for Muskoka understands that they are paying them off one by one, with either a post office or something else. We will soon get to the end of the Rielite vote, then I hope our Riel friends in the west will be satisfied.

Mr. CASEY. What makes this post office vote look worse than it is on the face of it, is the remark of my hon. friend who represents Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins). He says he will take pleasure in telling his Liberal friends that the Liberals in Parliament opposed the grant. By that remark he exposes the object of the whole proceeding; he

shows that this grant was made for political purposes: he shows that when we, on this side, criticise a transaction that is scandalous on the face of it, he takes advantage of it and attempts to make political capital in his own county. I say that such a method of treating this subject is quite unbecoming to the member for Hochelaga, who has always borne a character that would not lead one to suspect that he would treat such a subject in this manner. The transaction is the most scandalous of any we have had before us. St. Henri is practically a suburb of Montreal, and the office is merely a sort of branch of the Montreal office. The people evidently do most of their business in Montreal, as is seen by the returns. Under the circumstances, the proposal to erect a post office suitable for a large town or small city is absurd. If the Government could show any reason for the expenditure it would be different, but they consider the House has simply to register and carry out the decisions at which they have arrived. The Minister of Finance dropped a hint that may prove useful, namely, that some municipalities offered sites free, so as to induce the Government to erect a public building. If the hon. gentleman will undertake to erect public buildings in all places where free sites are offered I can promise him applications from more important places than we are now dealing with.

Mr. FOSTER. And with your support?

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has grown so accustomed to connecting the granting of public money with support for the Government he cannot disassociate them for a moment. Ridgetown is a vastly more important place than many of those named, and if a proposal were made to give it a public building I would give it my support.

Mr. BARRON. I was not surprised at the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) rising, in view of the statement made by the Minister of Finance, that in St. Henri they are paying $3,500 for a lot and in Orillia they are asking a free site as a condition of erecting a public building. What possible fairness is there in that action when a comparison is made between the two places. At St. Henri the gross postal revenue was $1,667, whereas at Orillia it was $7,857. The number of money orders issued at Orillia was 2,043, while at St. Henri it was 241. The value of money orders issued at Orillia was $25,207, while at St. Henri it was $3,010. The total commission received in Orillia was $203, at St. Henri $32; and so the comparison goes all the way through. I am not, therefore, surprised that the hon. member for Muskoka or any hon. member should rise and protest against such invidious distinctions being made with regard to public works. Take the deposits: In Orillia they were $81,811; at St. Henri, $3,500. I hope some different system will be pursued in distributing the favours of the Government.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) said the post office at St. Henri was an important distributing point. I observe that not one dollar was paid for forwarding.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). It is becoming an important distributing centre, because the population is increasing in that direction. When the new post office is established it will be an important distributing point for western Montreal

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It may become an important distributing point in the future, but it is not an important distributing point now. With respect to the cost of sites, the Minister of Finance has told us that the site will cost $3,500. I remember cases where large bills have been sent in for law costs for examining titles. I remember how for the new departmental building $7,000 were paid the lawyers for examining titles. In connection with the post office at Hamilton, although the site had been occupied by Senator McInnes' warehouse for many years, a favoured lawyer in Toronto was employed to examine the title, and he charged $180 or $190. I want to know whether the price of $3,500 in question includes examination of title.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). The price seems to be high; but when it is remembered that there is not a lot to be purchased in that immediate vicinity for less than 50 cents or 60 cents per square foot, and that the site is on an extension of St. James street, and in a locality where land is very high, I do not think the Government could have done better.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I want to know whether it includes the examination of title.

Mr. FOSTER. The memorandum I have is that the cost of the site will be $3,500.

Mr. CASEY. If this policy of erecting post offices in suburbs is carried out in Montreal, similar applications will be made on behalf of suburbs elsewhere. The member for West York (Mr. Wallace) must have been neglecting his duty in not securing the erection of a Dominion building at West Toronto Junction. If the Minister of Agriculture had remained a member of this House he might have secured a public building for some of the suburbs of London that are not yet incorporated. The principle of putting up expensive buildings in the suburbs of great cities is one which, if carried out throughout the Dominion, would involve a tremendous expenditure, and one which seems to be improper and wasteful.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary..... $20,000

Mr. FOSTER. We will reduce this appropriation, because the Opposition have kept us so long discussing the Estimates that by the time we get the money we will not be able to spend it this year.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. In that case we had better keep you here longer. It will be a good thing for the country if the fact that the session was prolonged would reduce the public expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see the item is for penitentiaries, and so long as the Opposition keep us here there will probably be not so much necessity for room there.

Brantford, Ont., Battalion Drill Shed.. $10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is going to be done with this.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is proposed to give it as a Government contribution to the city of Brantford to build a drill shed.

Carleton Place Post Office, &c..... $12,500

Mr. LANDERKIN. $26,000.

Mr. WATSON. What was the original contract for the building?

Mr. FOSTER. $14,000.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How was the price increased.

Mr. FOSTER. The $14,000 does not include the fittings or the price of the land, which cost $4,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should think from some discoveries that have been made in other parts of the building you had better enlarge them.

Cobourg Post Office, Custom house, &c... $1,500

Mr. BARRON. I would ask the Minister of Finance to allow that item to stand, because there is a matter in connection with it coming up before the Public Accounts Committee, and which would have been brought up earlier had we been able to get the returns in connection with it at an earlier date.

Mr. FOSTER. This is to complete payments for work done.

Mr. BARRON. I think we should have some discussion on this, because if the information given to some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House is at all correct there has been, in the language of my hon. friend behind me, a huger job in this than in anything we have discussed to-night. I happen to have seen the building, and to know something about it, and a most excessive amount of money has been already paid on it. Although the information was not given to myself, it was given to an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, and I can undertake to say that the Minister of Finance, if he had our information, would not wish to have the item pass at the present time without some discussion, which cannot be gone into until we have the matter brought up in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. All right, let it stand.

Government Printing Bureau, including electric light plant, &c.....$9,300

Mr. CASEY. The whole business of the Printing Bureau is so much in dispute just now that I think this item should be allowed to stand.

Mr. FOSTER. This is for the building and plant, which must be paid for. The chief architect says it is necessary for payment of contract on additional works carried out at the Bureau, inclusive of electric lighting, and to cover probable additional incidental expenses connected with the same.

Mr. CASEY. I must object to that item, for the reason that I think it is a very expensive way of obtaining light, both in the Printing Bureau and here, to have a separate plant for each. We have one plant for these buildings. Surely that could produce light also for the Printing Bureau, if necessary. But even so, I have every reason to believe that the light could be obtained much more cheaply from the electric company of the city; and, therefore, I do not see that there is any use of having a separate plant for each establishment. We all know that Government affairs of this kind cost a good deal more to run than those run on business principles. In the Printing Bureau the commission system has prevailed so much in regard to plant of other kinds that we may suppose it to exist in this case. That is why I ask that the item should stand, because a committee is enquiring into the affairs of that Bureau, and evidence might turn up in regard to this electric light plant similar to that which has turned up in regard to other services. The item is very vague, not mentioning anything but electric plant. Can the Minister state what this includes besides the electric light?

Mr. FOSTER. Here is an amount of $3,300 due for contracts, and a balance of $3,000 due on contract for additional work of fitting up electric light plant.

Mr. CASEY. Is the first item a balance due on building contracts?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; for other work besides electric light plant—for additional work on the building, fittings and furniture for the stationery office, all of which were by contract. The incandescent light was also by contract.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who holds the contract?

Mr. FOSTER. Ahearn & Soper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the amount of the contract?

Mr. FOSTER. $8,492 for the electric plant.

Mr. FORBES. How many lights is that to supply?

Mr. FOSTER. The power is to be sufficient to run 1,200 lights.

Mr. FORBES. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the contract has already been let?

Mr. FOSTER. The contract has already been let.

Mr. FORBES. Has the plant been supplied?

Mr. FOSTER. The plant has been supplied and is in operation.

Mr. FORBES. It strikes me that it would have been much more economical to have had first an estimate from the engineers as to whether it was advisable to put in a separate plant to light that building.

Mr. FOSTER. The engineers and the chief architect did certainly give their opinion.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Did the Government advertise for tenders?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; two tenders were sent in.

Mr. WATSON. Does the contract include steam plant and the dynamo?

Mr. FOSTER. No; simply the electric light plant. The new engines are got by contract for $1,000?

Mr. FORBES. It is certain that the same plant that supplies these buildings could easily supply the Printing Bureau. In order to put in an extra plant you have also to put in extra engines and boiler, and a separate staff of workmen. When these buildings are only a few hundred yards apart I do not see why the Government should go to the expense of a new outfit, when they had one already.

Mr. FOSTER. The power for lighting this building is not more than sufficient for that purpose.

Mr. FORBES. With the same boiler and the same engine and additional dynamo, and with the same men, you could run the electric light for the Printing Bureau.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend appears to forget that one of the objects in laying out Government work is to secure employment to as large a number of men as possible ; but in this case I find fault with the employment of a separate plant for either of these buildings. I have asked the Minister to give reasons why this is done, and why the light is not taken direct from the company that supplies the city and runs the street railway. Even if the Government, with its usual desire to create new positions for employés, insists upon having an electrical plant of its own, why is not the water of the Chaudière Falls used ? Surely the Government has a right to use some of that power. It is surely not all granted away to monopolists. If they must have a separate plant there is power enough there to run all the electric lights they want, even after all the mill-owners are supplied, and that water power belongs to the Government, and could be used, instead of this needless steam equipment. I would ask the Minister not to shelter himself behind the engineers, as other Ministers have done, but to tell me what reason of economy exists for having separate plants for the two buildings, or any plant at all, when the city is supplied by an electric light company. This is a question of policy, on which the hon. gentleman ought to have an opinion. He ought to be able to give reasons for the establishment of this plant. If a contract has been made and the money is due, it will have to be paid ; but there is no reason why we should not have explanations about it.

Mr. STAIRS. I cannot say I know as much about electric light as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes), but I have had some little experience of it, and I am confident that the hon. member and the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) are not correct in saying that the Printing Bureau could be lighted more cheaply by the plant which supplies the House of Commons than by a separate plant. The hon. gentleman must bear in mind that the plant which supplies the House of Commons is not run all through the year, and that a special staff has to be used for the purpose of lighting these buildings, whereas in the Printing Bureau they have their staff all the year round, and can utilize them in connection with their own plant. With all deference to the opinion of the hon. member for Queen's as to the importance of having highly skilled men to take charge of the plant, according to my experience there need be no difficulty in having the electric plant of the Printing Bureau under the charge of the engineers of that establishment, for both the dynamo and the electric engine are in the engine room. I am confident that any practical man, having to consider the question of putting in a separate engine and plant in the Bureau or lighting that building from a distant plant, intended only to run a few months of the year, would, as a matter of economy purely, adopt the system recommended by the Government engineer. As to the policy of obtaining the light from any electric light company in the city or of making the electric light in the Bureau itself, I am inclined to think, with all deference to the hon. member for Queen's, that, on the whole, it is cheaper for the Bureau to make its own light. I know, from what little experience I have had in connection with some factories at Halifax, that we find it is a great deal cheaper to provide the light from our own dynamos than to obtain it from any company, even at the lowest price the company will charge. It must be borne in mind by the Committee in considering the question of lighting an establishment like the Printing Bureau, or any printing establishment, where mechanics are about, and you have engines and boilers, you can utilize them in providing your electricity. I think that when my hon. friends opposite take these facts into consideration they will see that the plan adopted by the Bureau is, on the whole, a wise one, and one which, in the end, will prove the most economical.

Mr. FORBES. I quite agree with the junior member for Halifax that it is much more economical for the Government to supply the lights for its own buildings itself rather than take them from an almost monopolizing company like that of Ottawa. But what I object to is this : that having a separate public building it should be necessary to put in extra plant. The House of Commons is run from three to five months a year by electric lights, and the Printing Bureau is also run during that time. Why, then, should not the same staff of employés run both ? The same machinery which supplies electric lights to the House of Commons could supply them to the other buildings, and there would be a saving, at any rate, during three to five months in the year. The public offices of the various departments in the other buildings outside this House are run the year round, and are lighted by electricity also, and I do not see why the one plant cannot supply all the buildings, as they are all within an area not very large, through which lines can be easily strung. To put a separate plant in each public building is a gross waste of money. An engineer is necessary in each of the stations, and the dynamo station is not in the engine-room. You have an engineer and a fireman, and then your dynamo engineer and his employés in each separate building, and the staff in each one of these stations is enormous, and the cost of running them is something tremendous. A great saving could be made if the Government would look upon the matter in that light.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to know the cost of the engine and boiler required to run this chamber.

Mr. FOSTER. The engine, I believe, cost $2,000 and is not included in this vote.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What has been the cost of this building up to the present ?

Mr. FOSTER. $242,201.01.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does that include the plant ?

Mr. FOSTER. All cost of construction up to the present.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the amount of the plant ?

Mr. FOSTER. That was up to 31st December, 1890.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does that include the plant ?

Mr. FOSTER. That does not include what this item is to cover.

Mr. WATSON. Have the Government considered whether it is advisable to use water power in furnishing the light? The other electric companies have seen fit to utilize water power, and it seems strange that the Government, which owns the water power, should not use it. Electric lights can be furnished much cheaper by water power than by steam power, and it does seem strange to me that in a city like Ottawa where you have immense water power belonging to the Government, you should have incurred large expense in putting in steam plant. Have the department figured on the cost of putting in a plant at the Chaudière Falls and utilizing the water power there instead of steam?

Mr. FOSTER. The matter was fully considered at the time, and it was considered by the engineers and architect to be cheaper to furnish the Printing Bureau with its own electric plant and running it in that way. The only cost extra was the cost of the engine.

Mr. WATSON. And the fuel.

Mr. FOSTER. That is only a small amount.

Mr. WATSON. It takes so much fuel to make so much light.

Mr. FOSTER. There would have been a great deal of expense in utilizing the water power, and that was taken into account. I am not an expert in the business, but those who are came to the conclusion that the cheapest way was to use steam.

Mr. CASEY. It is strange that a public company, which has electric light for sale, should find it cheaper to use water power, and that the Government should find it cheaper to use steam. The electric light company must have the same difficulties in using water power as the Government would have had.

Mr. WATSON. What is the comparison in the number of lights?

Mr. CASEY. If the engineers reported that steam power was cheaper than water power, it is pretty clear they did not know their business, because business men do not use it in that way.

Mr. WATSON. What is the capacity of the plant installed in the Printing Bureau?

Mr. FOSTER. 1,200 lights.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely we are not to understand the Minister of Finance to say that there is no surplus water power available at the Chaudière. As long as I have been at Ottawa, I have never seen the Chaudière without observing any amount of water power going to waste.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is all leased.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But there must be a large amount going to waste.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the electric light company leased their water power from those who had leases from the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker is probably better qualified to speak on that subject than I am, but I should say, from seeing the place, that there was a huge waste there all the time.

Mr. SPEAKER. It requires a considerable expenditure of money to make the water power available, and, for a small plant, such as that in the Printing Bureau, I do not think it would pay the Government to take the necessary means to make the water power available. Take the two electric lighting companies now in existence in this city. Instead of leasing the water power from the Government themselves, and making it available by putting in wheels and so on, they have rented the water power from the lessees of the Government, and they pay a considerable amount of money for the use of those water powers, because the wheels are in and all the arrangements are made, so that they have only to attach their dynamos to those wheels. I think, if the Government undertook, for the running of a small plant, such as that in the Printing Bureau, to render the water power available, it would be found that the expenditure would be very much greater than it is under the present system. There are only 1,200 lights, a small engine has been put in, the steam from the boilers used for the printing presses is utilized. I have some experience in running electric lights myself, and on the whole I am convinced that the mode adopted by the Government is one which will involve the country in the least expense. As to the running of the lights from the present plant utilized for these buildings, I may say that a proposition was made for the lighting of the library by electricity, and it was found that the capacity of the present plant, of the engine and dynamos in use for the lighting of the House of Commons, would not be sufficient for the library. The capacity is taxed to the utmost for this House, and the lighting of the library would have involved an additional expense of $6,000 or $8,000 for that alone.

Mr. WATSON. If that is the case, I think there should be sufficient plant put in to light the library and the grounds, instead of continuing the use of gas: and, taking all this into consideration, I think the Government should have utilized the water power for the whole of these grounds and buildings, and the outside buildings. As to the cost of putting in the water wheel and so on, I am satisfied that the cost of the steam engine and boiler, and the installing of the same at the Printing Bureau, must have cost enough to put in the water power, even including the cost of a new bulkhead at the Chaudière Falls.

Mr. SPEAKER. My hon. friend must remember that it is not only the construction of the wheels, but the construction of flumes and other things, which would involve a very large expenditure, and, from the information I have had from the present electric lighting companies, I am convinced that if the Government had adopted the system proposed by the hon. gentleman they would have involved the country in a much larger annual expenditure than is entailed now.

Mr. WATSON. Of course, it is a matter of difference of opinion, but I am of opinion that it would have been cheaper to use the water power, not only for the present outlay but for the service in the future. One man could attend to all that is necessary to furnish light for all the Government buildings in the city. At present it will take a fireman and an additional man at each station, that is, four men, besides the fuel, and I am satisfied that the original cost of the steam plant would be sufficient to instal the hydraulic plant at the Chaudière Falls.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We formerly used gas in these buildings. Now we use the electric light. I

understand that, since we have used the electric light, the gas bills are as heavy as they were before. Is that so?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the information here-

Pembroke Post Office, Custom-house, &c.
—To complete.....$2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of that Pembroke post office?

Mr. FOSTER. The total cost, up to 31st December, was $31,294.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the cost of the lot?

Mr. FOSTER. $2,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the cost of building the requisite retaining walls to allow the lot to be used for the purpose of building a post office on it? I had the pleasure of paying a visit to Pembroke, and I was struck with the ingenuity which was manifested in fitting that lot for the purposes of a post office. It appeared to me that the lot had been selected with the laudable desire to give as much labour as possible. The lot seemed to slope down to the water's edge, and I noticed that there were retaining walls of excellent construction placed there. I should like to know the cost of the retaining walls.

Mr. SPEAKER. There are two sites available for the purpose of a public building at Pembroke. One was what was known as the O'Meara lot, which was valued at $6,500, and it would have been necessary, in order that the foundations might be properly laid, to have done a good deal of piling and concreting, which would have involved a considerable expense. The cost of the present lot was $2,500, and the cost of the magnificent retaining walls referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford was $4,000, making the total cost of the lot, including the retaining wall, no more than the price asked for the only other lot which was available. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that the building of that retaining wall was not only for the purpose of making the lot valuable, but also in order that it might serve as a foundation for the building itself. As a matter of fact, the retaining wall up to the street line, not only forms a foundation for the building, but it was utilized for all the purposes of coal storage, for weights and measures office, and an examining warehouse; so that the cost of building the retaining wall did not involve so much extra expense as the member for South Oxford believes it did.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It looked to be a very fine piece of architecture, in its way. But, seriously, it seems to me that $6,500, with all respect to the town of Pembroke, which is a thriving little town, is a tall figure for a site there.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid if my hon. friend wanted to buy a business site in the town, he would not be able to secure one for less money.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was informed that an offer was made by extra patriotic parties to sell very good sites for very much smaller sums. But the hon. gentleman does not gainsay the fact which I mentioned to the Committee, and which was brought very forcibly to my own attention, that a very large sum of money had to be expended in building what was necessary in order to make that fit to use as a site at all. The hon. gentleman knows that this post office is built on a lot sloping very smartly down to the river, so smartly that I should say a retaining wall of about 20 feet was required for a large part of the construction.

Mr. O'BRIEN. What is the population of the town of Pembroke?

Mr. SPEAKER. Between 4,000 and 5,000.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Then, that brings me exactly to the point I wanted to get at. The population of the town of Barrie is 5,000, and they had to find a site for their post office and public building; the town of Orillia has about the same population, and they had to find a site for their public buildings. I would like to know how this favouritism exists. There are three towns in a somewhat similar position as regards population and business; two of them have got to find their own sites for post offices and public buildings; the other one is favoured and the Government buys it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly it does not look like equal rights.

Mr. SPEAKER. The member for Muskoka will remember that although the town of Pembroke has a population of but a little less than 5,000, the amount of business that is transacted in the offices which this building will accommodate is very large. The postal revenue last year was $6,000, the Customs collections were $25,000, and the inland revenue collections between $20,000 and $25,000. All these services will be accommodated by the building erected at Pembroke.

Peterborough Custom-house.....$6,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. They have two sites for public buildings in Peterborough. This site was bought originally for the Custom-house and post office; another site was afterwards bought and the post office was built upon it. Then the Custom-house is built on this site. The Government there occupy two places of business, one for the Custom-house and the other for the post office, with officials in both, and they have to keep two separate sets of heating apparatus, two separate systems of lighting, &c. Would the Minister of Finance tell us a little about this?

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend has gone over that often and often in the House. The whole matter has been discussed here for two or three years.

Mr. BARRON. The post office and Custom-house are so intimately connected here that I would like to draw attention to the post office extras allowed, amounting to something like $10,000, and I fancy it would be the same thing with the Custom-house, and therein lies all this evil. I know myself that in the case of the Lindsay post office honest contractors have not any chances for tenders. Honestly agreeing at what they conceive to be a fair value for the building, they are cut out by those who tender at really too low a figure, but the person tendering at the low figure would get compensation in the way of extras. Now, in Peterborough, the post office is very intimately connected with the Custom-house, and there has been $10,000 paid to the contractor in extras, he knowing all the time that he was going to get this large sum in extras. The Finance Minister

must not think that because this matter was discussed two or three sessions ago, therefore the huge fraud has been forgotten, because there never was a greater fraud perpetrated or assisted by the Government than this fraud in Peterborough. The Government found that by buying one particular lot they would offend certain people who expected to sell another lot to them, and they got two different syndicates both coming to the Government and asking them to buy their respective properties. The Government could not please both syndicates, which were composed of strong supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, and instead of hon. gentlemen doing what was right and selecting the best site and disregarding everything but the public interest, they bought both properties, instead of buying only one, as they should have done, and as they would have done had they been actuated by proper motives. They have been forced to put up two large expensive buildings, whereas one would have done. In all other places they have the Custom-house and post office together; but in the town of Peterborough, for no reason except the fear of displeasing some friends, they not only went to the expense of buying these two sites improperly, but having got both sites then they erected expensive buildings on them.

Port Arthur Post Office and Custom-house $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. They have offered to give a site and, of course, the Government will take care that it is a proper site.

Mr. WATSON. If that is the reason, why is this vote in the Estimates?

Mr. FOSTER. The reason is that Port Arthur needs a public building, and has given us a site to have one built there.

Mr. WATSON. What is the amount of the population?

Mr. FOSTER. Population, revenue and increased business. The exports amount to the value of $219,000, imports to $310,000. Goods entered for consumption, $310,000; money orders issued and paid, $53,000, and postal revenue about $5,000.

Mr. WATSON. I can understand the plea for a post office at Port Arthur, as it is a growing place and an important point; but it is no justification for the votes passed to-night. This is the first item on which a satisfactory explanation has been offered.

Supreme Court, Ottawa, addition..... $17,000

Mr. FLINT. What is the total cost of the Supreme Court buildings?

Mr. FOSTER. The total cost to December, 1890, was $71,207.

Mr. FLINT. I think most visitors to the capital are rather disappointed with the architectural appearance of the Supreme Court building, and the Government, in spending this additional amount in this manner, while perhaps consulting the interests of economy, are not consulting the higher interests connected with the proper architecture for a building of that kind. I believe the time is coming when the Government should take into consideration, if they can utilize the Supreme Court building for some other purpose, the advisability of placing in the capital a building architecturally fitted for the high position the Supreme Court occupies in the country. Of course, this may be a matter that may take some time, as so much money has been expended on this building. I do not believe the situation, character of architecture and internal arrangement are such as should characterize our highest court. I believe this House would be disposed to be generous whenever the time should come that an appropriation was asked to place the building for this court on a proper footing. The public buildings in Ottawa generally, although no doubt considerable extravagance was displayed, which might, under other circumstances, have been avoided, are yet, on the whole, such as the people of the Dominion regard with pride on account of their architectural proportions, and I think the Supreme Court should occupy a building more worthy of the capital and the purpose for which the building is designed than is the building occupied by the court at the present time.

Toronto Drill Hall..... $40,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What quantity of land has been provided, and where is it?

Mr. DENISON. It is a large lot lying immediately behind Osgoode Hall in the heart of the city.

Walkerton Post Office, &c..... $8,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. What amount has been expended?

Mr. FOSTER. $10,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What amount will be required to complete?

Mr. FOSTER. About $20,000.

Mr. WATSON. What was the original contract?

Mr. FOSTER. The contract for the building was $14,550, site $1,491; then there were the necessary expenditures for fittings, heating, furnishings, incidentals and supervision.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who had the contract for fittings?

Mr. FOSTER. It is generally given to the contractor under architect's estimates.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How much was paid to the clerk of the works?

Mr. FOSTER. $700.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understand he has received $75 per month for over a year and a half, and that he is still employed.

Mr. FOSTER. At present he is not under pay.

Petrolia Public building..... $7,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the estimated cost of the building?

Mr. FOSTER. For everything included, $28,000. The postal revenue is over $6,000.

Public building at Smith's Falls..... $7,500

Mr. WATSON. What will be the total cost?

Mr. FOSTER. This is an amount to commence the work. I do not find any estimate.

Mr. WATSON. What is the population

Mr. FOSTER. The population is 5,400. The postal revenue is $6,000.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.25 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 25th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUPPLY BILL.

Bill (No. 167) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the public service (Mr. Foster), read the second and third times, and passed.

SUPPLY—WEST INDIA STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I gave notice yesterday to the hon. Minister of Finance that it was my intention to-day to call the attention of the House to the services which are being performed by the several steamships running between the Maritime Provinces and the West Indies, and to move a resolution upon the manner in which those services are being carried out. In fulfilment of my notice, I now rise, Sir, on the motion to go into Supply, to state as nearly as I can the facts in relation to those services, and to ask the House to disapprove of the manner in which the hon. gentleman has conducted the negotiations for them, and the manner in which he has let them. This matter was first brought to the attention of the House by the hon. gentleman in 1889, when he moved that a subsidy amounting to $60,000 a year should be granted by Parliament for the purpose of procuring steamships to run between the Maritime Provinces and the West Indies. That amount of money was voted to the hon. gentleman, and I suppose, although the principle of voting those subsidies was questioned, and severely questioned, by some hon. members of this House, it is now too late in the day to debate whether it was or was not desirable in the first instance that this money should be granted. I remember very well that this question was debated more than once in this House by my hon. friend who then represented Halifax, and whose knowledge of the subject, gained from long experience, gave him a very great advantage in discussing it—knowledge which he had acquired in carrying on trade with the West Indies and which enabled him to speak with authority—and he thought, and a great many on this side of the House concurred in his opinion, that instead of promoting trade, the hon. gentleman would be more likely to injure it, because he would to a great extent destroy the trade which had been carried on for many years with sailing vessels. The hon. gentleman pointed out that it was impossible for sailing vessels to compete with highly-subsidized steamboats; but there would never have been any serious ground for complaining that the quantity of goods which the Dominion of Canada had to exchange for the products of the West Indies could not be carried as a commercial undertaking by the owners of ships which were not subsidized. However, Sir, the hon. gentleman got his grant, and having got it, he advertised in the following month of July for tenders for those services. He divided the tenders into four different classes, which he called the "A," the "B," the "C," and the "D" services. So far as the D service is concerned, it will, I fancy, be eliminated altogether from our discussion, because no tender put in for it was ever accepted by the Government, and no boats have been put on that route.

Mr. FOSTER. No tender was received

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman says no tender was received, and, therefore, so far as I am concerned, I do not propose to refer directly or indirectly to the "D" service. The other three services, "A," "B" and "C," consisted of the following services: "A," from Halifax or St. John to Cuba and return, calling at Havana and Matanzas; "B," from Halifax or St. John to Jamaica and return, calling at Bermuda and Turks Island; "C," from Halifax or St. John (*viâ* Yarmouth if sailing from St. John) to Demerara and return, calling at certain intermediate ports. The advertisement calling for the tenders contained the following statements, which are material to the argument which I propose to submit to the House at a later stage, to show that the hon. gentleman has not acted consistently with the best interests of the country:—

"The above services to be monthly, and performed by steamships of a speed of not less than 12 knots an hour; and as regards the services marked "A," "B" and "C," of not less than 1,000 tons register, and with accommodation for at least 30 first class passengers; and as regards the service marked "D," of not less than 2,000 tons register, and with accommodation for at least 30 first class passengers.

"As regards the services "A," "B," and "C," persons desiring to offer to perform the same with steamers of less capacity and speed than above mentioned may submit their tenders, specifying the speed and capacity of the boats which they desire to offer, although the conditions above specified are those desired by the Government."

So that it will be seen that for these three services the hon. gentleman desired to procure boats of 1,000 tons in size, capable of steaming 12 knots an hour, and with accommodation for 30 first-class passengers. The hon. gentleman, however, reserved to himself the right to accept steamers of less capacity, not only for the classes specifically mentioned, but, if he desired, for a lower class of boats. The hon. gentleman received a large number of tenders. I am not going into the particulars of them. I desire, in the first place, to call the attention of the House to one tender, which the hon. gentleman received from a Mr. Joseph Wood, of Halifax. The correspondence with reference to his tender is very meagre, but it does seem to me that Mr. Wood was very unceremoniously treated, and very unfortunately treated, in the interests of the country. Mr. Wood had written to the Government on the 15th of February, 1889, when the matter was first mooted in the House, asking the hon. Finance Minister to inform him as to the proposed scheme:

"CENTRAL WHARF,
"HALIFAX, N.S., 15th February, 1889.

"DEAR SIR,—I shall feel obliged if you will inform me what is the proposed scheme of sailings to the West Indies, &c., to which you propose to apply the vote of $60,000 of subsidy named in the estimates submitted to Parliament.

"I presume you will call for fresh tenders, and that all the subsidies which have been are to be rearranged, will be submitted to fair and public competition.

"Considering the trouble and expense I was put to two years ago making proposals, &c., for West India service, I hope you will favour me with full information.

"When your Government advertised in 1887 I supposed you really intended business.

"Steamers suitable for such a service as you require must be built, and unless you stipulate for new steamers with every modern improvement for saving coal, &c., any subsidy will be wasted.

"Yours faithfully,
"JOS. WOOD."

Mr. Wood, who wrote this letter, is, I understand, a gentleman who has been engaged for years in the steamship service, and is at present running a steamer between Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island; and evidently, from the tone of his letter, he had been engaged in negotiations with the department previously, and considered he had not been fairly treated, and hoped on this occasion that the Government really meant business. But he pointed out the fact, which subsequent events established, and which the hon. gentleman was not justified in ignoring, namely, that steamers suitable for the service must be built, and that unless the Government stipulated for new steamers, the subsidy would be wasted. When the tenders were called for by advertisement, Mr. Wood tendered in proper time. He tendered for the service between St. John and Halifax and Demerara, calling at intermediate ports. He said:

"I offer for this route one steamer of 700 to 800 tons register, speed 12 knots, and accommodation for thirty first-class passengers. The steamer to be built in Scotland and classed 100 A 1, at Lloyds, and to be ready for service by September 1st, 1890.

"The subsidy payable by the Government to be $20,000 per annum, payable at the rate of $2,000 per round trip for ten trips to be made in each year, and contract to be for five years."

Accompanying that tender was a letter in which he said that this would be a first-class boat, superior to any steamer now running in the trade, and that its cost would be about $110,000. He also spoke of the trouble he had been to, during the past three years, to establish a Canadian line of steamers to the West Indies, and went on to say:

"If this last effort which I now make proves to be without result, if there is much more delay in deciding the matter, I shall be compelled, of course, to abandon the project altogether."

On the 24th of September, he got a letter from the Deputy Minister of Finance, intimating that his tender was not considered adequate, and would not, therefore, be accepted. Before I pass away from Mr. Wood's tender, I desire to say that he offered a boat complying in all respects, with the requirements the Minister of Finance thought necessary, except as regards tonnage. The tonnage called for was 1,000 tons, and he offered a new boat of from 700 to 800 tons, and proposed to put her on the route by September, 1890. It will be noticed that the Finance Minister, in calling for tenders, although he said the Government desired a boat of 1,000 tons, asked other people to tender for boats of a less tonnage, and less capacity, and less speed. Mr. Wood's tender was unceremoniously rejected. Subsequently the hon. gentleman accepted tenders from Messrs. Pickford & Black of Halifax, for the "A" and "B" services—for the "A" service the steamship *Beta*, a vessel of 670 tons, with a speed of eleven knots only, and a subsidy of $20,000 a year; and for the "B" service the *Alpha*, 514 tons, stated by Pickford & Black to be, after having a second deck put on her, 750 tons, with a subsidy of $15,000 per year, and a speed also of eleven knots. So that, although Mr. Wood's tender offering a boat of 700 to 800 tons, and complying, as regards speed, capacity, and passenger accommodation, with all the requirements of the Government, was unceremoniously rejected, Pickford & Black's tenders were accepted for the "A" and "B" services, although they supplied boats much below the 1,000 tons and much below the speed required. The hon. gentleman, I dare say, will explain this. Then, among the other tenders, we have one from Mr. Furness, of England. Mr. Furness is the owner of a large steamship line, a well-known man, in every respect qualified for the undertaking and able to carry it out, his name itself being a guarantee that any contract he entered into would be faithfully and efficiently performed. He tendered at the same time through his agents at St. John; and I want to call special attention to the tender he submitted. On the 29th of August, 1889, he tendered to the Minister of Finance as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—We are authorized by Christopher Furness, Esq., steamship owner, of West Hartlepool, England, to make the following tender to the Government for steam service between Canada, the West Indies and South America:

"PROPOSED SERVICE.

"A steamer to leave St. John, N.B., once each month for Demerara, calling at the following places, viz.: Bermuda, St. Kitts, Antigua, Guadaloupe, Dominica, Martinique, St Lucia, Barbadoes and Trinidad, and to return by the same route to St. John, N.B., and after landing her mails, passengers and other cargo there then to proceed to Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, before departing from St. John on the next voyage.

"In order properly to develop this proposed trade and to establish a first-class service that will be creditable to the Dominion of Canada and likely to compete successfully with existing lines from United States ports, new and fast steamers will have to be built especially adapted for the trade, which Mr. Furness is willing to provide as follows:—

"DESCRIPTION OF STEAMERS.

"Two first class iron or steel steamers to be built specially for the trade, each about 1,100 tons net register, with a speed of from twelve to thirteen knots, accommodation for about fifty first and second class passengers, the Government mails and capacity for about 2,000 tons of cargo: these steamers to be of the highest class and fitted with all the modern improvements, their estimated cost being about £50,000 sterling each.

"In the present state of shipbuilding in England it will be impossible to get these new steamers completed and ready for work before next autumn, and in the meantime Mr. Furness would commence the service almost immediately, and continue it until the new steamers are ready, with either the two superior steamers, *Rollo*, 1,022 tons, and *Orlando*, 997 tons, at present engaged in the mail service between Hull and Gothenburg, which have large accommodation for passengers and are lighted throughout by electricity; or the two steamers, *Belair*, 872 tons, and *Cipero*, 868 tons, at present engaged in the trade between Glasgow and the West Indies, which have the highest class at Lloyd's (100 A 1), and have sufficient passenger accommodation, with excellent saloons, for commencing the service, the speed of all three steamers being about ten knots.

"TERMS OF CONTRACT.

"The contract to be for a period of five years, but owing to the very great uncertainty regarding the result of the business, which might prove very disastrous, Mr. Furness wishes to have the option of cancelling the contract at any time on giving six months' previous notice to the Government.

"The subsidy to be $50,000 per annum for twelve round voyages, payable in monthly instalments on the completion of each voyage, and with a proportionate allowance for the part of any voyage completed in the event of steamer being lost.

"Owing to the necessity of his giving an early answer to the builders with whom he is in treaty for the new steamers, Mr. Furness would like to know the decision of the Government regarding this tender by 5th September, and you will therefore please communicate same to us by that date if possible."

On the face of it that was a tender, which, one would imagine, would recommend itself to the acceptance of the hon. gentleman. In the first place, it came from a man of the very highest standing, a large steamship owner, who has proved by many years' experience in the business that he was competent to fulfil any contract he entered into; in the next place, the proposal was to build first-class steamships of the speed, size and accommodation called for, and put them on the route at the earliest possible moment: in the third place, he proposed, in the meantime, until the steamers could be built, to supply other steamers of proper capacity, size and speed. Nothing would seem to be wanting, and he winds up his tender by stating that it was necessary he should have an answer by the fifth day of the following month. I have to complain that when the hon. gentleman had it in his power to enter into a contract with this large steamship owner, he failed to do so, and he failed to give Mr. Furness any answer until the following 20th of September, so that over a fortnight was allowed to lapse after the period of time when Mr. Furness told the hon. gentleman it was necessary he should give his answer, before the Minister of Finance gave any answer at all. Before giving his answer, he reported to the Council on the 18th of September in favour of accepting Mr. Furness' tender for service "C," his tender being the lowest, namely, $50,000 a year, as against $54,000 a year, the tender put in by one Mr. Van Wart, of the Province of New Brunswick. On the 20th September, the Minister of Finance telegraphed to Mr. Schofield, Furness's agent, offering him $48,000 *pro rata* for the intermediate or substitute steamers to go immediately on the route, and $50,000 after the new ones were put on. I do not think he needs have haggled as to the $2,000. I think his subsequent arrangements with Van Wart and his associates, and afterwards with Pickford & Black, as to the terms on which they should undertake the "A" and "B" service, show that he was not very particular about $2,000, or about twice or four times $2,000, and I think he was to blame in not having let Mr. Schofield know by the 5th September, whether his tender would be accepted or not, instead of delaying it until the 20th of that month, and then offering $48,000 instead of $50,000 for which Mr. Furness offered to enter into the contract. On the 27th September, the Minister telegraphed to Furness' agent, and on the 10th October he appears to have had a personal interview with Mr. Schofield in St. John. On the same day Mr. Furness telegraphed from England declining to enter into the contract, and the reason he gives is set out in the correspondence which I hold in my hand. I may say, in reference to this correspondence, that it is brought down in such a slovenly way, not arranged at all in chronological order, that it necessitates anyone who is interested reading it over four or five times before he can get any proper idea of what it is about. August and September are mixed up together, and sometimes August correspondence is placed after October. Mr. Furness telegraphed:

"Steamers offered withdrawn. Agree, postpone until steamers can be obtained. Authorize you to close on our terms, subject to being able to purchase suitable steamers."

After some telegraphic correspondence had passed, and, as I said, a personal interview appears to have been had with Mr. Schofield by the Minister, we have a letter written on the 24th October by Furness' agent, in which he says:

"Mr. Furness states that, owing to the Government's delay in communicating with him, the substitute steamers which were under offer to him were withdrawn, and that his recent efforts have been entirely unsuccessful in securing either those steamers or any other suitable ones with which to undertake the service, and that, owing to the very great uncertainty and risk connected with the business, he would not be willing to build new steamers without having first had some little previous practical experience of the trade with second-hand ones."

Then the letter goes on:

"After full consultation with our St. John friends, we have, therefore, concluded to withdraw Mr. Furness's tender which we do with very great reluctance, and at the same time we desire to thank you for the very great consideration that you have extended to us in the matter."

So we have on the 24th October the unfortunate announcement made by Mr. Furness that, owing to the delay of the Government in communicating with him, he had lost the steamers which, when he made the tender, he had an opportunity of chartering and putting on the route, and that he had to withdraw his tender accordingly. The Minister of Finance seems to me to have been culpable in that he did not, within the time Mr. Furness asked him to do so, acknowledge the receipt of the tender or make any statement as to whether he would accept it or not. A very great misfortune happened to the service and to Canada in that way, because I do not think anyone who knows anything of these gentlemen would doubt that, if they had received the contract, it would have been carried out faithfully, efficiently and well, and that the subsequent evils to the Canadian trade arising out of the contract the hon. gentleman did subsequently make, would not have occurred. After Mr. Furness had been, as I may say, put out of the way, after he had withdrawn his tender, the hon. gentleman reopened negotiations with his friend Mr. Van Wart, who lives, I believe, in Fredericton, and he talks on behalf of himself and other associates, but he does not say who they are. The hon. gentleman reopens negotiations with Mr. Van Wart. He had put in a tender for this "C" service amounting to $4,000 more than the tender of Mr. Furness, and I find that on the 8th November, the Minister of Finance telegraphs to him asking for lower figures. The correspondence is very amusing which took place at that time between the hon. gentleman and his friend, and I will ask the permission of the House to read it, that is, the telegraphic correspondence.

"Can you offer any lower figures for 'C' service as advertised for? Also, for what can you put on 11-knot 750-ton steamers, same route?

"G. E. FOSTER."

This was replied to on the same day:

"Recent rise in freights and iron prevents reducing "C" service below forty-one hundred, eleven knot class thirty-six hundred. Can you give early answer? Would visit Ottawa immediately and arrange."

"J. A. VAN WART."

The first impression one would form from reading this telegram would be that, after Mr. Van Wart had tendered, there had been a rise in freights and iron, but that would have resulted in an increase and not a reduction in the amount of his tender, but it will be seen that he was willing to reduce his tender from $54,000 to $49,200, or just $800 below Schofield's offer. The hon. gentleman replies the same day:

"Forward immediately your tenders in writing. Accompany with statement of *bonâ fides* and probable time commence service."

And on the same day from Fredericton there comes the offer from Mr. Van Wart for himself and his associates, offering to perform the service from St. John to Demerara and return by steamships of not less than 1,000 tons register and a speed of not less than 12 knots for the sum of $4,100 for each round trip, to be commenced with one steamer on or before the 1st of January following, and every six weeks thereafter, and within one year such service to be performed with two steamers making monthly trips and not less than twelve round trips in each year. The hon. gentleman closed with his offer, and on the 10th November Mr. Van Wart was informed that the Government had accepted his tender, and the hon. gentleman took special pains, in communicating that to Mr. Van Wart, to repeat to him that the boats were to be of 1,000 tons register and 12 knots speed, and that the price to be paid was $4,100 per round trip. The contract then, excepting the signing of the formal document, was complete, and no sooner was it complete than we had an application from Mr. Van Wart asking the Government to yield and make certain concessions to them, and the first concession they asked was that the Government should accept, instead of 1,000-ton boat of a speed of 12 knots, a small boat of 732 tons called the *Portia*. They accepted Mr. Van Wart's offer and the *Portia*, of 732 tons, and of a much less speed than 12 knots an hour, went on the service and performed trips in January, February and March, notwithstanding that she was nearly 300 tons less than the size stipulated for, and notwithstanding that she was a hundred tons less than the boats which Mr. Joseph Wood had tendered to put on. The *Portia* performs her two round trips and receives the $4,100 subsidy each round trip. Sir, we find at this time appearing upon the scene and in the correspondence, a gentleman who is not unknown to the politicians of this country, a gentleman by name George F. Baird, formerly a representative in this House, or rather a man who sat in this House for some years pretending to be a representative for the County of Queen's, N.B. We find that gentleman appearing upon the scene just after Mr. Van Wart's tender had been accepted by the Minister of Finance; we find him telegraphing to Mr. Foster, Minister of Finance, over his own signature, stating that this *Portia* was a sister ship to the *Miranda*—whatever boat the *Miranda* might be does not appear—and that no other boats offered compared with these vessels. So we find the hon. gentleman acceding to his request, and on the 29th of October, Mr. Van Wart writes to the Minister of Finance—evidently on very confidential terms, because he addresses him as "Dear Foster," and stating that, after trying all available sources, the *Portia* was the best boat he could get. Well, Sir, she went on, and after she had run her three trips Mr. George F. Baird telegraphs to the hon. gentleman asking him to allow a vessel called the *Loanda* to go on the service, and the *Loanda* went on the service. On the 18th of March of that year, while Mr. Baird was a member of this House, he writes to Mr. Foster: "I have chartered the *Loanda*," &c., &c., for this service. Now, I want to state to the House that the *Portia* performed the service and earned the $4,100 for each round trip before the company, which was afterwards formed, had received its letters patent, and although the money was not paid to Mr. Van Wart and his associates, of whom George F. Baird was one, the service entitling him to receive the money was performed in direct violation, as I state, of the Independence of Parliament Act, and Mr. George F. Baird, during those months, sat in this House as a contractor for the "C" service, having chartered a vessel—and I have it here under his own signature that he had personally chartered it—and that vessel performed the service and earned the money which he voted in this House should be paid. Subsequently the Canadian and West Indian Steamship Company was formed, of which Mr. Baird and Mr. Van Wart were members amongst others—the others I do not know, and I am not interested in knowing—formed as nobody can doubt, for the purpose of avoiding the Independence of Parliament Act. I do not think anybody can doubt that if Mr. Baird, as he says himself, chartered that boat, if Mr. Van Wart tendered in the first instance on behalf of himself and Baird, and Baird chartered the boat, if the boat performed the service and earned the money, and Baird was a member of Parliament at the time, he was violating the Act when he was voting that money for this service, and when any hon. gentleman votes money in this House for carrying out a contract in which he is personally interested, he is acting in a manner that this House has already described as discreditable. The next step in the programme is that this *Loanda* is placed upon the service. The *Loanda*, I may state to the House, did not conform to the requirements of the service as called for originally by the Minister of Finance in his printed call for tenders, or as repeated in the subsequent call when he asked Mr. Van Wart to amend his tender. In both instances the boats were to be 1,000-ton boats, of the speed of 12 knots an hour. The *Loanda* was a boat inferior in strength, inferior in tonnage, and disgraceful in accommodation, as I will shortly prove to the House. I cannot find that before the hon. Minister accepted this boat of inferior tonnage, and inferior speed, and of disgraceful accommodation, he ever sent any gentleman, any ship-owner, or any person having a knowledge of ships, to inspect that boat and see if she was fit for the service which he was then undertaking. It must be remembered that the hon. gentleman was seeking, as he stated himself, to open up a good service in the interest of Canada. In the speech in which he moved the House to vote that money in 1889, he stated it was of the utmost importance, absolutely essential, that we should have, not ordinary steamships but first-class boats, capable of a speed vieing with the boats running between New York and the West Indies. The hon. gentleman knew, as he said when he was insisting upon a 12-knot speed, that he was insisting upon a rate of speed that involved the expenditure of a very large sum of money; and every hon. gentleman in this House

who has had anything to do with steamships, knows that when you get beyond nine or ten knots at the outside for a steamship, every knot that you exact beyond that involves an enormous outlay of money; and when the hon. gentleman required 12-knot boats, he said he did it because it was essential in the interests of Canada that we should have a line running between the West Indies and Canada that would build up this trade by the certainty and frequency of the trips of the boats; and, Sir, by insisting upon these extraordinary requirements, the hon. gentleman frightened off all the class of men who were willing to tender and put on an ordinary boat. He had tenders by the score of boats of a less speed and a less tonnage, but he rejected them all with contumely, and he required this first-class boat. After Van Wart & Baird got the contract he put on the *Portia*, in the first instance, of a tonnage of 732, then he took the *Loanda* of 899 tons, and of a slower speed than twelve knots, of a speed of which I will give the House an idea directly when I read a letter from one of the passengers on that boat. Sir, I state, therefore, that there appeared to be a desire, from the very moment the hon. gentleman let that contract to Mr. Van Wart, to give him the contract on terms much more favourable than those asked for from the general public, a desire to grant concessions to him which were withheld from the general public, a desire, in other words, to treat him favourably at the expense of the country. Now, we find that that boat commenced to make her trips in May. On her first trip she left St. John the 27th of May, she made another trip on the 9th of July, she made another trip leaving St. John 20th of August, she made another trip leaving St. John the 17th October, and so far as Mr. Baird and his company are concerned, I think I am right in stating that the trip which she made in the following November was the last trip made by the *Loanda* under the ownership of the Canadian and West Indian Steamship Company *alias* Van Wart & Baird. I will point out to the House afterwards what became of the boat and why she was retained. It appears further from the papers that the Minister of Finance went down to the Province of New Brunswick and to the City of St. John, some time, I cannot ascertain accurately when, during the summer—August or September, I fancy it to have been—of 1890. It appears further that the hon. gentleman was informed by Mr. Baird, as he subsequently reported to Council, that this service was not a paying service. The hon. gentleman then and there, as he subsequently reported to the Council, agreed not only to continue this old boat the *Loanda*, inferior in size, tonnage and speed, and accommodation, so much inferior that she has been voted a disgrace to the whole service, but he actually agreed then and there with his friend to pay, not $4,100 per round trip, as agreed upon by the contract entered into by the Canadian and West Indian Company and the Government, but to pay him $6,150 per round trip for this very same service. And he agreed not only to pay $6,150, or $2,050 more than the contract stipulated for, but he agreed that the extra sum of $2,050 should be applicable, not to the future service to be performed, but to all the past service of the *Loanda*, and Mr. Baird at that time agreed to continue her on. The hon. gentleman, on 26th September, I think, reported to Council in that sense, and in his report he said he had made that arrangement with Mr. Baird when he went down to New Brunswick and before he went to the West Indies. The report was confirmed by Order in Council on 1st October, and it was said to have been made on 26th February, which is evidently a clerical error for 26th September, because it was confirmed on 1st October. In that report it is stated as follows:—

"The Minister further stated that in July last the manager of the company——"

Who was Geo. Baird, as he signs himself.--

—"informed the Minister of Finance that owing to the high price of charters, the heavy port charges in the West Indian ports, and the other large expenses incidental to the opening up and maintenance of the service, the subsidy agreed upon was insufficient to obtain the line, and that for each voyage made the company had been subject to a very considerable loss; and that it would be impossible for it to carry on the service under the existing conditions. The Minister of Finance, after consulting with the members of Council then in Ottawa, visited St. John and went carefully into the business of the company, and finally, in order to prevent an interruption of communication until Council should assemble in the autumn, he agreed to pay the company for each voyage made by the SS. *Loanda* on the basis of $49,200 for eight trips."

So the hon. gentleman personally undertook the responsibility, first, of doing what I think he should have delegated to a more competent man, a man engaged in shipping and acquainted with the shipping trade, which I do not think he ever was, of enquiring into the results of the round trips previously made by this boat; and, in the next place, he undertook personally to agree to the payment of $6,100 per round trip, instead of $4,100. When the contract was made in the previous March with the Canadian and West Indian Steamship Company it was expressly stipulated that they should put two ships on that route; that they should run every month a round trip, in accordance with the provisions of the tenders which were originally issued, and there was a provision made that for the first six months the company should be allowed to use the *Portia*, which was not of the size and tonnage required, but only for six months. The hon. gentleman appears to have violated the contract drawn. He did not require from Mr. Baird and his associates that two steamships should run after July, or that they should be of the size, speed and requirements of the contract; but he allowed the *Loanda* to go on running, making a round trip every six or eight weeks, and he paid them 50 per cent. more than under the contract they were entitled to receive from the round trip. The hon. gentleman may possibly be able to explain and justify to this House why he did so. But when the hon. gentleman made this report to Council he knew, although he did not state it to Council, that the time had elapsed during which they were permitted by the contract to run one boat only. He knew that under the contract which the Government had made with this company they were bound to put on two boats; he did not report that to the Government, nor did he report that they were running a boat in all respects inferior to the requirements of the contract. The Order in Council further said:

"The Minister also recommends that he be authorized to pay the Canadian, West Indian and South American Steamship Company (Limited) for each voyage made by the steamship *Loanda*, at the rate agreed upon by him, as above stated."

But that very report shows that the Minister did not stop there. He had learned from Mr. Baird, as he

says, in that personal interview which he had with him in St. John, that it was a losing speculation, that they had not got the bonanza they expected when they tendered. He agreed to pay them, not only for future trips to be made during the year, 50 per cent. beyond the contract price, but this increased price was to apply to all the past trips, and he agreed that at the end of the season of 1890 that contract should be surrendered and accepted by the Government from the hands of the company. The hon. gentleman agreed, moreover, to recommend to Council that a bonus, as I understand it, and I can understand it in no other way, should be paid to another company to take that contract off their hands. Pickford & Black, who had entered into a contract for the "A" and "B" service, to run to Jamaica and Cuba, about this time, were asked by the hon. gentleman the price at which they would tender for this new service which Mr. Baird had found unprofitable, and they told the hon. gentleman, as will be seen at page 62 of the papers, that they were willing to tender at a certain figure. Now, Sir, I want to call your attention to the fact that on the 22nd September, 1890, we find the following offer from Pickford & Black addressed to the Minister of Finance:—

"OTTAWA, 22nd September, 1890.

"Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER,
"Minister of Finance.

"DEAR SIR,—I beg to submit the following offer to perform a steam service from St. John, Halifax, to Demerara, calling at Bermuda, St. Kitts, Antigua, Guadaloupe, Martinique, St. Lucia, Barbadoes, Trinidad, going and returning.

"Such services to be performed by boats classed A 1 at Lloyds, twelve knots speed, and of not less than one thousand tons net register, with accommodation for forty first-class passengers.

"Sailings to be on fixed regular dates and not less than one every four weeks, but I am to have the privilege of establishing sailings every three weeks, if in the interests of trade and the line it is thought desirable by me to do so.

"For a sailing every four weeks I ask five thousand ($5,000) dollars per trip, equal to sixty thousand dollars per annum, and for each additional sailing, not exceeding four, the sum of two thousand ($2,000) dollars is to be paid.

"If the Government promptly accepts this offer, I will guarantee to have two boats on the route not later than 1st January, 1891.

"Yours truly,
(Sgd.) "W. A. BLACK."

That is dated the 22nd September, 1890, but the letter asking them to make that offer does not appear in the correspondence. This offer is made after the hon. gentleman reported that he had had an interview with Mr. Baird in St. John, when Mr. Baird told him the service was an unprofitable one, and when he agreed to increase the subsidy from $4,100 to $6,150. This firm comes in soon after, on 22nd September, and agrees to perform this service with similar steamers for $5,000 per round trip, and to put on two steamers after the 1st January. The hon. gentleman accepts the offer; but mark you, at the very time that offer was made, and accompanying that letter and dated from Ottawa, showing that Pickford & Black were here in personal communication with the Minister, that very same time there comes an offer from Pickford & Black asking that the sum of $15,000 be paid to them on the "A" and "B" contract, and beyond what in their contract they were entitled to, or had ever asked for. The facts connected with that are these: That when the "A" and "B" contract was entered into—that is, the contract for

running steamboats to Jamaica and Cuba—there was some delay in finally concluding on the terms, and in the month of November the Minister of Finance wrote to Pickford & Black, when the terms had been agreed upon, asking that firm from what dates they expected their subsidy to be paid, and Pickford & Black write, stating that they expect to be paid from November and December respectively. The letter in which they state that is dated on the 21st January, 1890, is addressed to the Deputy of the Minister of Finance and reads as follows:

"HALIFAX, N.S., 21st January, 1890.

"J. M. COURTNEY, Esq.,
"Deputy Minister of Finance, Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—We are in receipt of your favour of the 15th instant and note contents.

"On the 16th November, Hon. Mr. Foster wrote us advising that our tender for "B" service had been accepted, and on the 10th December we heard through Mr. Kenny that the Government had accepted our offer for "A" service.

"We suppose the contracts for these services will date from and with the November voyage of the *Alpha* which was begun November 15th, and for the *Beta*, with the voyage on which she started from here to Cuba, December 25th.

"We shall be glad to receive the contracts at your convenience.

"Yours truly,
(Sgd.) "PICKFORD & BLACK."

So that when they were asked in the month of January, 1890, from what dates they expected to be paid their subsidies, and they answered: "With respect to 'A' service, from November, and with respect to 'B' service, from December;" and the contract entered into between them and the Government contained a stipulation for the payment of these subsidies just as they asked it. They went on and performed the service and they got paid; but afterwards, when the hon. gentleman was negotiating with them in the month of September, 1890, to take off the hands of Mr. Van Wart and Mr. Baird the contract for the service, they asked him if he would not pay them $15,000 additional for the running of the boats *Alpha* and *Beta* on the "A" and "B" service anterior to November and December, and at a time when they were not under contract or agreement with the Government to run them at all. These gentlemen had been running the boats the previous summer as a commercial speculation without a contract with the Government direct or implied, and when they agreed with the hon. gentleman to take the contract off the hands of the Canadian West Indian Steamship Company, they asked at the same time by letter that they should be paid the sum of $15,000 for the time their boats were running before they ever entered into a contract with the Government at all. The hon. Minister of Finance bowed his head and accepted, and he reported in favour of their offer being accepted by the Government, and Pickford & Black took the contract off the hands of Baird and were paid the $15,000, and Baird was paid the $2,000 extra for the round trips the *Loanda* had run, or afterwards ran, and everybody appeared to be satisfied except the poor tax-payer who had lost from $35,000 to $40,000 by the transaction. But, Sir, what took place next? Did the Finance Minister exact from his new tenderers, or new contractors, that they would carry out the terms of the contract and put boats on, as they stipulated they would? Not at all. The hon. gentleman permitted the *Loanda*, a discreditable boat as I allege she was, to continue on-

that route long after they had entered into the contract.

Mr. FOSTER. How long?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will give the hon. gentleman the dates as nearly as I can gather them. They commenced in December, and they performed the service until the following April with the *Loanda*, and the expressed stipulation they made in the month of September, that on the first day of the year they would put on two new boats, was not carried out, and has not been carried out, as far as I know, to this date; at any rate, it was not carried out up to a very short time ago, as I will show. I do not know that upon that branch of the case I need say anything more. I state to the House, as I gather from these papers, that the hon. gentleman entered into an agreement with Pickford & Black to take that contract off Baird's hands, and having agreed the month before, or about the same time, to pay Baird 50 per cent. more than the contract entitled him to, he paid Pickford & Black $15,000, ostensibly for the running of their boats, before they entered into a contract with the Government, but practically and really, as I say, as a bonus to induce them to take the contract off Baird's hands. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman in his report to Council, which is dated the 1st October, 1890, made a report upon both branches of the case simultaneously, as if they were one dependent upon the other. He reported that he had agreed to pay to Baird's company $6,150 per trip, instead of the contract rate of $4,100 per trip. He reported that Pickford & Black undertook to put on two steamers of a thousand tons capacity and twelve knots speed, and with passenger accommodation, and monthly trips, on consideration of being paid $60,000 a year, with the option of making extra trips not exceeding four, at $2,000 per trip. He recommended that offer be accepted for four years from the 1st of January, 1891, and recommended at the same time that Pickford & Black be paid the $15,000 I speak of. Of course, Council accepted his report, and these persons were paid almost immediately. The very month in which the hon. gentleman reported to Council, his report was ratified, the $15,000 was paid to Pickford & Black, and $2,000 per trip extra was paid to the Canadian and West India Steamship Company beyond what their contract entitled them to. At that time it was known that the *Loanda* was not a suitable boat. At that time the hon. gentleman had evidence under his eyes, in a letter addressed to him by Pickford & Black, that the *Loanda* was not a suitable boat. In a letter dated the 16th of October they say to the hon. gentleman:

"The *Loanda* is not a suitable boat in our opinion, and from reports which have lately reached us this opinion is confirmed. It may be that we shall be compelled to continue her after December 31st, but only because we are forced to shall it be done."

I mention that to show that that boat for which the hon. gentleman had a short time previously agreed to pay so much more than the contract had justified him in paying was an unsuitable boat in the opinion of the very men who had taken the contract off the hands of the Canadian and West India Steamship Company, and that boat was taken over by them during the months of January, February, March and April. Now, a short time after they got this new contract from the Government, knowing that they had contracted to put on two new boats, they also applied for remissions of their contract. On the 12th of February, Pickford & Black cabled from London to the Minister of Finance that the *Loanda* was the only suitable boat they could get, and asked if she could be put upon the route, although not up to the requirements of the contract. There is nothing on the face of the papers to show whether that telegram was answered or not. But I find these gentlemen writing on the 17th of March from Halifax to Mr. Foster in the following terms:

"Under the date of 5th March our Mr. Black (who has been for the past six weeks searching England and Scotland for 12-knot boats suitable in size and draft of water to fill the requirements of the contract) writes that he can find piles of 9 and 10-knotters, but as yet has been unable to come across anything of the size required of 12 knots. While we are most anxious to fill this contract in every respect, both as regards speed, passengers' accommodation and size of the ships, we would, at the same time, beg to call your attention to the fact that all the boats running from New York to the West Indies make a speed not exceeding an average of 10 knots, and that practically the service will be just as efficiently performed by boats of this class as those of greater speed, as under any circumstances there must be considerable loss of time in port when we have two boats running, as the requirements of the service will not, for some time, warrant us in making more than monthly sailings. With 10 knot boats, we would lose from a week to ten days on each trip, lying idle in port, and with 12-knot boats, this loss of time would be doubled. We feel confident that if, after due consideration, you would so modify the contract as to allow us to perform the service with 10-knot boats, you would have no reason to regret it and we would be quickly in a position to fill the service to the satisfaction of the public.

"Mr. Black also advises us that he can charter the S.S. *Tolga* to run in company with the *Loanda*, until new boats can be procured, but we think if you will allow us to place 10-knot boats permanently on the route, he would, probably, be able immediately to procure them, in which case the chartering of the *Tolga* may not be necessary.

"In conclusion, we beg to offer you our congratulations on your return, and that your Government has been so well sustained in the last election."

That was one of the most important paragraphs in the letter from those gentlemen, who were asking that boats which could be put on the route for $20,000 a year less than boats which their contract required, should be accepted at their hands at the same price.

Mr. FOSTER. Would you say just now whether they were?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will say they were not accepted. I will say that the gentlemen were permitted to run old boats below the required tonnage, although on the face of the correspondence the hon. gentleman refuses their offer. I say that they were put on, with the consent of the hon. gentleman, after the *Loanda* had been driven off by an indignant public from the route, and the hon. gentleman appears, so far as I can gather, to assent to the regular subsidy being paid for the *Taymouth Castle*. Now, the hon. gentleman asked me to say whether they accepted that offer. I believe they did not accept it, and I will read to the House, as it is nothing but fair that I should, a letter which he wrote in the following month:—

"I have your letter of the 17th April, with reference to the substitution of the steamship *Taymouth Castle* for the *Loanda*.

"As you state, the former vessel is beyond the requirements of the contract, in size, but not so far as her speed is concerned, beyond nine knots. It would appear that she is to all intents and purposes a cargo boat, and will no doubt be an improvement upon the *Loanda*."

Here is a boat which they were offering to put on the line, which the hon. gentleman said himself was a cargo boat capable of running a speed of nine

knots, which he acknowledges will be an improvement on the *Leanda*, and he goes on and pays the subsidy for it. That is my answer to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman goes on:

"In this connection, I might call your attention to the comments in the press, which have appeared lately in the upper as well as the lower province papers, and which are not at all complimentary to the service as now maintained.

"It is of great importance that at the very earliest period you should advise me as to whether or not your firm will be able to put on vessels by the 1st July, which shall conform to the terms of the contract, and if arrangements are being made to build suitable permanent vessels for the route."

Now, on the face of the correspondence the hon. gentleman appears not to accept in so many words the offers which they made; but the hon. gentleman allows them to put on the *Taymouth Castle*, which he calls a cargo boat, capable of a speed of nine knots, and she has remained on that route from that day to this. They say that she is a better boat than the *Leanda*, and they have paid for her at the rate of $60,000 a year. She succeeded the *Leanda*, which remained the whole time that Baird's company had the contract, and after the time Pickford & Black took the contract off that company's hands and received a handsome bonus, till the following April. What was the character of this boat, the *Leanda*, for which such an enormous amount of money was paid? The hon. gentleman may in this connection recall the language he used to this House when he asked the House to vote that large amount of money for this service. He told them that he only justified it because it was necessary to have a service of first-class steamboats capable of highest speed, so that we could outvie New York; and I will read you a letter from a passenger on board of the *Leanda* which, in the month of April last, appeared in the *Monetary Times*; and to which the hon. gentleman, in his letter of 4th of May, no doubt, referred as some correspondence which was not complimentary:

"*Editor Monetary Times:*

"SIR,—It is a well known fact that the facilities afforded by the Canadian and West India Steamship Line sailing between St. John, Halifax and the West Indies are very poor, both for shippers and passengers, but few people know, perhaps, what a disgraceful state it has got into.

"I was unfortunately obliged to take passage on the SS. *Leanda* of this line on her last trip from Trinidad to St. John (being unable to get a boat of another line), having an idea that the accommodation was not very good, but not that it could have possibly been as bad as it is. I shall be pleased if you will show the matter up through your columns, as it is really to the interest of the travelling public, shippers, and I might say the public generally, that this state of things should be remedied, else they will go on and draw their subsidy and give nothing in return but very poor service.

"Complaints have been general for some time back as to the slow time this line makes, but their last trip beats the record.

"The *Leanda* left Halifax 10th February, reached Demerara 8th March, left on the 9th and arrived in St. John 31st March, thus taking 48 days to make the round trip.

"The boilers of the steamer, which had been leaking on the down trip, had got so bad after leaving St. Lucia that they with difficulty steamed four knots, and on reaching Barbadoes were obliged to remain a couple of days for repairs. By the time they had returned to Barbadoes the boilers again began to leak, and got worse as we went, until it was difficult to keep on the fires. And to add to this trouble, the coal was nearly all 'slack,' which fell through the grates in the furnace. The connections with the wheel on the 'bridge' were worn or broken, so that the steering had to be done from the stern.

"The worst time on an average was made between Bermuda and St. John, viz.: 4 1-5 knots, and that with good weather all the way. We had to stop during this run (which occupied seven days) three different times to tighten up the machinery, viz.: on 27th and 28th March, half an hour each, and on the 29th for fifty minutes.

"This line is the laughing-stock of the West Indies: neither shippers nor importers place any reliance on it. The passenger accommodation is of the poorest possible description, the staterooms dirty and improperly furnished. The food supplied is of the cheapest, and frequently unfit to eat; while the table linen is filthy, and the table napkins, especially, look more like dusters, and are all badly worn. The steward goes around with dirty grey flannel shirt, pants and boots; waiter No. 1 appears at table in a dirty pink woollen undershirt, pants (tied at waist with an old suspender), and a pair of boots. Waiter No. 2 wore similar costume, but no boots, and his feet looked as though never washed since he left home. The passengers were always glad to reach a port where they could get ashore and get a good square meal, and also procure provisions to carry them to the next port.

"The captain, by contract, supplies the food, and always turned a deaf ear when complaints were made. Even the men complained of not getting enough to eat, and three days before reaching St. John the firemen waited on the captain with a request for more food, or they could not work.

"The cook (an East Indian) was about as dirty a man as they could pick up, but then they got him cheap and it served their purpose. Passengers when passing the cook house had many a time to shut their eyes to what was going on. It is simply an imposition on the travelling public to advertise to sell tickets as they do for a first-class passage, with such miserable accommodation.

"ONTARIAN.

"13th April, 1891."

Mr. TUPPER. Is that signed?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes: signed "Ontarian." Letters making similar complaints, if I mistake not, appeared in the St. John *Sun*. The hon. gentleman himself, in his letter, calls attention to the disgraceful condition of the vessel, and the contractors themselves admitted that it was not a fit boat for the contract. In another letter, which will be found on page 73, they reply with regard to the qualifications of the *Leanda*:

"We have noted the opinion expressed in reference to the past performance of this service, and from what we can learn the travelling public have very good reason for complaint, but we assure you we took the earliest possible opportunity to get rid of the *Leanda*, although we have lost money in doing so."

They thus acknowledge that this boat, for which they were receiving $60,000 subsidy from the month of November to May, was a disgraceful boat and unfit for the service. Still, the Canadian and West Indian Company kept her on the route every month until November, when they handed her over to Messrs. Pickford & Black to continue the service. I have looked through the papers, but have been unable to find that a single dollar of reduction was ever made on account of the insufficiency of this boat, either from the moneys we agreed to pay the Canadian and West Indian Steamship Company or to Pickford & Black, who were paid $15,000 bonus for taking the contract off their hands. In that connection, a new contract was entered into with Pickford & Black, who obtained a much larger sum than was paid the other contractors. They put on the *Taymouth Castle* last April in substitution, and the hon. gentleman himself designated that vessel as a cargo boat capable of going nine knots per hour, and this is the boat that fulfils a service for which first-class boats of 1,000 tons registered tonnage and twelve knots speed, and first-class accommodation for thirty passengers, were required. Yet not a cent of reduction was made, and our money continued to be paid to the service, and, as far as I can ascertain, is being paid to this day by the *Taymouth Castle*. Tak-

ing the evidence of the hon. gentleman himself, that steamer not only does not comply with the requirements of the contract in any respect, but is totally unsuitable to perform this service, which alone, the hon. gentleman said, when the money was voted, would justify the House in voting it. I have stated to the House the facts as far as I could gather them. I hold in my hands the manifests of the cargoes carried by these boats during the time they have been in the service. I believe these manifests have been supplied to each member of the House, and if any member choses to examine them—these relating only to the "C" service, which I have been chiefly dealing with, running to Demerara—they will see that instead of a trade having been built up, it has depreciated, and the last cargo in that steamer *Lounda* from Demerara and the West Indian Islands to St. John and Halifax is a bagatelle, showing that the expense is not justified, and that instead of our building up a large trade, the trade has positively decreased, until it has dwindled down to really a trifle; and yet this is the service for which we pay this enormous sum. In view of these facts, I have determined to move a resolution, reciting them in chronological order, and asking the House to disapprove the conduct of the hon. Minister of Finance in the premises. I beg, therefore, to move:

That in the Session of 1889 Parliament voted the sum of $69,000 as a subsidy to provide for a line of steamships to run between the ports of Halifax and St. John and the West Indies and South America.

That in the month of July, 1889, tenders were called for by the Minister of Finance, to be received up to August 31st, 1889, for the several steam services required.

That three of such services were called respectively "A," "B" and "C" service; "A." being from Halifax or St. John to Cuba; "B," being from Halifax or St. John to Jamaica, and "C." being from Halifax or St. John (*viâ* Yarmouth, if from St. John) to Demerara, calling at certain intermediate ports.

That the advertisement for such tenders provided that the services were to be monthly, and to be performed by steam vessels of not less than 1,000 tons register, with a speed of not less than 12 knots an hour and with accommodation for at least thirty first-class passengers.

That such call for tenders also provided that persons desiring to offer to perform the same with boats of less capacity and speed than above stated might submit their tenders, specifying the speed and capacity of the vessels they desired to offer.

That pursuant to such call for tenders a large number were received, among them tenders for services "A" and "B" from Messrs. Pickford & Black, of Halifax, N.S., which were, after modifications, accepted, and a contract was on the 23rd day of April, 1890, entered into between said firm and the Government to perform said services as follows:—Service "A" with the steamer *Beta* (677 tons) and service "B" with the steamer *Alpha* (750 tons), and the said contract, at the request of the said contractors, was to be deemed to have been in force with regard to service "A" from the 24th day of December, 1889, and with regard to service "B" from the 15th day of November in said year, and to remain in force for the term of five years from said dates.

That among the tenders for the "C" service was one from Joseph Wood, of Halifax, N.S., providing a service, St. John and Halifax to Demerara, calling at intermediate ports, as required by the call for tenders, offering one steamer of 700 or 800 tons register, speed 12 knots, accommodation for 30 first-class passengers and classed A1 at Lloyds, and to be ready for service by September 1st, 1890, for the sum of $20,000, payable at the rate of $2,000 per round trip for ten trips to be made each year, and contract to be for five years.

That the Minister declined to accept such tender, on the ground that he did not consider the same adequate.

That in addition to the above tender for "C" service a number of others were received, but of those conforming to the Government's requirements (viz., 1,000 tons and 12 knots speed) the lowest were those of the said Pickford & Black, sailing from Halifax, $48,000 a year, and Mr. Furness, of England, sailing from St. John, $50,000 per year, and Mr. Van Wart (for himself and associates), sailing from St. John, $54,000 a year.

That the Minister of Finance on the 18th of September, 1889, recommended to Council the acceptance of the Furness tender.

That although such tender of Mr. Furness urged the necessity of his receiving the decision of the Government by September 5th such decision was not communicated to him until the 20th September, when the Finance Minister telegraphed his, Mr. Furness' agent offering $50,000 per year after the new boats referred to in Furness' offer were put on and $48,000 a year *pro rata* for the substituted steamers, until new ones were put on the route.

That on the 24th of October, 1889, Mr. Furness informed the Finance Minister that owing to the Government's delay in communicating with him the substitute steamers which were under offer to him were withdrawn, and that he had been unsuccessful in securing other suitable boats.

That on the 8th of November following the Finance Minister reopened negotiations with Messrs. Pickford & Black, and by telegraph with the said Van Wart for said "C" service, and on the following day the said Van Wart tendered, offering steamships of 1,000 tons and 12 knots speed, reducing his price from $54,000 to $49,000 or at the rate of $4,100 for each round trip, and providing one steamer making trips every six weeks for first year and two steamers making monthly trips in subsequent years

That on the 15th November following the Minister reported to Council in favour of accepting Mr. Van Wart's offer upon the above conditions, which report was concurred in.

That the said Van Wart, who had tendered for himself and associates, after the acceptance of his tender organized a company called the Canadian, West Indian and South American Steamship Company (Limited), and took out letters patent therefor under the Companies' Act and in the name of the said company, and on the day of March, A.D. 1890, entered into a contract with the Government to carry out such tender.

That Mr. Geo. F. Baird, then a member of the House of Commons for Queen's County, N.B., one of the associates of the said Van Wart in such tender, after the formation of the said company became the manager thereof.

That the contract so entered into provided that the said company should carry on said service with two steamers of not less than 1,000 tons register and of a speed not less than 12 knots, and with accommodation for not less than thirty first-class passengers, with a proviso that the service might be carried on for six months by the contractors with the SS. *Portia*.

That the *Portia* is a steamer of 732 tons only, and of a less speed than that tendered for, and was put on the route in the month of January, and performed two round trips in the months of January, February, March and and April, payment for which was not made till after the company was organized in March.

That in the month of May the SS. *Lounda* was placed on the route by the said company and continued thereon until the contract was abandoned by the company in November or December following.

That the *Lounda* did not comply with the requirements of the contract, being much below the same both in tonnage and speed, and being in other respects unsuitable and unsatisfactory.

That notwithstanding these facts the Minister of Finance agreed with the said C. W. I. and S. A. SS. Company, in the summer or autumn of 1890, that such steamer *Lounda* might be continued on the route during the year 1890, and that the Government would pay for each round trip by her the sum of $6,150, instead of $4,100, as provided by the contract: and, further, that such increased subsidies should extend to all previous trips made by the *Lounda* under the contract, and that such agreement was subsequently carried out and the increased subsidies paid to such company.

That after being informed by said company that they did not intend to carry out their contract beyond the year 1890 the Minister of Finance, without calling for new tenders, agreed with the above-mentioned Pickford & Black to give them a contract for said "C" service for five years—sailing from St. John, calling at Halifax—for the sum of $5,000 for each monthly trip by suitable steamers of the speed and tonnage called for by the former contract with the company, in all $60,000 per year, and at or about the same time agreed to pay and did pay the said Pickford & Black the sum of $15,000 in cash for certain alleged trips to the West Indies of the *Alpha* and *Beta*, made by said boats before the tender for their services had been accepted, and before the date from which

the said Pickford & Black at the time of entering into the said contracts ("A" and "B") claimed they were entitled to be paid.

That subsequently to such arrangement between the Minister of Finance and Messrs. Pickford & Black the latter, with the consent of the Minister, continued the SS. *Lucinda* on the service till April, 1891, when owing to the many complaints and the unsatisfactory nature of the service she was withdrawn and the SS. *Yarmouth Castle* substituted.

That the said *Yarmouth Castle* appears to be simply a cargo-boat, of a speed of about 9 knots, and altogether inferior to the requirements of the contract, and the said Pickford & Black have never yet furnished the class of boats required by the terms of their contract.

That the conduct of the Minister of Finance in the premises has been detrimental to the public interest and merits the censure of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say, in the first place, that I have no fault to find with my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) for the manner in which he has presented his motion, nor in the main have I any fault to find with his presentation of the facts, with the exception of two or three inaccuracies which I shall ask my hon. friend to amend, as I am sure he will, because I know he wants to give a truthful setting forth of the facts of the case. I find no objection to anything else except the resolution itself, and to that, of course, I am bound to object. Before the House has the opportunity of voting upon this, I think it right for me to traverse very briefly the ground my hon. friend has taken, and to supply some things which he has omitted, and I have jotted down the general run of the remarks I propose to make. The hon. gentleman dealt very lightly with the policy which was adopted by this House two years ago, when it decided to make an appropriation of $60,000 for the promotion of steamship services between Canada and the West Indies and South America. I shall be equally brief in my reference to that. The question of policy does not come up in this discussion to-day, but it is simply a question of administration. Suffice it to say, on the question of policy, that it was thought on both sides of the House that an experiment should be made in steamship services between this country and South America and the West Indies, and, after a thorough consideration of the subject, the vote was proposed and was carried by the House. As to the different arguments advanced on either side of the House for or against this policy, we have our opinions in regard to that, and that is not to-day under discussion. The next step that came, after that vote was granted, was the advertising for tenders. That was conducted in much the way my hon. friend has detailed to the House. It was the wish of the Government, if it could be accomplished without too much cost, to get boats of a thousand tons and of 12 knots speed, to do all these services which were to be performed between Canada and the West Indies and South America. It was also the desire of the Government to keep as well within the appropriation as could possibly be done, and therefore, in the advertisements themselves, the optional clause was placed so that if it were found that these boats of 12 knots speed and a thousand tons in capacity could not be obtained for this service without what might be considered too large an expenditure, we should have an alternative tender to be considered, of a lesser tonnage and of a lesser speed than that which we set down in the first part of the advertisements as what we should like to get if it came within our means. After these tenders were received, the services having been set forth in the three routes mentioned, "A," "B," and "C," the Government came to the conclusion, after looking over the tenders, that for the smaller services, so to speak, between Halifax or St. John and Cuba and Jamaica, those going, as it were, to separate individual islands, it would be all that we could expect to accomplish at present to get a service with vessels of about 700 tons and of a lesser rate of speed than 12 knots, say about 10 or 11 knots. It was, however, strongly held by myself, and I think the Council agreed with me, that for the longer service, that which had its outermost port at Demerara and the length of which voyage, a single voyage one way, was over 2,000 miles, with some 12 ports to be stopped at, with different ladings from those of the original ports of clearance, it was advisable to keep the tonnage up to one thousand tons at least, and to keep the speed at about 12 knots; so we acted in that determination. The tenders were given in, as my hon. friend has stated, and for the "A" and "B" services there was not much difficulty in choosing from the offers that were made. The offers were made, amongst others, by Messrs. Pickford & Black; for the "A" and "B" services their tenders were respectively $24,000 and $15,000. The Government at once accepted the $15,000 tender, but demurred to the $24,000 for the second tender, and ultimately they reduced that figure to $20,000, at which figure the Government entered into a contract with them. From that time till this those two services have been carried on in a fairly successful and satisfactory way, and my hon. friend has found no fault with these; therefore, I will dismiss them for the time being. When it came to the "C" service, more difficulty was experienced. The tenderers for that service were chiefly Messrs. Pickford & Black, Mr. Van Wart, on behalf of a company which he proposed to organize, and Mr. Furness, of the Furness line, a line of steamships well known in Europe, and, in fact, throughout the world. The tender which was the lowest of the three was that of Messrs. Pickford & Black, for $48,000. Mr. Furness' tender was, as has been stated, for $50,000, with a proviso that for six months he should put on temporary vessels as good as he could get and as near the requirements as possible, and that after that time, new vessels being in the meantime built, they should go on the service. Now, be it remembered that there is no difference of opinion at all between myself and my hon. friend as to the desirability of having got Furness & Co., under those conditions, to have taken up that tender, and although their tender was $2,000 more than the lowest tender of the three that we were especially considering, I thought it best under the circumstances to recommend to the Council that the Furness tender of $50,000 should be accepted. But I was also anxious to keep from giving more than the lowest tender for the temporary service, and, therefore, we coupled with the acceptance of that tender the proviso that so long as the temporary service lasted $48,000 should be given, but that when the new vessels were put on $50,000 should be granted, and I should have been very glad indeed if Furness & Co. could have accepted that. There was, however, one condition in the Furness tender which the hon. gentleman did not mention—it may have escaped his attention—it was this: They stipulated that at any time during the contract of five years they should be at liberty to withdraw from it on giving six months' notice.

Any hon. gentleman can see that that was a clause fatal to a continued service. If, after Canada had given her money and had put her part into the venture two or three years, the contractors were to say to themselves: We have something that will pay us better: this is not paying us as well as we thought it would, therefore we have a right to give six months' notice to terminate the contract, and we will do it—that would have left us in an unenviable position: therefore, I accepted, and the Council agreed with me, the tender of Furness & Co., under condition that this stipulation should be eliminated, and that they should take $48,000 while the temporary service was continued. Now, if that had been accepted everything would have gone on well and to the satisfaction of my hon. friend, so far as the tenders were concerned. Why was it not accepted? The tenders did not come in until late in the season: they came in just at a time when, as hon. members know, the Cabinet was dispersed to the four corners of Canada. August and the early part of September are the only period for a holiday that the Cabinet has, in ordinary years, and although those tenders came in, and although Mr. Furness was pressing in his desire to get an early answer, and although I strove to get that answer to him as speedily as possible, this was a matter which had so much depending upon it that it was impossible for a mere quorum of the Council to decide with reference to these tenders, and this answer was not given on the 5th of September, as requested, it was not given until a fortnight later, solely because it was impossible for the Council to be convened and to have a full number of its members to settle this affair. Those delays must inevitably take place, and I do not think that, under this version of the circumstances, there is much fault to be placed to my account, or to the account of the Government, in that respect. All possible speed was taken, but it happened to fall at a period of the year when it was impossible for Council to meet together in full numbers in order to settle the weighty matter of those contracts. Well, Sir, a fortnight after—not a very unreasonable length of time—an answer was given to Mr. Furness, in the line which has been stated. Mr. Furness replied that he would carry out that contract if he could possibly get the vessels for the temporary service; and, as I know, he set himself to work to get proper vessels, but such was the condition of freights at that time, and the call for vessels, and such are the peculiar requirements of the West India service, that he found it impossible, as he stated, to obtain the temporary vessels, and so, for that reason, and for another reason which my hon. friend read, but which he did not dwell much upon, he declined to carry out the contract. The other reason was one that tallied exactly with the provision that Mr. Furness put in his tender, as to being allowed to cancel it at any time at six months' notice; and it is borne out by the correspondence which has been brought down to the House, and borne out by the interviews I had with his agent in the city of St. John, the reason being that this was a new and untried service, in the nature of an experiment, that no full forecast could be given as to its outcome; and, as Mr. Furness himself stated, and as my hon. friend read, his other reason was that owing to the uncertainties of the new business, and the lack of information, the lack of knowledge as to how it would ultimately turn out, he was averse to entering into the contract unless he could have previously an experimental stage. I know that under the circumstances Mr. Furness felt glad that he was not called on to conform to his figures and to enter into that service for a period of five years, because he felt the uncertainties which were in the way, as the service had been untried and as one on which very few steamship companies could make any kind of a certain forecast. So much with regard to that matter. Mr. Furness' tender was withdrawn, not put out of the way, for there was nothing but a sincere desire on my part—and if the hon. gentleman knew the whole course of these transactions, as my colleagues in the Government know it, he would know that there was nothing which I tried for more than to have that contract taken, in the first place, by Mr. Furness, and carried out by him if it possibly could be done. It was not put out of the way, and when it went out of the way under these circumstances it was with my sorrow and my regret, and I have always thought since that it was a chance to have secured an excellent company, which possibly we would not get again. The first point in which I wish the hon. gentleman to amend his recital of the case is this—and it has escaped his memory, I suppose: After the negotiations were off with Mr. Furness there came the question as to what should be done with the "C" service, and on the advice of Council, after consulting with them, I had recourse to the next two available lower tenders. I opened up communication with Mr. Van Wart, representing a company to be formed, as the hon. gentleman stated; but I opened up at the same time communication with Pickford & Black, also tenderers among the lowest, *pari passu* with the negotiations with Mr. Van Wart, and I asked both of them to amend their tenders and send them into me, so that I could present them to Council. My hon. friend did not wish to do me an injustice———

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman may have done so, but I do not think it appears in the papers.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, in the Order in Council. I have the offer here. Perhaps just at this moment I had better read it. By Order in Council of 21st November, 1889, after stating that the negotiations are off with Mr. Furness, it continues:

"The Minister then entered into communication with Messrs. Pickford & Black and with Mr. Van Wart, two of the tenderers, and has received amended tenders from each for the 'C' service, viz.:

"Messrs. Pickford & Black offer to undertake 'C' service from St. John with the condition that their vessels should call at Halifax both inwards and outwards and that they be granted the subsidy for the 'A' and 'B' services at the rate of $20,000 and $15,000 per year respectively for monthly trips with vessels of 750 tons each and speed of 11 knots per hour. They offer for 'C' service,"——

And I ask the hon. gentleman's attention to this—

—"under these conditions, 750 ton boats with a speed of 11 knots, and ask therefor a subsidy of $45,000 per year."

So that my course was perfectly plain and perfectly consistent. The available tenders were, in my opinion, and that of Council, three—Mr. Furness, Pickford & Black, and Mr. Van Wart, for a company to be formed and represented by himself.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that when he opened negotiations

with Mr. Van Wart it appears from the papers that he similarly opened negotiations with Pickford & Black, and that they sent in a letter with respect to the service when he reopened the negotiations?

Mr. FOSTER. At the very same date and on the same day. Two offers came in very nearly at the same time, and both were considered by Council on the same day: there is the report of them and the action of Council on them. I think that fact probably escaped my hon. friend. It is, however, very material in the effect it might have on those hearing the recital of the history of this matter; and consequently I know my hon. friend will amend the recital of the history of the case by saying that instead of opening negotiations simply with Mr. Van Wart I opened correspondence with the other two tenderers that I considered available, Pickford & Black and Mr. Van Wart. As a result of that negotiation my hon. friend said that the correspondence with Mr. Van Wart was very amusing, and he read it; but no one laughed, and the amusing part did not seem to strike anyone. It seems to me to be a straight, business-like communication with Mr. Van Wart, and the same with Pickford & Black.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The amusing part was that he reduced his tender because iron had increased in price and vessels were difficult to obtain.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked each to send in an amended tender for these services. They did so, and here are their offers. Pickford & Black say: "We will put on 750 ton boats, with a speed of 11 knots per hour, and run them between St. John and Demerara, with the condition that they shall call at Halifax, for a subsidy of $45,000." Mr. Van Wart says: "We will put on 1,000 ton boats, having a speed of 12 knots, for a subsidy of $49,200 per year." When these two tenders came in there was little of choice in the direction of the selection, and I took without any hesitation the offer which was in accordance with our desires as to the tonnage and as to the speed, and contrasting that with the smaller tonnage and less speed offered by Pickford & Black, I recommended to Council that Mr. Van Wart's offer should be taken. And Mr. Van Wart's offer was taken. So much for that. Now, let us go to the next stage in the history. If the hon. gentleman has read the Orders in Council he will notice the recommendation in my report to Council that the offer of Mr. Van Wart for a company to be formed by him, and which was represented by him, should be accepted. It was accepted. The first vessel, as my hon. friend said, put on the route, was the *Portia*. She was not equal to the requirements that the stated contract calls for; but hon. gentlemen have heard my hon. friend read to-day Mr. Van Wart's offer and the Order in Council accepting it, and it was provided that for the first year it was within his offer and within the opinion of Council that the service could not be brought up to the full measure of what the stated service should be when once it was permanently formed, and provision was therefore made in the Order in Council to meet the case. The *Portia* was the first vessel put on the route. My hon. friend, if he had paid particular attention to the state of the vessel market at that time, and been trying to obtain charters, would have known how difficult it was at that time to obtain charters for steamers at all, and how especially difficult it was to obtain charters on vessels filling the terms of contract such as they were laid down for that service. I know that Mr. Van Wart and his agents scoured every available port on this side of the water in the North American continent, and made enquiries at every place in Great Britain, and that the only available vessel they could get was the SS. *Portia*. The *Portia* was accepted as a temporary vessel; she was the best that could be got; she was chartered by Mr. Van Wart, who was the representative of the company, and she was put upon the service, and her first trip commenced in January, 1890. Now, my hon. friend has suggested, if he has not stated—I think he stated it—that suddenly in March there appeared the name of Mr. George F. Baird, a man who claimed to represent Queen's County in this House, as he says. My hon. friend (Mr. Davies) might have alluded in a more generous way to a colleague in this House, to a man every whit as honourable, every whit as able, and every whit as manly as my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), or my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who, with his sceptical smile, rather leads me to think that he does not agree with my expressed opinion. I will take either of these gentlemen to the city of St. John, Mr. Baird's adopted town, and I will introduce him to the solid business men of that city, and he will find whether or not either of them can discover one man out of fifty in that city but who will give you the character that I have given of Mr. Baird. His question was discussed in this House; it was decided in this House, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) had better have taken that decision, and in speaking of past history in that way he might have avoided casting a slur upon a gentleman who, as I have said, is every whit as able and as honourable as himself. Mr. Baird, he says, crops up in March, 1890, in some answer to a question with reference to the vessel, and later in some negotiations for the vessel. Mr. Baird did crop up in March, and he had a perfect right to crop up in March. He had a perfect right to sit as a member in this House, and a perfect right to vote in this House, because Mr. Baird became a member of an incorporated company under the Companies Clauses Act on the 3rd day of February, 1890, and this was in March, 1890. I believe now, I may not be right in it, but I will state it and see whether I am or not: Will my hon. friend contend that if he happens to be in his capacity as a member of Parliament a director in a steamship company, or a member of a steamship company which is under subsidy from this House, that he is, therefore, violating the Independence of Parliment Act and subjecting himself to the harsh criticism of gentlemen on this side, because he is in the House when a vote passes, and because he is a promoter of a company to whom the appropriation is paid. I do not take that position, and I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) will take that position; and Mr. Baird was in exactly the same position in March, 1890, and at any day after February 3rd, 1890; and until that time it was Mr. Van Wart who did the business as a representative of the company. So much with reference to that. Now, Sir, we come to the next step in this history: that there immediately appeared a desire on the part of the Finance Minister to favour his friend, Mr. Van Wart. I come now to a part in this transaction in which theory and practice somewhat go apart. I dare say other hon. gentlemen have felt much the

same difficulty. There is often an ideal plan that you may have and which you may wish to carry out in your business, or any enterprise that you may undertake, but there is scarcely a man who undertakes an enterprise or a business who does not find when he gets down to the practical working out of it that the actual outcome is not quite up to the plan or to the ideal which he had in his own mind. Now, Sir, I state here that there is no evidence to show that I evinced any desire to show favours to my friend Mr. Van Wart. Mr. Van Wart is my friend; he is an honourable man, he is an able lawyer, and he has a future before him in this country. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I suppose, would meet me with the criticism that most men's futures are before them, as he did once in this House before; but, as far as wishing to, or actually granting, any favours to Mr. Van Wart from personal friendship, I have never been swayed by that and I have never done it. It does not appear in the evidence and it is not to be maintained by mere assertion. As I said before, the contemplation was, in the terms of Mr. Van. Wart's tender and in the Order in Council as well, that for the first year it would probably be found impossible to bring the service up to the character that it should have in its permanent form. The *Portia* was put on, and she was a vessel, I think, of 712 tons, or thereabouts. After the *Portia* had made two trips the *Loanda* was chartered, and the *Loanda* was a vessel coming up pretty nearly to the requirements in the point of tonnage; she was nearly 1,000 tons—nine hundred and some odd tons, I believe. The *Loanda* had a speed of 11 knots, and during the early voyages the vessel actually made a speed of 11 knots. She was allowed to be substituted instead of the *Portia*, as the best that could be obtained in the market at that time and as a part of the temporary arrangement. The *Loanda* remained in the service for a number of trips; and then comes another step in the history of the matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) says that it appears that about the middle of the summer, or in August, I went to the city of St. John and there I saw Mr. Baird, of the steamship company. That is true. The difficulties in the way of a sea service can only be known by a person who has gone into that matter experimentally and who has endeavoured to carry out such service in the teeth of the difficulties that occur. As soon as Mr. Baird, who is a gentleman of good business ability, went into that service and became the manager of that company, he put all his energy toward the fulfilment of the work which he had in hand, and those who, in the city of St. John, are conversant with that work, know that Mr. Baird did everything that a man could do in the inception of the service to make it successful. He spared neither his own means, nor his own time, nor his own ability, which he could have given to pursuits which would have brought in far more money and been more remunerative to him, But there were very great difficulties in the way. The service was a new and untried one, the number of ports to be called at was numerous, the distance was long, the vessel had to undertake a voyage of 2,600 miles there and 2,600 miles back, being a round voyage of over 5,000 miles. There was the difficulty of coaling, and the cost of coaling; there were the port charges, which are in some of these ports simply enormous; there were all the difficulties which I would not take the time of the House up in considering, to be met in the inception and first working out of a service of such a nature and plying to so many ports, and in a country of the aptitudes and habits of the West Indies and South American countries. These difficulties met Mr. Baird, and he struggled with them, and struggled with them manfully. He spared no expense in advertising; he spared no expense in the working of his service; but when June and July came Mr. Baird informed me that it was not possible to conduct that service with the subsidy which was given without a loss to the company of some thousands of dollars every round trip. I said to Mr. Baird, as manager of the company: "I do not want you to give it up; I want you to make the experiment, even though it cost you some money; make it, and make it as fairly as you can; it will grow better after a time." And Mr. Baird listened to what I said and went on with the service. But in July he informed me that it was impossible for his company to carry on the service any longer at the amount which was paid, but that they proposed, although they had sunk some $4,000 or $5,000 already, to venture the trip on which the vessel was then engaged, even though they should sink a large amount of money in doing so, and then to place the contract into my hands. I was met with that difficulty, in the middle of the season, when the Cabinet were separated. A portion of the Cabinet were here, and I consulted with them; we went over all the circumstances of the case, and I was authorized to proceed to St. John to consult with the manager of the company, and within certain limits to do what I thought was best to prevent a total cessation of that service, and of the traffic which was beginning to develop very well indeed —to prevent a complete stoppage before the experiment had had a chance to develop its prospects of success, though having been established upon a firm and steady foundation. I went to St. John; I saw the manager of that company; I went into all the affairs of his company; I went into all the details of its voyages. My qualifications for investigation may not be of a nature to be exactly agreeable to my hon. friend from Queen's, but what little ability and what little sagacity I could muster up I applied to the examination of the matter in hand, and I came to the conclusion, which no sensible man could avoid, that the company at that time were carrying on the service at a loss of some thousands of dollars for each round trip they made, and under these circumstances it was impossible for them to maintain it. I was, however, confronted with this difficulty, that before any new arrangement could be made, either by advertising for further tenders or by finding out from those who had already tendered if they were in a position to amend their tenders and continue the service, if this service was not maintained in the meantime a complete stoppage would take place, and the stream of traffic which was commencing to swell and grow would be entirely diverted, and it would be almost impossible to restore the prospects which I considered were good for a lucrative and profitable trade between our ports and the ports of the West Indies and Guiana. I, therefore, took the responsibility, upon the advice of the Council, of deciding the case there and then by a practical test —whether this service should be allowed to stop for

six months, and this whole stream and tendency of traffic, which was being developed, and well developed in this line, should be diverted and dissipated, and that six months afterward we might again attempt the conditions which should be favourable to a continuance of such service on an improved basis; and I concluded there, as any sensible man would conclude, that I would rather add something to the subsidy in the meantime than to have the service cease, with all the evil consequences that I thought would ensue. It was on that consideration alone that I pressed that view upon my colleagues, and that afterwards, when we came together in full Council in October or November, they sustained me by Order in Council. That was the whole sum and substance of the matter; and I agreed to allow $49,200 for eight trips, instead of requiring twelve trips, for the trips being made by the steamship *Loanda*, and by that means I prevented the service from stopping. I kept up the connection, and I afterwards, I think, got a good offer; and this service now, I am happy to inform the House, is, I believe, placed upon such a steady and sound basis that we shall have no more trouble for the remainder of the contract time. That is the whole sum and substance of the matter, and I think I took a sensible business course. The cessation of the service was in the meantime provided against, I do not attempt to conceal, at an additional cost of $2,000 per trip; but the arrangement was one which left the promoters not gainers but losers to this day of over $5,000 on their venture. What I mean is, that the company, after all has been paid them on the eight trips that have been made, are out more than $5,000 of their own money. They referred the matter to me, not in any whining or complaining way. They have simply given me the facts of the case; and I have said to them: "It is impossible for me to recommend any more relief than that which I have done, to maintain the service; you entered this at your own venture, and must bear a portion of the loss;" but no one who knows anything of this enterprise will say that Mr. Baird and his associates have made money out of the transaction. Next came the question, how we should provide for the stated service. My attention was at once turned to Messrs. Pickford & Black, who were the next lowest tenderers, and I telegraphed to Mr. Black to meet me at St. John when I should be there. He came and met me. I canvassed the whole question with him, and I asked him to make me an offer for taking up that contract, with three more trips added. Mr. Black and I canvassed the whole question. He went and consulted his partner, and made the amended offer, which is a matter of record in the papers, and that offer I recommended to the Council, the Council agreed to my recommendation, and the contract for the remaining part of the five years—not five years from this time—was entered into with Messrs. Pickford & Black, by which we agreed to give them $60,000 a year for twelve round trips, with the option of making three extra trips at $2,000 per trip. Now, my hon. friend thinks that in this transaction there was something which knitted on to the dropping of the contract by the South American and West Indian Steamship Company, in providing for another claim by Pickford & Black in connection with this West Indian service. The thing is just exactly as it appears on the record. The papers are before the House, and there was no desire to conceal anything. If there had been any such desire on my part it would have been a very easy thing for me to have separated the transactions and put them in different reports. But there was no suppression in the transaction at all, for it was, I considered, a fair transaction, and I recommended it as such to the Council, the Council sustained my view, and the sums were paid. The claim of Messrs. Pickford & Black arose in this way: Parliament had been urging the establishment of a West India service for several years, tenders had been advertised for, and in due time this appropriation of $60,000 was recommended to the House. Messrs. Pickford & Black had tendered, and the year before they had put their steamers on the route but had received no subsidy. The $60,000 was voted for the West India and Canadian service from the 1st of July, 1889, to the 1st of July, 1890, and tenders were called for; and if it had not been for the difficulties that arose the tenders would have been accepted, and the contract would have dated from a period much anterior to the actual date and more favourable to the contractors than that ultimately assigned. But, owing to the various difficulties that arose, it was November and December before the contracts were actually entered into, and Pickford & Black laid their claim for subsidy from 1st July before the Government. They said that a vote of $60,000 had been granted for the year, from the 1st of July, 1889, to the 1st of July, 1890; that they had tendered for the service, that they had put on their vessels in any case, that they were given the mails on the 1st of July, and had been carrying on the service from the 1st of July to November, and that it was owing to the delays on the part of the Government that the contract was not entered into earlier in the season. They claim, therefore, that they having performed the service, and the Government having received the vote for that service, they ought to be paid for what they had done during those intervening months. I replied, at first, that this matter ought not to be brought up until the year had more nearly expired, since, at the best, I would only recommend to Council a consideration of this claim if anything remained over unexpended from the vote, that I did not propose that vote should be exceeded, and that I was unwilling to ask Parliament for more than it had granted. It was not until after I had found out that the services could be carried on for the year within the amount voted that I placed before the Council the claim of Messrs. Pickford & Black for their services, not alleged, as my hon. friend said, but actually carried on in the regular way from the 1st of July until November of that year. That is all there is to that transaction. Whether the arrangement has been made whereby Messrs. Pickford & Black took up the contract from the 1st of January, 1890, or not, I would have considered their claim, which was simply standing in abeyance; and if there had been money I would have recommended that they should be paid for the services they actually performed. Now, with regard to the last point, performance of their contract by Messrs. Pickford & Black. Their contract was for four years, and the conditions were as my hon. friend has said. But there arose the same difficulty as to the procuring of vessels. Mr. Black, in the last part of the year, as soon as it was definitely fixed by Council and

arrangements had been made with him, went to the West Indies and visited all the ports, arranged all his agencies there, and thence went to Great Britain, where he endeavoured diligently to obtain vessels which would meet the requirements of the contract. At the same time, I was anxious that this service should go on uninterruptedly, and as the *Loanda* had carried on the service during the preceding year, I gave permission for her to continue carrying on the service for one trip. She did this for one trip and part of another, when her place was taken by the *Ulunda*. Thereafter the *Taymouth Castle* and the *Duart Castle* were approved for the regular service and they are now on the route. Now, there is something which needs explanation, so far as the *Taymouth Castle* is concerned. The member for Queen's was perfectly justified in his criticism upon me for having allowed that vessel to be put upon the route, from the papers that were brought down. I regret now that this letter was written. But when application was made to have the *Taymouth Castle* put on I asked one of my officers to get me a description of the vessel. He gave me his report, and from that I took the view which I penned as to the capabilities and style of that vessel, and wrote to Mr. Black that it did not seem up to the requirements of the contract. My hon. friend has the correspondence before him, and he will see that immediately upon receipt of that letter Mr. Pickford corrected my wrong impression with reference to the *Taymouth Castle*. I had that vessel fully inspected by the responsible officers of the Department of Marine, and I will read that report to the House:

"The *Taymouth Castle* is an iron screw steamer registered in London, G. B., and owned by Mr. Christopher Furness, of West Hartlepool. She was built by Messrs. Barclay & Carle, of Glasgow, in 1877, and classed 100 A1, her official number is 76,947 and the registered tonnage 1,172 tons. The length of the vessel is 300·1 feet, breadth 32·3 feet and depth 25 feet. She has five watertight compartments enclosed with strong bulkheads, the engines are of the compound type, with cylinders 36 by 63, and the nominal horse-power is 190. She carries six boats, four of which are life-boats, with room in all for 170 people in case of disaster, and the vessel has four good compasses, one of which is Sir Wm. Thompson's patent compass. She has also four winches for working cargo. At present there is cabin accommodation for 40 first-class passengers, with a ladies' cabin, water closets and 2 bath rooms. There are also closets and bath rooms for the officers. The cabin accommodation can be increased at any time by removing a bulkhead and putting temporary berths at short notice. Cabin passengers were formerly carried in this space. There is also a music room and a smoking room. The vessel carries two officers, one boatswain, one carpenter, eight seamen, three engineers, eight firemen and one donkey man. There is a large ice house, capable of holding twenty-five tons. The character of the vessel is good, and she is in first-rate condition at present, and fully equipped for carrying passengers and mails."

So that in these respects she is fully up to the requirements of the contract.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is her horse-power?

Mr. FOSTER. 190 nominal:—

"The capacity of the bunkers is 800 tons, and the consumption from 17 to 20 tons per day, with a speed varying from 10 to 13 knots per hour. The log-books for several voyages show that she has steamed from 10½ to 11½ knots per hour, and upon some occasions the speed attained has been 12 and 13 knots. The log upon the recent voyage states this latter rate, 13 knots, once or twice during the voyage. The speed of 12 knots can be attained at any time upon an increased consumption of coal when found necessary."

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the size of her cylinder

Mr. FOSTER. The engines are a compound type, the cylinders 36 by 63:—

"The *Taymouth Castle* is fully equipped for carrying cabin passengers. She is at present fitted with berths for the accommodation of 40 passengers. This accommodation can be increased at short notice. The general condition of the steamer is very good."

(Sgd.) "W. H. SMITH,
"*Chairman.*"

Mr. Smith is chairman of the board of examiners, by whom, in connection with our engineers, she was thoroughly examined. This shows that the *Taymouth Castle* is not the kind of vessel which I at first thought she was. Upon inspection by our officers it appears that, in every respect, she is up to the requirements called for in the advertisement for tenders. Her speed is a maximum of 13 knots, and she easily attains 12 knots by an increased consumption of coal. The sister vessel to this is the *Duart Castle*, built, I believe, by the same firm, and formerly owned by the same. She is a vessel superior in some respects to the *Taymouth Castle*; and for the further information of my hon. friends, I may say that on these certificates given by our officers, and after a thorough examination of the vessels made by our officers, the *Duart Castle* and the *Taymouth Castle* have been accepted as vessels to be permanently placed on the route. They are both over 1,000 tons, both have a speed of 12 knots, both have the accommodation for passengers which is required. Their freight accommodation is, of course, ample, and I think I might in this connection read some of the notices that have appeared in reference to the *Taymouth Castle*.

Mr. FLINT. Is the *Duart Castle* on the line yet?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; she is at Halifax now. I find the *Taymouth Castle* in her first trip, from the time she reached St. John and Halifax and the various West India ports, has met with very general approval from all sources from which we can glean information, and I will read some of these. I will quote from the St. John *Globe*, which of course is not a supporter of the Government, as my hon. friend knows, but no doubt its report will be a very fair report. Its news reports are generally very fair. It says:

"The steamer *Taymouth Castle*, which arrived yesterday from the West Indies, is a decided improvement on the *Loanda*, and no doubt will give satisfaction to both pleasure seekers and shippers. Several alterations have been made in her accommodations to suit tropical weather. A large music room has been fitted up just forward of the main saloon. Her staterooms are large and airy, and her saloon is all that can be desired. All her rooms will be newly painted in Halifax, the material having just arrived in the *Damara*. Her decks are just the thing for promenading. The officers are capable and courteous. The steamer was hailed with delight at every port she visited in the West Indies, and a large number of persons visited the ship. She carried quite a number of passengers between the different islands, and the prospect of doing a good trade seems to be excellent. Her cargo is being turned over in splendid order, and so far only one cask of molasses has been found 'foaming.' This is a rare thing in a cargo. The *Taymouth Castle* will leave for Halifax Tuesday afternoon."

From the St. John *Gazette* we have much the same kind of a notice, and from the *Globe* we have another notice, which is an editorial notice. It says:

"The manifests show that the outward cargoes were large, and apparently they increased as the time went on. The return cargoes are not so satisfactory, but that is not to be wondered at, for the present tariff on West India goods is sufficient to kill the trade coming this way."

That is the *Globe's* way of putting it, you see:

"The general impression is that putting on the *Taymouth Castle* will stimulate the business, as she is superior to any steamer yet upon the route."

The *Telegraph* also gives a complimentary notice in the same way of the *Taymouth Castle*, and I have numerous others here which I will not read. They are all about in the same line, and all speak very complimentarily of that vessel. I have seen also from the West India press notices of a similar kind, and I have no hesitation whatever in saying that the *Taymouth Castle* in her first trip to the West Indies has proved herself to be in every way a staunch, good, reliable, pleasant vessel, and that the service has been excellent, and that, taking all in all, she fulfils the requirements of the service in a very reasonable and fair way. The *Duart Castle*, as I have said, is a still better vessel, and these two have now been advertised for regular sailings six months ahead. I may state that I made it a condition of this last arrangement with Pickford & Black that they should, in addition to running these steamers of the kind and quality and with the regularity we require, bind themselves to keep a good live agent on the West India side and on the Canadian side constantly engaged in working up and building up the business. I think, therefore, I may say to the House that the difficulties of the undertaking, which have been very great and very annoying, are now about over, that we have the service at last on a stated and regular basis, and, I think, on a satisfactory basis, as far as the vessels are concerned, and that we now have an opportunity for the next four years, or the next three years and a-half, of fairly testing what there is in the attempt to build up a trade between ourselves and the West India Islands and British Guiana by a service such as this. Now, as to the *Loanda*, I acknowledge the corn as to her condition in the last part of her work. At first she did good service. She steamed easily 12 knots. Sometimes she steamed 15 knots, but perhaps the tide helped her. In her first voyage she made easily 11 knots, but in the latter part of last year and the beginning of this year she depreciated, and the voyage in which my hon. friend's Ontario correspondent seems to have been a sufferer, was a most disappointing and disagreeable voyage. The fact is that the vessel broke down during that voyage, as better vessels will sometimes do, and the state of things was not at all creditable. However, that has been done away with, and would have been done away with before had it been possible for Pickford & Black to have got their vessels earlier. As to Mr. Wood's tender, he tendered for a 750 ton vessel.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Between 700 and 800 tons.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes: and we were of the opinion that we would not make a steady contract for any service for such a very long voyage with the prospects of full cargoes with any vessel of a less capacity than 1,000 tons. Mr. Wood's tender was not so satisfactory in other respects. Mr. Wood had been a tenderer before, and I do not think that he gave any very strong grounds—for the vessel was not built; it had still to be built—for assuring us that it would be to our advantage to enter into a contract with him under these conditions. It was on those grounds that that tender was ruled out. Now, one word in closing as to the route itself, as to an assertion made by my hon. friend, which he had no right to make if he had been conversant with the facts, as I must think he was. He states that nothing has been done; that there is no improvement. Now, that service commenced at a minimum. On her first voyage the *Portia* took $12,000 worth of goods, on the second voyage $16,000 worth, on the third $18,000 worth, on the fourth $25,000 worth, on the fifth $31,000 worth, on the sixth $37,000 worth, on the eighth $38,000 worth, and on the last voyage $36,000 worth. So that there has been a very satisfactory and a very large increase in the value of outward cargoes. It was stated by my hon. friend, in the course of last year's debate, that there would be nothing for this vessel to carry, except lumber—anybody would know that. My hon. friend from Halifax, Mr. Jones, at that time sitting in the House, declared that nothing would go from the port of St. John except a little lumber, if that did. Yet, Sir, the facts of the case were that an immediate and wide interest sprang up in this West India service, extending as far west as the western part of Ontario, and hon. gentlemen who will look over the statement which has been placed before them, of the goods actually carried, will see that lumber was the smallest element of the cargoes carried, and that manufactured goods, and produce from all parts of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, went in increasing quantities to British Guiana and the West Indies. I acknowledge at once that the volume of business is still small, but I must add that the increase which has taken place has been very encouraging, and I believe that the stimulus that has been given to our trade in the West India markets by the beneficial results of the Jamaica exhibition, by the exhibition of our wares in the other Islands, and by the actual sales that have taken place, the actual consumption which has taken place, by the business connections which have been formed, has materially helped to lay a foundation for a very large and very lucrative business between this country and the West Indies and South America.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have you any details of the cargoes that are now being carried?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not just now, but I am told that they are keeping up to the maximum amount; the details will appear in the manifests, but the manifests are not laid upon the Table later than the last month in the last year. I may say, with regard to steam vessels on this route, and the idea of this traffic being done by sailing vessels alone, that nothing was more apparent to me in my trip through the West Indies than this fact: That the reason why the United States of America supplied seven-tenths of the needs of the West India Islands in classes of goods which Canada produces to advantage and could easily supply, was because of the regular, and swift, and stated steam communication between the ports of the United States and those Islands. I believe that if ten years ago we had adopted the policy of subsidizing steam vessels, and had put them upon those routes and kept them there, we would have had a very large share of that traffic, and we should have kept it by our enterprise and by the business connections which we made. Business connections tend to prejudice in favour of or against a country's wares, and in every

Island where the United States have made connections they look for a development of trade in that direction, and the influence is all in favour of the United States products; the difficulties, if there are any, are all against Canadian products and the products of other countries. So that prejudices, as unfounded as they possibly could be, existed in the West India Islands in reference to what Canada could give, and the quality of what she could give. That Canada could give good cheese, could give good butter, that she could give potatoes, that she could give flour that would keep, was scouted. I found no heresy more general than this, that Canadian flour was of no use to the West India purchaser, because it would not keep in a warm climate. That was mere prejudice, but it was effectual to bar out almost every barrel of flour from the West India markets. Well, Sir, that has been partly dispelled by the sending of a small cargo of flour to Trinidad, which was baked by their bakers after it had been kept there for two or three months, and pronounced to make as good bread as any they had had in that Island. This prejudice was dispelled by the experiment of the exhibition at Jamaica, where barrels of flour were kept for two, or three, or four months, and then baked up and distributed to the people, and the result was that it made as good and as sweet bread as any of which they had had experience of in this Island; so that to-day that heresy is entirely overcome, and cargoes of flour are going to the West India Islands, just the same as cargoes of flour are going from the United States of America. That prejudice is overcome, and a few years of constant communication will overcome other prejudices and give us a chance in our natural markets equal to the chances that the United States have. Their better chances, so far, have been because they had a regular and stated communication, and because of the connections which always grow up with these steamship lines. Now, I beg pardon of the House for having wearied it so long. If my hon. friend will amend a part of his recital, as I know he will, and make the facts all right, I will be obliged to him, and if he will strike out the codicil, so to speak, I would not mind voting for his resolution. However, I leave the case in the hands of the House. I have made this a business statement, because I thought it was the best plan to pursue, and having done so I leave the rest in the hands of the House.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance in attempting to explain the very remarkable circumstances attending the awarding of the tenders that have been referred to and of the general transactions in connection with the subsidies to further the West Indian trade, went into an elaborate eulogy of the benefits and advantages of that trade to the people of the Dominion of Canada, although, at the same time, stating, which is perfectly correct, that a discussion of that question is not pertinent to the resolutions under discussion this evening. I presume that the mover of the resolutions purposely avoided entering into a consideration of the general merits of the question as to the advisability of the Dominion of Canada heavily subsidizing steamers to compete with sailing vessels and to compete with other steamers in any branch of this trade, because it would open up a very lengthy and, to a certain degree, unprofitable discussion. But as the Minister of Finance has alluded to this question, perhaps it may not be out of place to call attention to the fact that, owing to the policy of the Government or, at all events, in spite of the much-vaunted policy of the Government, our trade with the West Indies has lamentably fallen off, and this in a large degree since the National Policy came into operation. A study of the details of our trade with the West Indies in lump and in detail would be very interesting, no doubt, and of great advantage, not only to the Government themselves in preparing to receive offers for steamers of this kind, but it would be of great advantage to the trading community generally. Unfortunately, the policy of the Government has been such as in a large degree to strike down the trade of the Dominion with the people of the West Indies and with South America, and it is no wonder that having thus by their policy to a large degree destroyed this very profitable trade to our people, they are now anxious to make use of the public funds in order to endeavour to repair that injury which their own policy has caused. A very casual glance at the Trade Returns show that our trade within the last ten years, as compared with that of the previous seven or eight years, with the West Indies, has fallen off more than one million dollars a year, and I think it is not unreasonable to say that the Minister of Finance and hon. Ministers opposite will require a large amount of subsidies granted to steamers to make up for the great loss their policy has brought on the people of Canada in connection with this trade. If we look back at the trade of the Dominion with the British West Indies alone we will find that during last year the total export trade was less by $700,000 than what it was in 1877, the trade in the latter year reaching $2,171,000. In 1879 the total export trade to these Islands was $1,943,500; in 1878, about the same amount; in 1873, $1,809,000; 1875, $2,254,750; 1876, $2,148,490; while in 1890, after the full fruition of the operation of the National Policy in so far as it affects this trade, our total export trade to the British West Indies was of the value of $1,460,659. One of the great objects of taking the public money to subsidize these steamers to produce a regularity of trade between the British West Indies and the Dominion of Canada has been to assist the manufacturing industries of the Dominion, because I have no doubt that, as regards the exports of natural products, ninety-nine hundredths of all our natural products would be exported with much greater advantage by sailing vessels and the ordinary means of commerce, without aid by subsidy, than by one, two or three lines of steamers, because the bulk is great, and one or two lines of steamers would scarcely affect the quantity of that class of exports to the West India Islands and the South American Main. But in manufactured products alone our exports have largely fallen off during the last 8 or 9 years. Had the present Dominion Government been able to show that the exports of manufactured goods to the British West Indies—and it is in consequence of want of time to tabulate the figures that I speak of the British West Indies, and do not refer to the Spanish West Indies or South America—now reached $298,804, as was the case in 1876,

one can imagine the extravagant eulogy that would have been bestowed on the National Policy. Not only in this respect, but in other directions, has the trade declined. In 1875 our exports of manufactured goods to the British West Indies was of the value of $146,580; in 1874, $66,942; in 1878, $97,072; in 1877, $87,458; 1879, $100,000, while in 1889 the trade had fallen to the paltry sum of $36,300. In has increased during 1890 to $62,000; but this to a certain extent may be attributed to the operation of these subsidized lines of steamers, because there was a certain amount of anxiety on the part of traders in St. John and Halifax to try the effect of these steamers. But even with the aid of subsidized steamers our exports of manufactured goods has shown no appreciable growth; but as this is to a certain extent foreign to the line of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), I will pass from that, and refer more particularly to the charges made by these resolutions and followed up by the careful and admirable speech of the mover. I notice that the hon. Minister of Finance avoided most carefully dealing with the trenchant points of these resolutions in the speech of the mover, and while he went into very lengthy explanations of some matters he failed to deal in a satisfactory manner with those points of the resolution which I think require explanation before Parliament. But as the subject is a somewhat complicated one to those who have not had the opportunity of carefully perusing the speech of the mover and perusing the papers to which they refer, I may be pardoned if, even at the expense of being somewhat tiresome, I go to a very great degree over the ground so ably trodden by the member for Prince Edward Island. In order to consider this matter clearly, let us state succinctly the nature of the contracts into which the Government entered in pursuance of the vote of 1889, and the circumstances which led up to that vote. The Government deemed it desirable to have offers for three lines of steamers between Canada and the West Indies, one line to extend its route as far as Demerara. In the advertisement for tenders the first was called "A," which was for a line from Halifax or St. John to Cuba and return, and the other was called service "B," which was a line from Halifax or St. John to Jamaica, calling at Turks Island and Bermuda. Before considering the circumstances in connection with contract "C," the correspondence of which is much more extensive, and which contract is open to more animadversion, if possible, than contracts "A" and "B," I will refer to the latter contracts first. What are the facts of the case in connection with contracts "A" and "B," to which the resolutions point? It seems that Messrs. Pickford & Black, an enterprising firm in the City of Halifax connected with the shipping trade, tendered for these two services. I need not go at length into the correspondence which leads up to the granting of the contracts, but I may say in general, in speaking of these contracts, that I think the Government was negligent and guilty, and merits the condemnation of Parliament for the unbusiness-like and careless manner in which these tenders were called for from ship-owners throughout the world. The resolutions were passed through Parliament early in the year 1889, after a long course of discussion in this House and throughout the country as to the advisability of opening up these routes. Parliament prorogued, I believe, on the 2nd May, and yet up to the middle of July the Government had not formed a scheme, or did not give to the world any idea as to the nature of the contract which they had in view; and not until the 15th July do the advertisements calling for this service appear before the public. Now, in business transactions involving such large interests I contend that a longer notice should have been given to the ship-owners and ship-managers in all parts of the world who desired to tender for these contracts, and the Government could not plead that there was not abundance of time to formulate the scheme, and to give intending contractors a more extended opportunity for studying the matter and for seeing whether they could offer tenders with satisfaction to themselves and with a likelihood of success or not. Taking the advertisements to have been issued by the Government about the 15th July, it is not beyond the grounds of probability to say that fully a fortnight must have elapsed before this notice could have been in the hands of the proper parties to tender, and then we find that they were limited to the short space of thirty days in which to tender for contracts aggregating an expenditure of from $50,000 to $100,000 a year. The contracts, according to the terms given by the Government, called for first-class ships of at least 1,000 tons, and a speed of at least 12 knots an hour. All who are acquainted with shipping are aware that steamships of 1,000 tons, with a speed of 12 knots, are very scarce; and the whole correspondence from Furness, from Joseph Wood, and from the Blacks, goes to show that such ships cannot be procured, except that they are built for this special purpose, and that vessels of a smaller tonnage and of a less rate of speed could be tendered for much more cheaply and are much more easy to procure. The Government so framed its tender that they did not give intending contractors a fair opportunity to study this question, nor did they give the people of this country the opportunity which they should have had to have had this service performed as cheaply as possible. I will call the attention of the House to the manner in which the tenders were offered and the manner in which intending tenderers must have been confused by the wording of the advertisement. It says:

"For each of the above mentioned services, proper accommodation for the transport of mails must be provided. The above services to be monthly, and performed by steamships of a speed of not less than 12 knots an hour: and as regards the services marked 'A,' 'B' and 'C,' of not less than 1,000 tons register, and with an accommodation for at least thirty first-class passengers: and as regards the service marked 'D,' of not less than 2,000 tons register, and with accommodation for at least fifty first-class passengers."

In the latter clause of the advertisement the Government makes an intimation as follows:—

"As regards the services 'A,' 'B' and 'C,' persons desiring to offer to perform the same with steamers of less capacity and speed than above mentioned may submit their tenders, specifying the speed and capacity of the boats which they desire to offer, although the conditions above specified are those desired by the Government."

Now, the first thing which must be noticed, and which is plainly admitted on this record, is that in regard to services "A" and "B" the designs and intentions of the Government have been frustrated and have been a complete failure, and we are carrying out to-day a service between Jamaica and

Halifax, and between Cuba and Halifax, with small steamers of an ancient style of build, in substitution for the steamers which the Government deem to be proper and fit for this service. The Minister of Finance has not stated upon what ground the Government, or his department, made up their mind to insist upon the class of ships which they called for in this tender, nor upon what ground they were induced to vary their determination in all three of these cases. At any rate, instead of having ships of 1,000 tons, as the Government desired, and as a result of the scheme which they promulgated to the world, we are now favoured in this service by old and small steamers, one of 677 tons and the other of 750 tons, and of a less speed than 12 knots an hour. Pickford & Black secured the contract for these two services, the one at the rate of $20,000 a year and the other at the rate of $15,000 a year. I will read some of the correspondence upon which this contract was entered into, because it touches immediately upon the gravamen of the charge laid before this House. Messrs. Pickford & Black were running these steamers as a commercial speculation previous to these tenders being called for. I believe they began their first trips in the fall of 1888. There had been subsidies previously paid for a service of this kind, and the Government had stopped this subsidy, I presume, for reasons satisfactory to themselves and to the country. This subsidy, after having lapsed for several years, and the service having been abandoned, was taken up as a commercial speculation by the enterprising firm mentioned, and they were running these ships to the West Indies on routes, which if they were not exactly the same, were very similar. They tendered for and accepted the contract to carry out the services "A" and "B" at $20,000 a year and $15,000 respectively. The contract was not signed until long after the tenders were verbally accepted by the Government, and they mention in their correspondence that when the contract was finally executed it might include two trips or more which took place previous to the execution of the contract. I cannot say that there was anything very unreasonable or unfair in this, and so the contract was made to provide for that. The contract was dated the 23rd of April; but the correspondence which practically concluded the contract closed about the latter part of November, and in their correspondence they ask that the trips beginning on November 24 and December 15 may be included in the contract, and they were accordingly included, and they received their pay for those two trips. It is fair to assume that the trips were performed satisfactorily, for we find that the firm received cheques for their money with due regularity, after filing with the department the manifests of their cargoes and the proper certificates that the work had been performed. After the lapse of about a year, towards the close of 1890, the other tenderers for contract "C" found that they had made a bad bargain, that they were losing money. They desired to get rid of their contract and they appealed to the Finance Minister to help them out of the difficulty in which they had become involved. At this juncture Messrs. Pickford & Black, who had the contract for the "A" and "B" services, and who were performing it satisfactorily, accordingly, dating from November and December, 1889, and receiving their proportion of the subsidy for each trip, stepped in, and at the suggestion of the Finance Minister offered to take the unfortunate contract off the hands of the St. John Company. At this juncture precisely they put in a plea to be paid an extra allowance on their contracts "A" and "B"; and as the correspondence on that subject is somewhat interesting, I will read it. The hon. Finance Minister had been in St. John looking at the books and affairs of the West Indian Steamship Company: and feeling disposed to accede to the request of this company to relieve them of their contract, and also to hand it over on more advantageous terms to the firm of Pickford & Black, we find that he suggested to Mr. Black, who was acting for the firm, to write to the department the following letter, dated Ottawa, 23rd of September, 1890:—

"DEAR SIR,—In September, 1888, my firm first commenced the West Indies steam service. During the session of 1889, $60,000 was appropriated as a subsidy for the development by steam of trade with the West Indies.

"In November, 1889, we completed arrangements with the Government to perform two of the services asked for, viz., Canada to Cuba and Canada to Jamaica, by which we were to receive a subsidy.

"Whilst operating these lines previous to November, 1889, we did so at loss to ourselves. The routes were very expensive ones and no return cargoes could be got.

"As a portion of the $60,000 placed at our disposal in the winter of 1889 has not been expended, I would ask that we be paid for the work performed from July 1st, 1889, (from which date the vote was available) until November, 1889. The country had the benefit of the services, which were as regular then as they now are.

"As I understand that unless the unused portion of the $60,000 is appropriated before the 30th instant it will be no longer available, and in view of your early departure from the Capital, I would ask you to kindly give this your immediate consideration."

On the 26th of September the Minister of Finance reports to the Council in favour of accepting this offer; on the 1st of October the report is approved in Council; and on the 3rd of October Messrs. Pickford & Black receive in cash from the Department of Finance $15,000. Now, I say, apart from charges of direct malfeasance or any charges which might imperil the seats in Parliament of those who had anything to do with it, you can scarcely find a parallel to this transaction in the Finance Department, or in any other department of the Government of Canada. While this Legislature or any Government would be disposed to deal fairly with contractors who are unfortunate enough to make errors of calculation, and who are carrying out a meritorious public service, and to be as easy as possible in the face of a written contract, yet I venture to say that you will never find, and you ought not to find, such barefaced robbery of the public treasury as we find to have been committed on behalf of this firm in its dealings with the Finance Minister. The sum of $15,000, which had never before been claimed, and for which there was not the slightest ground for claiming either in law or equity, was coolly paid out by the Finance Minister to this firm. Did this transaction stand by itself it would be perfectly inexplicable; no man in his sober senses could imagine for one moment why such a transaction could have taken place; but taken in connection with the other circumstances, and agreements, and payments, at the same period, the whole thing becomes clear and lucid; but it does not by any means lessen the culpability of the Finance Minister or of the Government in acceding to such a preposterous proposition. I do not blame Messrs. Pickford & Black for securing from the public whatever money they may

think in their own minds they are honestly entitled to. They were running their steamers as an ordinary commercial speculation, and it may or may not be true that they were not making money out of them; but can this be put forward as any ground on which to support a claim on the public treasury—that because in the ordinary course of their business they are performing a service for the country, they should be rewarded? But when we consider this transaction in connection with the Baird contract we can see the motives underlying this large gift by the Government to Messrs. Pickford & Black, and the reason of the eagerness with which the Finance Minister ran to the rescue of his friends Messrs. Baird & Van Wart to relieve them from the difficulties in which they had placed themselves by their eagerness to secure the "C" contract. Let it be clearly understood, with regard to the payment of $15,000 to Messrs. Pickford & Black for the "A" and "B" services, that it is the flimsiest and most shallow excuse to say that they had earned this money, or had any other right to it than any commercial trader sailing his vessels around the coasts of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. But when we follow the transactions which took place with the West India Steamship Company we see the motives and reasons, which were not creditable to the Finance Department, why this extraordinary transaction was permitted. Let me then direct the attention of the House from "A" and "B" services to the "C" service, which requires a little more lengthy examination. Service "C" was a line from Halifax or St. John *viâ* Yarmouth, if sailing from St. John to Demerara and return, calling at Bermuda, and certain West India Islands. For this service it was insisted, and is still insisted by the Government, that the ships must be of 1,000 tons burden, of a speed not less than 12 knots, of first-class accommodations and complete in every particular. It is somewhat gratifying, although at this late hour, over two years after these tenders were offered to the public, and nearly two years after tenders were accepted, to find that we are only now on the eve of having a service at all approaching that which the Government required. We find, for the first time, not from the papers before the House, but from information vouchsafed by the Minister of Finance, that at last we have, in the *Taymouth Castle* and the *Duart Castle*, two steamers which approach the requirements of the contract entered into by Messrs. Pickford & Black and the overthrown contract of Messrs. Baird & Van Wart. Now, the tenders for service "C" were advertised for at the same time as these other tenders; and we had in this connection this unfortunate circumstance, which is so peculiar in the conduct of the Government, namely, that tenders are so worded that when they come before the Government, the Government is almost in the same position as if none had been called for at all. We have this anomaly on the face of the record, that we have a hard and fast line, but with exceptions so large that almost any tender can be accepted by the Government without going outside the terms of the advertisement. Contract "C" required the ships to be of the speed and tonnage and to have the other qualifications I have mentioned; but tenders were allowed offering ships of a different tonnage and speed. All those desiring to tender had the short notice I have mentioned, a notice which was very unbusiness-like, and neither fair to the tenderers or the country. We find that Messrs. Pickford & Black made an offer of a line from St. John, by way of Halifax to Demerara; we find that the Messrs. Furness, of England, made an offer in precisely the terms of the main requirements laid down by the Government, and we find that other tenderers also made offers. There was a tender by Mr. Jos. Wood, which I will read. Mr. Wood, early in the session of 1889, wrote to the hon. Finance Minister, asking him what was the line that Parliament, or the Government, would be likely to require. He answered promptly, that the Government at that time had no scheme in their mind, but that, at a later period, they would inform him what their views were. But the only information he received must have been from the public prints, when the call for tenders was published. However, in the month of August, he made a tender, under the second clause, for the service "C"—a tender somewhat different from those required by the Government as regards the tonnage. His tender was as follows:—

"I beg to tender as follows, for the West India service; from St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S., to Bermuda, Martinique, Barbadoes, Trinidad and Demerara, calling at intermediate islands when sufficient encouragement offers, returning from Demerara, Trinidad and Barbadoes to Halifax and St. John, N.B.

"I offer for this route one steamer of 700 to 800 tons register, speed 13 knots and accommodation for 30 first class passengers. The steamer to be built in Scotland, and classed 100 A1 at Lloyds, and to be ready for service by September 1st, 1890."

Over a year ago, had this tender been accepted and a contract entered into, this firm would have been obliged to place this first-class vessel on the route, a vessel differing from the requirement of the Government only in the fact that it was 200 tons less than that called for; and they offered to put it on the line for a subsidy of $20,000, payable at the rate of $2,000 a trip for ten trips per year. Here was a most advantageous offer—an offer more advantageous by 60 per cent. than that which the Government have at present accepted for steamers of a somewhat larger size. In a letter accompanying this tender, Mr. Wood, referring more particularly to the steamer, says she must be superior to any steamer now running in the trade. In his first letter he gives the Government advice, which subsequent events have proved to be very wise and judicious. However, without much ado this tender was thrown aside and not the slightest weight attached to it. Another important tender for this service was received from the great ship-builder of Hartlepool, Mr. Furness, the owner of a substantial line of steamers running between various portions of the globe, and a gentleman whose name is a synonym for integrity and ability. But I need not enlarge before this House on the commercial standing of Mr. Furness. I will only say that so pleased was the Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick at the idea that Mr. Furness was likely to get the tender that he telegraphed him his congratulations and best wishes for success in his enterprise. The tender of Mr. Furness is worthy of consideration, because it was accepted by the Government, and because it was one which, if it had been carried out, would have given this country a line of steamers to the West Indies far superior to that which it has at present, or is likely to have for a long time to come, under the present contract. One reason given by the Finance Minister for objecting to the Furness

tender is certainly a very extraordinary one, and that is, that Mr. Furness desired to be able to give six months' notice in case he wished to terminate his contract. This the Finance Minister declared to be a serious objection ; but he had no scruple about permitting the Canada and West India Company to throw up their contract after one or two months' notice, and in going personally to work, by private contract and tender, to induce other parties to come in and take the bargain off their hands. If a house like that of Mr. Furness threw up the contract at the end of six months as being unpracticable and unfair, the country would have a guarantee that the circumstance really justified them in throwing it up, and the Government would have been held blameless. But, owing to the delay of the Government in giving Mr. Furness a reply to his request, he was compelled to instruct his agent to withdraw from the contract, and the Government lost the advantage of having the business in the hands of a house of that standing. Then, Mr. Furness being out of the way, the Finance Minister opened negotiations with the parties he intended all along should have the contract. There can be no other reading of this extraordinary correspondence. No one acquainted with the facts could come to any other conclusion than that it was understood beforehand, if possible, Messrs. Van Wart & Baird should have the contract. During the time these appropriations were before the House Mr. Baird was a member of this House, supporting the Government. He is a legal gentleman by profession, but, to a certain degree, is engaged in commercial pursuits. His partner, Mr. Van Wart, is also a legal gentleman, who, so far as I am aware, was not previously engaged in any shipping transaction. The Minister of Finance has stated that charges were made against the personal integrity of these gentlemen. I challenge, however, the most careful criticism of the remarks of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) to find the slightest indication of any such charge. It is true the hon. member for Queen's commented somewhat sarcastically upon the political position Mr. Baird then occupied, and I think that any such comments were perfectly justified by the circumstances of the case. But in regard to his commercial character, in regard to his commercial integrity, I have not heard that there was ever any charge, and I am certain that there was no charge or insinuation of that kind made in the speech of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) ; but we find that this gentleman was associated with Mr. Van Wart, a great friend and supporter of the Finance Minister, and they undertook to organize a company to obtain this contract and to carry out the trade which that gentleman had advocated in this House, and in order, as it appears here, to oblige the Finance Minister. At any rate, the tender they made was a lower tender than that of Furness. The first tender was $54,000. After the Furness Company was got out of the way negotiations were opened between the Finance Minister and Pickford & Black, and VanWart & Baird, to see if they would not take up the contract ; and here comes in a circumstance which I think is not creditable to the commercial sagacity of the Finance Minister or of those members of the Government who are concerned in working up this trade. All the correspondence that deals with this goes to show that from the first it was apparent that any trade which was to be built up must take in the port of Halifax as well as the port of St. John, but the Government determined that this should have a political character, and they rigidly insisted that Halifax should be excluded from the terms of the first contract, and that the trade should go from St. John to Demerara, though they allowed the vessels to call at Yarmouth. Messrs. Pickford & Black insisted that, in order to make this trade pay, they should call at Halifax, and the results have proved the wisdom of that course, because experience has shown that the principal trade has gone by way of Halifax. Mr. Joseph Wood also insisted and placed in his tender that Halifax should be a port of call ; but no, the Government had formed their plan and intended to stick to it. Finally, however, after the ignominious failure of their attempt to carry out the St. John idea, they were obliged to come to the terms which had previously been suggested, and the original idea of Messrs. Pickford & Black and of Mr. Joseph Wood was carried out, and the trade was transferred to a steamer that would call at Halifax and carry the commodities to the West Indies by way of Halifax. The situation then is this : A contract is entered into finally, after negotiations which I will not weary the House by reading, but which are very instructive, in connection with the strong suspicion which has prevailed that it was intended from the first that these gentlemen should have the contract whether or no, and I will read some portions of that contract. The contract was executed about the middle of March, 1890, although the tenders were accepted in the autumn of 1889. It is possible that one reason for this delay may have been the fact that a member of Parliament and his associates were engaged in endeavouring to get up a company in order that the contract should not be made with a member of Parliament, and the money should not be paid to a member of Parliament, but to a company of which he was the manager. The contract provided :

"That they would maintain during the continuance of this contract and carry on efficiently a regular service from the City of St. John, N.B., in the Dominion of Canada, to Demerara, calling at Yarmouth, N.S., in the said Dominion, and at certain islands in the West Indies, said service to be carried on with two steamers of not less than 1,000 tons register, with a speed of not less than 12 knots an hour, and with accommodation for not less than 30 first class passengers, all steamers to be subject to the approval of the Finance Minister ; provided always that the service may be carried on by the contractors with the steamer *Portia* for six months from the commencement of this contract."

Here we find an extraordinary arrangement that, whereas a first-class service is contracted for, to be worth $4,100 a round trip, the Government were to pay for an inferior steamer in size and speed precisely the same rate of subsidy as they were to pay for the first-class service. One would have supposed that both the tenderers and the Government would have made some distinction between the two classes of vessels, and that some proviso would have been made that the amount should be reduced if the service was not so efficient as the contract called for. Not at all. The *Portia* is to be paid at the same rate as the first-class vessels. The *Portia*, however, was unsatisfactory. She performed but two trips, and received her subsidy in due course. And then comes another violation of the contract with the consent of the Government. It appears that these contracts are

not only made to be broken, but are made to be ignored from the first. With the consent of the Government, the *Loanda* is substituted for the *Portia*, and she performs six trips. However, the steamer being so unacceptable to the travelling and commercial public, being a perfect laughing-stock throughout the West India Islands, so that the very objects of Parliament and of the Government were liable to be frustrated by her operations, the company finds itself in a disastrous condition financially, and is determined to get rid of the contract. We find no proviso in the contract for any penalty in the case of non-fulfilment, we find no bond or guarantee that the company will perform the service, but on their simple demand they are released from the contract. We find the Finance Minister personally called upon to inspect the books of the company, and for what purpose? The most extraordinary errand that a Finance Minister of this country was ever called upon to perform, in my opinion, was when we find the Minister of Finance in the office of Messrs. Van Wart & Baird, in St. John, inspecting their books in order to see if their statements were correct that they were losing money by the contract. One would expect that the Finance Minister of Canada would have sent an expert there to examine the books, and would have had a report to lay before his colleagues, and would have had something to bring before the House to show why he did not inflict a penalty on this company, and why Parliament should deal generously with them, and should not exact the full penalty which should have been exacted under a contract of this nature. But, after the solemn assurance given throughout this correspondence that they would provide first-class passenger and freight accommodation in first-class vessels, and after providing first the inferior vessel, the *Portia*, and then the very unsatisfactory *Loanda*, according to their own reports, according to all the representations made, and according to Messrs. Pickford & Black, the Finance Minister relieves them of the contract and pays them a large additional sum, not only for future trips, but for back trips of this vessel. She was receiving $4,100 for performing a service which they had guaranteed they would place a 1,000 ton ship, making 12 knots an hour, on the route to perform; and finding they were losing money, that the public were becoming disgusted with the service of both of these boats, the Finance Minister agrees to give them $2,050 per trip more at the end of that year, and to pay them for the back trips; consequently, Baird & Van Wart, under the name of the Canadian West Indian and South American Steamship Company, received from the Finance Minister and the Government $8,200 in cash more than they were entitled to under the contract, and more than they were entitled to in law or equity. They were relieved from the contract, and a new contract was made with Pickford & Black to take this old and discredited steamship off their hands and put it upon this line, including a call at Halifax; and Pickford & Black, in order that they might be induced to undertake the new contract, received from their friend, the Finance Minister, an addition of $15,000 in cash. Here is a peculiar circumstance in that the letter asking for the $15,000 is dated on the 23rd September and the report to Council asking the Government to consent to relieve the West Indian Company from their contract and to pay them the extra $8,200 for services which they had guaranteed to perform with superior vessels for $4,100 and the acceptance of the new contract for the "C" service by Pickford & Black, all took place simultaneously, and were all included in the report of the Minister to Council, which was approved on the 1st October. We find, then, that the country is robbed to the extent of $23,200, and the country is worse off, in regard to this West India trade and in regard to the efficiency of the service, than it was before. Messrs. Pickford & Black go on with the *Loanda*, calling at Halifax and undertaking to carry out their contract. Now, I will call the attention of the House to the contract with Pickford & Black, after our friends in St. John were so handsomely provided for to enable them to wind up the transactions of their company without any loss. The contract of Pickford & Black was dated on the 3rd of November, 1890, and this provided that they would, during the continuance of the contract, undertake to:

"Efficiently establish, and maintain, and carry on, from the port of St. John, in the Province of New Brunswick, to Demerara, a regular and efficient service, by steamers classed as No. 1 Lloyds, of not less than 1,000 tons net register, and capable of a speed of not less than 12 knots an hour, and containing sufficient accommodation for 40 first class passengers, &c., &c."

We would have thought that after this experience on the part of the Minister of Finance, for which the country has had to pay so generously, he would have formed some contract with the new firm which would have been binding upon them and binding upon the Government, but up to this hour that contract has not been carried out. We learn from the speech of the Minister of Finance that now, for the first time, they are beginning to carry out this contract, and the two steamers (certainly not the class of steamers that are mentioned in this contract) are undertaking to carry it out. They may be very good vessels, but I think it is within reason to say that steamers built in 1877 and 1878 are not, at the present time, first-class steamers. They may have been first-class steamers at the time they were built, but when we consider the vast improvements that have been made in the construction of steamers, the construction of engines, the lighting, and all the arrangements of these vessels, a steamer built in 1878 would not to-day be considered a first-class ship in comparison with those that are turned out at the present time from the great shipyards of the mother country. My opinion is that the country is paying too much, that smaller sized vessels would be more satisfactory, because they can call at ports at which these large vessels cannot call. To sum up this whole matter, the Finance Minister has admitted the correctness of the statements contained in the resolution of the hon. member for Queen's, but he has demurred from the conclusion that the Government and the Finance Minister are to be condemned for the part they have played in this transaction. We find that from beginning to end the ideas and schemes which the Government have held forth to commercial men and the people of this country have not been carried out, that an inferior class of steamers up to the present hour have been employed, and they have been receiving the full amount of the subsidies offered for much superior vessels, that the terms of the contracts have been persistently ignored from

beginning to end, and that the sum of $23,200 has been paid for which the parties receiving it have no claim in law, or equity, or justice. The most they could have asked for would be to be relieved from their contracts without any penalty. I think the whole conduct of the Minister of Finance and of the Government in this transaction has tended, not to advance the interest of the West India trade, not to advance the interest of the people who are interested in that trade, but their conduct has been a detriment to the trade, because it has created a prejudice in many of the West Indies which it will take months and perhaps years to overcome. I think the Government is censurable for handling the finances of the country in the way they have done in this instance, and the proposition that because tenderers and contractors with the public for certain services can make a plea that they are losing money, they can put their hands into the treasury and recoup themselves for their loss, that the treasury of this country can be used to relieve people from their contracts —I think these are propositions that ought to be condemned by this Parliament, and the Minister making use of his power for such purposes ought to receive the severe censure of the representatives of the people in this House. This whole transaction is unbusiness like, unsatisfactory, very suspicious in many of its circumstances, although there is no positive proof of direct fraud. These large sums of money have been paid out under circumstances that cannot be defended. At any rate, if principles of this kind receive the approval of this House, the road will be much easier to enable future Finance Ministers to tamper with public contracts, and to tamper with public funds, making things easy for those who deem themselves to have been unfortunate in their efforts to carry out a contract which they have entered into with the Government of the country.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), in his opening remarks, made the statement that the falling off which he alleges has taken place in the trade of Canada with the West Indies is due to the National Policy. My hon. friend is very apt on all occasions to attack the National Policy, and I assume that he means that the higher tariff which prevails to-day in Canada, and which applies solely to the imports, and not to the exports of Canada, is the cause of the diminution which he says has taken place in our trade with the West Indies. The hon. gentleman knows, because he has taken some pains to inform himself generally on this question, that the trade of the United States with the West Indies, the trade of that country whose tariff is much higher than ours, has increased very largely within the last 10 or 15 years; and I therefore think my hon. friend, when he considers that that highly protected country, the United States, was able to extend its commerce with the West Indies, can hardly blame our protective policy for the fact that our trade with the West Indies has not extended as rapidly as we would desire. But I think my hon. friend, if he had anxiously searched for a reason for the non-extension of Canadian trade, would have found it was largely owing to the fact that we have not had steamers to export our goods from Canada to the West Indies, while the Americans have paid very great attention to their trade with the West Indies and South America, and as a result of that attention their commerce with those countries has very much increased. It was stated earlier in the session that our exports to the West Indies had fallen off to the extent of $1,000,000, taking the commerce of 1873 and comparing it with that of 1890. If that is correct, it is certainly deeply to be regretted, and it behooves the Government and Parliament to see if some remedy cannot be applied. But I have taken the trouble to examine into the general trade, exports and imports, for some years past between Canada and the West Indies, and I find that in 1873 Canada's collective trade with the West Indies, the Spanish West Indies, the French West Indies and the other West Indies, amounted to the value of $6,163,425, and that in 1889 it amounted to $6,062,873, or a difference of about $100,000. It is true that the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), in the remarks which he made, confined himself principally to our trade with the British West Indies; but my hon. friend must remember that the steamers to which he has made reference during his speech ply not only to the British West Indies but to the foreign West Indies also. I, therefore, think it would have been more accurate, if the hon. gentleman desired to make a fair comparison, to have taken our trade with the West India Islands collectively. The hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution also attempted to convey the impression to the House that there was not much hope for the extension of Canadian trade with the West Indies. I must remind hon. gentlemen that this question of our trade with the West Indies was brought up in this House in 1887. It was discussed very fully, and the Minister of Finance of the day, Sir Charles Tupper, committed the Government to the policy of granting a subsidy for steamers in order the better to develop our trade with the West Indies. It is true, looking at the matter historically and chronologically, that no resolution was introduced to that effect till 1889. But hon. gentlemen who were here in 1887 will remember that several hon. members then contended that we had many articles of manufacture and many agricultural products which could be exported advantageously to the West Indies if we had proper facilities for so doing. I remember listening with pleasure to the remarks made by the present member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) on that occasion, in which he pointed out that there were many articles which we produce and manufacture that could be exported advantageously to the West Indies. If we will for a moment glance at the commerce which now exists between the United States and the West Indies we will, I think, find that the argument then made by the member for Kent was well founded, and that the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) is wrong in his contention that there is no prospect and no possibility of developing a large commerce with those Islands. I find that in 1889 the United States exported to the West Indies bread, and biscuits, and wheat flour, and other breadstuffs, to the value of $6,831,402. Hon. members from Ontario, no matter on which side of the House they sit, will admit that it should be possible for us to develop the flour and breadstuff trade with those Islands, or at least to secure for ourselves a portion of the large commerce which is now carried on in those articles with the United States. But, in order to do so, we must have the same facilities for exporting those

articles as exist to-day in the United States. I find in 1889 Canada's total trade with the West Indies was only $6,000,000, and yet the United States, in the one item of breadstuffs, exported more than the total trade, exports and imports, of Canada with those Islands. I find, too, that in the item of hay the United States exported $71,800. We all know there is a surplus of hay in the Dominion of Canada, and if we had greater facilities to-day for the transportation of hay to those Islands we could compete on favourable terms with our neighbours for that market in that article. To show how large is the commerce between the United States and the West India Islands, I may say that in looking over the exports of that country I find that in 1889 the United States, in pork products, exported goods to the value of $6,000,000. In dairy produce they exported goods to the value of $777,000. No hon. gentleman will contend that in cheese we cannot compete with our American neighbours, if we have equal facilities of transportation. I find that vegetables were exported by the United States to the value of $610,000; and it was only the other day that my hon. friend from King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden) called the attention of the Government and the House to the anxiety which existed among the farmers in his fine county because they feared that under the new trade arrangements, which had been brought into existence between the United States and Cuba, possibly these farmers would be unable to export their vegetables to the Island of Cuba. My hon. friend placed before the House very fairly and very squarely the fact that it much concerned those he represented that every effort should be made on the part of the Government to secure, as far as was in their power, an arrangement whereby the products of Canada should be treated, in the Island of Cuba, on the same terms as those of the United States. I put it to my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden), if it is not necessary in conducting that trade, and in moving such perishable articles as vegetables and fruits, that they should be transported regularly and quickly, and that it can be done much more advantageously by steamers than by the old-fashioned sailing vessels. Therefore, I hope that I shall have the pleasure of voting with my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) to-night. I wish also to point out to the House that in the item of manufactures of wood the United States exported to these Islands, in 1889, goods to the value of $2,174,884. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not a very high opinion of their own country, of its manufactures, of its products, or of its possibilities; but the most pessimistic amongst them will admit that in wood and wooden manufactures we are in a position to compete with our neighbours when we have equal opportunities and equal terms of doing so. Again, I find that the United States exported to the West Indies during the year 1889 furniture to the value of $590,500, and I am satisfied, from my knowledge of the manufacturers of furniture in Canada, that with an effort on their part, and an effort on the part of the agents of the steamship lines, a large trade could be done in that important branch of commerce if we only had the same facilities, the same regular, and rapid, and systematic means of transportation as the Americans are provided with. Therefore, I think that my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), instead of blaming the National Policy, because, he says, our trade with the West Indies has not been as large as it was some fifteen or sixteen years ago, should have attributed that diminution, not to the National Policy, but to the unfortunate circumstance that we have not had steamers to transport our products to the West Indies. The present Government, in its anxiety to increase the commerce of the country, to develop our manufactures, and to add to our foreign trade, asked Parliament to subsidize these lines of steamers to the West Indies. In my humble way I advocated that measure to the best of my ability, and certainly I never gave a vote, or expressed an opinion with more confidence, or that I looked back to with more pleasure, than the vote that I gave and the remarks I made in favour of subsidizing a line of steamers to the West Indies, and so endeavouring to secure new markets for Canadian products. Until recently, Canadian trade with the West Indies was very much confined to the Province of Nova Scotia alone, and for years it had been conducted with sailing vessels, and it was languishing for the reason that we could not expect these sailing vessels to compete with the numerous lines of steamers which plied from the United States to these Islands, and hence it was that the Government asked Parliament to grant a subsidy for a suitable steamship service. The subsidy was divided into three sections; section "A" being from Halifax to Jamaica, calling at Turks Island and Bermuda; and section "B," from Halifax to the Port of Havana, in Cuba, and back. There was no great difficulty in inaugurating these services, because there had been a service which had been subsidized by the Imperial Government from Halifax to St. Thomas, and, afterwards, for a short time, to Jamaica. That Imperial subsidy was withdrawn, the steamers consequently ceased running, and all steam communication between Halifax and the West Indies was stopped. When, in 1887, the Government of Canada proclaimed its intention of subsidizing a line of steamers to the West Indies, I understand that Messrs. Pickford & Black, and other friends of theirs, associated themselves together and bought two steamers for the purpose of placing them on those routes. They bought the Cunard boats, the *Alpha* and the *Beta*, and these boats have been doing the service between Halifax, and the points which are known in the subsidy as sections "A" and "B." Section "C" called for a service from the port of St. John to the Windward Islands and British Guiana, and at that time it appears no suitable boats could be immediately found for the service. It is stated in the papers now on the Table that Mr. Wood, of Halifax, offered a vessel of some 700 tons, but she was considered too small by the Government. Whilst the Minister of Finance was willing, in order to get these services promptly established, to take smaller vessels for the "A" and "B" routes, he believed that for the "C" service it was necessary that a vessel of larger tonnage should be secured, and, consequently, I believe Mr. Wood's tender was not accepted. Mr. Wood has, within the last few years, placed two very efficient steel steamers on the coasting service of the Province of Nova Scotia, and one of them, which has been engaged in the service for some years, has proved to be a very satisfactory vessel. The other one has only recently arrived in our waters; and I have no doubt that if Mr. Wood was as successful in the West India project as he has been with these two vessels the matter would

have worked satisfactorily. Be that as it may, for the reasons which the Minister of Finance has given us this afternoon, he was not disposed at that time to accept Mr. Wood's offer. It appears, then, that the next lowest offer was that of Messrs. Pickford & Black, of Halifax, and there was an offer also from Mr. Furness, of the well-known Furness line of steamers. The Finance Minister has mentioned it, if I understood him correctly, that Messrs. Pickford & Black's tender was accompanied by the stipulation that those vessels should sail from Halifax; and it seems that it was desired that the vessels should start from St. John, call at Yarmouth, and then proceed on their voyage; and the hon. Minister intimated to Mr. Furness that his tender would be accepted, only stipulating, inasmuch as Mr. Furness had not time to build steamers specially for the service, that while he was using other vessels the sum should be reduced to $48,000. I think no great fault can be found with the hon. Finance Minister for having suggested this arrangement to Mr. Furness. I might be disposed to think that the offer of Messrs. Pickford & Black was an equally good offer; but, at all events, as it did not quite coincide with the views of the hon. Finance Minister, certainly the next best arrangement he could have made was to have accepted the Furness tender. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister has explained to us this evening that there was some delay in conveying the intelligence to Mr. Furness that his tender would be accepted. That was an unavoidable delay, and when the intelligence was communicated to Mr. Furness he immediately cabled begging to withdraw his tender, and stating that he was not prepared to enter into a contract for five years, unless it contained a clause permitting him to withdraw from it at six months' notice, or unless he had an opportunity of testing what trade could be developed by experimenting with steamers on the route. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that Mr. Furness should have taken that course, for the reason that he had at the time no steamer that was suitable, and it was unnecessary for him to build steamers. It was a new service, unlike the other services, the results of which were known; and he would, therefore, have been compelled to go to a large expense, probably £100,000 sterling, to build steamers for this particular service, of which he had no knowledge and of which he could not gauge the results from the experience of others. Therefore it was, I infer, that Mr. Furness declined to enter into the contract. Offers were then made for this "C" service by certain gentlemen in St. John; and one of them, Mr. Baird, has been referred to in a very unfair and uncomplimentary manner by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who introduced this resolution. Instead of censuring Mr. Baird for the part he took in this transaction, I think he is rather to be commended. Mr. Baird was anxious to increase the trade of the country and of his own city, and to bring to it business from the West Indies which it had not at that time. Mr. Baird finally succeeded in securing the contract for the company with which he was connected, or rather the contract was given to the company; and having the contract they were obliged to look for a steamer, and they discovered that it was exceedingly difficult to get a suitable one; because hon. gentlemen must understand that the steamers are obliged to call at ten or twelve ports, and that in some of these ports the water is shallow and it is necessary to have vessels of light draught; and I assure hon. gentlemen who have no personal knowledge of these matters, and who have not perhaps taken the trouble to inform themselves upon them, that it is much easier to find a vessel of two or three thousand tons to engage in the trans-Atlantic trade than a vessel of one thousand tons to engage in this particular trade which we are now considering. The consequence was that this company was compelled to charter the best obtainable steamers—first, the *Portia*, which I know is a good, safe vessel, and subsequently the *Lounda*. It appears from what we have heard this evening that the *Lounda* made the first two or three voyages successfully. After that she seems to have broken down, and I am prepared to say, from what I have heard from others—I have never seen the ship myself—that the few last months of her employment in the West India service were very unsatisfactory, so unsatisfactory indeed that when the contract was ultimately taken up by Messrs. Pickford & Black they recognized her as unsuitable for the service; but having no boat immediately available, they asked the Government to employ her on one or two trips, and it was upon one of these trips that the accident occurred, a description of which was given to us by the hon. member who moved this resolution. Now, Mr. Speaker, Messrs. Pickford & Black are really not to blame for having failed to secure immediately suitable vessels for this service. I know, as a matter of fact, that one of these gentlemen, as soon as they secured the contract, went first to the West Indies to make their business arrangements there, to appoint their agents, and then proceeded to England to endeavour to purchase two suitable steamers. As a result of their visit to England, they finally chartered two steamers, the *Taymouth Castle* and the *Dunvegan Castle*, and these ships have been accepted by the Government as suitable for the service between Canada and the Windward Islands and British Guiana. I have not seen these ships myself, but I have read descriptions of them in our local newspapers, and I have heard them described by gentlemen of experience and knowledge in such matters, who have visited them, and I have come to the conclusion that they are in every way well suited for the work, and will conduct the contract satisfactorily. Mr. Speaker, I really expected, after the very clear and exhaustive and eminently satisfactory explanations which the hon. Finance Minister gave the House of this whole transaction, that, as his words fell upon the ears of my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I., he would have risen in his place and asked permission to withdraw this resolution. In fact, one wonders why such a resolution is introduced into this House; and seeking for a reason, the only explanation which suggests itself to my mind is the fact that when these hon. gentlemen last moved a vote of want of confidence in the Government they went over to the Pacific coast for a pretext, and moved a resolution assailing the policy of the Government for some transactions on the Pacific coast. That resolution fell very harmless upon the House, and still more so upon the Government and the country, and I assumed that, having failed in the west, they must now turn their heads to the east; and having ransacked the archives, they imagine

they have discovered something here which partakes of the policy of the Opposition. The policy of the Opposition is a policy of scandal and slander. If they had not a scandal they would not have a political existence. They have never attained power since Confederation except through a scandal; and they are no good at anything except hunting up scandals. They do not always find them, but they are always zealous in the search. They take up a piece here and there, and hope, by putting the various pieces together, to succeed in making a case against the Government; but, when their work sees the light of the day, or the electric light of this House, it is easily destroyed and its falsity immediately recognized. That is the only explanation which suggests itself to my mind for the appearance of this resolution in this House to-night; and, I am quite sure that there is actually less cause for this—if it be possible to have less cause—than there was for the resolution moved in this House, only a few days ago, in reference to the conduct of the Government on the Pacific slope, and I am equally certain it will meet at the hands of members of this House that fate which it deserves.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has done me the honour to make a personal reference to myself, and I cannot do less than respond. I am sure the House will be glad to know that I do not intend to enter at all into the details of the letting of these contracts or the change of contract from one set of men to another, as that subject has been very fully gone into by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). I do think that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), who is certainly very discursive in his observations, was rather unfortunate in the conclusion of his speech, when he charged the Opposition with taking great delight in scandals; and, from the tone of my hon. friend, one would suppose that he believes there are no scandals. Does the hon. gentleman desire to convey the impression that he himself has not been a witness to the discovery and proof of any scandal during this session? I think he will scarcely undertake to say that he has not; and, if it were only necessary to have a scandal in order to bring the Liberal party into power, it seems to me there will be a very short time indeed before that party will be in office. But I do not propose to be led away from the main question under issue in order to discuss these scandals, which, no doubt, Sir, will shortly be brought to your attention. I propose to address myself to the trade aspect of this question entirely. I might, however, premise my remarks by saying that no better argument as to the impossibility almost of creating trade between this country and the West Indies could be found than that which is furnished by the history of what has been described to-night as the "C" service—the service which was undertaken by the company managed by Mr. Baird, running a line of steamers between St. John and Halifax and Yarmouth and Demerara. We find that these gentlemen had to send to the Finance Minister to have their books examined in order to demonstrate to him that they were making a loss, and then we find the Finance Minister increasing the amount of their contract by 50 per cent.; and notwithstanding that increase, we find that those gentlemen were forced to give up that contract, and the gentlemen who took it over received the solace of $15,000 for doing so. But my hon. friend from Halifax, in referring to myself more particularly, said that he knew I would be favourable to this grant because of the importance of the trade to which he said I had referred on a recent occasion in this House, the trade in potatoes between the western portion of Nova Scotia and the Island of Cuba. He pointed out that I had said there was great anxiety on the part of the people with reference to that trade, owing to the new tariff arrangements between the United States and Spain; and he pointed out, further, that these potatoes are perishable articles, for which it is absolutely necessary rapid means of transit should be provided by steamers. Now, I can tell my hon. friend that the chief anxiety of the people engaged in that business in my county is that they should be left severely alone. So far from this subsidy having been any assistance to them, they consider it to have been a positive hindrance, and I will tell the hon. gentleman why. Last year, that trade having grown to such large proportions, four or five gentlemen living in my constituency chartered a steamer and put her on the route between the terminus of a railway in that section and the Island of Cuba. They did not ask any subsidy nor did they want any. If proper relations can be continued between this country and Cuba, if we can be put on the same footing with Cuba as the United States, we are prepared to go on with that trade; and not only do we not ask for a subsidy, but we ask that a subsidy be not granted, because that which has been granted has been a direct interference with the trade. What do we find? Since a steamer has been put on the route by these private gentlemen—and I am happy to say that their venture resulted in a very handsome profit to them—Messrs Pickford & Black, the favourites of the Government, endeavoured to make arrangements, which could only be temporary, of course, with certain speculators in the county to reduce the freight rate on potatoes to the West Indies in order to kill out the legitimate enterprise which had been established by these gentlemen. That is the way the subsidy voted by this Parliament and taken out of the pockets of the people has been made use of. I contend not one dollar of this subsidy goes into the pockets of the people and that it does not in any way aid the trade. So much for the potato trade to which my hon. friend has referred. He criticised the observations of my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), who said that the diminution of the trade of this country with the West Indies was the direct result of the operation of the National Policy. I heartily agree with that statement of my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), notwithstanding the ingenious argument which my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) attempted to adduce against it. My hon. friend from Halifax refers to the trade between the United States and the West Indies, and says that the United States is a more highly protected country than this country. Let me point out to the hon. gentleman that the United States is evidently not satisfied with the trade she is doing with the West Indies, because she is now taking steps to bring about absolute free trade with those Islands. Anyone who has studied political economy knows that, in order to have a large export trade, you must have an import trade, and

that is what the United States is recognizing, and it is taking steps now, as I have said, in order to increase its trade with the West Indies, to have absolute freedom of trade with those countries. My hon. friend stated that there were many natural products which could be exported to the West Indies if there were proper facilities, but he had just before admitted that 16 years ago our trade with the West Indies was greater than it is to-day, and we have had the facilities offered by steamships subsidized by this Government for eighteen months past. The hon. gentleman surely knows that for half a century the Province of Nova Scotia has been exporting the natural products of fish, lumber and potatoes to the West Indies, and has been doing a large trade in each of these articles, and I believe that trade would have gone on increasing; but it seems that there was a feeling in this country, in Government circles, at all events, that we should emulate what was being done in the United States, and that, because trade was growing between the city of New York and the West Indies, we should do something to encourage trade with the West Indies by giving subventions to steamers. But my hon. friend knows well that the steamers to which he refers as plying between the United States and the West Indies are not subsidized steamers; he knows that not a dollar of subsidy is paid to encourage that trade. It is a trade which has grown up naturally and does not require subsidies, just as the trade between the western part of Nova Scotia and Cuba in the article of potatoes was a natural trade, and would have grown if the trade relations had continued to be as favourable between this country and the West Indies as they are between the United States and the West Indies. When this proposal was made to subsidize a line of steamers between Canada and the West Indies it was done with a view of developing the trade. Developing the trade in what respect? I have pointed out that, in so far as the export of fish, lumber and agricultural products is concerned, that trade was carried on to the fullest extent. Then, if there was any trade to be developed between this country and the West Indies it must have been in the way of manufactured goods with return cargoes of fruit, and that is the great trade which is done between the cities of the United States and the West Indies to-day. The Minister of Finance told us, in the concluding part of his speech, that the steamer going from St. John, and plying on what is known as the "C" route, began with a cargo valued at $6,000, and that the last cargo taken by her was valued at $36,000. But he did not tell us what sort of articles she carried. I venture to say that that trade, which is an export trade solely, was simply a displacement of trade, that we were simply taking away from the schooners the trade which legitimately belonged to them, and transferring it to the steamers, so that the subsidy is a positive injury to the large class of people who are engaged in the schooner trade between this country and the West Indies. It was then proposed to develop a trade with the West Indies in manufactured articles. I ask the House how these hon. gentlemen expect to develop a trade in manufactures with the West Indies or any other country, where they have to meet in the open market all the manufactures of other countries, when they are afraid in this country to meet the manufactures of other countries. Here surely, if anywhere, we could meet them on our own ground. They have against them—I refer to manufactures from England and from the United States—the natural disadvantage of distance, and freight rates to pay, but we have to erect barriers of 35 per cent. to keep those manufactures out of this country. Hon. gentlemen propose that we shall go into the West Indies and compete with free trade England and with the United States, when we are afraid to compete with those countries in our own market. Now, with reference to what these vessels are to bring back to this country, I have heard no one speak to-night of return freights. When the hon. the Finance Minister referred to the increase of trade in this particular line of steamers running to the West Indies, which he said had gone up in value from $6,000 to $36,000 per cargo, he referred to the value of the exports alone. If he had taken the trouble to look at the imports—and I have no doubt he knows that very well—he would have to admit that there was no increase in the imports, and there can be none. We have not the market. What is the great article of import which the vessels plying between the United States and the West Indies bring back? Fruit. The banana trade has grown there to immense proportions. If a steamer load of that kind were to be brought into Canada, where would it be disposed of? Take our own cities, such as Toronto and Montreal. Where do they get their supply of this fruit? Is it from steamers coming to Halifax and St. John? I never heard of it, and the manifests do not show it. That trade comes through New York; and unless a fast line of steamers can be put on at an enormous cost that trade will never come direct to Canada. The United States has an enormous consuming population, which we have not in Canada, so it is absurd to expect that we shall receive, within many years, at any rate, any return cargoes from the West Indies. Then, what is the object of giving this subsidy? Simply for no other purpose than to pay these vessels for coming back in ballast. That is the kind of trade it is proposed to tax the tax-payers of this country to build up between Canada and the West Indies. Trade is only desirable when it is profitable, and trade, in order to to be profitable, must be natural. Now, I would ask my hon. friend the Finance Minister, if all these difficulties beset this trade that he is now attempting to build up between this country and the West Indies, what is going to be the result after the treaty comes into force which we were discussing the other day, which has been made between the United States and the West Indies? What will be the result when the Spanish West Indies, San Domingo and the British West Indies are forced into closer trade relations with the United States? What will become of his subsidies then? He will have to increase them enormously in order to control any portion of that trade. In conclusion, I would point out to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance what, in my judgment, is the only remedy for these trade ills which are surrounding us on every side, and that is to adopt the policy of the Liberal party of this country. Instead of going from Dan to Beersheba, from one end of the earth to the other, to find a market, and subsidizing steamers in order to build up a trade, let him adopt the sensible policy of endeavouring to get closer trade relations with that country which it is most natural for us

to trade with, the country lying right alongside of us. When that is done, and when this country is enabled to make a satisfactory treaty of reciprocity with the country to the south of us, then Canada will become a prosperous country, but I venture to say that it will take many subsidies such as the hon. gentleman is defending here to-night to give us the trade with the West Indies or with any other country for which we seem now to be languishing.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister of Finance invited me to amend one of the paragraphs of that resolution. I will make a change in the paragraph referring to the reopening of negotiations by the Minister of Finance, by inserting the names of Pickford & Black, so that it will read that negotiations were reopened with Pickford & Black and Van Wart.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,
Allison,
Amyot,
Armstrong,
Bain,
Barron,
Beaubien,
Béchard,
Beith,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Brown (Chateauguay),
Brown (Monck),
Cameron (Huron),
Campbell,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Christie,
Colter,
Davidson,
Davies,
Dawson,
Devlin,
Edwards,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Fraser,
Frémont,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gibson,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Hargraft,
Harwood,
Hyman,
Innes,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Legris,
Lister,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
McGregor,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Mousseau,
Mulock,
Murray,
Perry,
Préfontaine,
Proulx,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Savard,
Scriver,
Semple,
Simard,
Somerville,
Trow,
Truax,
Vaillancourt,
Watson.—82.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Baker,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bowell,
Burnham,
Burns,
Cameron (Inverness),
Carignan,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Corby,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Davis,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Ives,
Jameson,
Jones,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Léger,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Mackintosh,
McAllister,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McKay,
McKeen,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Monerieff,
Montague,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Pelletier,
Prior,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Skinner,
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brockville).—107.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Barnard,	Mr. Welsh,
Mr. Earle,	Mr. Fauvel,
Mr. Ryckman,	Mr. Delisle,
Sir Donald Smith,	Mr. Mackenzie,
Mr. Wood (Westmoreland),	Mr. King,
Mr. Pope,	Mr. Paterson (Brant),
Mr. Macdowall,	Mr. Sutherland,
Mr. McLean,	Mr. Yeo,
Mr. Ferguson (Leeds & Gr.),	Mr. Spohn,
Mr. McCarthy.	Mr. Bardett.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. members for Quebec County (Mr. Frémont), and Beauce (Mr. Godbout), came into the Chamber after the question was partially read: more than two pages of it were read in French when they entered the Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER. Was the hon. member for Quebec County in the House when the question was put?

Mr. FREMONT. I came into the Chamber when the question was being put by the Chair, and consequently I considered myself present.

Mr. SPEAKER. Was the hon. member for Beauce in the House when the question was put?

Mr. GODBOUT. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I was in the House when the reading of the question commenced, and I have heard it sufficiently, I think, to understand it so as to be able to give my vote.

Mr. TAYLOR. When is the question considered put?

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is as follows:—If a member is not present in the House when the question is put by the Speaker, he cannot have his vote recorded. Let the hon. members answer for themselves. Was the hon. member for Beauce in the House when the question was put?

Mr. GODBOUT. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. Was the hon. member for Quebec County in the House when the question was put?

Mr. FRÉMONT. I came in during the reading of the resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. You must say yes or no.

Mr. FRÉMONT. Yes.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Brandon Post Office..... $16,500

Mr. WATSON. What is the total cost of the Brandon post office?

Mr. FOSTER. The total probable cost is $63,000. This vote is for the completion of the public building.

Mr. WATSON. What is the amount of the original contract?

Mr. FOSTER. The original contract for the building was $31,500.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the architect's estimate of the entire cost?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know; but the contract was for $31,500.

Mr. WATSON. How much was paid for the site?

Mr. FOSTER. $5,460. It takes up four lots, and has a frontage of 96 feet.

Mr. WATSON. From whom was it purchased?

Mr. FOSTER. It was purchased from D. Hopp and W. Proudfoot, and the Scottish Ontario Land Company.

Mr. WATSON. Were public tenders asked for the erection of the building?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; tenders were asked for, and the contract given to John Hanbury, of Brandon, in June, 1889.

Mr. WATSON. Was his the lowest tender?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the Minister not able to give the architect's estimate of the entire cost?

Mr. FOSTER. The estimate of the probable cost is $63,000; that includes land and all fittings, heating apparatus, lighting, and so on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the population and postal revenue of Brandon?

Mr. FOSTER. The postal revenue is $11,000, money orders $83,000.

Mr. MULOCK. What amount is paid in salary to the postmaster?

Mr. HAGGART. The postmaster receives $2,300, and $300 for forwarding allowance, and $340 for rent, fuel and light; there is also a commission on money orders.

Mr. WATSON. How is the balance made up over the amount of $31,500 contract for building?

Mr. FOSTER. The amount for the building contract is as I have stated. The contract for heating is $4,750. There is furniture fittings, and so on, amounting to $8,000, and there is fencing, and footpaths, and incidentals.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is the postmaster there?

Mr. HAGGART. I think he is Mr. Kavanagh.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that he gets a salary of $2,300.

Mr. WATSON. Who is the clerk of works? How long has he been engaged, and what is his salary?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chubb is clerk of works, salary $75 per month, and he is engaged since the contract was gone on with, in June, 1889, I think.

Mr. MULOCK. There are $8,000 yet to be accounted for?

Mr. FOSTER. There must have been some additions to the original contract in order to make up the difference. The deputy will make a note of that, and I will be able to give an explanation later.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the item had better stand until the information is brought before the Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it is necessary for it to stand.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is. The Committee cannot discharge its duties intelligently and vote this sum of money unless the Minister gives an explanation about the $8,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I have explained every item, and stated that there must be some extras on the contract.

Mr. MULOCK. We have a little experience in dealing with extras, and as the time is coming for putting an end to that business we cannot begin earlier than to-night. The Minister speculates that this $8,000 must be for extras, but he has not the faintest idea of what it is for. Yet the hon. gentleman will not allow the item to stand. I think it would be very wrong that the Minister should press it without giving us that information. The House and the country has had a good deal of experience in extras, and for my part I protest against this vote being passed until the Minister gives us the necessary information.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the request made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is a very reasonable one indeed. If we discharge our functions, and properly scrutinize these items, it is not only our right but it is our duty to ask the Government to give us full information as to the mode in which they spend the money, and if the Government is unable to account for $8,000 of a vote it is an unbusinesslike way to allow it to pass. While I am on my feet I wish to call attention to the general principle of the votes that we are giving for erecting public buildings. Here is a town of some 4,000 or 5,000 inhabitants, and I suppose it is a town that is likely to increase in size. We are now asked to expend $63,000 in that town, and the interest upon that sum at 4 per cent. is something over $2,500 a year, which represents the rental for a post office building in a town of 4,000 or 5,000 inhabitants. I cannot help saying that that is an extravagant mode of doing business, and under such a system as that we can easily account for the enormous debt and the enormous expenditure of this country. In the United States I believe they not only do not erect a building in a town of this size, but they confine the post office to a rental of about $500 a year. I may be mistaken in the amount, but I think it is the maximum allowance that the Government of the United States will pay for a post office in a town of this size, while here we are proposing to build a post office

the interest on the expenditure of which will be five times as much as the allowance for rent in the United States would be. We have gone too fast and too far in this system of erecting public buildings in small towns, and it is good time to consider whether we cannot economize in this matter without injury to the public service. I think this vote is an excessive one anyway, and whether it is excessive or not the House is entitled to know how this money will be spent. They are not to take it for granted that this $8,000 will be all right, that it does not matter, and that it should not be subject to criticism. We should know how the Government propose to expend this money.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no objection at all to the information being given, but my hon. friend from North York preferred a demand rather than a request.

Mr. MULOCK. I used the word "suggest" to begin with.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we should be reasonable in passing these Estimates. I find that the contract for the main building was $31,500, but up to the 16th of March, 1891, $44,500 has been spent, out of which you take the $6,000 for the site, leaving $38,000 in round numbers; and I find that there is a balance due on the 16th of March, 1891, on a contract for additional work, of $4,000, which would make in all for the building $42,000, or something like $10,000 above the original contract. I find that this building is not simply a post office, but it comprises also the Custom-house, the examining warehouse, a gas inspection office, the weights and measures office, the inland revenue office and the land office on the first and second floors, as well as the caretaker's chamber, and the attic is to remain unfinished at present. These are under contract, and the money is due upon them. I think we shall have to vote the amount, and I will lay the full explanation on the Table to-morrow if they are wished for, so that they will be had before concurrence. The information may be satisfactory to my hon. friend the moment he sees it.

Mr. CHARLTON. If it were not satisfactory, we could not stop and discuss it on concurrence.

Mr. DALY. If the hon. member for North Norfolk will take the trouble to look at the Postmaster General's Report he will find that the postal revenue of the Brandon post office last year amounted to $11,232, the number of money orders were 2,322, the amount of money orders issued was $37,682, and the total amount of money orders paid was $44,776.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have seen all that.

Mr. DALY. If the hon. gentleman has seen all this, I think it would be sufficient to show him that this office is a necessity, and he would find that towns in Ontario, which are forty or fifty years of age, do not produce within $3,000 or $4,000 of the amount of postal revenue that the city of Brandon does. I may state, for the information of the hon. gentleman, that there are not over eight places in the Province of Ontario, excluding the cities of Toronto, Hamilton, Kingston and Ottawa, that have a larger revenue than the city of Brandon. As the hon. Finance Minister has stated, this building is not alone for post office purposes, but is to be used also for a land office, a Custom-house, an inland revenue office, a weights and measures office, and other purposes. The receipts of the Brandon land office are larger than those of any other land office in Manitoba or the North-West Territories, and the requirements are such, that a few years ago the building, which was then occupied as a post office and land office, was destroyed by fire, and, as it had not the proper vault accommodation, thousands of records were lost, greatly to the inconvenience of the Government and the public. In this building large vaults have been placed, so that the records of the several departments will be preserved. This building has remained in an uncompleted condition for six or seven months, and the people are waiting patiently for the accommodation until hon. gentlemen opposite allow these Estimates to pass. I am constantly in receipt of communications asking me why the building is not completed, and I have simply to reply that, until the Opposition allow these Estimates to pass, the people will have to remain without this accommodation.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman was not here last night, or he would not have made the statement he has. He talks about the large revenue of the Brandon post office. It was pointed out last night that in Woodstock there is a revenue of $15,432, and there is no post office there. So that the hon. gentleman can see that there are places in Ontario which yield a larger revenue than Brandon and which have no post offices, and I will tell him the reason why. Brandon is represented by a supporter of the Government, while the County of Oxford never sends a man here to support the Tory party. It is a good, honest, intelligent constituency, and it sends men here to represent honest principles, and the result is that it cannot get a post office or any other public building; but simply because Brandon sends my hon. friend here it gets a post office. These post offices are peddled around from one constituency to another, wherever they can do the most good.

Mr. DALY. Does the hon. gentleman insinuate that I am here to represent dishonest principles? I want the hon. gentleman to understand that I come here to represent just as honest principles as he or any other member of this House does. I want him to understand that my election was fought on as good principles as his, and particularly on the question of unrestricted reciprocity, and if the contest had lasted a week longer I would have had 600 majority instead of 400. The hon. gentleman asked for a post office at Listowel, which has a two-penny-half-penny revenue of $4,129, and one at Mount Forest, which has a two-penny-half-penny revenue of $3,902. I did not ask the late Minister of Public Works for this Custom-house, post office, inland revenue office and Dominion lands office until I felt that I was perfectly justified by the facts and figures in asking for this building as an absolute necessity; and if it is a fact that Woodstock has not a public building that is Woodstock's misfortune, and if the people of Woodstock send representatives here who do not show that enlightenment that others do, I suppose they will have to suffer.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman makes a statement that is not true. He says I demanded post offices for Listowel and Mount Forest. I have not made such a demand; but I compared the

revenue at those points with the revenue at other points where post offices have been built. For instance, take St. Henri, in the Province of Quebec, where the revenue was only $423, and in towns like Mount Forest, and Listowel, and Harrison, where the revenue is much larger, no such buildings are erected. It is a gross injustice to build a post office at St. Henri, where the revenue is so small, and leave other places with a revenue of $4,000 and $5,000 without post offices. Yet the hon. Finance Minister laughs. Perhaps he can afford to.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not deny me some little luxury.

Mr. McMULLEN. We do not wish to do that: we understand what the hon. gentleman's laugh means: but, at the same time, we consider it our duty to discuss these points. I do not find fault with the erection of a building at Brandon if it is considered a necessity. Possibly the accommodation to be had there was so very poor that this building is a necessity; but we want to have an estimate of what it will cost. The hon. gentleman says it will cost $63,000, but he can only account for $48,000. The balance he says is extras. Well, $10,000 or so in extras is a little too much to put in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have done this thing before, and we always found the estimate exceeded by fifty or a hundred per cent. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Daly) has complained that the building has been standing there unfinished for seven or eight months and nothing done. I would ask the Finance Minister if there is not a clerk of works in charge, and whether he is being paid all this time, while waiting until Parliament will vote the money necessary to go on with the work?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) denies that he ever asked for any post office for Mount Forest, Listowell and Harrison. Why, not later than last night he made that demand. He said there were post offices being put up in other places, and asked why there were none at Mount Forest, Listowell and Harrison. He has again brought up the question of Woodstock. I have heard many hon. gentlemen opposite refer to the fact that Woodstock, which has a revenue of $15,000, has no post office. The hon. gentleman ought to state the whole facts. Some years ago a gentleman put up a suitable building for a post office in that town and rented it to the Government for $400 or $500 a year, for a term of years; that building is in a central position and supplies all the wants of the town, and the town is not suffering in any way for want of postal facilities. I have no doubt that if other men in other places would put up suitable buildings similar arrangements could be arrived at, and these places would have all the accommodation they could desire. It has been said that the Government are building post offices only in those constituencies where they get political support. Well, we have a town in the riding of West York, which, in the near future, will be entitled to ask for additional postal accommodation, but which has not yet asked for it, although West Toronto Junction is a town estimated to contain 6,000 or 7,000 people. We have not even asked the Government to build a post office there, but we think a good time is coming in the near future, when in a year or two we will have 12,000 to 15,000 people there, and will then be in a position to ask the Government to build a post office; and I have no doubt, this Government being in power, as it undoubtedly will be, we will have a magnificent post office in that town.

Mr. CHARLTON. No doubt the hon. member for West York is correct in anticipating that when he asks the Government for an appropriation for a post office he will, in all probability, get it. He is not at all counting without his host in this matter, but I am afraid my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) will not meet with the same consideration should he make a similar demand. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), in dealing with the case of Woodstock, has stated a fact which illustrates the very principle I have urged the Government to adopt. Woodstock has a population of about 12,000 and a postal revenue of over $15,000, yet it has not been necessary to erect a post office there, because the Government have been able to rent suitable quarters for $400 or $500 a year.

Mr. WALLACE. The building was put up specially for that purpose.

Mr. CHARLTON. That does not matter. What I contend is, that in the case of Brandon and scores of other towns, where larger appropriations are expended in the erection of postal buildings, the Government might pursue the policy they adopted at Woodstock, and rent buildings. The building the Government propose to erect at Brandon will cost us in interest $2,500 at 4 per cent. a year, whereas, in Woodstock, which has three times the population, the people are well accommodated at a cost of $500 a year, because the Government have rented premises there, instead of putting up a building of their own. In the United States, where they have had long experience in postal matters, and have an admirable system, and where they have succeeded in making their postal service almost meet expenses on a postage of 2 cents per letter, they have pursued the policy of erecting post offices only in large cities, such as New York, Philadelphia and Buffalo. There is a sliding scale and rule in the department, which restricts the Government to the allowance of a certain rental in towns of a certain size, and having a certain amount of postal revenue, and the town of Brandon, under the American rule, would not be given an allowance of more than $500 a year for the rental of a post office. Yet our Government are asking us to vote an amount, the interest on which, in connection with the amounts already voted, will amount to $2,500 per year. The whole system is wasteful and extravagant, and is pursued for the very purpose the hon. member for West York has stated, when he says that in good time he will be able to get a post office in his riding. That is the policy pursued by the Government, the policy of making grants to hon. members, such as the hon. member for West York and others supporting the Government. The hon. member for Brandon waxed very warm in his defence of the Government in this matter. He says it is highly necessary to give the little town of Brandon $63,000 for a post office. I believe, that town could be adequately supplied with all the necessary postal facilities by a grant of $500 a year. The hon. gentleman told us there were only eight towns in Ontario that have a larger postal revenue than Brandon. He is entirely mistaken. There are thirteen or fourteen towns in Ontario which have a

larger postal revenue than the town of Brandon, and I trust his statements are more correct in other cases than in this.

Mr. DALY. I am perfectly correct in saying there are only eight towns. Of course, I did not include towns such as Toronto.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman said there were eight towns, including Toronto, Hamilton and Paris.

Mr. DALY. If I did so, I was mistaken, for I find there are thirteen exactly.

Mr. CHARLTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of very great importance to this country to reduce its expenses. We have a public debt of nearly $50 a head, while the United States has a public debt of less than $15 a head. It is a matter of some consequence for us to see whether we are handicapped in the race of progress or not. When we have an enormous public debt, and enormous annual burdens, and cannot adopt a policy which is calculated to advance public prosperity because of the burden of taxation which weighs upon our shoulders, it behooves us to reduce our public burdens and to practise economy, and we should commence by curtailing these enormous expenditures on public buildings, such as this expenditure of $63,000 for public buildings in a little country town like Brandon. We should adopt a business system in our expenditures on public buildings and public works. The sooner the Government realize that in the public interest they should stop these excessive appropriations the better for the country. We have lately unearthed a great many transactions which have aroused public attention, and this is a time when we had better attempt at least to give the people economical government and honest government, and then we will put an end to the system of favouritism in the construction of public buildings all over this Dominion. What we are now discussing is a question of favouritism in the town of Brandon. If that district were represented by anyone who was not a supporter of the Government, does anybody suppose that an appropriation would be asked for a post office there? No; it would be placed in the category of Woodstock, where a building is rented for $500 a year and is pronounced ample for all the purposes for which it is required, as the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has declared. We ought to see if we cannot manage to remove from the shoulders of the people some of the heavy burdens which are now laid upon them.

Mr. WATSON. While agreeing with the general principle laid down by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I cannot agree with him that there are no grounds for erecting a public building in the city of Brandon. When we compare that city with some of the towns for which we passed votes last night, I say it is entitled to a public building. It is a growing town, and has a population of between 4,000 and 5,000, and the revenues received there are large. Take the town I live in, Portage la Prairie. It has a revenue of $7,500, and yet we voted last night tens of thousands of dollars for public buildings in towns with revenues of only $600 or $700. If the line were laid down in regard to revenues, there is no doubt that Brandon would come in. It is true that $63,000 is a very large amount for a public building for a town of the size of Brandon, but when we learn that is for a land office, a Custom-house and a post office combined, it does not seem so very extravagant. However, what we want to know is how the money is spent. As I said last night, we have reason to believe that all the money we vote is not expended as this House intends it should be. There is a discrepancy of $8,000 here between the amount expended and the amount for which the hon. gentleman who has charge of these Estimates can give an explanation. I will not discuss our elections in the North-West. I will not discuss whether the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) would have been better off after two weeks more time to canvass, though I doubt if he would; neither will I discuss the cry he says he used against unrestricted reciprocity during that election. His constituents will have to judge of his action in regard to that matter. I will not discuss his support of honest government and honest principles, and the way in which he has carried that out. That is another matter for his constituents to judge of. What I want to get at is, what this money is to be spent for. If there is a discrepancy of $8,000 which cannot be explained, I think the item should stand until some explanation can be given.

Mr. FOSTER. I will have to give the explanation again. I do not think there is any possibility that any of this money is going into the elections, or is to be devoted to any other purposes than those for which it is voted.

Mr. WATSON. You are $8,000 short.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an amount of $31,500 for the building, $4,750 for the heating, and that makes $36,250. Then you must add $5,460 for the price of the lot, and you may round that up by expenditures which I suppose are necessarily incurred in getting the land, and the like of that. Then I find that, not for election expenses or anything of that sort, there was a total expenditure up to the 16th March, 1891, on the building, on the land and the contracts, of $44,500.

Mr. WATSON. What is that spent for?

Mr. FOSTER. For land and on the contracts. Then there is a balance due on March 16th.

Mr. MULOCK. If you want the Committee to give credit for the $44,000, it will be necessary to explain the difference between the figures you have given and the $44,000. The totals you have given do not amount to the gross sum you say has been spent.

Mr. FOSTER. I am trying to show that $44,581 had been spent on the contracts and the land up to the 16th March.

Mr. ALLISON. Is that item of $41,710 included in the $44,000?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. The amount expended up to the 16th March and due on the contract and additional works amounts in round numbers to $49,000. That leaves a difference of between $7,000 and $8,000. The only explanation I know of is that the $7,000 or $8,000 is expenditure over and above contract price.

Mr. WATSON. That is what we want to know.

Mr. FOSTER. That is information I have not here now, but I will bring it down. It is evident that it has gone into additions to the building, such, for instance, as the vaults.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think you had better let the item stand.

Mr. FOSTER. If the House is to take the position that every item in regard to which explanations cannot be given immediately is to stand, we might as well let the Committee rise. The hon. gentleman has had a fair explanation. It is patent to the Committee, and, as I have stated, the explanation will be brought down.

Mr. CHARLTON. I cannot see what difference it makes whether we let the vote stand now till we get explanations or wait till concurrence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There was an announcement last evening that $60 were charged for steps three feet long for a certain post office that would cost only $2 or $3. The hon. gentleman knows that there has been a great deal of enquiry with regard to the management of this particular Department of Public Works, and these extraordinary excesses on every contract, no matter how simple the building may be, is certainly a suspicious circumstance, and the House is under obligation to the public to enquire with some care into all these excesses. I do not think it is an unreasonable request that the Minister should give full explanations with regard to this $7,290 before the item is passed. This is a very large percentage. What is there in the construction of a building of this sort that would lead an architect to go so much astray, or to be so careless in the preparation of his estimates?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is too suspicious about everything. I do not suppose he will maintain that a public building can be let to contract and can be finished within a dollar of the contract price. If he has ever built a house for himself, as no doubt he has, he will find that the estimate of the cost and the actual cost do not always tally. There is here only a discrepancy of $7,000 on a total of $63,000, which is not a large percentage.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). $7,000 on $41,000.

Mr. DEVLIN. I have called attention already this session to a point which is somewhat similar to those mentioned in discussion; it was about the Buckingham post office.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not on that item.

Mr. DEVLIN. You are on the Brandon post office, and your generosity with respect to the Brandon post office induces me to believe that you might be just if not generous in another point. To show how these building are distributed, I will take Aylmer East, whose gross postal revenue is only $1,238, and I find it has a post office costing over $12,000. Of course, I do not complain of that; on the contrary, I am perfectly satisfied. Take the City of Hull: it affords a gross postal revenue of $2,974, and I am informed by the Minister of Public Works that the post office of that city has cost over $30,000, and I do not complain of this. Now, the town of Buckingham, in the County of Ottawa, has a postal revenue of $2,327, much larger than that of Aylmer, and the money orders issued amounted to $19,968; so that, according to revenue and business, the town of Buckingham is as important as either Aylmer or Hull. Notwithstanding the fact that petitions have come to the Government over and over again asking for the establishment of a proper post office in the town of Buckingham, they have invariably been disregarded. The petitions, I know as a fact, have been presented generally on the eve of an election, and although perhaps the promise then held out was not an official one, still, it was asserted on many platforms that this post office would be erected. Yet they have but a little side building there, which I believe some time ago was broken into and robbed, and much money lost; it is a little side-room, the rental of which is only $100. In the consideration of this item for the Brandon post office it is well that we should exercise some caution, when we find that something like $64,000 is generously and quickly voted, whereas in a point of such importance as Buckingham nothing is done. Is it possible that unjustifiable delay is inflicted because the town of Buckingham happens to be in a county which does not send a supporter of the Government to this House?

Mr. FOSTER. Question.

Mr. DEVLIN. The question may not be interesting to you, but it is interesting to the people of my county. It is useless for me to draw your attention to these matters; I would get about the same answer which has been given to so many deputations that have waited upon the Government. Last night, when reference was made to the post office at Woodstock, you did not call question, nor did you call question when reference was made to many other post offices; but the moment that I mention a place, where a grave injustice is done, then you call question.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) stated that last night I demanded a post office for one or two places in my riding. The hon. gentleman's ears must have deceived him, for I challenge him to take up the *Hansard* and read it over and point out where I made any such a demand. The hon. gentleman makes the statement at random, and he does not attempt to educate himself as to the facts before he gets up and makes charges. I repeat what I said last night, that we can build post offices in places like St. Henri, St. Jérome, and other places in the Province of Quebec that do not give over $2,000 or $3,000 of a revenue, but the Government pass over places like Mount Forest and Harriston. I mentioned this last night, but I made no demand for a post office. In connection with this vote, we are quite willing, I am sure, on this side, to vote an item where a well-defined and well-outlined statement is presented of the reason for which the money is to be expended. Now, we are willing to vote the amount the hon. gentleman asks for, less the $7,000 for which he cannot give a satisfactory reason. If you will deduct that sum we will pass the vote. The late Minister of Public Works estimated the total cost at $31,500; we have now spent $49,000, and we are asked to increase it to $63,000, $7,000 of which cannot be explained. The item should be allowed to stand until the explanation is forthcoming.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The request made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is a reasonable and proper one. We know the administration of the Public Works Department has been scandalous during the last few years, and this is only another exhibition of it. A building that was estimated to cost $31,500 has had $49,000 already expended on it. We do not expect the Minister of Finance to know the details, but he should learn them from

the officers of the department, and we should not be asked to pass these items without explanation. This is another proof of the incapacity of the officers and the head of the Department of Public Works, and I feel very loathe to vote one dollar to be expended by the Public Works Department until there is a complete change of every officer from the head down to the foot. They have not entered into a single contract for the last 10 or 12 years in which there have not been changes and alterations made, and the amount asked for has been exceeded by double and sometimes treble. We must obtain the explanation required in connection with this item. The officers of the department should have furnished the Minister of Finance with all the information, and we have the sorry exhibition of $49,000 having been spent, and the Government cannot tell the purposes for which it was spent. Under these circumstances, the item should stand until the officers have an opportunity to look over the matter and give particulars as to where the money was spent. It is anything but a business-like transaction to spend $63,000 in a place the size of Brandon, with the amount of revenue there collected, especially when by spending $400 or $500 annually the Government would be able to secure a good building. The fact is, there has been so much boodling, robbing, stealing and swindling going on under the administration of the Public Works Department during the last few years that it is our bounden duty to insist on the fullest information being furnished before money is spent by the present officers of the department.

Mr. HYMAN. The case of the Brandon post office is like several of those discussed last evening. First, there is a sum put in the Estimates for the purchase of land. Next year we have an amount for the contract. Next year we have an amount for extras and to complete. It seems to me, as a business man, that this Committee should insist that when any item is put in the Estimates the House should be put in possession of full information as to the amount of contract. We found last night that the same method was pursued in the case of other buildings as has been followed in regard to the Brandon post office. First, an estimate was put in for a certain sum. That money was expended, and in some instances not expended in the purchase of land. But even then the House was not put in possession of information to enable members to tell what the total expenditure would be for that particular purpose. That is the way the present vote is attempted to be forced through the present Committee. It is only right and proper that we should be placed in possession of the fullest information. We have at present these facts: that a certain amount of money was paid for the land, that a contract was entered into for the building, also contracts for heating and other matters, making in all $54,000. We are told in addition that the total expenditure will be $63,000. Surely we are asking nothing unfair in requesting the Government to allow the item to stand until we are put in possession of information in regard to the difference between $54,000 and $63,000. I quite understand the position of the Minister of Finance, who cannot be expected to have at his fingers' ends the details of the department, but we have a right to those details, and he should obtain them from the department before we are asked to pass this item.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is trifling with the Committee, after the reasonable request for information to which we are entitled, to insist on pressing this vote. I trust the Minister of Finance will understand that it cannot be done very readily. We stand in the position that we are entitled to the information. We readily understand that the Minister of Finance may not have the information. He may believe the matter is all right; but there are reasons which lead us to think it is our duty, before voting money, to know to what it is to be ultimately applied. I do not want to offer factious opposition in this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. Hon. gentlemen opposite will swallow anything, and not hesitate to vote tens of thousands of dollars without stopping to make enquiries. We are here as custodians of the public interest. We are sent here to vote the public money and to keep down taxation, and we have a right to obtain this information before passing this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. It is plainly seen that the matter does not end there. My hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) says he is anxious to have this item explained, but the debate is not over before my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) rises and says that he is going to take a point in advance, and actually left it to be understood by the Committee that he does not think a dollar ought to be voted until every officer in the Public Works Department has been turned out and some one else put in. It is plain to be seen that the object of the Opposition side is that the item shall not be voted, and if one piece of information is given another will be demanded, and so it will be tried to prevent the vote. I think I have made a fair proposition to the House. Hon. gentlemen know that I am not the head of that department, and that I am simply doing the best I can. They know well that the gentleman here is not the gentleman who formerly has been here to give the information on the facts. I will bring the information down to-morrow, and why should not the items pass, especially when behind this objection comes up the threatening form that other demands will be made.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the hon. gentleman from Kent (Mr. Campbell) must be responsible for his sayings. He stated that——

Mr. WATSON. I do not see that the Minister who has charge of these items has any reason for complaint. He is the Finance Minister, and after the exposures that have been made in connection with the Public Works Department he should wish to know how this $9,000 is added to the cost of the building.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to know, and I propose that the Committee shall know before the item is finally passed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As I understand this item, the Minister has shown that the original estimate for this building was $41,710, and he says there has been spent beyond that $7,290, making $49,000 in all, and he is asking a further appropriation of $14,850, so that the appropriation he is now asking for, added to the expenditure which has already taken place, amounts to something in the neighbourhood of $64,000—some $22,290 in excess of the original estimate.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is all wrong on that point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to call his attention to what was said last year. Sir Hector Langevin being interrogated in regard to this Brandon post office, said :

"The amount expended up to the 31st December last is $16,919. When the work is completed it will have cost between $45,000 and $48,000. After this vote is taken we will have only about $550 to ask."

That was the statement last year. My hon. friend will see that Sir Hector Langevin, the Minister of Public Works, was gravely in error in the statement he made to the House of at least $15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. In view of that, I will let the item stand. If that statement was made I think an explanation is necessary, and we will see where the explanation comes in.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Winnipeg immigrant buildings—To complete..... $2,000

Mr. MULOCK. What is the explanation of this?

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend want all the explanation?

Mr MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. This vote of $2,000 is required for completing during the fiscal year 1891-92, as per subjoined estimates of the chief architect, the immigrant building which is being erected at Winnipeg on lots Nos. 46, 47 and 48, Maple street, to replace that destroyed by fire. Total expenditure incurred up to March 16, 1891, $16,981.81; balance due on contract and additional works, March 16, 1891, $2,647; furniture and fittings ordered, $16; cooking ranges, &c., ordered, $585; one basin for agent's office, $50; fencing and footpaths, $660; superintendence and incidental expenses, $939; heating, electric lighting, removal of old building, and fitting up same as wood and coal shed, removing caretaker's house and repairing same, &c., covered by vote in Supplementary Estimates, 1890-91, $2,000; total probable cost of new immigrant building, $24,678.81. Deduct total expenditure up to March 16, 1891, $16,981.81; balance on hand, March 16, 1891, $3,697; vote in Supplementary Estimates, 1891, to reimburse Department of Agriculture out of their immigration appropriation for 1890-91, $2,000—total, $22,678.81. Grant required to complete in 1891-92, $2,000; contract No. 1793—on construction of building, $13,736; contractors, Dryden & Charlesworth, of Winnipeg; date of contract, 13th September, 1890; date of contract completion, 15th January, 1891; building heated with hot air and hot water by E. & C. Gurney & Co., at a cost of $950, the tender of this company being the lowest of the five received; building handed over to the Department of Agriculture on the 2nd April, 1891. The building measures 126¾ by 30¾ feet, is all of wood above ground, and has two stories and attic, with a kitchen in the rear, the whole standing over a basement of stone. The basement contains a wash-room, fuel-room, bath-room, w. c's., and the store-rooms. On the ground floor are located the men's and women's wards, the kitchen, intelligence office, agents' and assistants' offices, &c., and on the first floor additional men's and women's wards, dressing-rooms, store-rooms and baggage-rooms.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister of Finance whether he stated that the original contract was for some $13,000.

Mr. FOSTER. $13,736.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood him to read from the memorandum that the total expenditure up to the 16th March, 1891, was $16,981.81. What was the difference on?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose part of it goes for land, which cost $5,000.

Mr. MULOCK. I observe, in addition to this, the $16,981 is called balance on work, so that it would appear there was something spent on the contract before that.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon; I did not read it in that way. I read that the total expenditure incurred up to 16th March, 1891, was $16,981.81.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood the Minister to say that the item was $2,647.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a balance due on the contract and for additional work.

Mr. MULOCK. If the $16,981 was on the contract, and the balance on the contract and on additional works is $2,647, that brings the amount up to over $19,000 on an original contract of $13,700, or an addition of $6,000. I would ask the Minister to explain that difference.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know any explanation, unless the cost of the land was taken in. The land was bought in 1888 from Mr. A. M. McIntyre, at a cost of $5,000.

Mr. WATSON. When was the first vote taken for this building?

Mr. FOSTER. In 1888, which corresponds with the time of buying the land, and the expenditure in 1888 was just $5,041, which would pay for the lot, I suppose, and the little expenses which were necessary in connection with it.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister should be able to say whether that is on the contract or on the land. Can anybody give the information?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the information given ought to be satisfactory.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister says that he thinks this $19,000 includes the purchase of the land. We are simply asked to draw conclusions. Certainly the Minister in charge of these votes should give us authoritative statements. Does he take the responsibility of saying that the cost of the lot was included in this item, or does he simply quote from the paper put into his hands? He ought to know whether the purchase money of the land is included in this sum or not. He is the responsible person, and not the book. He cannot take shelter under the book.

Mr. WATSON. I think we are entitled to this information, and we will stay here until we get it. The Opposition are not responsible for the fact that we have not a Minister of Public Works who knows these items, and the very fact that there is a vacant chair there ought to make us more particular about passing these items. I understand that the hon. gentleman has his deputy sitting beside the chair,

who might be able to give the information, because we have been given to understand lately that the deputies in the public departments know a great deal more than the Ministers.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would like to call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the peculiar position occupied by the hon. gentlemen who are discussing this item to-night. The Minister in charge of the estimates has given the Committee full information, and some gentlemen propose that the item shall not be passed because the Minister of Finance will not pledge his own word as to his personal knowledge that the statements on which the estimates are being passed are correct. I wish to say this: that such an assurance will not be given on the personal responsibility of any member of the Government. We are not in a position to tell the House the details of the expenditures in different parts of the country from our own knowledge and information at all. We are obliged to give the information with which the departments furnish us, and when we give that information we give all that we possibly can. To ask that a Minister in charge of Estimates should be put in the position of a witness, who has to make his statements on his personal knowledge, is to ask that which is entirely impossible. We can only give this information as it is furnished us by others, and not on our personal knowledge.

Mr. HYMAN. Do I understand that when statements are made in the House they are simply made on the responsibility of the officers in the departments, and that we have not Ministers who are prepared to state that they have any knowledge of the fact?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HYMAN. That is the statement of the hon. Minister of Justice. He tells us that we have to accept the statements of the officers of departments.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Certainly. Does the hon. gentleman suppose, for instance, that when I ask a vote for penitentiary buildings I am supposed to know the size of the masonry, the number of men employed, the number of tools they use, the number of nails driven? Everything of that kind which I give to the House I give on the responsibility of the officers from the information which they give me; and I could not attend to the duties of the Government or the department if I travelled around the country looking after these details.

Mr. HYMAN. I merely ask whether we are to accept the statement of the Minister of Finance. The simple statement is that there has been an expenditure of $5,041 for land, and we want to know whether that is included in the $16,000 or not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Minister states that he is so informed.

Mr. MULOCK. No; the hon. Minister of Finance has read no statement from any officer stating that the cost of the land was included in the amount of the expenditure. He only guesses it is so.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I heard him say it twice.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that the hon. Minister of Finance simply draws the deduction that such is the case from the information before him.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the Minister if the cost of the land is included in this amount. If the Minister says yes, he has the information there, we will accept it.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister will say what he has already said. That is the information as given here. I find that this land was purchased from A. M. McIntyre on the 3rd of March, 1888, at a cost of $5,000; in that year a vote was taken and an expenditure made of $5,041 directly after; and the total expenditure up to 16th March, 1891, was $16,981. I cannot draw any other inference than that. I have been passing Estimates here for three years, and I have seen a great many Estimates passed, and I have never seen quite such a scene in the House before on an item of this kind.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand the position of affairs is somewhat changed. According to the position the hon. Minister of Justice takes we are not in possession of the information as to whether the department itself says this $4,500 is included in the Estimates or not. The hon. Finance Minister says he finds from the statement placed before him by the department that there has been an expenditure of $4,500 on land. I am perfectly satisfied to take that information, if the hon. Minister is prepared to state that the department says the $4,500 is included in the $16,000. He does not say that, but says that the deduction from the information before him is that such is the case. He does not say the department says so.

Public Buildings generally—Manitoba..$2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that what may be called the ordinary expenses of repairs and caretaking in those public buildings, or is it for a special purpose?

Mr. FOSTER. It is to cover the cost of any unforeseen works, improvements or repairs that may have to be carried on during the fiscal year in the Province of Manitoba.

Winnipeg Military Buildings—Fort Osborne $1,500

Mr. FOSTER. This is to make provision for the construction of a new guard-room and hospital at Fort Osborne, as requested by the Militia Department. The new guard-room will cost $750 and the new hospital $2,000.

Mr. MULOCK. Are they under contract at present.

Mr. FOSTER. I should think not, as the vote is not given.

Public Buildings generally—North-West Territories $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is the same as the item for Manitoba. It is to meet unforeseen works, improvements and repairs during the year.

Residence for Lieutenant-Governor, Regina, including stables and other outbuildings, fencing, roadways, &c..... $6,310

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know what the total cost of the residence for the Lieutenant Governor is going to amount to.

We are asked this year for $6,310, and last year we voted $22,000 for the same purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. The total cost of the residence, including stables, outhouses and grounds, is $60,355.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to call the attention of the House seriously to this. It does appear to me that the idea of expending $60,000 for the residence of such a functionary as the Lieutenant Governor of our North-West Territories is a huge mistake. It is about as gross a piece of extravagance as one can imagine. His income is about $7,000 a year, and why on earth ought he to have a residence costing $60,000 provided for him? Ordinarily speaking, a man occupying a $60,000 house would require, to keep it up and live in a style befitting the house, an income much more closely approximating $27,000 than $7,000. I think we are making a tremendous mistake in providing functionaries of this class, who ought really to be to some extent business men, with residences of this kind. It is absurd to suppose they can keep a court there. There is no doubt whatever that men in a house like that will be tempted to spend more than the sum we are able to give them for their ordinary expense. A building costing one quarter the amount would be amply sufficient for all legitimate purposes as the residence of the Governor in that territory.

Mr. FOSTER. It is almost too late now to raise the point, as the expenditure is pretty nearly all made. Of course, the building will last a long time; and as the North-West Territories become developed and populated it will remain as the Government building of that territory.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What was the original estimate of cost?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell. What I have here is the probable cost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The mere fact that we were not advised, as I was certainly not, that we were about to expend that sum for the erection of a residence for the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, does not alter the question of policy I have raised. Every practical man knows well that if you put an official in a very expensive house you add enormously to his expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt the expenditure is a large one.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the extent of the reserve of grounds? What is the building constructed of? Who received the contract? Was it let by tender? Who is in charge as clerk of the work? What progress is being made with the building?

Mr. FOSTER. The new residence we erected on the Government reserve; the walls are of stone in foundation and of brick above ground. The partitions, the floors and roofs are of wood. The main building is 64 feet 6 inches by 55 feet. Additions for servants, offices and bedrooms, 56 feet by 42 feet. The basement contains furnace, fuel and stoves, and a brick tank for rain and well water. The ground floor contains a lobby, vestibule, halls, stairs, dining-room, two drawing-rooms, library, wine vaults, billiard room, housekeeping room, kitchen, servants' hall, brick safe and lavatory, &c. On the first floor there are fifteen bedrooms, two dressing rooms with baths, and a bath room, &c. The contract was given on the 19th of March, 1889. The contract price was $26,950. The heating apparatus was also let by tender, the contract price being $5,150.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is it heated with?

Mr. FOSTER. Hot water.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Minister of Public Works last year, in reply to Mr. Wilson, who asked how much the residence for the Lieutenant Governor at Regina was going to cost, replied that it was expected it would cost about $42,000 altogether. Now we are asked for $61,000. This is another instance of the good management displayed by the officers of the Public Works Department.

Mr. FOSTER. That estimate was only for the Lieutenant Governor's residence, and did not take in the outhouses and stables and grounds. I have the figures here, showing that the building itself and furniture and fittings would cost $45,000, but there are besides the outhouses, &c.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The answer given by the Minister of Public Works that it would cost $42,000 altogether would be interpreted by the House to mean everything possibly connected with the building.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. Minister ought to insist on his officers ascertaining what the whole thing has cost.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole cost would be about $60,000, which includes outhouses, stables and grounds.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Have there been any changes in the building itself.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who got the contract?

Mr. FOSTER. The contract was held by Henderson, of Toronto.

Mr. DAVIN. A first-rate Reformer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When this item was first introduced it had a very modest appearance. It read: "Residence for Lieutenant Governor, $12,000." That was as late as 28th April, 1890.

Mr. FOSTER. That must have been part of the vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is stated that this is to carry on the work of construction, as Sir Hector Langevin appears to have stated. The botheration of all this is, that we are seldom put in possession of all the information. I am not blaming the Minister of Finance in this matter. I think the party to be blamed is the Departement of Public Works, and probably the late head of it. Instead of stating the amount the work is to cost, we are presented with little patches of it in this way.

Mr. FOSTER. Shreds and patches.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Shreds and patches, if you like, but the worst of it is that the patches grow so confoundedly. Now we find that the cost will run up to $60,000 or $61,000, or perhaps more. The item in the estimate at first is only $12,000, and no information is given unless there is a very close and critical examination, such as my

hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) is now instituting.

Mr. MULOCK. They do not seem to appreciate it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Finance Minister did not seem to appreciate it just now.

Mr. FOSTER. I will take it in later.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If it had been stated that a residence for the Lieutenant Governor would cost $20,000 or $25,000 none of us would have objected, but I think the line must be drawn at $30,000. I think such an expenditure is neither for the interest of the present Lieutenant Governor nor of his successors, nor of the country.

Mr. MULOCK. I see we must have more information on this subject. The hon. gentleman says the contract is $26,950. Is this contract for the main building, or for the residence, with all the outbuildings?

Mr. FOSTER. I judge it is for the residence, because there are additional requirements. There are additional requirements for outhouses, stables, fences, roadway and sidewalks, estimated at $14,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the size of the stables?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not that information here.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are they to be finished in mahogany?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that we are now taking part of the item of $60,000. The hon. gentleman says the contract for the residence amounts to $26,950, leaving the outbuildings to be completed, which will cost $14,000, and that the heating will cost $5,150. What about the remaining? What are the details of that balance? Is it for furniture?

Mr. FOSTER. The furniture is included in the $45,000. Up to May the 1st, 1891, the total amount expended, with the amount due, was nearly $46,000, and that includes the furniture and fittings.

Mr. MULOCK. What part of that is on the contract for the outbuilding?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not separated here.

Mr. MULOCK. We should have that information. We want to see if what has been expended is within the contract.

Mr. FOSTER. I will bring down the information.

Mr. WATSON. How is the amount of $15,000 remaining to be spent?

Mr. FOSTER. For stables, outhouses, sidewalks, and so on.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister explains that $45,000 has been expended on the house, furniture and fittings. The contract on the house was $26,900, leaving $19,000 yet unaccounted for, unless it was expended on furniture and fittings. If it has been so expended we should know how the furniture was bought, and whether by tender or not.

Mr. FOSTER. That might be a very good thing to enquire into in the Public Accounts Committee, but this has been already expended, and will appear detailed in the Auditor General's Report. Surely the hon. gentleman does not want me to read over that account. It is not to be paid out of this vote.

Mr. MULOCK. This $6,310 is for general expenditure on account. Any amount that may be owing for fittings or furniture may come out of this.

Mr. WALLACE. It does not say it is for furniture or fittings.

Mr. MULOCK. There is an "etc." If the "etc." has no meaning let it be struck out. Do you propose to strike out that "etc."

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Mr. MULOCK. What is included in the words "*et cetera*"?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the item had better remain until we find out.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably the vote had better stand until we get information as to the *et cetera* in this item. The objection is a tremendous one, no doubt.

Mr. WALLACE. I move that the *et cetera* be struck out.

Mr. DAVIN. These grounds have to be fenced and laid out. It would not do to have Government House without gardens around it. When one considers the importance of the place and the territories, I am surprised that hon. gentlemen carp at it. My hon. friend who belongs to the Reform party suggests that the member for Marquette should not be hypercritical, because, if their hopes are realized, he may one day be in Government House himself.

Mr. MULOCK. I want information from the Minister before this item is voted. I do not propose to vote the hard-earned money of the people without knowing what it is for, and that there is a sufficient reason. You are asking us now to take money from the people and put it into the construction of a luxurious establishment for a luxurious official, one practically unnecessary in conection with the affairs of the country. We are told now that out of $54,000 expended, $26,000 at most are for a contract for the building. What became of the other $19,500? All the information we have is that it may have been spent for furniture and fittings. Probably it was, and we want to know how much was spent for furniture and how much for fittings. Has the contract estimate been exceeded? Were there conditions and extras? These are points that should be furnished at this period of the investigation.

North-West Mounted Police Buildings, including water supply and fire protection $30,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is in pursuance of the expenditures which have been going on for a number of years for the accommodation of the Mounted Police. This vote is to make provision for barracks, officers' quarters and proper accommodation for the Mounted Police force in the North-West, the whole in accordance with the plan which has been adopted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At what particular points is that $30,000 to be expended?

Mr. FOSTER. In 1888 there was expended $129,000; in 1889, $84,000; 1890, $40,000; in 1891, $50,000 was voted, of which $19,000 was expended

up to the 31st of December. I find that the buildings are scatttered over the different parts of the North-West where the police are stationed. The estimated requirements for 1891-92 are for Regina, Prince Albert, Battleford, Maple Creek, Medicine Hat, Fort Macleod, Fort Saskatchewan, Calgary and Lethbridge, amounting to about $30,000.

Mr. WATSON. We are taking large votes from year to year for the police in the North-West, and it appears to me that a number of these points mentioned here are accessible by railways, and we ought to be figuring on doing away with the number of police that we have in the North-West. It appears to me that if a certain portion of the money that is expended in maintaining the mounted police in the North-West was expended in trying to induce immigrants to go to that country we might be able to do away with this mounted police force altogether in a short time. This appears to be an annual and a permanent charge, because I suppose the buildings erected for this purpose will be good for nothing else after the police are through with them. Are these buildings erected by the police, or are they erected by contract, under plans and specifications?

Mr. FOSTER. They are let by contract, I should judge, because I see contracts are given here for certain ones. There are contracts as small as two or three thousand dollars.

Mr. WATSON. This fire protection—where is that?

Mr. FOSTER. There are eight portable fire extinguishers required for the different barracks.

Mr. MULOCK. Are these works let by contract?

Mr. FOSTER. The works of construction are let by contract and public tender.

Mr. WATSON. Are these fire extinguishers small Babcocks?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There was a large tank put up at headquarters at Regina very similar to railway tanks. It was in the centre of the barrack yard.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Last year $7,250 was voted for the Regina buildings under this same vote; Prince Albert, $12,000; Fort McLeod, $3,000; Medicine Hat district, $3,000. Is it proposed to do more at these places this year?

Mr. FOSTER. We are not at that item yet.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I desire an answer to my question.

Mr. FOSTER. Regina, Prince Albert, Battleford, Medicine Hat, Calgary and Lethbridge are the principal points at which expenditures will be made.

Mr. McMULLEN. What will be the character of the buildings?

Mr. FOSTER. Wood, lath and plaster.

Edmonton Registry Office..... $7,000

Mr. McMULLEN. For what is this money required?

Mr. FOSTER. It is required to build a registry office for the keeping of the papers. They are now in a wooden and unsafe building, and a fire would destroy most valuable records.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this the whole cost?

Mr. FOSTER. This amount is to make provision towards the construction of a fire-proof registry office at Edmonton. The office now used is a small one, rented and wooden.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will this complete it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes. The most expensive part will be the vault, which will cost $1,500.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not understand it is necessary to build a registry with a vault, for the whole building should be fire-proof.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We have not been so extravagant as that in the North-West.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is in my own riding a brick and fire-proof registry office, and no vault is necessary. It would be cheaper to make the building fire-proof than to put in a vault.

Court House, lock-up, and police accommodation $12,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is this to be provided

Mr. FOSTER. At Grenfel, Maple Creek, Medicine Hat, and Moose Jaw.

North-West Council Chamber, Regina.. $8,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What will be the entire cost?

Mr. FOSTER. The total amount expended up to December 31st last will be $5,000. $15,000 will be the total cost, The building is stone.

Mr. WATSON. Is the building brick or stone? The member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says it is brick, and I believe the Minister of Finance said it is stone.

Mr. DAVIN. It is composed partly of stone and partly of brick.

Mr. MULOCK. Has the work been carried out under contract?

Mr. FOSTER. The building is not completed. This is a balance required to complete.

Mr. MULOCK. What were the other votes?

Mr. FOSTER. $8,000 in 1890, of which $175 was spent; in 1891 $13,000 was voted, of which $5,000 was spent, and for 1892 this vote is asked.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the amount of the contract?

Mr. FOSTER. $8,993.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the balance of the $15,000 for?

Mr. FOSTER. For drains, cesspits, plumbing, &c., $1,000; heating, $1,800.

Mr. MULOCK. Who has the contract for heating?

Mr. FOSTER. The contract for heating is not let. Then there are fittings, window shades, tables, desks, mattings and general furniture, $2,500.

Prince Albert Crown Lands and Timber Agent's office..... $6,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is this for?

Mr. FOSTER. To make provision for a suitable building to contain the offices of the Crown lands

and timber agents and registrars, at Prince Albert, which is one of the chief centres of trade in the North-West.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the estimate for the completion of the building?

Mr. FOSTER. The chief architect places the probable cost of a building 50 by 30, as described by the Interior Department, approximately, at $15,000; however, it is not proposed to erect a building costing that.

Mr. HYMAN. Do I understand that $6,000 is to be the total expenditure?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That will about cover the building.

Mr. MULOCK. Including the furniture and fittings?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That would be extra, but it would not be large for a place like that.

Vancouver Post Office, Custom-house, &c. $40,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What are you putting up here?

Mr. FOSTER. We are putting up a fine public building at Vancouver.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance what the total cost of these buildings will be?

Mr. FOSTER. I find the total probable cost of everything, buildings, and furniture, and fittings, and all, is to be about $85,000.

Mr. FLINT. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he thinks that good enough for the people of British Columbia. I think that is a small amount considering the speech we had from the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) the other day.

Mr. PRIOR. That was just the reason I asked the question, because I thought it was a very small amount.

Mr. FRASER. Are we to understand that this, in the meantime, will satisfy the hon. gentleman?

Mr. PRIOR. I may state to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) that Vancouver is not in my constituency, but, knowing as I do, that the city has grown from nothing to be a city of 14,000 inhabitants in the last three years, I think it is only right that the Government ought to know what it is likely to become in a few years, and, therefore, I should not like to see the Government putting up a building which, in a few years, they will find inadequate for the requirements.

Mr. FRASER. My question was one of concern about the hon. gentleman as to whether this vote this year will satisfy the district.

Mr. CORBOULD. When you take into consideration that only six years ago there was no Vancouver at all, and that to-day it is a town of over 13,000 inhabitants, my only doubt is that the building will not be large enough. When the public buildings were erected in Winnipeg they were thought to be large enough, but in a very few years they found it necessary to enlarge them. I am only afraid that if Vancouver grows in the future as it has in the past, the building which is now going up will not, in a short time, be sufficient to accommodate the business which is done there.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say that I think it excessive to spend $85,000 in a building of this kind in Vancouver. That city will undoubtedly be a shipping point on the Pacific coast of this Dominion, but there is no country around it that possibly can contribute to make it a large trade centre.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman has evidently never been there.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was there. I travelled all over the section, and it is a sand bank from one end to the other, with some timber.

Mr. CORBOULD. The finest land in the whole Dominion of Canada is in the district of New Westminster, and within a few miles of Vancouver.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, within twelve or fifteen miles on the other side of the Fraser River.

Mr. CORBOULD. Within six miles.

Mr. McMULLEN. I say there is nothing but timber and shipping there. It will, no doubt, be an important shipping point, but, at the same time, I consider the cost of this post office excessive. Is it to be built of brick or stone?

Mr. GORDON. I am afraid that my hon. friend must have visited British Columbia some years ago, and he must have had spectacles on him when he found sand around Vancouver. As far as my observation has gone it is a clay and gravel soil, all the way from Vancouver to Westminster.

Mr. WATSON. May be you had spectacles on.

Mr. GORDON. Perhaps I had, and they generally improve my sight. I think the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) could not have been based on any modern information as regards Vancouver. The building will comprise a Custom-house, post office, savings bank, inland revenue office: and I am satisfied that if the place grows as it has been growing it will require all the accommodation that an $85,000 building will afford. I say this from personal observation of the progress the place has made.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman tell us whether this building is to be of brick or stone?

Mr. PRIOR. It will be built on sand.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman want to know what the building is to be composed of?

Mr. McMULLEN. I want a decent answer, and if these gentlemen opposite want to make their hisses and cheers they can do so. I want the Minister of Finance to answer the question and I do not want him to sneer at me.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is quite out of——

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not out of order. I asked you a courteous question.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is quite off his base. Why all this perturbation? When the hon. gentleman asked for information I did not sneer at him.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, you did.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not. Surely the hon. gentleman will take my word for it. I had no purpose of sneering at my hon. friend. When he put his question I simply looked up and said: Do

you wish a description of the building? What right had the hon. gentleman to "fly off the handle" like that? If he wants information he should surely conduct himself like a gentleman.

Mr. McMULLEN. I asked whether the building is stone or brick.

Mr. FOSTER. And when I commenced to answer, the hon. gentleman flew off into abuse. The main building of the new post office at Vancouver will be L shaped in plan, 81 feet by 64 feet, and three storeys high, exclusive of the basement, all of stone; in the rear a one-storey annex with basement 35 feet by 55 feet, is to be put up. Under the main building the basement is to be divided by brick partitions into furnace and fuel rooms, and post office store room, the basement under the annex will be use for bonded goods. The post office will be located on the ground floor of the main building and the examining warehouse on the ground floor in the annex. The first floor is to contain the Customs and Inland Revenue offices, also quarters for the post office inspector; the second floor is not yet allotted to anyone in particular. There will be a brick vault on the ground floor for the use of the post office, and two on the second floor for Customs and Inland Revenue purposes.

Victoria Drill Hall, locality furnishing site free of cost $20,000

Mr. WATSON. Will this complete the drill hall?

Mr. FOSTER. There has been no expenditure up to December 31, 1890. In 1890, $10,000 was voted, and this is to make provision for the erection of a drill hall in the City of Victoria during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1892.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the estimated total expenditure?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not any estimate of that.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Government propose to pay the whole cost of erecting the building?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe the estimated cost of the building is $27,000.

Mr. WATSON. I understand that other cities are asked to contribute towards the erection of a drill hall. How is it that the Government propose to give almost the total amount for this building?

Mr. PRIOR. I might state that in other cases the cities where drill halls have been erected have been asked to supply the site free. Such has been done by Victoria already. The site has been supplied by the Provincial Government. At the present time there is a small drill hall in which a company cannot be manœuvred. We have four companies of artillery, and the place is not suitable to drilling; and the Government have seen fit to ask for a grant for a proper drill hall. I am sure that everyone will agree with me that if the militia is to be kept up at all it should be looked after. There is no use getting men to enlist if you do not provide them proper places to drill in. This drill hall will be 160 feet long by 75 feet wide. It is only large enough to drill a decent battalion in, and it will be put up in no more extravagant manner than any similar buildings in other places.

Mr. WATSON. How much did Victoria contribute?

Mr. PRIOR. Half an acre of land, which is worth $12,000.

Mr. HYMAN. I quite agree that Victoria should have a drill hall, and that it should be treated in this respect just the same as other cities in the Dominion. The vote to the City of Brantford appears by the Estimates to be in the same position as that of Victoria. It supplied a free site, but the total vote was only $10,000. I see that the total vote for Victoria is about $20,000. I quite agree that Victoria should have what is fair and proper, but it should not have more than other parts of the country.

Mr. WATSON. Has not Victoria been treated more favourably than Brantford? I understand that the Government are voting to the Brantford drill hall $10,000 and the city $10,000, but they are proposing to vote the whole cost of the drill hall at Victoria.

Mr. HYMAN. Is that the fact?

Mr. FOSTER. The fact with reference to the drill hall at Brantford is that $10,000 was what the Government agreed to give. Both Belleville and Brantford applied for assistance, and the Government agreed to give each $10,000. The City of Belleville itself put up its drill hall, and when it was finished and approved of a grant of $10,000 was given to it. To Brantford $10,000 was given in the same way.

Mr. WATSON. Why, then, make an exception of Victoria?

Mr. FOSTER. You might as well say why make an exception of Toronto or Montreal.

Mr. HYMAN. I do ask why make an exception of any place? This is not a local matter of Brantford, or Victoria, or Montreal. These men are for the protection of the country, and this House ought, I think, to adopt some principle in regard to the erection of all public buildings, and abide by it, and such principle should be applied to Victoria just the same as to every other place. I would go further and say that some exception might be made in favour of the cities of the North-West, agreeing that a somewhat larger appropriation might be made to them than their present population would warrant, but it also should be made on a principle applied to all alike. It seems to me entirely unfair that Brantford should be required to pay $10,000 towards its drill hall. I do not think this country should go begging in that way. I think in the face of other expenditures we are quite able to provide accommodation for our volunteers, and we should do so with no niggardly hand. I do not think it is fair or right to ask the municipalities to pay half the cost of those drill halls.

Mr. MULOCK. I think Toronto contributed more liberally to her drill hall than Victoria is doing. My recollection is that Toronto supplied the site and a large portion of the money too.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member is mistaken The city furnished the site only.

Mr. CORBOULD. If there is any town which has anything to complain of, I think it is the city of New Westminster. It has two companies and they have no place to drill in. That city has offered to contribute eight acres of land worth $40,000, and still it has not a drill shed. If it is ready to con-

tribute in that liberal manner, a drill shed should be given to it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would advise the hon. gentleman to advocate the sale of four acres for $20,000, and then put up a building on the other four acres.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 1.30 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 26th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

VOTING ON DIVISIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. A question has been raised with reference to the proceedings on divisions, upon which I think the House ought to come to some decision to guide us in the future. It will be found, on reference to Bourinot's Parliamentary Practice, page 388, that the question is there referred to as follows:—

"When the clerk has declared the numbers, any member has the right to ask that the names be read in alphabetical order, in order to give an opportunity of detecting any errors or irregularities. The vote of a member may be challenged in the English Commons before the members are declared, or after the division is over; but this is generally done in the Canadian House when the House Clerk has given the result. If a member was not present in the House when the question was put by the Speaker, he cannot have his vote recorded."

Should a member after having voted, be asked by the Speaker whether he was present when the question was put, and reply in the negative, his name will be struck off the list, and the clerk will again declare the numbers. The point has been raised as to what is meant by the phrase: "If a member was not present in the House when the question was put by the Speaker." What is meant by the question being put? That is the point on which the House ought to come to some decision. I may state to the House, that my own opinion, after carefully considering the whole matter, is, that putting the question means reading the whole question, either in one or the other language, from the beginning. If the House comes to that or any other conclusion, their decision will guide us in the future as to what constitutes putting the question.

Mr. TROW. Suppose a member should have been in the House during the whole discussion and be absent a few moments while a part of the motion was being put, but be present before the whole motion was put, would he have the right to vote?

Mr. SPEAKER. I thought the reason for the conclusion I had arrived at was so obvious, that it was not necessary for me to state it. The reason is, that every member is supposed to vote intelligently on every question submitted to the House; and to enable him to do that, it seems to me he must hear the question put. The hypothetical case raised by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) does not seem to me to affect the question, because the member in that case is not supposed to take for granted, that the question before the House is that which he had heard read prior to its being put. The question he has heard read may have been disposed of, and the question before the House, when he came in, may have been entirely different.

Mr. OUIMET. The interpretation which the Speaker has put upon the Rules in the case under consideration, seems to me to be the correct interpretation. Putting the question comprises the reading of the motion from the Chair, before the votes are called out and recorded. When a discussion begins on a certain motion, submitted to the House by a member, two or three other motions may be made while the discussion is going on. A motion may be made to adjourn the debate or the House, and if a member who was present when the first motion was read by the mover, leaves the House previous to the question being put by the Speaker, and returns just as the vote is about to be taken, he cannot say that the motion before the House is the one which he heard read, unless the motion to be voted upon is read to him by the Speaker or the Clerk. Again, the original motion may have been disposed of, and a new motion proposed since the member has left the House. When the Speaker rises to put the question, he says: "The question now before the House is as follows," and then he reads the motion, and that is putting the question. That is the knowledge which the members present must have of the motion put before the House, in order to be entitled to vote, according to the Rule as laid down in the Rules and Orders of the House. This is also in accordance with the practice ever followed since I am a member of this House. Therefore, I think the decision of the Speaker is correct, and ought to be adhered to.

Mr. TROW. Would you rule, in the event of a member coming into the House, before a motion like that of last night, which was very lengthy, is completely read, that the member would not have the right to ask the Speaker to read the question again, as he had only heard half of it?

Mr. SPEAKER. My opinion is he would not. The view is clearly laid down that a member who has indistinctly heard the motion read may require it to be read again: but the rule is that he should be in his place during all the time the question was being put, and he can only require it to be read the second time, in case he heard it indistinctly the first time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When you look at the English practice, you will see that it does not admit of so narrow a construction, because a member is held to be present when the question is being put, although he be in the lobby and may come in and vote afterwards. The doors are closed when a division is being taken, so that he cannot come in then, but when the question is being put—if that means when the motion is being read—surely a member is present, even if he has heard only a part of the motion; and our practice allows any member, after a motion has been read, to ask to have it read again, if he did not understand it. If a member were to come in while a motion was being read, you, Mr. Speaker, would find it difficult to say to him: You cannot ask that this motion be read because you were not present when the clerk began

to read it. In my opinion, a member is present if he be here at any time while the reading of the motion is going on.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. member for Bothwell did not quite understand what I stated. I do not pretend to say that I could not be required to read the motion a second time if it was indistinctly heard; but what I do say is that the rule is absolute that a member must be in his place in the House when the question is first put. With reference to the practice in England, it may be desirable that I should read from the *Hansard* of 1855 a decision of the Speaker of the House of Commons with reference to a question which arose there. Before reading that, however, I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that we cannot draw an exact parallel, as we cannot find an exact English precedent to govern us in this matter, because in England the outer doors are locked after the members are called in, and no member can obtain admittance to the body of the House after the members are called in. Here the practice is different. The outer doors are not locked, and members may come in after the question has been put, without any obstruction. The following is what occurred in the English House of Commons:

"When the numbers were announced at the Table by the tellers, his (the Speaker's) attention was called by the learned member for Wallingford to the fact that three members, among whom was the Secretary of State for the Home Department, had voted in the majority although not in the House when the question was put.

"The right hon. Baronet stated that he was in the lobby beyond the folding doors, at the back of the Chair; and the question which he had to submit for the Speaker's decision was, Whether a member under such circumstances was entitled to have his vote recorded, or whether he is disqualified from voting, being considered not in the House?

"Whereupon Mr. Speaker said, That to entitle a member to vote he must have been in the House and within the folding doors, and must have heard the question put.

Further on he says:

"Strictly speaking, when the question is put, every member ought to be in his place—no member should be standing upon the floor. It is the duty of the Serjeant-at-Arms to clear the lobby of members, and those members who do not wish to vote have the liberty of retiring to the room beyond the lobby. All members who are in the lobby ought to come into the House and vote, but they ought not to be allowed to vote unless they are within the walls of the House—inside the folding doors."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course this question is to be considered altogether apart from past occurrences, and that is the most satisfactory manner in which to settle a matter of order and procedure, but it is well to come to some conclusion about it, because different impressions have prevailed, even amongst members themselves, as to what the law of Parliament is on this subject. Sometimes, a member who has not been in when the reading has begun either in French or in English has refrained from voting, and sometimes he has adopted the view that he has a right to vote if he was in when the Speaker asked whether the motion or the amendment should be adopted. In my humble opinion, there seems to be no doubt as to the correctness of the rule according to either English or Canadian procedure as you have laid it down, and I think it would be best for us to understand that that practice will be followed hereafter, so that any confusion on the subject should be removed. A great deal may depend on the wording of the resolution as it is put to the House, and the essence of the rule and its justice altogether depend on the fact that the language may be changed from time to time. Some of us may be in the House when an hon. member moves a resolution, and we may even participate in the debate on it and may be perfectly familiar with its terms, but it may be that, before it goes to a division, the language of the motion may be altered by consent of the House or otherwise, or it may be—though, of course, not in going into Committee of Supply—that amendments may be moved, and the essence of this rule is that a member should not have the right to vote unless he were present in the House and heard the whole of the motion either in English or in the other official language. This rule is well illustrated by the English practice of closing the doors and preventing anyone from coming in after the Speaker rises to put the question. If it were admissible in England that a member, after hearing part of the motion, should vote if he were in his place when the Speaker asks "Shall the motion be adopted," then the doors would not be closed until the question is put in that way, but the fact that they are closed when the Speaker rises to read the motion shows that the rule extends that far, and that the meaning is that the words of the motion should be heard by every member in order to entitle him to vote.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the House will permit me, I will read the following:

"When all the doors are thus closed, the Speaker again puts the question, and the ayes and noes respectively declare themselves. By the Standing Order of 19th July, 1854, the Speaker is obliged to put the question twice, because the sand-glass is not turned until the voices have been taken; and in the meantime, members who were not present when the question was put, gain admittance to the House. None of these could vote unless the question were again put; and it is, therefore, the practice to put the question the second time after the doors are closed, in order that the whole House having had notice of a division, may be able to decide upon the question when put by the Speaker."

That is the English practice. Then I would ask the attention of the House to this provision under our practice. Any member may ask to have the motion or resolution read again. Supposing a member comes in in the middle of the reading of a resolution and hears but a part of it, has he the right to have the motion read again?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why not? He is present.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My hon. friend will see that only a member who has a right to vote has a right to have the question read again. The rule is that, after the vote has been taken, a member who has not heard the question may ask to have it read again in order that he may vote; but, if he were not present when the Speaker put the question, he would not have the right to vote, and therefore would not have the right to demand that the question be read again.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the Minister of Justice will see that he is begging the whole question. What is meant by putting the question? The Speaker asks the House if it is ready for the question, and he declares that the noes have it and then someone calls for a division. The question has been put. Are all those who are not present in the House at that time not to vote? Clearly that is not a rule which anyone recognizes. It seems

to me that, if a member hears a portion of the question, it would lead to a great deal of difficulty and confusion if it had to be first decided whether he was in the House or not at the time the Speaker or the Clerk rose to read the resolution. Let us suppose, for instance, that we have a French Speaker, and that he commences reading the resolution in French, and subsequently the Clerk reads it in English. If an English member comes in during the reading in English, he may vote; but, if the member happens to be French and part of the reading is over before he reaches here, is he to be excluded from voting?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the fact to be ascertained is whether a member was present in the House while the resolution was being read, and then you cannot go back of that to find whether he was in the House when the Speaker rose to read the resolution.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is mistaken in attributing to the Minister of Justice a *petitio principii*.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh: translate, *en francais*: explain.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for Bothwell said the Minister of Justice was begging the question, and the logical and technical term for begging the question is *petitio principii*. The putting of the question here does not correspond to the first putting of the question in England, but to the second. In England the Speaker puts the question, and the ayes and noes are cried. If there is a defiant "the noes have it" or "the ayes have it," then he sees there is to be a division. He takes his glass and turns it up and says "strangers will withdraw." Then the whips go out to bring in their men, and when the sand in the glass has run down, the doors are closed and the Speaker rises and reads the question. There is no case of the putting of the question in England which is analogous to our putting the question here in the way contended for by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Therefore, I consider that, if we are to follow the English practice, we must insist that a man shall be present when the question is put; and though it may be an extravagant proposition that every member shall understand the question which he votes upon, yet we must abide by that proposition. I must say, however, that sometimes a motion is put before this House that it would require a Penang lawyer to understand. I will candidly confess that last night I voted for the first time, and I hope for the last time, without at all understanding the proposition of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies).

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will cordially excuse the hon. gentleman for the vote he gave last night, after the explanation he has made. The practice that prevails in this House is so different from the practice in England, that I do not think we can come to any sound conclusion from reading the English precedents; but I will say that adhering to the mere form in which the rule is expressed, is apt to lead us astray unless we get below the form and see the spirit which gave rise to that rule, and the object the rule had in view. Now, in England there is no difficulty at all, because the question is put a second time after the doors have been closed, and therefore every one in the Chamber must hear the question. Now, what is the substance and spirit of the English rule? It is that the member shall be present in order that he may hear the question read; that is attained by shutting the door, and I think that is the spirit of the rule that should apply to our practice. I agree with Mr. Speaker, so far as I may form a judgment, that the members of the House who vote should hear the question put before they vote, and that involves of necessity that they should hear the whole question put. But I differ very seriously with you on the construction of the rule which permits a member, who has not heard the whole question put, to ask that it be re-read to him. The object, I take it, that we have in view, is this: In the first place, to insist that members shall not vote unless they have heard the question put; and, secondly, to permit every member who is in a position to vote, to do so, so that you cannot deprive a man of his vote who is ready to give it, under ordinary circumstances. Now, a man may make a motion in this House that he may thoroughly understand, understand it better than anybody else, and he may have gone out into the lobby for a moment and then come in after the Clerk has begun to read the motion, and if you say that after the motion has begun to be read, although he is the author of it himself, he is to be excluded from voting, you do him a great injustice. I submit that if a fair construction was put upon that rule which allowed a member to have the question re-read to him if he had not heard it already, we will get rid altogether of the difficulty. We might, therefore, insist, in the first place, that no member should be entitled to vote unless he was in his place and heard the question put, and we could add as a rider that if a member was present before the question was actually put by the Chair, and had only heard part of it read, he should be allowed to have it re-read to him. That, I think, would enable everybody who votes to comply with the general rule that he shall understand what he is voting about, and, secondly, we would escape the undesirable consequence of excluding from actually voting an hon. member who understands the question and desires to vote.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may be permitted to say one word at this point of the discussion. I take it that the entrance of the Serjeant-at-Arms, after the members have been called in, is equivalent to the running out of the sand-glass in the English House of Commons; that is my view in regard to it. Now, it seems to me that if the practice were adopted of allowing members who came in after the motion had been put from the Chair, and who had not heard it read, to require it to be re-read again, our proceedings would be protracted almost indefinitely, because if that were allowed in regard to one hon. member, it must be allowed in regard to 20 or 30, and if 20 or 30 members were to come in one after another and require the question to be re-read, it would be a very inconvenient thing, and would protract our proceedings to such an extent that it would not be tolerable. I may say in regard to the remarks of the Minister of Justice on this question, that I think it should be viewed entirely from a non-partisan standpoint. Whatever rule we adopt will certainly apply to both sides of the House. It seems to me, if the House will agree

with me, that we should adopt strictly the rule that a member who has not heard the question put from the Chair, and read either in French or in English, should not be considered as having been in the House, and as having heard the question read.

Mr. TROW. I agree with your ruling that a member should be within hearing of the motion when it is put to the House. Now, this question arises in my mind: Supposing that an hon. member should be in the gallery and had heard the motion, he is within the precincts of the House. I recollect on one occasion that I called Sir Charles Tupper from the gallery and he came down and voted, because he had heard the question distinctly.

Mr. SPROULE. It must be within the memory of several of the older members of this House that we have had a ruling upon this question several times. I know that I myself came into the House at one time when the question had been partly read, and I refrained from voting because I did not hear it all. At other times I know that members have come in while the question was being read, and when the vote was challenged they were asked if they heard the question read, because it was assumed, very properly, that if they did not hear the question read, they could not vote intelligently upon it. I may say that, according to the ruling that I have heard in this House several times, I have understood it to be the practice that every member should be in his place during the time the whole question was read. Now, take the motion that was put before us last night, after the question was put from the Chair and the order had been given to call in the members, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) made several changes in the motion, and although a member might have heard the question put from the Chair and had gone out for a moment, and had come in after that question was read, he could not vote upon it intelligently, because the reading of it was materially changed after the order had been given to call in the members.

Mr. DENISON. I would suggest that the matter be left to the leader of the Opposition and the Speaker.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that we must make a definite rule of some kind on this question, and it matters little what decision we come to, provided it is understood. Now, if the rule was adopted that henceforth no man will have a right to vote after a certain time limited by that rule, of course after that it must be adhered to. I remember distinctly that on one occasion in the past a member was allowed to vote when he stated that he had heard the resolution read in one language, and that was allowed after the Serjeant-at-Arms had come into the House. But if you make a rule that no man will have a right to vote after the Serjeant-at-Arms has come into the precincts of the Chamber, let it be so understood, and all hon. members will govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. CASEY. While agreeing with my leader that it does not so much matter what decision we may come to, I think it is very desirable to have the rule made as liberal as possible. The rules should be such that every member may be allowed to vote who wants to vote. Mr. Speaker has pointed out that the entrance of the Serjeant-at-Arms is equivalent to the running out of the glass in the English House of Commons, and he thinks no one should vote who is not in the House at that time. I beg to suggest as a relaxation of that rule that if any member has come in after the Serjeant-at-Arms has entered and can say he has heard the question read from the Chair, either then or at any previous time, or has read it on the Notice paper, he should be in a position to vote. Of course, the question is put from the Chair at the time it is moved. Every member in the House heard it then, and every member in the House should, in my opinion, have the right to vote, even if he had not heard the question from the Chair, if it be a motion of which notice had to be given, he had read it on the Notice paper. As a matter of fact, the obstacles placed in the way of members voting should be as slight as possible, and should only prevail when it is shown that the hon. member had no knowledge of the matter on which the division was taken. I do not agree with the rule suggested by you, Mr. Speaker, that no one should vote who came in after the Serjeant-at-Arms; but I should like to see any hon. member who asserted that he had heard the motion put from the Chair at any period of the debate, or that he had read it on the Notice paper, have the privilege of voting. It is very important we should have the fullest opportunity of exercising the duty which we are sent here to perform.

Mr. SPEAKER. Let me state my ruling, so that the House may thoroughly understand it. My ruling is, that a member must be in the House and have heard the question read from the beginning, in either official language, to entitle him to vote.

Mr. FRÉMONT. There is no doubt when I voted last night I thoroughly believed I had the right to vote. I have since hunted up English and Canadian precedents. I find no English precedent that can apply. I heard it mentioned on the floor of the House this afternoon that there were several Canadian precedents, but I have made search and I could not find any in *Hansard* or any other book. Of course, I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of respect, and as I voted, believing I had the right to vote, and as by your decision I had not such right, I wish to withdraw it.

Several hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. IVES. Mr. Speaker, under your ruling it will be necessary hereafter that the Clerk of the House should translate the main motion as well as the amendment. He has hitherto been in the habit of translating the amendment only.

THE MEMBER FOR EAST NORTHUMBERLAND.

Mr. FLINT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to a question of privilege. It will be remembered that on 20th August, the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) rose in his place and made grave charges against the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane). Certain clauses in those charges were deemed by the House, as well as by the hon. member for Huron, to be too general in their character. I, therefore, rise to make the following statement:—

"Mr. Flint, the member for the electoral district of Yarmouth, states that he is credibly informed and verily believes,

1. That Edward Cochrane was, during the last Parliament, and now is the member for the electoral district of the east riding of the County of Northumberland.

2. That while he was such member it was corruptly agreed to by and between the said Ed. Cochrane and John D. Clouston, Wm. Johnson, Wm. Brown, and Robert May respectively, that if each of them would pay to him, or to certain other persons for him, or for political purposes, the sum of $200, he would procure for each of them the position under the Government of Canada, of attendant or keeper of one of the swing bridges over or across the Murray Canal.

3. That in pursuance of such corrupt agreement the said several sums of money were paid, and the said persons were so appointed to said positions.

4. That while he, the said Edward Cochrane, was such member as aforesaid, it was corruptly agreed by and between the said Edward Cochrane and one Henry May, that if the said Henry May would pay the said Edward Cochrane, or to other persons for him, or for political purposes, the sum of $200, he would procure for the said Henry May, the office or position under the Government, of foreman or overseer of employés under the Government.

5. That in pursuance of the said corrupt agreement the said sum of $200 was paid, and the said office or position duly received by the said Henry May.

I make this statement not asserting personally as to its truth or otherwise, but, being credibly informed, I make this statement as a member of the House. I, therefore, move :

That the foregoing statement be referred to the Select Committee composed of Messrs. Caron, White (Shelburne) Tisdale, Skinner, Mulock, German and Cameron (Huron).

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Allow me to suggest that the hon. member allow the motion to stand until to-morrow as an informal notice.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman knows that the session is far advanced, and this is a matter that will require some considerable consideration. The motion was made on 20th August, and the other charges were referred to a Committee, which has not been called together. Unless some useful object is going to be served by allowing the motion to stand till to-morrow, I submit the motion should be moved to-day, and the matter referred to the Committee, so that the Committee should be able to get to work. The members have first to meet and organize, and then they will have to subpœna witnesses, and so it will be Tuesday or Wednesday before the first meeting for business purposes can take place. Of course, if the hon. member for East Northumberland desires the opportunity to answer, I have no objection to the postponement, but unless something of the kind is desired, it should go to the Committee to-day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The charges which have just been read by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) have nothing to do with the charges referred to the Committee, and there is nothing in the paper read by the hon. member for Yarmouth to stay the investigation of the other charges for a single moment. Therefore, there is no excuse for refusing to give decent notice with respect to these charges. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) has said that unless some useful object is to be served, the matter should be disposed of to-day. There is a useful object to be served, for in a matter of privilege affecting perhaps the seat of a member of this House, we should be at liberty to give proper consideration to see that the charges are specifically made, and on the responsibility which should attach to the hon. member for Yarmouth if the charges are unfounded. It is simply for these reasons I made the request ; and although the rule may entitle an hon. member to move without notice as a matter of privilege, yet inasmuch as it concerns his own seat as well as the seat of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), I think it is better that we should follow the practice of at least giving the House and the member charged, the courtesy of reading the document which is presented to the House. In ordinary course, what the charged member should do, is to rise in his place and make his answer to the charge and then withdraw. That can hardly be possible in regard to a set of charges read here for the first time, and besides that, members themselves have to consider the propriety of the course that ought to be pursued on such an occasion. We ought to see in every case that the charge is so clearly made that it warrants an investigation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I merely rise to say that I do not think the hon. Minister is quite justified in imputing to my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) that he acted with indecent haste.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not say that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman thought, at least, there ought to be decent notice given.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member did not object to my suggestion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to point out what the facts are. When a general resolution was moved the other day by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), it contained specific charges and it also contained a general charge. It was then objected, and I think the objection was fairly well taken, that the general language used in the general charge ought to be withdrawn ; that the charge ought to be in its nature specific, so as to give the member charged something like fair-play, and a knowledge of what the charge was. That objection was sustained by both sides of the House, and the hon. member who moved the resolution withdrew the charge in its general terms, stating that he would formulate and present to the House a charge in specific language and reduced to a certainty. Under that notice this charge has been made to-day, and I would respectfully suggest to the House that my hon. friend is not open to the imputation of springing this by surprise upon the member charged, or acting with other than proper regard of the proprieties of debate ; because the notice was given the other day that this would be put in form and presented to the House.

Mr. BARRON. I should say, that knowing the charge was going to be made, I saw the member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) this morning, and I read the charges to him just as they are presented to the House to-day, so that I do not think it is fair to suggest even for one moment that any undue haste is shown.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The expression "undue haste" was made from the other side of the House and not from me. On the contrary, I judged from the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) that he acquiesced in my suggestion that it should stand over, and therefore it would be very wrong to impute anything undue to him in that regard. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) says that he showed the paper to the member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), but I think we all have an

interest in this, and we all have a right to see that the charges have been properly made.

Motion allowed to stand.

THE CENSUS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I believe my hon. friend the Postmaster General promised my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Casey) that he would to-day make a statement as to the results of the census. I suppose he is prepared to do it.

Mr. HAGGART. Not just now, but after dinner I certainly shall.

THE REGINA *LEADER*.

Mr. TROW. I wish to take the earliest opportunity to give the Secretary of State an opportunity of placing right an answer that he gave on Monday, in reply to a question that I put for an hon. member who was absent. The hon. Minister stated that for printing and publishing in the Regina *Leader* the expenses for 1886 were as follows :—1st July, 1886, to 30th June, 1890, $1,488 for advertising, and $515 for printing, and since the 30th June, 1890, $315 for advertising, and $75 for printing. I find by the Auditor General's returns for the various years that in 1887, for printing in the Regina *Leader*, there was paid $4,767.40, and for advertising $508.22. In 1888, for printing, $4,976.55, and for advertising $363.70. In 1889, for printing in the same paper, $6,060.90, and for advertising $340.08 ; and in 1890, $6,490.95 for printing, and $327.48 for advertising. The sum total of both amounted to $23,955.78. I merely wish to ask how the Minister made such a glaring mistake of thousands and tens of thousands of dollars.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend knows very well, and his smile tells me he knows, that I was not mistaken. If he quoted my answer from *Hansard* he would have known I was right.

Mr. TROW. I am quoting from the Conservative paper of the city.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If my hon. friend read the document that I have addressed to the person who prompted the first and second questions, he would have known what my answer was, and what my answer is. I answer for the department here in regard to printing and advertising, and I said that there were $1,488 for advertising, and $515 for printing, from the year 1886 to the year 1890, and from the year 1890, $315 for advertising, and $76 for printing, which I stated were exactly the figures that had passed through the Printing Department here which I control. I stated besides that there were other sums of money that had been paid to the *Leader* Printing Company (Limited), which were verified and settled at Regina, and which were all to be found in the Auditor General's Report. That was my answer.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Trow) has learned the lesson, that it is not safe to believe in Conservative papers.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 116) to further amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Costigan.)

BEET-ROOT SUGAR.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 168) to encourage the production of Beet-root Sugar.

Mr. BEAUSOLIEL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not rise with the intention of opposing the Bill introduced by the hon. the Minister of Finance. I consider it a step in the right direction ; but as it is a very short step and I look upon it as an indication of an intention on the part of the Government to consider the question and propose to this House at a future session a definite measure on the subject. The result of the present measure may be to allow the Farnham manufactory, which has again been put into operation during the year, to live for another year or two, but this alone cannot justify the sacrifices which the Government ask of the House. The beet-root sugar industry may become a great source of wealth for the Province of Quebec in particular, and for Canada in general, but if such a policy is to be only for a year, and apply only to one manufactory for this short space of time, I say that it is not a policy, but rather a temporary expedient, unworthy of a Government. Therefore, I look upon the Bill introduced by the hon. the Minister of Finance, as a proof that the Government begins to realize the importance of the cultivation of beets, and of the manufacture of beet-root sugar in Canada. I look upon it as a promise of enquiry and information, and as an indication that the Government will propose, in the near future, the adoption of a settled policy, which will allow this industry to firmly establish itself, and to stand the competition of the foreign production, which, in the United States, is efficiently protected by a premium of two cents per pound for a period of fifteen years. Under such conditions I am glad to support the Bill of the hon. the Minister of Finance. But once more, I expect that at another session, the hon. Minister will have a more effective policy, a policy in all respects similar to that which obtains in the United States, and which is the only one which can create and bring into permanent existence the beet-root sugar industry in Canada.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

INSPECTION OF SHIPS.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of amendments reported from Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 149) respecting the Inspection of Ships.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman explain what the amendments are ?

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman was not present, I think, when we were in Committee, but we adopted the suggestion he made—and I think I showed him the draft of the amendment before moving it—to exempt vessels of the Lloyds class.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand that sea-going ships properly classed at Lloyds and at the Bureau Veritas are to be exempt from the operation of the Act ?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes, with this exception, that we only mention Lloyds in the Bill, on the ground

that it is just as well not to mention the foreign register; but ships registered in the Bureau Veritas will be exempted by Order in Council.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it had been my intention, as I gave notice to the hon. Minister of Finance last night, to have brought up to-day the question of the use made of the Governor General's warrants, and I still propose to bring it up, at an early day. But I find that an important piece of evidence, which I had supposed was printed and in the hands of all the members, is only in manuscript, and there is only one manuscript of it, and consequently it was quite impossible for some hon. gentlemen who desired to take part in the discussion, to master the details. Therefore, although I am sorry to disappoint the hon. Minister of Finance, having communicated privately with him, and finding that he is willing to overlook the disappointment in consideration of my resuming the subject at an early day, I do not propose to trouble you this afternoon.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. BARRON. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire for a short time, assisted by some of my hon. friends opposite, to discuss the important question of the Trent Valley Canal. I desire to point out to-day, as I have pointed out before, that this great work——

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my hon. friend if he has a motion to propose?

Mr. BARRON. No. This great work, Mr. Speaker, is considered of very great importance by a very large number of people in the Midland district of the Province of Ontario, many of whom, in fact all of whom, are very anxious to have the work speedily begun and rapidly completed. In approaching the discussion of this great subject, I do so well knowing that the Government of to-day is not the Government of a few weeks or a few months ago—that the hon. gentleman who leads the Government to-day——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him one moment. The Minister in charge of the department is ill; he has been so for three days, though he came from his sick-bed, last night, to vote; and I am afraid that, if the hon. gentleman called the attention of the House to the matter to-day, neither he nor the House would get the information which it would be desirable to have, and perhaps, therefore, the hon. gentleman would take another day.

Mr. BARRON. Of course I am desirous of meeting the wishes of the Government as far as possible; but I was going simply to make a statement of the facts and discuss the merits of this project, and to ask the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are living in constituencies affected by this great work, to join me in the discussion, and to present to this House, and through this House to the people of Canada, the merits of this great work. I do not see why the discussion could not be taken up later by the hon. Minister who has charge of the department, if he desires so to do; but if the Government really sees any reason why I should postpone my remarks, I am, of course, quite willing to accede to the wishes of the Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it would be better in every point of view, inasmuch as there can be practically no discussion on the subject to-day without the Minister being present, and I do not know in what way he could avail himself of another opportunity of speaking on the question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt my hon. friend would desire in all respects to consult the convenience of the Minister in charge; but unless we are to understand that the Minister of Customs is going to remain permanently Minister of Railways and Canals, which I think is hardly likely, it is quite evident that no very special object could be gained by his presence. He is merely holding that portfolio, as I understand, perfunctorily, and has no special acquaintance, that is to say, in his official capacity, with what has been done in regard to the Trent Valley system of navigation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He is acquainted with the present state of affairs with regard to that subject. From the observations which the hon. member from North Victoria has occasionally made on that question, I understand that the information in the department and the progress of matters in regard to the subject are within the knowledge of the Minister in charge of the department.

Mr. BARRON. Then, the hon. Minister wishes me to postpone my remarks?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it would be better that the hon. gentleman should do so. I think it would be more satisfactory to himself in the long run, and I should be glad that he would do so.

Mr. BARRON. I am only anxious that the fullest discussion should take place, and that the people of Canada should know the position of the Government on this question, and should know all about it. For this reason I will be very glad to accede to the wishes of the hon. Minister and wait; but, of course, I expect that they will give me an opportunity to bring the matter up again.

SLAUGHTER OF AMERICAN CATTLE IN CANADA.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would like to ask the leader of the House whether he is in a position to give this House to-day, or at any later time, any information as to an important subject which has been mentioned in the Senate by the First Minister, that is, the slaughter of American cattle within the Dominion of Canada, and the conditions under which it is proposed to permit it, and how far such a proceeding would interfere with, or in any way disturb our own trade in cattle? And how these cattle, coming to this country for slaughter, as now proposed, come in in bond for exportation or for competition with the cattle of the country? Would they be subject to duty, or to what duty? Those questions we would

like to have a little information about, whenever it is convenient for the Government to give it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. One of my colleagues will be glad to make a statement on that subject to-morrow, or any other day that will suit the convenience of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Repairs, furniture, &c., Public Buildings.. $120,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I think a close, careful and searching criticism should be entered into with regard to the items under this head. I find by the Auditor General's Report for this year that we have spent $123,460 on repairs, heating and water for the buildings at Ottawa, including Major's Hill Park and the grounds here, without including charges under the contract for keeping the grounds clean. There must be an enormous unnecessary expenditure in this connection that could be well done without. For instance, it costs us $6,500 to keep Major's Hill Park in order. We are paying the City of Ottawa for water sprinkled upon it to keep the grass green, although the citizens of Ottawa are those who principally enjoy the park.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend would confine himself to the first item, we will take up Major's Hill Park later.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to draw attention to the enormous sums spent annually on repairs, and to the necessity for a considerable decrease.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that the wishes he has expressed from year to year have been very liberally met this year, as we have reduced this vote by $50,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that, and am very glad to see it.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the character of this expenditure?

Mr. FOSTER. Repairs and furniture, and all that sort of thing, in all the Dominion buildings in Ottawa and elsewhere.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does this include wood?

Mr. FOSTER. No; this is only repairs for furniture.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does it cover Rideau Hall?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. What amount of furniture was furnished the Langevin Block last year?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to give my hon. friend that information, but that will be got in the Auditor General's Report, and is rather the result of last year's expenditure than what this is to apply to.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find by the Auditor General's Report that under the head of Ottawa building, repairs, and furniture, we have the item, W. Horace Lee, rent of building on Wellington street, twelve months, $900. What does that refer to?

Mr. FOSTER. That is the rent of the building which was occupied on Wellington street by officers of the Indian Department. They are now removed to their permanent quarters in the Langevin Block.

Grounds, Public Buildings, Ottawa..... $7,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that our grounds are extremely badly kept. I have noticed, strolling about our grounds, that this year, they have been in many cases scandalously ill-kept. The watering and general attention paid has been very bad. If we are to pay $7,000 a year for the care of the grounds, the work should be done properly. Only last night I noticed that one of the lawns contiguous to the building had been trampled over with horse hoofs. I suppose they had been using the lawn mower without protecting the hoofs of the horse.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably the pads were worn off and no supply to get others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be, but it seems to me, whoever is the contractor, if you are giving him $6,000 or $7,000 a year he should be better looked after. I notice that the watering is extremely badly done, and that the whole thing practically, for a large portion of the year—there is some improvement now—is exceedingly ill-kept.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is quite right in asking that the grounds should be well taken care of. The work is done by contract.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the contractor?

Mr. FOSTER. H. Robertson.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is that the gardener?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; he has been the gardener.

Mr. CHARLTON. Were tenders invited for this?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much does Mr. Robertson get?

Mr. FOSTER. $5,600 a year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to add my protest to that of other hon. members in reference to the state of our grounds during the greater part of this summer. In the past we had been accustomed to look upon the grass plats and flower gardens around these buildings with pride. They have been very pretty things to look at, and to show to our friends who came here from a distance. They were very pleasant for those who could spare half an hour in the evening to walk around these buildings in order to get a breath of fresh air. But, before the heavy rains began about six weeks ago, and for six weeks before that, the condition of the grass plats was simply disgraceful. The contractor, instead of watering them with a proper hose and a fine spray, turned on the nozzle of the hose and sent a stream of water over the grass, with the result that the grass would not only not grow from the watering, but would be utterly destroyed. This is not only my opinion, but I have heard the same from at least twenty other members. I have spoken to the man who was handling the nozzle, and have asked him why this was being done. Sometimes he would dash his stream on to a flower bed and would destroy the flowers. I think these things should be brought to the attention of the contractor, and that he should not be allowed to carry out his duties so carelessly and inefficiently as he has done this year. I am the last to object to

reasonable economy, but the manner in which these grounds have been kept for some years past has been creditable, and we do not want to degenerate and allow them to be in the condition which they were in six weeks ago before the rain came. Thanks to the rain, and not to the nozzle, the grass is now very nice to look at, but that is owing to causes over which the contractor had no control. The contractor's attention ought to be called to this matter.

Mr. SCRIVER. I would ask the Finance Minister if the appliances for irrigating are provided by the contractor or by the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. He has the stock. He has to keep it up to the conditions and to provide everything new.

Mr. SCRIVER. The hon. member has spoken of the method pursued in irrigating the land in the lawn in front of the building, but the use of the hose which has been adopted is calculated to do injury rather than good. I was struck with the difference between the appearance of the lawn in front of these buildings and that in the Major's Hill Park, the difference being principally due to the use on Major's Hill Park of those revolving sprinklers which throw the water over the grass in a proper way. I think that a change should be made in the mode of irrigating adopted by the contractor in front of these buildings.

Mr. CASEY. How is the Major's Hill Park attended to?

Mr. FOSTER. By contract.

Mr. CASEY. The Government must have been more fortunate in their contractor in that case, because the contrast is remarkable between these grounds and those in front of the buildings, not only in the character of the sod, but in regard to the floral decorations. The flower beds on Major's Hill are very fine, while those here are mean. They are filled with the cheapest flowers that you can find in a cottage garden, with the exception of a few specimens in each bed. The condition of these flower beds compels one to ask for what purpose our conservatory is kept up. I would ask if the maintenance of the conservatory is included in this contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it is.

Mr. CASEY. I say that the shabby supply of flowers in the flower-beds around the House makes one ask why we should keep up this conservatory at a very considerable cost, for that must represent the greater part of the $5,600 voted for keeping up the ground. The mere cutting and watering of the grass is not the work of more than two or three men at the most, and would not be in the hands of a private individual, so that the maintenance of the flower-beds and the conservatory must be the principal part of the contract price. The conservatory is full of flowers in the winter time, when it is of no use to the public, and in the summer we find now that the flowers are not used to decorate the grounds, and the conservatory is not so placed that it could be a pleasant spot for the public to visit. Then, I ask, for what purpose is it kept up? All the conservatory flowers that are on the grounds could be hired from any florist for $50 for the season. Of course public rumour states that Ministers' dinner tables are supplied from this conservatory.

Mr. FOSTER. That was explained last year.

Mr. CASEY. Does the hon. Minister of Finance never get any for his table?

Mr. FOSTER. Never.

Mr. CASEY. And the hon. gentleman is in a position to say that none of the other Ministers or the Speaker get any?

Mr. FOSTER. I am only responsible for my own.

Mr. CASEY. Does the hon. Minister know that other Ministers get these flowers?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will name the Minister who has received the flowers, no doubt he will get an answer.

Mr. CASEY. It is reported that all the Ministers' tables are furnished in this way. I should like to know if any Minister will deny it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I deny it.

Mr. CASEY. Then, if that be so, we are absolutely wasting all the money we spend on that conservatory.

Mr. FOSTER. Now the hon. gentleman has catechised the members of the Government on this subject, perhaps he will allow me to ask if he never had a flower out of that conservatory himself?

Mr. CASEY. I had one bouquet once. If that conservatory is kept up for the benefit of Ministers it should be so understood, and if it is not we are wasting the money. The flowers bloom unseen and waste their sweetness on the desert air. They are not set out on the grounds, and they are not in a position where they can be conveniently visited by anyone, and the keeping up of that place is a waste of public money. There might be room to object to the Ministers getting floral ornaments at the public expense, but that might be regarded as one of their perquisites; but, if they do not get these flowers, I protest against keeping up an expensive conservatory with a man of high scientific knowledge in regard to floriculture, at a high salary, when all these flowers that are displayed could be got from a florist.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would draw the attention of the acting Minister of Public Works to the fact that the grounds here are not properly watered. I am sure that many hon. members have experienced the inconvenience that I have myself, of walking through clouds of dust in coming up to the buildings, dust so thick as to render it almost impossible to see our way. Once during this session I went across the House and spoke to the Minister of Public Works about it, and he immediately notified the man in charge and had it attended to. The improvement only lasted for a short time, and in dry weather now it is as bad as before. I think our Parliament grounds should be properly watered, so that members may not experience this annoyance. The streets of the City of Ottawa are well watered, and I cannot see why the approaches and walks about these buildings should not also be kept well watered. The man who has the contract for this should not be allowed to neglect his duty in this regard. I see the Government is asking $7,000 for the grounds and public buildings at Ottawa, and the Finance Minister states that the

contract with Robertson is $5,600. What is the balance for?

Mr. FOSTER. For keeping the roofs clear of snow and ice in the winter, and for the distribution of ice in the summer.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend's remarks about the approaches to the House prompt me to ask the Minister in a friendly spirit why it is that we cannot have a plank walk in the middle of the avenue in front of the building, or sidewalks, instead of having a mere sand road? Have you any objection to making an asphalt pavement on the avenue, or putting a sidewalk through the middle of it?

Mr. FOSTER. We have been trying to keep down expenses as much as possible.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is right.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be expensive to make an asphalt pavement.

Mr. CASEY. The usual roadway put down on the streets of cities is not too expensive to be used on the approaches to the House of Commons. I think it costs as much to keep the present road clear from snow in winter and dust in summer, as it would to put down asphalt sidewalks.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is a difficulty from sand in the road drifting over the sidewalks. Along the parapet wall the walks are at times covered with sand. I would recommend narrowing the walk, and covering it with some substance to prevent the sand drifting upon it in dry weather.

Mr. FLINT. We are treated every year to a discussion on the conservatory, and some of the Ministers seem anxious to repudiate the idea that they get any flowers from the conservatory for their own use. As far as I am concerned, and I think that is the opinion of the House, I would not object to allowing the Ministers to get flowers from the conservatory, because they are under certain obligations that private members are not under. I do not think it is at all improper that the Ministers should be supplied in moderation with these articles.

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. I see you are paving the way for the incoming Administration.

Mr. FLINT. As this appears to be a time for the ventilation of subjects of small importance in themselves, I would ask the Acting Minister of Public Works to call the attention of whoever may be acting for the department, to the unsightly appearance presented by the ends of the gas pipes cropping up from the ordinary stone fence surrounding the grounds of this building. I have counted as many as eight, which are certainly very unsightly. These grounds are very beautiful and the stone steps are certainly handsome, but it is unpleasant to see the ends of the gas pipes sticking up where there ought to be some stone ornament. I think $150 would supply something handsome, and I would suggest that the attention of the architect be called to this matter.

Mr. WELSH. The matter about this conservatory has been brought before this House time and again. I see by the *Hansard* that this matter was brought up on the 4th of March, 1890, when I made some remarks about it. I said:

"I do not profess to be a Minister, and if I could not make a better Minister than one hon. gentleman I am looking at, I would not be a good one."

He is not here now, he is not a Minister, thank God. I made the remark at that time that I had made it my business to call on the Public Works Department. I did not know whether I was going into a menagerie or a lunatic asylum, and I might have added, or a den of thieves. However, I made this remark over twelve months ago:

"If I could not make a better Minister than the Minister of Public Works, I would not be a good one. He has had a good raking over, and he will have many more if he does not mend his ways. I want to know who gets the flowers, what they are for, who has the right to them?"

I said afterwards to the Minister of Public Works:

"I want to know from the hon. Minister of Public Works, if I call in the morning and ask him for one of those flowers, if he can give it to me?"

"Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

"Mr. WELSH. Well, who can give it to me?

"Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Nobody."

Well, if that is the fact, if the new Minister of Public Works will give the same answer, what is the good of keeping that conservatory there? Why expend so much public money upon it, if neither the Minister nor the members can get a flower out of it? Now that we are going to have a change in the head of the Public Works Department, I hope this business will be attended to. If the conservatory is kept there I hope it will be for the use of the Ministers. I think they have a right to go there and get flowers, because they have to entertain and keep up their house in Ottawa, and it is perfectly right they should take flowers. I also think that if a member of Parliament goes and asks for a bouquet it is right he should have it. If the old Minister of Public Works was in his place I would not speak upon this subject now, because I know it would be useless. I have been deceived in every shape and form, in everything, and every time, that I have had anything to do with the Public Works Department, ever since I came to Ottawa, and I hope there will be a change for the better.

Removal of snow, Public Buildings, Ottawa..... $3,000

Mr. CHARLTON. I thought that $1,400 of the last item was for the removal of snow. Is this duplicated?

Mr. FOSTER. This is also a contract for the removal of snow and ice from the sidewalks and roads around the departmental blocks, Parliament Buildings, Rideau Hall and the other Government buildings in the city.

Mr. McMULLEN. Last year only $1,700 were spent for the removal of snow. Why is $3,000 asked now?

Mr. FOSTER. These contracts are let yearly, and it is desirable to allow a margin. For two years past the expenditure has averaged $1,800, and for three years it has averaged $1,900. The $3,000 were asked last year as well as this year. I will reduce the vote to $2,200.

Heating Dominion Public Buildings.. $60,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is this the total cost?

Mr. FOSTER. This is the total cost for heating public buildings at Ottawa, including wages of staff and fuel.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the cost of wood per cord?

Mr. FOSTER. Maple $4.95, mixed $4.75, pine kindling $3.75. The contractor is Mr. John Heney.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How is it that for some hardwood $6, and even $6.50, has been paid?

Mr. FOSTER. That covered some of the hardwood cut into two or three short lengths.

Mr. CHARLTON. Was the wood reckoned by the cord of 128 cubic feet?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; that is provided in all Government contracts.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Wood is often reckoned 4 feet when it is only 3 or 3½ feet.

Mr. WATSON. The wood appears to be about 3 feet long.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The wood delivered in Ottawa is generally 3 feet long, as is that delivered to the Government; but when it is delivered a cord must be 4 feet high, 8 feet long, 4 feet wide. The contractor has to make the cord up to 128 cubic feet.

Mr. CASEY. I notice mixed wood is only 20 cents less than rock maple. The rock maple is not an extravagant price, but $4.75 for second-class wood is so.

Mr. CHARLTON. If we understand that the mixed wood consists of maple, birch and beech, it is all right.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what it is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It strikes me it is a very expensive proceeding to heat this building with wood instead of coal, using the usual proportion of one ton of coal to two cords of wood. We are throwing away a great deal of money by using $33,000 worth of wood and only $14,000 worth of coal. I should imagine that if we had properly constructed heating apparatus coal would be cheaper and more efficient than the large quantity of wood consumed.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice the Government have a wood yard. There is a sign to that effect on the canal bank. Why do they keep a wood yard?

Mr. FOSTER. It is part of the Government reserve, and it would be impossible to pile the wood on these grounds.

Mr. CASEY. It is John Heney's wood yard?

Mr. FOSTER. It has been so for the last twenty-five years.

Mr. CASEY. He gets it without paying any rent.

Mr. FOSTER. He pays no rent under the contract.

Mr. CASEY. Why does he not pay rent?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is part of the contract.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Rent was paid up to 1886.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think it is a question for the serious consideration of the Department of Public Works as to whether they should not use coal rather than wood for heating the Dominion buildings. I fully agree with the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Chartwright) that when wood costs $5 a cord and coal can be obtained for $6 a gross ton, there is no comparison as to the comparative cost of using the two kinds of fuel, and the department should give its serious consideration to the expediency of making this change, if they desire to effect economy.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the department has carefully gone into that question. As coal gets cheaper, the argument is stronger in favour of its general adoption. That would necessitate a change in the furnaces, and that expenditure would have to be taken into account. Another element that entered into the choice of fuel was the effect of heavy coal smoke on the buildings themselves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You could use anthracite.

Mr. CHARLTON. We could obtain smoke consumers, which would obviate the difficulty as to the dense coal smoke. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he is aware that the difficulty arising from the smoke could be entirely obviated by the use of smoke consumers, which will not only prevent the nuisance from smoke, but which will add to the fuel properties of the coal by consuming the smoke and gases? Is there any reason why coal could not be substituted for wood, with the present machinery and furnaces?

Mr. FOSTER. They would have to be altered.

Mr. CHARLTON. Anything more than the grate bars?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say to what extent.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We want to find out just exactly what this wood costs. We want to find out what the value of the rents of these lots are, and if the canal tolls are remitted on the wood brought in here for the use of this House. I think this item had better stand until we get that information. Up to the year 1878, there was $296 paid for a small portion of the land that has been given away to the contractor for this wood yard, and I understand that the contractor does not pay canal tolls either. A portion of the land has been transferred to another department. The contractor for the wood has had all these advantages, and we want to know what they amount to. It is necessary for us to know this before we can discuss the item. We are paying in the neighbourhood of $60,000 for heating, and perhaps $20,000 or $30,000 more in the way of other perquisites to the contractor. It does seem a fabulous sum and we want to know all about it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is a great deal of information that the Committee ought to have with regard to this matter. These lots on the west side of the canal paid a rental until 1878, but since then no rent has been collected. The property was formerly in the Ordnance Lands branch, and it has been transferred to the Public Works Department. Here is a party entering into a private arrangement with the Government, without any contract based on tender, and he is given a large tract of valuable property and no rent is charged. Then he brings his wood into the city and all the canal tolls are remitted to him, and I have heard reported in the city that he often brings in wood purchased by other parties for sale to the citizens, who have it brought in in Mr. Heney's name, because by doing so they are not obliged to pay tolls to the Government. I say that that

whole subject requires investigation. It is a matter about which, if the rumours have any foundation at all, serious abuses exist that require to be redressed. Wrong is being done to the public whose property is being used without any valuable consideration being given, and, in the second place, wrong has been done to the other parties who perhaps, if a fair opportunity were given them to furnish the fuel to the Government, would do so for a less sum than is now being paid.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend takes rather a responsibility upon himself when he argues from a basis that wholesale frauds are being perpetrated in the way in which he suggests; that is, that Mr. Heney, having the piling ground and bringing in the Government wood as he does without paying canal tolls, takes advantage of that to supply largely to the citizens, and that others take advantage on account of cheapness of getting their supply from him. If that were so that would be an outrage.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. But is it so, and is it not rather a responsible thing for an hon. gentleman here, unless he has some pretty definite knowledge with regard to that, to set such a statement afloat and to base an argument upon it? If the hon. gentleman has any information that that is so, he should give us that information, because it is in the interest of the Government and of the public as well, to have any such possible abuse as that prevented.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the hon. Minister will see that when he gives a large tract of land to a party without any rent being charged, and when he remits canal tolls, he invites abuses of that sort. It is perfectly obvious that if the ordinary rule was followed, and Mr. Heney paid rent and paid canal tolls, such an abuse would be impossible; but the Minister sees himself that whether the statement is well founded or not, it is a possible thing to happen. I would like to know whether the Minister does not know that Mr. Heney supplies wood to a very considerable number of citizens in the City of Ottawa. I would like to know whether he does not know that Mr. Heney piles the wood which he supplies to the Government and to citizens upon the same ground, or, whether that wood is measured until it is brought into the yard here; whether the whole of the wood in that yard is not Mr. Heney's wood, or one portion of it Government wood and another portion held to be delivered to private citizens. The hon. gentleman will see that he has made an arrangement that is unfair in itself. In the first place, every wood dealer ought to have an equal opportunity to tender for the supply of wood; but that opportunity has not been given. I have heard from various quarters, that the private citizens in Ottawa pay less for their wood than is paid by the Government. Then, in the next place, the other dealers who sell wood to the people of this city have to pay canal tolls, and have to pay rent on the land that they use as a wood yard. Mr. Heney pays neither. He has valuable land from the Government without giving the public compensation for the use of this land. Other parties bringing their wood from a distance have canal tolls to pay, and Mr. Heney has no canal tolls to pay. Can the Minister say that Mr. Heney has paid canal tolls on wood supplied to private citizens?

Mr. FOSTER. Do you say he does not? I think you have the onus of supporting the charges.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Government has devised a system which necessarily leads to abuse, because it invites abuse, and I call the attention of the Minister to the fact. The subject is, no doubt, a subject for enquiry, and it is one which I believe will be enquired into before the session ends.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think I can offer some explanation, as far as my memory goes, on some of the points raised by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. The remission of the canal tolls is a long standing claim from the time Mr. Heney became contractor. He held this same contract under the former Government, and the price of the wood was just about the same as it is now, in proportion to the circumstances of the two periods. Hon. gentlemen will admit that the principle has been acted on that, in the case of everything transported through the canals on a Government contract, the tolls should be refunded. That was the principle upon which Mr. Heney's tolls were remitted by an Order in Council passed some six or seven years ago; and after the transference of that branch to the Department of Railways and Canals, the officer in charge raised the question whether the Order in Council remitting the tolls in the past was sufficient authority for him to remit them now. The question was brought before the Council, and it was decided that the principle was the same, and another Order in Council was passed, affirming the principle that the tolls should not be charged on the wood delivered to the Government. I may say that when the original order was passed the question was raised whether it would cover wood other than that supplied to the Government, and the officers were instructed that the remission could not go beyond the amount of wood supplied to the Government. I am willing to admit that if the contractor should pile there wood to be supplied to private parties, it would not be fair or right.

Mr. CHARLTON. Can it be shown that he pays any tolls at all?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yet he sells wood to the citizens of Ottawa.

Mr. COSTIGAN. But the instruction was given that the refund should only extend to wood delivered to the Government. Then, with regard to the renewal of the contract, it was renewed at the lowest prices paid, and it was renewed for the same reason that the contractor during the Administration that preceded the Sir John Macdonald Government had his contract renewed. There was an impression that the wood was being paid for at a higher price than the wood supplied to the citizens, because there was an impression on the public mind that the Government were not paying for a full cord, that is, for 128 cubic feet, became some of the wood was only three feet long; whereas, if the wood was only two feet long, the contractor had to make up it up to the full 128 cubic feet. With regard to the privilege of piling wood along the canal bank, we all know that it was waste land, and for many years it brought no revenue to the Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When?

Mr. COSTIGAN. During the last twenty-five years.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Are you stating that authoritatively?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman will let me get through, my argument will bear criticism. The land was leased for a number of years during the time Mr. Heney had the contract and was delivering wood under the former Administration. That land, though leased, had paid no rent, and there was a large amount of arrearages because no rent had been collected, and it was arranged with the holders that the building owned by them should be taken for rents due. The reason Mr. Heney's rentals were remitted was because he supplied such an immense quantity of wood to the Government that there was not room to pile it in the yards near the furnaces. It is not possible to put one-twentieth part of the wood on these grounds which the contract requires him to deliver in the yards here, and he is necessarily obliged to handle it twice—to pile it in his yard on the canal, and deliver it to the departments at such times as will most suit their convenience. Therefore, it is for the convenience of the Government and the public that he is allowed to pile the wood there instead of piling it on the Government grounds. I think that explanation should be satisfactory.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How do we know what the amount of the contract is unless we know the amount of the tolls which have been remitted? The amount of $60,000 is put down for heating the public buildings, and then we are told that there is a refund of canal tolls. How much is that? Then, if he pays no tolls on the wood which he brings there for the supply of private parties in the city, we want to know that; we have a right to know that. As a matter of fact, so far as I am advised, rent was paid for those lots, and the last payment was made in April, 1878.

Mr. COSTIGAN. On part of the lots. There are several lots in the basin.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Since that time no rent has been paid on any of those lots by Mr. Heney. We were told the other day that Mr. Heney holds a great many lots there. I put a number of questions on the Paper with a view to discussing this item properly, and they should have been answered on Monday. Sufficient time was given to secure the answers, and why were they not answered? Those belonging to the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice were answered, but the others were not. I think the Minister stated that there was rent paid for lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 up to 1878, but there has been nothing paid since. We know that the contract for this wood is at $4.95 and $4.75 per cord, and we know by the Auditor General's Report that $6 per cord is paid for some, and $6.59 for other wood. We do not know how many dollars a year the country has lost or has refunded to Mr. Heney on his contract. We want to know what he has paid for the privilege of piling his wood on those lots. I was told by the Minister, the other day, that some $1,167 was paid in rent by other people who have lots in the canal basin; and would it not be right and fair to charge rent to the contractor who has a contract with the Government?

Mr. CASEY. The others do not subscribe to testimonials.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is this the reason why no rent is paid by the contractor for the ground he uses on which rent was paid up to a few years ago? Is this the reason why the canals tolls are remitted? If it is, we want to know it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Is the hon. gentleman asking a question, and will he have a reply?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I want a reply. I want to know the amount of the canal tolls refunded to Mr. Heney since he has had the contract?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman asks a question, but he does not want the answer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Very well; I will let you answer that question.

Mr. COSTIGAN. You ask if the reason for these remissions was that they contributed testimonials.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I did not say that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman repeated it and I rose to answer it, and I answer in this way. That is not the reason, and the hon. gentleman who puts the question dare not assert it. Does he understand me now?

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the reason the public are pilfered out of this land, and that the public domain is given to a contractor, and that the public revenues are given to a contractor, and that that contractor gets more per cord for his wood than he sells it at in the city?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He does not. I wish to say that I volunteered the statement of what was within my knowledge from having had to do with this branch of the service before, and I stated what I knew about it. But I have nothing to do with that service at present, nor have I had anything to do with it for years past. But speaking from memory, I offered what information I could to the Committee. In reply to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who said that under this system the present contractor had an advantage over other contractors from the fact that he was allowed free yardage and tolls, that remark might have applied to the past, but the hon. gentleman, if he will look into the matter, must admit that it does not hold good at present. The tolls were remitted several years ago, and the contract of which we are speaking now was entered into, and tenders were called for, after the principle of free canal tolls was well known to the public and after it was well known that that principle would govern the contract. All the tenderers were, therefore, after the principle of remitting the tolls had been adopted, in the same position as Mr. Heney in tendering. Before that, the hon. gentleman's argument would apply to some extent; but since the remission of the tolls, that being known to the public, and it also being known that no rent was collected for the storage of the wood on Government property by the contractor, the hon. gentleman will admit that every tenderer was in the same position.

Mr. MULOCK. Was it stated in the advertisement calling for tenders that the contractors would be entitled to remission of tolls and free use of the Government land?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not more than is stated when calling for tenders for works on canals, or for building or repairing public works. Every contractor who tenders knows that he will be refunded all

tolls paid by him for the passage of material to be used in the construction or repairing of a canal.

Mr. MULOCK. I fail to see how a person tendering for wood would know he was entitled to use property belonging to the Dominion Government free from rent or payment of any kind. I fail to see how the general public would know that. Mr. Heney may have known it, as he has been a Government contractor for years, and may have acquired that knowledge from his experience. But he ought not to be the sole one to possess that knowledge. There is only one fair way of doing the business. Everything connected with the contract should be set forth in the advertisement calling for tenders, so that all tenderers would be on the same footing. There should be no opportunity given to bring a charge of undue influence. The Government were not bound, after this contract was awarded, according to the Minister's statement, to remit the tolls and allow the contractor to occupy the Government land free. Therefore, this contractor, after the contract was entered into, when given remission of the tolls and free occupation of Government land, was, in fact, actually given so much money without rendering value for it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not in this contract.

Mr. MULOCK. Can you show that he was entitled, as a matter of contract, to these allowances? The fact that he had been dealing with the Government in other years, and that the Government chose, from time to time, to make allowance to him, did not create an obligation on their part to do so at all. You were not bound to do so when this new contract was entered into.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. How were you bound, as a matter of law, to allow this contractor free use of the canal and of Government land.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot answer the hon. gentleman; I do not know that anyone can.

Mr. CASEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. member for Elgin is so accustomed to applaud that he applauds before he knows what I intended to say, and will not wait for my answer. It is not information, or explanation, or reasonable statement the hon. gentleman wants, but merely to criticise and throw out insinuations across the floor of the House. At least, it looks very like that, and makes it unpleasant for gentlemen on both sides. When the claim of Mr. Heney was put before the Government, it was considered side by side with the principle adopted and carried out since Confederation on all other public works and contracts, when the canals were used. This was the only exception; this was the only case in which the drawback had not been allowed; and the case made out was so strong as to be irresistible. In accordance with the practice followed, of refunding the tolls on materials moved through the canals to be used on such works, the Government decided that this contractor, having established his case, had as good a right to a refund as other contractors had in other cases, and we laid down the principle that these moneys should be refunded. That was settled, and the hon. gentleman will see that the contract price for wood now is somewhat less than the price charged before, and it is reasonable to draw the conclusion that Mr. Heney and the other tenderers tendered, knowing that they would not have to pay the canal tolls and storage.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How did they know?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That, therefore, may have been the reason why Mr. Heney tendered lower.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How did the general public have knowledge of that?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There are several ways of informing the general public.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Were they informed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman having asked the question once, I am intelligent enough not to require it to be repeated. I may not be so, from his point of view, but I would ask him not to interrupt until I have given him an answer. The public have the best opportunities of knowing all about these matters, not only through the ordinary means, circulating news by the press, but there is not a question of this character that has not been discussed from time to time in Parliament and the discussion published in *Hansard* and most of the newspapers. What better means of information could hon. gentlemen desire? Do they ignore the Official Debates and the press? They are the best means of giving information to the public; and no one will say that the people in Ottawa, and it was Ottawa people who tendered, did not know exactly how the case stood.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has Mr. Heney been a contractor for the supply of wood continuously since 1878?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has he not been a continuous possessor of this property since 1878?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know anything about the possession of the property.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who have been the contractors during the past ten or twelve years?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There has been no rent paid since 1878. There is a large area of property on which wood is piled. Mr. Heney is a dealer in wood continuously.

Mr. DEWDNEY. A company owed the Government a lot of money and went into liquidation. The only thing the Government got out of them was one of their buildings.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). From 1878 there has been no rent paid; and surely if the company the hon. gentleman refers to were unable to pay rent, the property should have been taken from them before; but I understand Heney was using it before, and has been using it continuously since, whether he was a contractor with the Government or not.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have the tender here. This does not specify that he is to get his wood without paying canal tolls. This is what the public have to guide them in tendering. If others knew the canal tolls would be remitted, they would probably have tendered at a lower price. If that was the law, why did they not state it in the tender. You cannot find anything about a refund of canal toll, and we suppose that the tender is the basis upon which the contract is made. Then I will read the answer which was given to a question which I put in the House on Monday:

"Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Has Mr. John Heney the contract for supplying wood for heating the Public Buildings in Ottawa? If so, when did he first receive it, and was it by public tender? How long did the contract run? Has it since been renewed, and how often? If so, was it by public tender, and at what price per cord?

"Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. John Heney has the contract for supplying wood for heating the Public Buildings at Ottawa. Mr. Heney was first awarded the contract for wood supply, after a call for tenders, on the 27th October, 1868, for three years. This contract was subsequently continued to him to the 21st December, 1872, when new tenders were again called, and he was awarded the contract. On the 30th October, 1874, a contract was again entered into with him for one, two or three years. In March, 1879, a contract was again made with him. The contracts of 1868, 1872, 1874, and 1879 were awarded after a call for public tenders. The agreements of 1871 and 1873 were extensions of one year, authorized by Orders in Council. On the 10th March, 1881, the wood contract was awarded to W. McCaffrey, after public tenders; and by Order in Council of 17th December, 1883, this contract was continued until 1885, when new tenders were called for. Tenders were called for on the 11th March, 1885, for supply of firewood for three years for Public Buildings, Ottawa. J. M. Quinn was the lowest tenderer, and got the contract at $4.95 for rock maple, and $4.75 for mixed hardwood. On the 11th May, 1885, an Order in Council was passed, allowing Quinn to transfer his contract to Heney, Heney to carry out the contract at the rates stated in Quinn's tender. The contract ran from the 1st September, 1885, to the 1st September, 1888. It has been renewed twice by Order in Council—on 7th December, 1885, for three years, from 1st September, 1888, to 1st September, 1891, and on the 24th April, 1891, for three years, from 1st September, 1891, to 1st September, 1894, at the rates of Quinn's tender, namely, $4.95 for rock maple, and $4.75 for mixed hardwood."

What interest could the public have in that? Tenders were not asked. The contract was renewed without calling for tenders, and the public has no right in this tender whatever. Now, about the matter of testimonials. The Minister of Inland Revenue, when the member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) said the others had not subscribed and Mr. Heney had, seemed to get into a wonderful state of excitement. I do not know whether Mr. Heney took any part in regard to these testimonials or not, but I am advised that he not only subscribed to the testimonial to the Minister of Inland Revenue and to the testimonial to the late Minister of Public Works, but that he passed round the list and raised the money, or was one of those who did so. I do not desire to be offensive to the Minister, but I am offensive to the system. The Minister of Justice took the same ground the other day, that the principle of accepting testimonials on the part of Ministers was contrary to the independence of Parliament. That was my principle before, but it is a new principle for the party behind the Minister of Justice to adopt now, though they know that the Minister of Inland Revenue received a testimonial as well as the Minister of Public Works. You may gloss it over as you will, but it has the appearance that John Heney got these privileges, and that this was one of the considerations which paved the way to his getting them. Get angry or get excited as you will, but there is no view you can take except that the public domain was given away, the public revenues were given away to this man, and this man was one of those who took a hand in getting up testimonials for Ministers of the Crown. If it is fair to ask Mr. Bate to pay a rent of $466.25 for a lot there, why would it be unfair to ask Mr. Heney to pay rent for his lots? Did Mr. Bate subscribe to that testimonial or not? That is a question which should be answered. There are others who have to pay rent, and why should they pay rent and Mr. Heney not pay rent, when we are dealing with him to the tune of $40,000? Does Mr. Heney pay toll on the wood he sells to the citizens? There is no spirit of faction in what I am saying. I simply want to get at the facts of the case, and I do not want to be personal or offensive to the Minister or to anybody else, but I am stating things which I know and which I have heard in reference to this matter, and which I think the Government owe it to themselves and to their supporters to clear up. I think they owe it to the country to show why it is that they give these privileges to this contractor and why he is so favoured, why he gets these lots rent free when others have to pay.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DENISON). Is this item carried?

Mr. LANDERKIN. No; it cannot be passed till we get the information we have asked for.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Inland Revenue argues inferentially that the public must have known that these matters were to be part of the advantages given to the contractor by reason of the fact that to-day, as he says, the wood is being supplied at a lower rate than formerly. That is not a fair position from which to draw such a conclusion. It is no fairer than the argument which has been presented to the Public Accounts Committee, that the public is getting full value for the services rendered, though public servants are deriving advantage as well. I see by the Auditor General's Report that Mr. Heney in the last four or five years has received $157,846.10 or, one-sixth of a million dollars. That is to be found on page B—386. I ask whether, in a contract of this importance, business principles should not be applied to the letting of it? Will the Minister explain why, on each occasion, there is not a public advertisement issued asking for tenders and setting forth all the advantages each one is to get. I ask the Minister of Inland Revenue to explain how any one except Mr. Heney who might get the contract would be able to get possession of this property of which Mr. Heney has had possession for so many years, in time to store the wood there. The fact is that Mr. Heney being in possession of that property places anyone else at a disadvantage, so that Mr. Heney had the exclusive privilege of being in possession at the time of the expiration of these contracts. Am I to understand that there was no advertisement for tenders issued last November?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The contract has been extended.

Mr. MULOCK. There was no invitation to the public to compete?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No. The contract now held is held on an extension.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the date of the original contract?

Mr. FOSTER. 1885.

Mr. MULOCK. When did that contract expire?

Mr. FOSTER. In 1888.

Mr. MULOCK. It was renewed in 1888, and again in 1891 on the terms of the contract of 1885, and that without tender?

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct.

Mr. MULOCK. This book shows that from 1885 to 1888, about $100,000 has been paid under contracts, and since then we have about $30,000 a year under this contract. Now, this is an amount large enough to demand the application of strict business principles, and if the Government depart from business principles without being able to assign business reasons, they will expose themselves to observations that are equally painful to those who have to make them, and to those who have to listen to them. In this particular case I think every person who is familiar with what has occurred now, must come to the conclusion that for some reason, either negligence or something else—I hope and will assume that it is negligence or indifference—for some reason, this is given to a private citizen without tender. Now, the time has come when this has got to end, when the people of Canada must get value for their money, and those who are responsible for the people not getting value for their money, must be called to account for it. It is pitiable to observe what is going on here. No excuse is assigned for what has taken place. The Minister of the Interior gives certain reasons that in his mind are satisfactory, but they are not business views. He may think it is quite satisfactory for the Council to sit quietly down and renew contracts, but it is against all sound business principles. No county council would dare to do such a thing, no public body answerable to the people would dare to do what the Government are doing. They have come to the conclusion, apparently, from long enjoyment of office, that they are above and beyond the people. I trust they will become awakened to the fact that they are answerable to the people. It is the people's money you are wasting, and everything you are giving to John Heney illegally is the people's money, and it is a gross breach of trust to hand over their money to individuals without getting value for it. This same feature crops up in almost all the transactions we are called upon to consider, and until there is a proper application of business principles, the Government must expect to hear these criticisms; they cannot hear them too often, and if they are deaf they must hear them until there will be some ears that will hear them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Is not that a bull—if we are deaf we must hear them?

Mr. MULOCK. I say they must be uttered until other ears will hear them. I mean, that if the Government will not hear them, perhaps other men will be put in their places who will hear them.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). That will take some time.

Mr. MULOCK. I dare say it will, but while these methods continue we must continue to protest. At all events, it is our duty to protest until the people, whose money they are spending, calls them to account for their breach of trust.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman says no business firm would do what the Government are doing.

Mr. MULOCK. I said no public corporation.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Well, the hon. gentleman is not aware of all the facts of the case. The Government of Mr. Mackenzie gave a contract for the supply of wood for the public buildings here in Ottawa, to this very same John Heney, and extended it by Order in Council. Did any Conservative on this side of the House feel justified in making the cowardly insinuation across the House that Mr. Mackenzie had been dishonest in giving that contract? No. The same explanation was made by the friends of the Mackenzie Government, and the same reasons were given, namely, that the prices under which the contract was extended at that time were satisfactory in the public interest—and they were higher than they are now. But no one charged the Government with wholesale bribery and corruption because they extended that contract, and hon. gentlemen opposite have no more reason for making charges to-day about the extension of the contract at a lower price than there was then for making a charge against the Mackenzie Government.

Mr. ALLISON. If all that has been said is correct, and if the Government stood in the position of an individual, I do not think that they would have any right to charge Mr. Heney rent for this property. According to statutory limitation in Ontario, ten years' possession gives a man ownership of the property, and if Mr. Heney has had this property in his possession ten years or over, he is the absolute owner of it, and the Government have no right to charge him one cent.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sorry the hon. gentleman puts that idea into Mr. Heney's head.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. gentlemen opposite find fault with us for criticising this item.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can tell them that I have received no less than three letters since I came to Ottawa, from private individuals, asking me, as a member of Parliament, to investigate this matter. In the City of Ottawa, Conservatives have stopped me on the street, men that I know, and have told me there was a screw loose in connection with this matter. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen if it is any wonder that the Opposition consider it their duty to criticise these items. People in the City of Ottawa think that there is a job here. I casually happened down to Mr. Heney's yard a short time ago, not with the intention of looking after his wood or anything else, but with the intention of calling upon a friend in that section, and I was spoken to by no less than two men and asked why we permitted such a condition of things to exist as to allow Mr. Heney to occupy lands that belong to the Government, and to have advantages under his contract that others were not made aware of when the contract was let, and in this way, year after year, to pocket large sums of money. Now, the reason why people are beginning to get suspicious that Mr. Heney is making a very nice thing, is, I understand, that he is building a nice residence on Sandy Hill, and he has built a steam tug here, or a pleasure yacht, and he has honoured the retired Minister of Public Works by calling it after his name, he calls it *Sir Hector*. I dare say that he feels himself in duty bound to honour the Minister by so doing. Now, I say it is quite clear that we are using an enormous amount of wood. I would like to say to the Minister of Inland Revenue that, with respect to the statements he has made to this House with regard to the way the wood was measured, I ven-

ture to say that he is not correct in that statement, and I will tell him why. I will ask my hon. friend to go out and look at the wood and see how any person can possibly measure it so as to get 128 cubic feet in a cord the way the wood is piled up there now, some of it is only three feet long, some three feet and a half, some three feet nine inches, and so on, in one pile. I do not think my hon. friend, with all his ingenuity, is able to measure that wood so as to get 128 cubic feet in a cord long, in the way it is piled up now.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am satisfied the hon. gentleman is in error.

Mr. McMULLEN. Let my hon. friend get an engineer, or whoever measures the wood, to go down there and see if he can get his full complement of wood. I would like to know how you are going to get 128 cubic feet in a pile of wood 8 feet long, that is only 3 feet, 3½ or 3 feet 9 inches long. My hon. friend has given the amount paid to Mr. Heney for wood for the last four or five years. I would advise my hon. friend to look at the Auditor General's Report; indeed, I would strongly recommend all the Ministers to give a little more attention to that report than, apparently, they are accustomed to do, and then they will be better able to answer questions. In 1885-86 we paid Mr. Heney $25,140 for wood; in 1886-87 $31,490; in 1887-88, $33,996, or $9,000 more than 1885-86. This is a distinct increase, because the Langevin Block is not included in either estimate. How does it come about that at the same rate $9,000 more has been paid during one year than a few years previously. When we consider the amount expended on coal and wood it is evidently time some change was made. Coal and wood cost $61,899; lighting of Parliament buildings, including Rideau Hall, $28,483; water for grounds and buildings, $15,123; removing snow, $1,795; Major's Hill Park, $6,323; telephone rents, $3,285; and these items, together with the cost of maintaining the Parliament grounds, in the order in which they are kept, which is in very poor order, the expenditure has reached $123,460, or over $10,000 per month. It is time some changes were made in the mode of heating, because we are wasting money in burning wood rather than coal. Before the item is passed, we are entitled to know what is the refund to Mr. Heney on wood. The Auditor General's Report says the refund on wood bought was $1,000. Was any refund made to him in any other year? It is said that the Government allowed tolls to be refunded whenever Government work is done. I challenge hon. gentlemen to state any other case where a refund was made except in the case of wood.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman is evidently not aware of the facts as they exist. He is evidently under the impression that this is the only case where a refund has been made. I stated before that a strong argument in favour of acknowledging the claim was that in every case of contract for canal construction or repairs, the contractor pays the tolls on his barges going through the canals, and, on a certificate being presented from the engineer that the material is connected with a Government contract, the tolls are refunded in every case.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not admit it is right that this should be done. Why should these refunds be made any more than the duties collected should be returned on goods imported for militia clothing. The Minister of Militia takes contracts for overcoats and clothing for the militia, but he does not return the duty to the manufacturers on the materials imported. Again, do the Government return the duty on coal; and do the Government return the amount of the canal tolls when coal is brought here from the American side?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the Minister of Finance give the particulars in regard to the amount collected from Mr. Heney and the amount refunded to him? The department should know what tolls are collected and what tolls are refunded.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope that the position will not be taken that the questions asked as to the reservation of land, or the value of the rental, or the refund of canal tolls are sufficient to cause hon. gentlemen opposite not to pass this item. While these questions may arise in the discussion, they are not necessarily germane to it. What we are discussing is an item for so much money to provide wood and coal. Any information with respect to wood and coal, quantity and price, I am prepared to give, and I have given, and I have given all that a reasonable committee would ask in order to pass the item. If there is any question of policy, such as allowing a refund of tolls or regarding a piling ground, that is a question which stands by itself; but it is an unreasonable position to take that the item should stand until these questions are thoroughly debated and satisfactorily answered, and I do not think reasonable men will insist on that view. Any other information germane to the subject I shall be glad to furnish.

Mr. WATSON. We are thankful for that information. I should like to ask if the Public Works Department has arrived at the relative value of coal and wood; as to how many pounds of coal are equal to a cord of wood?

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is going too deeply into technical and scientific matters, and I do not possess any information on that point, which is not germane to the passing of the item. It may be quite germane as to the propriety of using coal or wood. But contracts are running, and amounts of money have to be paid.

Mr. WATSON. As the hon. gentleman cannot furnish this information, the item should be allowed to stand until he obtains it. We should not pass estimates for buying wood if coal is cheaper than wood. I know there are men in business using steam power who have estimated the relative cost of wood and coal, and have come to the conclusion that coal is the cheaper. I am satisfied that, at the present prices of coal and wood, the Public Works Department would find coal much cheaper than wood. But the department evidently has not made any calculations, and the Minister cannot answer the questions——

Mr. FOSTER. But the contracts are running.

Mr. WATSON,—we say the contracts should not run. The Government saw fit to renew these contracts by Order in Council without consulting Parliament. They have taken the responsibility of renewing these contracts, and they certainly must

expect to have these items severly criticised if it can be shown that coal is cheaper than wood.

Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before six o'clock we asked for some information in reference to this wood contract, and we do not think until we get that information that the item should pass. We want to know the cost of the heating; we want to know the cost of the wood, we want to know what tolls were refunded to the contractor, and the value of the lots occupied by him. We think we should get this information, because, in the meantime, we do not know what we are paying for the wood.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this item be carried?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Not until we get the information.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give the hon. gentleman all the information that is pertinent to this question. This is a vote for heating the public buildings. The vote is for $60,000, and the following is an estimate of that sixty thousand in items. It is to pay for the wages of the heating staff, including the wood pilers and coal men, for the wood and coal itself, and contigencies $1,000, making up $60,000. Last year there were 2,980 cords of wood used at $4.75, 3,670 cords of wood at $4.95, 59 cords at $6, and 30 cords at $6.50. The price of the wood last year, as this year for the contract, was: maple, $4.95; mixed, $4.75, and pine, $3.75. The contractor is Mr. John Heney, of Ottawa. The contract was given by tender in 1885 to one Quinn, who afterwards assigned it to Mr. Heney, who carried out Mr. Quinn's contract. In 1888, on the advice of the engineer of the department, the contract was, by Order in Council, extended for three years, and about the expiration of that time it was extended for another three years at the same rates. The contract now has to run until 1894 on the last three years extension. So much for the wood. The lowest tender for coal this year was accepted, being for 2,600 tons of furnace coal, at $5.20; 50 tons of egg coal, $560; 140 tons of stove coal, $728, making a total of $14,508. I may say with reference to the coal that the tenders this year were about $1 per ton lower than the price paid on the tender last year; that arising from the fact that the Government proposed, unless it could get it cheaper, to make some arrangement of its own; and the tender prices this year seem to have come down about $1 per ton less than last year, and are very reasonable, as will be seen by the quoted price of $5.20. These are the items which make up that sum of $60,000 which is asked for. That, I think, is reasonable and fair information, and as such I submit it to the Committee. If my friends of the Opposition are willing to take the responsibility to obstruct Supply on fair information being given, they may take that responsibility.

Mr. McMULLEN. We do not wish at all to obstruct the proceedings. We ask what is the rent of the premises occupied free of charge by Mr. Heney the wood contractor; we ask the amount of canal dues that have been refunded to him in connection with this contract, and why the refund has been made? I think these are fair questions in connection with the wood contract, and the Minister should answer them.

Mr. FOSTER. These questions have been asked and have been answered as to the reasons why the refund was made; it has also been explained that this piling ground was allowed to be used by the contractor, and has been used by him for years. These are two matters of policy which do not affect the prices which are to be paid, and which the Committee is asked to vote for contracts that are running. If the Opposition do not agree with the Government in their policy in these two respects, that is no reason why this vote should not pass. That is a reason why the Opposition should characterize their opinion of that policy by a motion in this House if they please.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman give the information with regard to the amount of canal tolls that were refunded?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not that information, but I will get it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When will you get it?

Mr. FOSTER. I will get it and bring it to the House as soon as it can be got; but it is not pertinent to this vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. The reason the discussion was somewhat extended before recess was to give the Minister an opportunity to get this information during recess. The hon. gentleman having undertaken the charge of the votes for the Public Works Department, it is not to be expected that he should have all these matters at his fingers' end; but I think, as a simple matter of courtesy, he might have met the Opposition to the extent of obtaining that information during the two and a quarter hours since 6 o'clock, and then he could have fairly asked that we should allow the item to pass, even though there might be other questions which he could not answer. We may sometimes in the view of the hon. gentleman be somewhat unreasonable in our demands, but I think this is a reasonable demand for the amount of the refunds which have been made on the canal tolls. If the hon. gentleman were himself at the head of the Public Works Department, I am quite sure that he would be in a position to answer that question, and would have taken pains to get the information. He has at hand the chief officials of the department; and why did he not suggest to them that they should return after recess prepared to answer this reasonable question as to the amount of the refund of canal tolls. If he had done that, I think the Opposition would have been prepared to accept a fair reply to that question, and let the item pass.

Mr. FOSTER. Nobody disputes that the hon gentleman is entitled to have that information, and I will get it. That is not the question in point at all, and I think that when I give him my promise that the information shall be furnished to the House, that is all that can reasonably be asked. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that the information will be brought down, and he knows that it was almost impossible to get it after all the offices were closed and everybody had gone away,

even if it were pertinent to this item. Questions are on the Paper in regard to these canal tolls and refunds, and information is being gathered upon the whole subject, and will be brought down as soon as it is obtained.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The question of the policy of the Government in regard to the refunding of canal tolls to those who have contracts on the canal is one thing. Mr. Heney had no canal contract; his contract was a wood contract; and how is he affected by a question of policy in regard to those who have contracts on the canal? We do not desire to be captious, but we think the Government should come down with the information as to the amount of these refunds to Mr. Heney. Then we want to know the amount per cord that they charge on the canal. We want to know exactly how much this wood contract costs. We are asking nothing unreasonable; the information should be in the department, and it should be given at once.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say who has the contract for the coal?

Mr. FOSTER. C. C. Rae & Co., of Ottawa.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman said last year that they were paying more for coal than they ought to pay. I inferred from his observation that the Government had notified the coal men that if they did not reduce the price, they would do something. They invited tenders, the result of which was that they got the coal $1 a ton cheaper.

Mr. FOSTER. Tenders were asked for every year for coal.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman said that on that occasion they had notified the tenderers that if they did not get the coal cheaper they were going to do something, he did not say what. We know that there is a sympathy between the price of coal and the price of wood; if the price of coal falls $1 a ton, the price of cordwood also falls.

Mr. FOSTER. Not always.

Mr. MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman had done a little kicking in the cord-wood line, does he not think that he would have saved something on that as well? If he had squeezed his friend Mr. Heney, he might have made Mr. Heney come down; but he did not want to squeeze Mr. Heney. There is no doubt that in this case the Government have done something which they ought not to have done, and it augurs very poorly for the Administration when we find a transaction like this defended by the Minister of Finance, who ought to take care of our funds instead of utilizing them apparently as if they were his own. That is not the true position for the Finance Minister to take. If he could have saved $1 a cord on wood, he ought to have done it. I notice that there are two items: one, "Heating public buildings, Ottawa, $60,000," and a little further down, "heating Dominion public buildings, fuel, &c., $60,000." In order that we should have no confusion between the two, would the hon. gentleman state what buildings are included in the vote now under consideration?

Mr. FOSTER. It is explained by the vote—Public Buildings, Ottawa. The other item is for all the buildings throughout the provinces.

Mr. MULOCK. The other vote has nothing to do with any of the buildings of the capital?

Mr. FOSTER. No; the two votes are quite distinct.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman explain why he did not do as well in the wood line as in the coal line?

Mr. FOSTER. In the wood line we did as well as we could do.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Public Works Department did not give an opportunity to see whether it was possible to do as well as they could do; they did not advertise for tenders. They renewed the contract with Mr. Heney time after time at his own price. If the hon. Minister of Finance were doing business for himself, he would not do it in that way, but he would see that those in the wood business would have an opportunity of tendering for a contract of this magnitude. If we look at the county buildings all over the province, we find that the county councils advertise for tenders for the small quantity of wood or coal required for those buildings; yet here we have this Government renewing their contract with Mr. Heney, from year to year, without soliciting tenders from other people. He gets his own price for the wood for three or four years at a time, and the public are not allowed to compete at all. When the Finance Minister obtained a reduction in the price of coal, why did he not try his hand in getting a reduction in the price of wood? Was it because Mr. Heney is a favourite of the Government, and was of use to members of the Government in getting up testimonials on different occasions? The Finance Minister says the information asked for will be forthcoming, but this is the proper time when it ought to be forthcoming. The hon. gentleman knows very well that, though he may bring down the information on concurrence, there is no opportunity then for criticism. The request of the Opposition is a reasonable one, that we should have the necessary information before voting the money, and if the Minister cannot give the information the item should be allowed to stand. There is no excuse for withholding this information. The Finance Minister knew this item was coming up, he knew this discussion would take place, and as acting Minister of Public Works he ought to have seen that this information, which we have a right to expect, was forthcoming.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to repeat the question I asked before recess, as to the relative value of coal and wood. Has the hon. gentleman obtained any information on that point?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not, but I will obtain the opinion of the engineer?

Mr. WATSON. Could not the hon. gentleman's officer, who is here, give him the information?

Mf. FOSTER. He is not the engineer.

Mr. WATSON. I must say I consider it a great loss to the country to use wood instead of coal. I estimate one ton of coal is as good as two cords of wood. The Government have paid on an average $4.95 per cord for wood, and during the last year, they have paid $6 per cord. Everyone knows that coal can be handled at much less expense than wood. More than that, the wood runs from 3 to 4 feet in length; and I venture to say that if any portion of the wood is 4 feet in length, the gentlemen who measure it will measure it in the interest

of Mr. Heney, and the Government will not get full value.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend raises a question which is quite proper to be discussed, as to the relative value of wood and coal. But while it is an interesting question, on which my hon. friend may have strong opinions, it is one rather for experts to settle than this House. Moreover if any change were made, it only could be decided upon after diligent enquiry on the part of the officers who have this matter in charge, and after they had come to the conclusion that it would be economical to substitute coal for wood. It would be impossible to make any change in the course of the fiscal year, some months of which have already passed, and these contracts are running. Therefore, although the hon. gentleman has raised an interesting subject for discussion, it is one which cannot affect one way or the other the passing of the item under consideration, and it is one on which this House could not come to a conclusion to-night.

Mr. WATSON. This is the only opportunity we get to criticise the public expenditure. This matter was criticised a year ago and the same argument used, and no change made. I find that for cutting the wood $1.25 per cord is paid for cutting it once, and $1.75 for cutting it twice. This is an expense which would not occur in the case of coal. I venture to say there is not a gentleman in this House who pays more than 50 cents per cord for cutting wood once and 75 cents for cutting it twice. This runs the price of this mixed wood up to $6 per cord if cut once, and $6.50 if cut twice, so that actually a cord of wood costs more than a ton of coal, and a ton of coal is as good as two cords of wood.

Mr. FOSTER. The officer informs me there is no such amount as $1.75 paid for cutting ordinary wood two cuts for ordinary purposes; but $1.75 may be paid for cutting up wood into very small pieces, splitting it, and making it into kindling wood.

Mr. WATSON. I take the Auditor General's Report, and I suppose that is accurate. I find on page 386—B that of hard wood there were 2,980 cords and 34 feet, at $4.75; of mixed wood, one cut, 59 cords at $6, or a difference of $1.25.

Mr. TISDALE. That is a small item. It shows that is for kindling wood.

Mr. WATSON. Then there is mixed wood, two cuts, 30 cords at $6.50. This wood is used for various purposes. I say that coal is cheaper than wood, and I believe the country would save thousands of dollars annually by using coal instead of wood.

Mr. FOSTER. Last year there were 59 cords of wood, one cut, at $6, and 30 cords, two cuts, at $6.50. That is only 50 cents extra.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know whether the contract with Mr. Heney stipulates for a certain quantity of wood per annum, or just for as much as you choose to take.

Mr. FOSTER. It is what is necessary to be used.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have you freedom to take 500 or 5,000, as you like?

Mr. FOSTER. We take what is necessary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No quantity is stipulated?

Mr. FOSTER. No; but you know about the quantity, year in and year out—6,000 or 7,000 cords.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister may fancy that we are too critical, but I was talking to a wood contractor in Ottawa, and he said he did not know of the contract being renewed, and did not know that the canal tolls were to be recouped to the man who had the contract. There has been a good deal of query in Ottawa in regard to this contract. A good many people have an idea that Mr. Heney is having an advantage which many others are denied, and I intimated that before recess, and asked the Minister to furnish us with figures as to the amount of the refund of the canal tolls. There are many people in this city who are anxious to find out what that amounts to. We are within our rights in asking to have that. The Minister says he will give us that information afterwards. We have no other opportunity of getting that information except on concurrence. I think I came to this chamber about the same time that my hon. friend did, and, as a rule, my experience is that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House are anxious to get away home at the time of concurrence, and a very great deal is put through in a very short time. I do not blame the Government for that. I know that sometimes my hon. friend is not prepared to take much cognizance of what I say, but I think he should have placed himself in a position to give us these figures, because it is in the interest of parties in this city who are anxious to know the bottom of this whole contract with Heney. We are trying to discharge a duty which is unpleasant to us. I do not wish to delay the proceedings of the House, but we should have that information.

Mr. HYMAN. It seems to me that there is a very important principle involved here. In the first place, I understand that tenders were called for. I would like to know whether it was understood by those tendering that the canal tolls would be remitted, and that the contractor would have free piling grounds. If it was understood in that way, there might not be so much fault found with Mr. Heney's original contract, but if it was not so understood, it would appear that the Government, after having let the contract, allowed Mr. Heney to have certain favours shown to him which those who might have contracted could have no cognizance of. I would like to know from the Minister if the specification included remission of canal tolls and free piling ground? Surely, this is a fair question to ask.

Mr. LISTER. The question of my hon. friend from London (Mr. Hyman) is a fair question, whether all the contractors were put on a fair basis, whether everyone knew that canal tolls were to be remitted, and that the piling grounds were to be free?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the drift of the discussion this afternoon shows that, in 1885, that information was given to the contractors.

Mr. LISTER. That does not answer the question: whether all the persons who were asked to tender were given to understand that they would have the canal tolls remitted and have free piling grounds?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the canal tolls were remitted long before that—I think in 1880 or 1881.

Mr. LISTER. I know, but that is not answering the question.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is not the least doubt about that. My hon. friend might make some argument about the fact that specific information had not been given, but he knows that, setting aside all these matters, contractors, if there were no other sources of information, who were intending to tender for any given work would find out the conditions before they tendered. We know that this has been discussed for years and years. It is in the papers, it is in the discussions of Parliament, and any would-be contractors, knowing that the canal tolls had been refunded and that the piling ground had been used, would make themselves masters of the information they required : and it has always been supposed that we have received the wood at a cheaper rate on that consideration.

Mr. LISTER. You did not receive it any cheaper. I suppose there are specifications made by the proper officers which show all the conditions and all the privileges the contractor is to have, the prices he is to receive, and everything connected with the contract, so that it would not be necessary for the contractor to enquire from individuals because the specifications would show the conditions on which he tendered. As far as this wood contract was concerned, the wood contractors in this section of the country have concluded that it is of little use to tender to the department for this particular contract. It seems that Mr. Heney has a prescriptive right to it. No one else has any chance. A contract is entered into by the Government with him which does not show all the conditions and privileges which the contractor is to have. That contract, in some mysterious way, is renewed from time to time without asking for fresh tenders, and it is given to Mr. Heney upon the terms contained in his original contract. No person acquainted with business methods will say that this was a proper way of getting supplies for the public buildings of this country. Every citizen of Canada whether he lives in Ottawa or Kingston, or any other place, has a right to open and free competition for furnishing everything this country requires in the shape of supplies. It is a most suspicious circumstance that this Mr. Heney, considering his past record, considering that he has been a confidential supporter of the Government for a great number of years, should have a monopoly for the supply of wood required by the Government—and such wood ! I will venture to say that in no market except Ottawa could any person be found to buy the wood that is sold by him to the Government of this country. It is poor in quality, it is short, and in every way it is wood that would not be taken by any purchaser, hardly, in any town in this country. Yet the Government are paying this man the enormous price of $4.95 for this wood, when coal would be a great deal cheaper, and the only conclusion to be drawn is that the Government desire that this extensive contract shall be continued in the hands of this man that he may continue to make enormous profits out of it. I venture to say that in London, or Hamilton, this wood would not bring more than $2.75 a cord ; people would not have it at any price. This question has been a subject of debate for nine years at least. Every session this question of wood has come up, and for the Minister to come to the House now and say : Oh, let this item pass and we will give you the information on concurrence, is an old way the Government has of putting off these ugly questions. We know that the late leader of the House used to say : We will give you all the information in our power, if you will only let this matter stand until concurrence. When concurrence came, all a member could do was to ask about it once, the information given was scanty, and we received no satisfaction. The Minister of Finance is paid seven or eight thousand dollars a year for giving this House all the information it requires upon every item of the Estimates that he asks us to agree to, and it his plain duty to prepare himself, or at all events to have his deputy post him, when he asks this House to vote this amount of money. It is his plain duty to be in a position to give every possible information that members may require for the purpose of showing to them that the contract is a fair one, that the price is fair, that all parties are treated on equal terms. I say that unless the Minister is in a position to give the information asked for, this item should be allowed to stand until he can give that information.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Minister explain the division of the $60,000 ? I have taken down the figures which he has given for coal and wood, and he will require $47,403.85. He mentioned there was something else to be defrayed out of that vote, wages and contingencies ; will he say what the contingencies are ?

Mr. FOSTER. The item of $1,000 for contingencies is for whatever small unforeseen requirements may arise in connection with the wood or coal supply, as if more help were needed than has been estimated for, or if any investigations were to be carried on with reference to the coal, or anything of that kind—whatever little incidental expenses that may be necessary. There must always be an amount for that.

Mr. MULOCK. Would it not be proper to separate the item ? The wages account is an entirely separate matter from heating.

Mr. GIBSON. I would ask the Minister what reason he has to give for the continuation of Mr. Heney's contract ? Does he call for fresh tenders for the wood ?

Mr. FOSTER. That question has been asked at least a dozen times.

Mr. GIBSON. Had I been here and heard the answer, I certainly would not have asked for the information again.

Mr. FOSTER. The principle which we might observe for the despatch of business in Committee is something like the principle recommended by the Speaker's ruling to-day, that a member ought to be in his place in the House when a question is being put or discussed.

Mr. GIBSON. Perhaps the Minister is not always in his place in the House, as well as I. I may say that I am always in my place in the House, I have never left this building until the House is closed ever since I came here this session. I have other duties to perform as well as to sit here, and I ask the Minister, in all fairness, to give me a reason

why Mr. Heney's contract is continued without fresh tenders being asked for?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has put it so winningly that I cannot help but answer that question again, although it has already been answered two or three times. Before 1885 the Government advertised for tenders, and contracts were given by tenders, and these contracts were, from time to time, extended by Order in Council. That practice has existed ever since Confederation. When we took office in 1878 we found the contract, after having been extended, it was in 1879 given on tender to McCaffrey. When his contract expired it was given on tender to Mr. Quinn, that was in 1885. Mr. Quinn could not carry out his contract, and he transferred it under the same conditions to Mr. Heney, and from 1888 that has been extended twice, on the ground that satisfaction was given by the contractor, that the price was not considered to be more than a reasonable price, and it was considered that the Government was getting as good value from the contractor as could possibly be got. On these grounds, which are thorough business grounds, the Government extended the contract. The same is done in a man's own business, the same is done in the public business. In many cases contractors, who have performed their contracts to the satisfaction of the department, if the rate is considered to be a reasonable one, have their contracts extended, instead of the Government asking for tenders, although the general practice of the Government is to ask for tenders.

Mr. GIBSON. I am glad to get this information from the Minister. When the Government continue contracts of this kind do they ask from other people prices in order that they may not be giving Mr. Heney or any others undue advantage?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government possesses itself of all information to make sure as to their action; and the Minister must be possessed of that information and bring it to Council when such a proposal is brought to Council. He possesses himself of that information necessary to convince him and Council that this contract which he proposes to extend will give us the work or the supplies as suitably as they can be obtained elsewhere.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think hon. gentlemen will find reason to approve of this contract when they know it was made on the recommendation, or with the concurrence as regards its extension, of John R. Arnoldi.

Mr. LISTER. It is but fair to say to the Committee that there is a rumour in the city that Mr. Heney for years has supplied gentlemen occupying high official positions with wood, for which he has never rendered an account.

Mr. FOSTER. A similar insinuation, and I call it a mean insinuation, was made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to-day; and when I asked him to inform me as to the particulars, so that the outrage might be stopped, he refused to give them, and said the onus rested on this side of the House. There is nothing worse in one respect than for responsible men to rise and give wings to a rumour of that kind, which is very damaging, and it should be given only on square and fair information. I ask the hon. gentleman if he has any information in that regard, such as ought to be sufficient to lead him to take the position he did to-night, and to give that information to the Government.

Mr. LISTER. I have in the discharge of my duties as a member of this House never hesitated to make charges, in spite of the fact that I have been threatened by the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite that if I failed to prove them I must take the responsibility for them. I have made more than one charge against men occupying high official positions, and have sustained them in face of the fact that I have been assailed by the Conservative press of the country. I have been as much as told that if I failed in proving those charges my expulsion from the House would be the consequence. I will tell the Finance Minister what I have heard, and what is common rumour in this city, and if a man with his ears open wants to hear it he can do so: It is, that men occupying high official positions have received wood from that gentleman for years past, and he has never rendered an account. If the hon. gentleman wants me to be more specific I will give the information to him as a man, as man to man.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I shall be very glad for the hon. gentleman to do so. I want to point out the unfairness of this course. How many men are there in this city holding high official positions? There are dozens. Are none of them honest and honourable men, men with families and business reputations and the like of that? When the hon. gentleman gets up and makes that wide assertion without particulars, he exposes every honourable man who occupies an official position in this city to the finger of scorn and to the suspicions of an unjust kind, and in that respect it is a mean thing to do. Perhaps I use too strong a word when I say a mean thing; but it looks to me in that light. What the hon. gentleman might have done was to have given information privately to a member of the Government, to myself for instance, and then if we had not acted, he might have used his power as a member to see that the outrage was not carried on. But the hon. gentleman will see in a moment how unfair it is to loosen every tongue of slander and every suspicious mind in this city against every man holding a responsible official position; and, to-morrow, after this statement has gone abroad, every man holding an official position is liable to be hooted at in this city as a man who gets his wood for nothing.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. In the light of certain revelations made recently before a certain Committee the charge made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) cannot be considered as anything very astounding or startling. We have had revelations which must have startled not only this House but the country at large; and I may say that I as well as the hon. member for Lambton have heard such reports. I fancy that if the Public Accounts Committee had the opportunity of sitting more frequently we would have a great many more revelations than have yet been made with respect to the transactions of public servants in Ottawa lately and for years past. But, aside from that question, the Minister of Finance stated a few moments ago that the Opposition were trying to impede the progress of the Estimates, that they were acting improperly in asking for information which, he said, he would give afterwards willingly. If there is any obstruction it is not on the part of

the Opposition, who wish to decide this matter fairly. The members of the Government occupy official positions and are paid handsome salaries for performing certain duties. They know the duties they have to discharge and they come to the House with that knowledge. If they come here to beg from the Opposition to let them push the Estimates through without supplying the necessary information, it is the Government who are acting as obstructionists and not the Opposition. This evening the Minister has refused to answer questions put to him for the purpose of eliciting information and to enable hon. members to give an intelligent vote on the question and know whether they would be acting rightly in voting $60,000 for heating the public buildings at Ottawa. What have we been told by the Minister of Finance? That when the Government let the contract it was to be presumed that all those men who wished to tender were aware of the practice of the Government, that the contractor was allowed free land for piling ground and that his canal tolls were remitted. I ask the Minister of Finance if that is a proper way to conduct public business, that, if when asking for tenders for public works certain special arrangements not put down in black and white should be assumed to be made. How are public contractors to know this? If I wish to make a contract for wood with the Government, how would I know, except the Government in their advertisements and specifications stated the fact, that I would be supplied with piling ground free of charge and that the tolls on all my wood passing through the canals would be remitted? It is too much for the Minister of Finance to say the whole matter was fair and square, because men who tendered ought to have known these allowances were made by the Government; and how could they have known them unless the Government had put them in possession of the facts. To all appearance this contract cannot be justified before this House and the people. This man Heney has been a favourite, and his contract has been renewed time and time again without other people being asked to tender or given an opportunity to tender. Why should this be so? There must be some reason why this man, above all other men, should be favoured in this wood contracting business. It is a large contract, a large sum is expended, and we have a right to enquire into everything in connection with the matter. I say, as I said before, that unless the Minister of Finance—he having charge of this department at the present time—is prepared to give this House the information which is absolutely necessary that we should have before we can give an intelligent vote on this subject; instead of acting as an obstructionist as he has done in this matter by refusing to give us the information, he should say: I will let this item stand until I put you in possession of all the facts bearing on this matter. This I think would be the honourable course for the Finance Minister to pursue. It would be the course that would be proper, and that would be in the interest of the conduct of public affairs, and I feel satisfied that he will be doing credit to himself if he will adopt the suggestion made in a proper way by the members on this side of the House, and allow the item to stand until we get the information.

Mr. TAYLOR. We began about ten minutes to four o'clock to discuss this item and it is now ten minutes past nine.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. TAYLOR. If hon. gentlemen keep quiet, I will give it to them loud enough before I get through. A great deal of information has been elicited outside of the question at issue. My friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) and my friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) have endeavoured to paint this Mr. Heney in very high colours. I presume Mr. Heney, who has the contract for supplying the wood to-day, is the same Mr. Heney who had the contract for supplying wood to the Government under the late Mackenzie Administration.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What has that got to do with it?

Mr. TAYLOR. He is the same man and he had a higher price per cord in 1874-75 from the Mackenzie Government, when wood was cheaper, than he has now when the wood is dearer. When his contract expired under the Mackenzie Government he came to that immaculate and pure and honest Government and asked to have his contract extended for another term, and they extended it at the same price without calling for tenders.

Mr. LANDERKIN. For how long?

Mr. TAYLOR. For the time he asked.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did you see the *Hansard* yesterday and what the Minister of Justice stated there?

Mr. TAYLOR. I heard the discussion and I did not interrupt my hon. friend opposite when he was speaking. The contract was extended by the Mackenzie Government and it was at a considerably higher price per cord, than this same Mr. Heney is obtaining from the Government now.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the price?

Mr. TAYLOR. My friend has the price before him and he can read it if he wants to know.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You should not talk about a thing you do not understand.

Mr. FOSTER. We would not get a word in a month if you apply that rule to yourself.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am making the statements in my place in this House and they are correct, if not more so than the statements my hon. friend makes. I say that the contract price to-day is cheaper than it was during the Mackenzie Administration.

Mr. WATSON. Give us the figures?

Mr. TAYLOR. The contract price is lower to-day than it was under the Mackenzie Administration, and the price of wood to-day is higher per cord, not only in Ottawa, but in every town along the line than, it was during the time of the Mackenzie Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite have wasted the time of the House from four o'clock this afternoon until nine to-night, and not one of them has made a statement that he, or any other person, could supply the wood at any lower rate than the present contractor. No fault has been found with the Government that the price is too high, and until they show that, there is no ground for argument in this discussion. The Minister has made a fair and complete statement of what this vote is for. The contract price is fixed, the Government can take as much of the wood as they require and not one gentleman opposite has risen in his place to say that he can furnish wood at a lower rate. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) says the wood is not good, but I say that

the wood delivered in that yard to-day is a first class merchantable article. I think I know as much about wood as any member in this House, for I have handled hundreds of thousands of cords during my life, having had a contract with the Grand Trunk for many years to supply wood. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) stated that some of the logs were only three feet three, and three feet six, and that no man could measure that wood to give satisfaction. Now, the Grand Trunk contracts were all in the same way, 128 feet per cord. The wood used to be put on the line, in some cases two feet six long, and some running up to four feet. The inspector would simply take the average length, height and width of the pile, multiply the three together and divide it by a hundred and twenty-eight to get the cords. The same system of measuring is carried out in the present case. You cannot have it all sawn to an exact length of three or four feet. The wood is measured from point to scarf and an average struck for the whole. But that is outside of the question here. The vote is for so much money to supply so much coal and wood and to pay the labourers, and when hon. gentlemen opposite are asking for unnecessary information they are simply burking the progress of the work of the House. They have been five hours discussing the question whether they will heat this building next year or not, and not one of them has made a charge that the wood could be bought for less than it is purchased for now. They are trying to blacken the character of the officials of this city, making assertions about Mr. Heney, the same gentleman who furnished wood during the Mackenzie Administration without contract, and had his time extended at a higher price. Whether he gave his wood to officials or not, is no person's business. If Mr. Heney wishes to make a present of a cord of his own wood to an official, that is Mr. Heney's business.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. I say that is Mr. Heney's business. I will just cite a case. There is the Customs Department here; and I will take the commissioner of Customs, or the assistant commissioner of Customs. They are officials occupying a high position in the service at Ottawa; and suppose Mr. Heney wants to send each of these gentlemen five cords of wood, what has that to do with the contract for supplying the House of Commons? If Mr. Heney sees fit to do it, it is his business; and the character of these officials should not be besmirched by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You believe in taking boodle in wood or anything else.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is an insinuation my hon. friend has no right to make. I do not believe in taking boodle, and I will help to put down boodle transactions as fast, or a little faster than my hon. friend if he shows them. It is beneath the dignity of hon. gentlemen occupying a position in this House to try to besmirch the character of every public official in the city. The fact remains that Mr. Heney, whether he is an honest man to-day or not, was the same gentleman who under similar circumstances, but at a higher price, had his contract extended by that immaculate and pure Liberal Administration that my hon. friends opposite think so much about. They say they would not extend the contract and that they would call for tenders, but they did not do that when they were in power. We have heard it explained to-day, that before the Minister of Public Works came to Council and asked to have that tender extended, he made enquiries and found that Mr. Heney had fulfilled the contract satisfactorily, and at as low prices as could be obtained anywhere else, and no hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House during the discussion has had the manhood about him to get up and say that he would deliver that wood at five cents a cord less than the present contractor. But they tried to blacken the characters of public officials in this city, many of whom I am proud to say have just as high a sense of honour as men occupying seats on either side of this House; and I think that hon. gentlemen ought to think more of the reputation of the officials of this country of ours than to say they could be bribed by a cord of wood.

Mr. WATSON. I am rather surprised that any gentleman should get up in his place in this House and attempt to read the members on this side a lecture such as the hon. gentleman has attempted to read just now. He tells us that we have no right to criticise these items——

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. WATSON,—because we did not show that wood could be purchased more cheaply, and that nothing is wrong. We have great reason to suspect that something is wrong, particularly after listening to the hon. gentleman who occupies a prominent position on the other side of the House, I suppose next to that of a Cabinet Minister. He tells us on this side of the House and the country that Mr. Heney, who is getting $30,000 annually for furnishing wood to the Government, has a right if he sees fit to make presents to any high official of the Government—that that is his own business. We have evidence that the very man who inspects this wood, and who makes the contract, Mr. Arnoldi——

Mr. FOSTER. He does not make the contract.

Mr. WATSON,—that he did receive presents from persons who had dealings with the Government, and he has been dismissed for having done so—that very man who inspects the wood, and makes the report on which the contract is let, received presents of brass dogs, tandem harness, jewellery, and even horses; and we have a gentleman, the chief whip of the Government side, getting up and telling us that this is perfectly right.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order. I made no such statement, and the hon. gentleman has no right to say that I did. I did not refer to Mr. Arnoldi. I referred to officials occupying high positions in the Government. If Mr. Arnoldi did wrong, I am as ready to condemn him or any other gentleman occupying a position of trust in the Government of the country; I am just as ready to crush them as he is; but he has no right to put down my throat statements which I did not make.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman did not refer to Mr. Arnoldi, but he said that the hon. Minister of Customs or the Deputy Minister of Customs might accept a present of cordwood.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman is entirely misquoting me.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If the Minister of Customs had been here, he would have crammed those words down the hon. gentleman's throat, because it is well known that, if there is a Minister on the Treasury benches who desires to secure for his Administration a reputation which is above anything like scandal, it is the Minister of Customs; and the idea of a supporter of the Government getting up in his place and telling the Minister of Customs that it would be no harm for him or his deputy to accept a cord of wood from a contractor, is a direct insult to the Minister of Customs and his deputy: and I fancy that the Minister of Customs, when he comes to hear it, will sit on the member for Leeds with considerable vengeance.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the hon. gentleman reads my speech to-morrow, in *Hansard*, and then reads his own, if he has a spark of manliness about him, he will come forward and apologize, because I made no statement in reference to the Minister of Customs or any of the Customs officials.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TAYLOR. I said this, that if Mr. Heney wished to make a present of a cord of wood——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Five cords.

Mr. TAYLOR.—of five cords to the commissioner, or the assistant commissioner, whose business was that, as to what Mr. Heney chose to do with his wood?

Mr. CHARLTON. That is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. One of the hon. gentleman's intimate friends say that his statement was not true.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that our hon. friend from Leeds was quite in accord with the action of the hon. Minister of Justice, in accepting the resolution of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the other night with regard to testimonials and presents; but he differs now. The other night when the hon. Minister of Justice accepted that resolution, my hon. friend sat in his seat and quietly acquiesced, and now he makes a difference.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not make a difference. I did not say it was right for the officials to accept it. I said that if Mr. Heney liked to give away his property, that is nobody's business.

Mr. McMULLEN. There was another statement which the hon. gentleman made to which I want to draw attention. He said that Mr. Heney had supplied wood in the year 1875 for more than it was supplied for during last year. Now, I hold in my hand the Public Accounts for the year 1875-76, and I find that for all the wood that Mr. Heney delivered for heating the public buildings in Ottawa, that year, he got $18,213.29, whereas last year he got $33,000 for heating the same buildings.

Mr. TAYLOR. I said that it was more per cord.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend may possibly have the advantage in that respect, because the book does not give the rate per cord. In the same year we only paid altogether for heating the buildings here $40,321, and we are now asked to vote $60,000, that is $20,000 more than it cost in 1876 to heat the same buildings.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not the same buildings.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, what has been added? There has only been one wing added here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. The Langevin Block.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Langevin Block is not included in the accounts for 1889, which we are discussing; so that we have virtually the same buildings, which it then cost $40,000 to heat, while now we are asked to vote $60,000 for the same service. The accounts for that year do not give the number of cords.

Mr. WATSON. I am glad to know that the hon. member for Leeds does say that Mr. Arnoldi should not accept brass dogs, horses and harness.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Speak to the question.

Mr. WATSON. I am speaking to this very question. The man who inspects the very wood that we are discussing——

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is not right. That gentleman does not inspect this wood.

Mr. WATSON. He did inspect it.

Mr. FOSTER. He did not inspect this wood. He did not inspect a single stick of this wood.

Mr. WATSON. I understand that Mr. Arnoldi's position was to make purchases of coal and wood.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Arnoldi was not to make purchases at all. No purchases were made except by contract, which was sanctioned by Order in Council.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Arnoldi reported on the contracts, and I have information that Mr. Arnoldi, instead of dealing with the coal merchants of this city, because he did not receive the tandem harness in time, was going to buy the coal direct from the Pennsylvania coal mines; and I believe he was presented with the tandem harness by the Ottawa merchants for the purpose of securing the contract for that coal by the merchant.

Mr. FOSTER. You have no grounds for saying that.

Mr. WATSON. I have grounds.

Mr. FOSTER. Why did you not go to the Public Accounts Committee and state it there.

Mr. WATSON. I am not a member of that Committee; I wish I was.

Mr. FOSTER. You could have attended it.

Mr. WATSON. I am surprised that any gentleman in this House should say it is right for any contractor dealing with the Government to make presents to officials, as has been stated here to-night by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). The Customs commissioner, to whom that hon. gentleman said there was no objection in a contractor making a present, has the duty of appraising goods, and should not receive presents from any contractor.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not discussing that.

Mr. WATSON. The explanation given by the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Taylor) makes things worse. He is troubled with a wooden head.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Finance Minister has said that when the Government renewed the contract, they were in possession of sufficient information to enable them to arrive at the conclu-

sion that it was in the best interests of the country the contract should be renewed. He will not deny that he said that. That information the Minister of Finance should put in our possession.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to Mr. John Arnoldi's connection with this matter I beg to call the attention of the House to the fact that on the certified copy of the report of the Privy Council, under which, as I understand, Mr. Heney's contract was arranged, it is stated:

"On the report of the mechanical engineer—[that is Arnoldi]—to the effect that the terms on which Mr. Heney has his contract are reasonable, and that it would be in the public interest to grant an extension of the time of the contract."

Now, bearing in mind what is known as to Mr. Arnoldi's habits and practices, surely the Minister cannot be surprised that when it turns out that this contract was renewed, without competition, for a sum involving $100,000 at least, on the recommendation of a public official who has, I believe, —the Minister will correct me if I am wrong—been dismissed by himself and colleagues for the grossest possible misconduct in office, surely he cannot say my hon. friends are not justified in looking on the renewal of the contract with grave suspicion.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend's position would be entirely fair if we were now entering on a contract and the House were asked to ratify a contract made on the recommendation of Mr. Arnoldi, under present circumstances. But this is a contract which has already been entered into, and which we are bound to carry out. The real point, however, in all this discussion, is, are we paying more than a reasonable amount for wood of that quality? No attempt has been made on the other side to prove that we are not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Unless you have the tenders, it is quite impossible for the members to know whether the contract was on the most reasonable terms possible or not.

Mr. CHARLTON. The assertion made by the Minister of Finance that this is not the time to enter into consideration of this matter, that it is simply a question of voting the money to carry out a contract in existence, will hardly hold water. We have a right at any time to scrutinize the conduct of the Government upon a vote for the expenditure of money; and if, as has been asserted, there has been anything irregular or improper in the awarding of this contract, it is proper for us, even at this eleventh hour, to enquire into that matter. The Minister ought to furnish us with the report upon which this contract was renewed. It seems, and the Committee is only in possession of the fact for the first time to-day, that this contract which was entered into in 1885, was renewed in 1888 by Order in Council without advertising for tenders, and again renewed in the same way in 1891. Then there are dark rumours, which have been made public for the first time, that the contractor, Mr. Heney, was a subscriber to the testimonials of the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Public Works, and was very active in securing subscriptions from others. Under these circumstances the subject is one that naturally begets suspicion in the minds of hon. members, and this is the time for bringing the matters to judgment. We are unearthing a good many things, and we want to know of the Minister of Finance if he had good reasons for renewing the contract. It has been said on that side that this course was pursued by the Mackenzie Administration, but that has not been established, and in any case it does not follow that the precedent was a good one. We are told that the price charged for this wood is as low as the wood could be procured at. But how do we know that? Here is a contractor who has private information to the effect that he will be relieved from the payment of tolls on this wood when brought through the canal, and that he will be permitted free use of the ordnance lands for piling ground. He has these advantages over others.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman means to misstate the case, and I would call his attention to the fact that he is making a statement for which there is no justification whatever. Mr. Heney did not get private information about the remission of canal tolls and the use of Government land, and there is nothing to justify any hon. gentleman who will consider the matter, in making such an assertion. Such an assertion is entirely unfounded. The tenders were called for after it was decided and generally known that the Government would refund the canal tolls.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does the Minister of Inland Revenue propose to tell this House that, in the specifications upon which that contract was let, the public were informed that the canal tolls would be remitted and free piling ground given? Does he suppose that we, for a moment, believe ex-Alderman Heney was not in full possession of all these facts and did not know he would have these special advantages? If he did not know that in 1885, he knew it in 1888.

Mr. COSTIGAN. So did every other tenderer.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Government did not allow other people to get that information.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; they accepted tenders.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; they renewed this contract twice by Order in Council; and if, in 1885, the Government had decided to give these special advantages, they should have advertised and stated the specific terms on which the contract would be let. We are entitled to demand that the information, the report upon which the Government acted upon both those occasions in renewing this contract by Order in Council, shall be furnished to the House. I believe a large sum of money has been lost to the country by not advertising for tenders in an open, business-like way, apprising the public of all the conditions upon which the contract would be given, including the remission of the tolls and free piling grounds. I believe the Government have not acted on business principles in twice renewing this contract when the public at large knew nothing about it when the contract was first let in 1885. We are entitled to have the report and the evidence upon which the Government acted, and the reasons that induced it to take this action.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Minister spoke about the $1,000 for contingencies being required for investigations. What investigations have taken place in relation to this wood contract? Has there ever been one? Was it alleged that the measure-

ment was short, and were any parties asked to investigate and enquire into it? This is a very proper question. I understand that there was an investigation.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you have more information than I have.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understand that it was asserted that the measurement was short, and I am informed that Mr. Robertson, the gardener, was one of those employed on the investigation. There were a number of years when Mr. Heney did not have the contract. Was that because he gave short measure? Why was he reinstated? The Minister says the contingencies were set apart for investigations.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you not know that the contingencies have not been voted yet?

Mr. LANDERKIN. There were contingencies oted last year.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not talking about last year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Are you going to have a change of policy?

Mr. MULOCK. It is the old policy.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, it is the old policy, and, if so, you are going to have contingencies this year. I should like to know whether Mr. Robertson and others were on an investigation in reference to the short measurement of wood?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Before the item is passed, I think I am entitled to an answer to the straightforward question I put to the Finance Minister on the declaration he made to this Committee, that the Government were in possession of certain information before they passed the Order in Council renewing the contract with Mr. Heney, which enabled them to come to the conclusion that it was in the best interests of the country that that contract should be renewed. The Finance Minister has stated that in his place here to-night, and this Committee has a right to be put in possession of the information upon which the Government concluded to renew this contract in the interests of the country. I ask the Finance Minister to be kind enough to give me an answer to this question, which I think is a fair and a pertinent question. If he has the information, we are entitled to receive it, and I fancy he will expedite business by giving it. There is no use his trying to obstruct this Committee any longer——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SOMERVILLE,—and, if the Government will persist in obstructing the business of this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SOMERVILLE,—the fault lies with the Government and not with the Opposition. I ask the Finance Minister to give me an answer to this question.

Mr. BARRON. I think this House ought to emphasize, and to emphasize most particularly, that the point in this discussion——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh; hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON. I say to——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON,—to emphasize the point——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh; hear, hear: *en français.*

Mr. CHARLTON. As there seems to be a disposition to prevent discussion, I think it would be better to move that the Committee rise.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BARRON. The point is not——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON. The point is not that——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON. It is not whether the Government has paid too much or too little——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON. The point is, Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON,—in the Public Accounts Committee——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON—we are sometimes being charged with being obstructionists. I want to know why——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. member for Leeds——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. member for Leeds——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Chairman, keep order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. I made a motion a few minutes ago.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said a short time ago that there was great obstruction or delay by reason of the talking on this item lasting from four to nine o'clock. If the Finance Minister had given the information which was asked or had allowed this item to stand, as other items have been allowed to stand——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. BARRON,—but he has refused to do that. I say it is not fair in an important matter like this, where accusations have been made, that the Finance Minister should not allow this item to stand as he has allowed others to stand.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON. We must say that the simulated rage and the assumed indignation of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) of which he tried to make this House understand that he was sincerely possessed, on account of the action taken by hon. members on this side of the House, in regard to this item——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON,—I am bound to say that hardly any hon. gentleman in this House will believe——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON,—will believe in the assumed indignation and the simulated rage of the hon. gentleman opposite——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BARRON,—when we see that he is always ready and willing to stand by and back up hon. members on the Treasury benches.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON. The Minister, or his Commissioner of Customs may receive a cord of wood from the gentleman who supplies wood for the Government, but if a poor official receives the present of a cord of wood he is ready to cut off that official's head. The Finance Minister seems so anxious to burke enquiry that he will not allow an item to stand, so that the people's representatives may get more information on the subject. The other night, on an important matter, he was willing that an item should stand, but to-night, when the most grave accusations are made, not against city officials, as the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) tries to make out, but against men in high places in the Government, the Minister is anxious to burke enquiry by refusing to let the item stand.

Mr. TAYLOR. Name the officials.

Mr. BARRON. I name the hon. member for Leeds as a man always ready and willing to back everything, no matter how bad it may be, provided it is done by a member of this Administration, while he is willing to cut off the heads of some minor officials like Arnoldi and others, who have taken credit to themselves for having done so. The price of wood is lower now than it was in Mr. Mackenzie's time, and one reason for that, in Alderman Heney's case, is that the Government allow his wood to come up here free of toll, they give him low freight rates, and advantages which were not offered to other men. I think that all these contracts should be let by tender, and it is a matter of no importance whether you are geting the services at a reasonable price or not, so long as you observe the principle of doing the work by tender and giving every person the same chance.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the Opposition are not pursuing the best course to get information on this item, and I admit that they are fairly discharging their duty in endeavouring to get all reasonable information which would enable them to judge whether the price paid is too high or not. But that information has been given several times over to-night. As I understand the duty of an Opposition, if they do not want to let an item pass, they might either move that it should be struck out, and have it either voted down or carried, or they might enter a strong protest against it and allow the item to pass, thowing upon the Government the responsibility for it. But to continue a debate on an item from four o'clock in the afternoon until ten at night, and asking the same questions over and over again, looks more like obstruction than an honest desire to get information. I think hon. gentlemen would be discharging their duty much more fully to their constituents if they took either of the courses I have pointed out. We know that on almost every item the same demand comes from the Opposition: Let this item stand, there is something wrong about it. Now, we are making little or no progress with the estimates. Much more information, I believe, is given this year than has been given upon some other items in past years, and which was considered sufficient by hon. members in previous Parliaments.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have had a long discussion upon this matter, with a good deal of warmth and a good deal of humour, and I want to address a few words to the Committee from a purely business point of view. Besides expressing an opinion, which any hon. gentleman may feel himself bound to express, upon the course of the Government, it is also the interest of everybody to get on with the public business, and I am sure that after the session has been nearly four months in progress it is no pleasure to hon. gentlemen on either side to see business move so slowly, unless they want to see the session prolonged till winter.

An hon. MEMBER. Stern duty.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It certainly must be a very stern duty which obliges hon. gentlemen to spend six hours in the discussion of a by gone question like this contract. I am not surprised, nor do we complain in the least, of the expressions of opinion of hon. gentlemen on your left as regards the conduct of the Government in renewing this contract. The facts are all before the Committee. What sense of duty, stern or otherwise, is served by constant reiteration of the complaint? This contract was renewed in accordance with the practice that has prevailed, rightly or wrongly, in relation to it for many years. The question is: What information can we give the Committee with respect to this contract? None that is not already before the Committee. The hon. member for North Norfolk or the hon. gentleman behind him declared that we ought to give all the information on which the contract was renewed. The Committee has it. Mr. Arnoldi's report on this question is set out verbatim in the Order in Council which renewed the contract. The report of Mr. Arnoldi is nothing more nor less than a statement which is cited in that Order in Council. There is nothing further. We are asked with respect to the refunds of canal tolls. The last refund was made by a vote of this Parliament. There has been no refund of tolls made since. Any other information which hon. gentlemen appear to desire they have before them in the contract and the fyle of papers laid on the Table of the House. With respect to the call for tenders, we have nothing to produce in regard to that matter. What possible information is there that we are able to give the Committee which it does not now possess? If there is any, we will table it to-morrow; but, in the meantime, provision must be made for heating the buildings during the coming winter, and that is all the item is to provide. We have heard much in regard to the impropriety or propriety of renewing the contract without asking tenders. All that has passed. The justification of the Government is before the Committee, and there is really nothing more, if the House discusses this item for a week, that we can lay on the Table.

Mr. LISTER. There is no doubt the position of the Minister of Justice is a very fair one on this question. I do not suppose it is possible to give any further information, except as to the ground on which the Minister recommended to Council that Mr. Heney's contract should be renewed. I do not agree with the Minister of Justice that no good can come out of this discussion. There will be much benefit derived. A contract, which we consider an improper one, was entered into with Mr. Heney under circumstances which we consider

suspicious. If no other good has been done than to prevent in the future a system which I consider pernicious from every standpoint you can view it, then the work of the Committee to-day has not been lost. The Minister of Finance attempted to justify the extension of the contract by comparing it with the action of a business man. He said that if a business man entered into a contract and satisfied himself that the contract was fairly fulfilled and that he could not better himself in any other way, then he, as a business man, would renew the contract. I desire to say to the Minister of Finance that a business man can do what he likes with his own money, but the Government are in the position of trustees, and for the purpose of satisfying the public mind as well as being sure beyond peradventure that they were getting the best bargain it is proper and right, nay more, it is the imperative duty of the Government to ask, when a contract expires, that it should be re-let after public competition. They are trustees for the public, and they are bound to see that the best is done in the interests of the public, and that can be done in only one way, and that is by inviting public competition. The smallest corporation in this country contracting for the smallest article for the use of the town invariably asks for tenders at the end of each year for the current year. Looking at this matter from every standpoint, and considering the recommendation by Mr. Arnoldi, I hold it to be the duty of the Government to see that contracts are awarded after public tenders are invited and that the lowest tenderer obtains the contract.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In regard to the remarks made by the Minister of Justice, I may say that I want to ascertain if there has been any refund of canal tolls, and if any canal tolls have been commuted, not only on wood for the Government, but on all Mr. Heney's wood passing through the canal. The Government keep books, and can surely furnish this information. I contend they have not given the Committee the information we want, so that we can ascertain the amount we are really paying for the wood used in this House. I think it is due to themselves and their supporters that this information should be furnished.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will answer the hon. gentleman, as far as I am able to do so. I think that the last remission of canal tolls was made, to the extent of $3,000 or $4,000, by a vote of this House in 1886. Since that time, acting on the sense of the House, as then expressed, no canal tolls have been collected on wood for the Government, supplied under Government contract, by Mr. Heney.

Mr. MULOCK. How do you know, when wood comes through the canal, whether it is for the Government or for the public?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is brought in and laid on the piling ground for the Government. I do not know what particular means are used to identify it, but there is no authority to let a stick of wood pass except the Government wood. If a stick of other wood has been allowed to pass free of toll, it is in violation of the law, and if it is so stated it will be investigated.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice will see that if wood passed through the canal free there must be some way of identifying wood for the Government.

Mr. LISTER.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the hon. gentleman can lay a full report on the Table as to this point. The member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) made a very reasonable request, and it should also be complied with now or later on. It was, that the documents on which the Minister made the recommendation to Council be also communicated to the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have explained that it is there in the quotation from Mr. Arnoldi's report.

Mr. MULOCK. I have read the document in question, and that refers to the renewal in 1888, until 1891. It does not refer to the renewal that has recently taken place. It may be that the renewal which recently took place, was on the same recommendation; but this is not a copy of the recommendation for 1891. I understand the contract in question has been entered into this year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was nothing further except a report of the same kind and a comparison of the prices ruling at the time.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice was not in the House when the Minister of Finance stated that Council were advised that the prices were fair prices, that they were reasonable prices, and Council had full information on this subject before it approved of the memorandum authorizing this contract. If that was the case, there was a written communication on the subject to Council, setting forth a comparison of prices and the opinions of those qualified to advise as to whether the prices were fair or not. That information, the Minister of Finance told us, was submitted to Council, and if so it is the information for which I understand the member for North Brant asked. I ask whether, if the item now pass, that that information will be given?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Any information there is upon the subject will be given. My belief is that the report of Mr. Arnoldi may be, and probably was, that the prices were fair and just, and that a renewal would not be against the public interest, and there was nothing more than a statement made, probably verbally, of the prices ruling at the time. I think that is all the information that there could have been. Whatever information there is will be laid on the Table to-morrow. Even if it were produced to-night, and even if it were found to be wrong the Committee would still make provision for the coming year for the fuel. There will be no hesitation in laying all information on the Table.

Mr. MULOCK. That will be satisfactory.

Gas and electric light, public buildings, Ottawa, including roads and bridges	$26,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Where are these lights on roads and bridges? Do they include Major's Hill Park?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are at Rideau Hall and at the Post Office and also at the Chaudière Falls.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How is the gas arranged for?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is only one gas company in the city; it is furnished by metre, at $2 per thousand.

Mr. WATSON. Has any comparison been made between the cost of electric lighting and gas?

Mr. FOSTER. I am informed that the price of gas is about equal to the cost of electric light, and is of better quality.

Mr. WATSON. I believe it is of better quality, and, as the prices are equal, the Government ought to do away with the old gas lamps around the buildings and put in electric lights. The Government ought to light these grounds with their own electric light plant, and do away with the gas bill altogether.

Mr. CAMPBELL. With regard to the price paid for gas, I certainly think the Government ought to make some effort to get it reduced. It seems strange that the Government, who use so much gas as they do about these buildings, should pay the enormous price of $2 a thousand for it. There is hardly a town in the Dominion where you could not buy even a thousand feet at that price, and even less. I am informed that in Toronto gas can be got for $1.25 a thousand, and in Montreal at $1.50. I think we had better start a gas company of our own.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am informed by a gentleman who ought to know that the price of gas in Montreal is $1.50 a thousand, and gas ought to be manufactured as cheaply in Ottawa as it is in Montreal or Toronto. To pay such a price as the Government are doing is to encourage a monopoly. We have our own electric light plant, and I think it ought to be sufficient to do all the lighting of all the public buildings at Ottawa. It is well known that one of the senators owns nearly all the stock in this Ottawa Gas Company: he is an influential and wealthy man; and I suppose a favour is granted to him in giving him the gas contract from year to year at this exorbitant price. I think the Government ought to save this large sum of money by using the electric light altogether.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do we pay for the electric light?

Mr. FOSTER. One cent an hour in the post office. The lights we have here are generated by our own machinery.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Practically, what do they cost us?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell how much.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because that question bears very directly on the point raised by my hon. friend. It does appear to me that the charge for such a large quantity of gas as we consume is high; and as we have an electric light plant, we should do very much better to supply ourselves entirely.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course we have only one gas company here, and if we take gas we have to take it at the same terms as the company charges private parties. It is true we make a very large purchase, and for that reason we might expect some discount on the price. However, the department is examining into the probable cost of generating sufficient power to light all the buildings with the electric light, and upon the result of this investigation will depend, I suppose, to a great extent whether we shall put in machinery, and use the electric light entirely in place of gas. If, after this investigation, it is found that this can be done economically, I have no doubt it will be done.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would suggest to the hon. Minister, that in the event of his adopting the system of lighting entirely by electricity, he should not remove the gas fixtures, because there are occasions when the electric light plant breaks down, and the light fails, and the gas fixtures should be retained, so that in the event of such accidents the gas might be utilized.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is quite true that such accidents do occur, particularly during thunderstorms. I should think we could easily enough extend our plant so as to supply ourselves with the electric light at a very much less cost per annum than we pay for gas.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask if the department have made an estimate as to the actual cost per hour of a sixteen-candle power electric lamp.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no estimate of that.

Mr. WATSON. How many lights are installed in the building?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the number.

Mr. WATSON. What is the cost of the present plant that is installed here?

Mr. FOSTER. I will make a note of that, and get the information.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I see that you purchased 1,200 incandescent lamps at an average price of 62 cents apiece. When purchasing that quantity of lamps you ought to get them at from 35 to 40 cents apiece.

Mr. WATSON. Where were those incandescent lamps purchased?

Mr. FOSTER. They were supplied by the two companies at the time of the installation.

Mr. WATSON. The price is very high. At page 386—R of the Auditor General's Report, 1,200 incandescent lamps are charged at $765, or about 64 cents each.

Mr. FOSTER. These were installed five or six years ago. They can be purchased much more cheaply now.

Mr. WATSON. This is the last Auditor General's Report.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You can buy them now in any quantity from the Edison Company at 35 cents.

Mr. WATSON. I am afraid the Government did not get the discount, but that the commission went to some other place.

Water, Public Buildings, Ottawa..... $16,500

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know whether the Government have to pay for all the water used on Major's Hill Park. That park is kept in a very good condition, but when the citizens of Ottawa are getting all the advantages of it, it is unjust that the Dominion should pay for all the water used there.

Mr. FOSTER. It is done under an agreement made with the City of Ottawa, which has been running for years.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has the Minister given notice to the corporation that the Government are not going to keep Wellington Street in order, now that the electric cars are running over it?

Mr. FOSTER. I think notice has been given to that effect.

Allowance for fuel and light, Rideau Hall.....$8,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This seems an enormous amount to pay for heating and lighting one house. As I understand, it is not all expended in heating and lighting, but is a bulk sum allowed every year. The proper way would be for the Government to foot the bills and not vote a lump sum.

Mr. FOSTER. This arrangement was made in Lord Dufferin's time to get rid of the difficulties and expense of supplying fuel and light to Rideau Hall under Government supervision or contract. Notwithstanding the positive assertion of my hon. friend, this amount does not provide what is actually expended. The matter came under my personal attention in this way: Lord Lansdowne kept an account of everything in this connection for one or two years. I saw the accounts myself, and they actually footed up over $8,000 for this purpose. If my hon. friend will look into the peculiarities of Rideau Hall, he will find that it seems to have been specially constructed with the view of consuming a great deal of light and heat. It would not be in the interest of the Government, or the country, to disturb the existing arrangement.

Mr. CASEY. It is quite true Rideau Hall appears to have been planned for the purpose of making it inconvenient to heat it, but this sum is so enormously in excess of what would be required to heat a rationally built house of that size, that suspicion must arise that whoever pays out this amount is being cheated by somebody in the matter. It would be better if the Government would secure every year the accounts and present them to the House. If they did so and compared prices, we might possibly be able to have the work done cheaper. There are great improvements in heating apparatus of late years, some of which might be utilized, as it is many years since the apparatus at present in use has been put in. It must not be forgotten that the engineer in charge for many years past has not been a cheap one, and perhaps a new engineer will find a cheaper way of doing things than Mr. Arnoldi did.

Mr. FOSTER. This was not under Mr. Arnoldi's charge but Mr. Ewart's. I do not think that we could make any change for the better and we must either do the work ourselves or keep our agreement. If we demanded the accounts, that would break the arrangement, and I know that no new arrangement would be found as satisfactory as the present one.

Mr. CASEY. Probably it would be better, under the circumstances, to sell Rideau Hall.

Mr. WATSON. If this enormous expenditure is to go on annually, it would be better to get rid of the rookery and put up a new building. Last year we spent $10,000 in ordinary repairs. It appears to me that $2,500 or $3,000 ought to be quite sufficient for heating any building sufficient to accommodate the Governor General and his retinue. Of course if Lord Lansdowne kept a strict account and gave a statement to the Government, we must accept that statement of the actual cost, but it seems an enormous sum to expend in heating and lighting any one building.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that at the close of the present Governor General's term of office, we should wipe out this item altogether. The Governor General gets $50,000 a year, and if we give him a free house and furniture, he should pay for the heating and lighting. This country cannot stand more than $50,000 a year for this purpose. I do not know in whose time this expenditure on light and heat was instituted, but I believe it was in the time of Mr. Mackenzie, probably when Lord Dufferin was Governor. I do not care what Government did it, they made a mistake. I think we should go back to the first principle of giving the Governor General $50,000 a year, and let him find his own light and so on. I think it is extravagant for us to give him $5,000 for travelling expenses, $8,000 for fuel and light, and $50,000 for salary, and in addition to that to keep up the furniture in the place. The expenses run up from $90,000 to $100,000 a year for the salary of the Governor General, and keeping the building in repair and supplying additional furniture and so on. I think we should cut it all off. Come down to $50,000 a year salary, and let him do for himself. That is more than he is worth to us.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very free criticism.

Mr. MULOCK. It may seem plain talking, but when very serious matters are under consideration here and Parliament is in session, I understand that the duties of his office have not required His Excellency to be in attendance at the seat of Government, but he is able, I suppose, with due regard to the public interest, to occupy his time in perhaps more agreeable duties than attending to public affairs here. I am of the opinion that we hedge round the representative of royalty here with too much of the odour of sanctity, and that we avoid criticising the expenditure of public money in connection with that branch of the service when it demands criticism. For my part, I think it is quite as much open to criticism and that we should be quite as free to criticise it as any other branch of the public service. I feel quite as free to do it, and I always thought that the annual allowance of £10,000 sterling as salary was an excessive allowance. When we bear in mind what other large sums that institution costs us, when we bear in mind how much is paid directly and indirectly to maintain the office and the incumbent of the office, I think the clear sum of £10,000 sterling is more than this young country can pay. We are being ridden to death by officials. We have the Governor General and we have Lieutenant Governors from ocean to ocean. Last night we had a long discussion in reference to an amount of $60,000 for the Lieutenant Governor's residence in the North-West, and now we find the Minister suggesting that we ought to take into consideration at an early date the propriety of building another residence for the Governor General here.

Mr. FOSTER. That suggestion came from a member on your own side.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister set the idea going when he said that it costs so much because of the difficulty of keeping these old shambles in repair. Taking the price of fuel, this amount of $8,000 would represent 1,600 cords of wood at $5 a cord, or 1,600 tons of coal at $5 a ton.

Mr. FOSTER. This includes light as well as fuel.

Mr. MULOCK. Very well. What is the estimate for the heating, apart from the lighting?

Mr. FOSTER. This is in pursuance of an arrangement by which we pay a sum of $8,000 a year for that purpose.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the amount was based on information he had received from his predecessor.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not remember the division.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the present incumbent of this office was appointed, the matter was under discussion, and then we were met with the objection that we could not change the amount during the incumbency of the then Governor General, and we are told to-night that the same difficulty stands in the way, and that we cannot change the arrangement during the incumbency of the present Governor General; and so it never happens that Parliament is in session and that the Government thinks of this matter until a new officer is sent out here. I maintain that there is no such contract with any Governor General. He is appointed by the home authorities, and the only contract is that contained in the Imperial Act which declares what his rights are. That Act declares that the Governor General is entitled to £10,000 sterling a year, and no more. It does not give him any more rights, and I presume he has no more rights than those which are set forth in the Act itself. He accepts the office with the emolument set forth in the Act and no other, and so I maintain that it is competent for the Parliament of Canada at any time to make any provision it likes as to the incidental expenses, which are pure gifts and not the payment of debts to His Excellency. I, for one, object, and shall continue to object, to any bulk sum being given, lumping, as it were, the amount, instead of giving the actual amount required. If it required more than $8,000 to perform this service, I suppose we would have to pay it, and if it required less we would simply have to pay what was necessary. It is an unsound principle to lump things in this way and give an enormous sum, which almost shocks one, to carry on a branch of the service such as this, and I trust that before we are called upon again to deal with this item, the Minister will have placed it on a proper system. If not, if he is here then, he will be inviting a much more severe criticism than he is receiving to-night.

Telephone Service, Public Buildings, Ottawa..... $3,500

Mr. CAMPBELL. How many telephones are there, and what is the annual rental of each?

Mr. FOSTER. You will find the information at page B—387 of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I see that the telephones are rented at $35 and $40 apiece. Last year, the Minister of Public Works stated that the annual rental was $30. The price of the telephones, wherever I have been, is only about $35 a year, and when two or three telephones are taken by one firm, they get them for less than that. It seems strange that, when we get so many telephones and pay $3,500 a year for them, we should be paying more than any private firm would in any little town in this Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. We are paying no more, and I think a little less, than is paid for similar service in private houses in the city. I do not know that we can dictate our own prices. If we get these telephones we must pay what is the current rate.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But, surely, when you take so many telephones, you should pay less than a private person?

Mr. MULOCK. How many in all?

Mr. WATSON. Is there a difference in the price of telephones in these departments?

Mr. FOSTER. I think not. Some of them may be for a portion of the year. I think the price is $35 a year.

Mr. WATSON. Probably they charge extra for the dual language.

Mr. McMULLEN. In my county they only charge $15 a year for telephones.

Mr. FOSTER. We get them just as cheaply as private individuals do.

Mr. MULOCK. At this rate you have 100 telephones—a very large number. There ought to be a list of the telephones placed on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. They are to be found on page B—387 of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. MULOCK. The schedule is not full. I see they are grouped together. Is there a fixed fee, $30 apiece?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; $35 each.

Mr. MULOCK. I think you are very luxurious in this matter of telephones. I think the officials are getting telephones in their private houses. Why is that?

Mr. FOSTER. The officers live at their private houses, and if they have telephonic communication with the office, it must be where they live. For instance, I have to have one in my house. I have no telephonic communication with my private secretary, but it might well be that I would wish to have it, and the telephone would have to be in his house as well as in mine.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is that the reason why telephones are kept in the houses of the Ministers?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly. I have none with my secretary, and I have often felt the inconvenience of having none.

Mr. MULOCK. I see there is one in the office of the Resident Comptroller of Stores, Mounted Police, office canal basin. Why should there be a telephone at the residence of the Comptroller of the Mounted Police? I do not understand that he has to carry on business at night. I make no objection to a telephone between the Minister and his secretary. According to this schedule there are telephones scattered all over the city in private houses.

Mr. FOSTER. Give those that you object to?

Mr. MULOCK. Agriculture Department, office of Minister and Deputy Minister. I do not object to the Deputy Minister, but I object to their being one in the office of the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. Why should he have a telephone?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very important department, and if you raise no objection to the Minister having a telephone with his deputy, you can raise no objection to the Superintendent General having a telephone with Mr. Vankoughnet.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think it is at all necessary that Mr. Vankoughnet should have a telephone at the public expense. I do not think there is any necessity for a telephone between the deputy who has charge of Indian Affairs, and the head of his department. I can understand a Deputy Minister being in direct communication with his chief, but I doubt if there is much communication between the head of the Department of the Interior at night, and the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.

Mr. FOSTER. On the contrary, I think there is a great deal.

Mr. MULOCK. Why should there be a telephone at the residence of Mr. Justice Burbidge?

Mr. FOSTER. He is the judge of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. MULOCK. You might as well pay for blacking his boots, or carrying him home to his house, as to pay for a telephone to his house. I would like to know what occasion he has, as judge of the Exchequer Court, to communicate from his residence with the Government. You might with equal justice have a telephone in the residence of every judge of the Supreme Court. Then, there is a telephone in the residence of the Registrar of the Supreme Court. Why should he have a telephone at the public expense? He is not at the beck and call of the Government after court is over. In Toronto we have any number of officials in connection with the administration of justice, and there is the same need of their having a telephone as for this official at Ottawa. Such a thing was never dreamed of in Toronto. It is one of those methods of transferring private expenses to the public purse.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt that the Minister of Justice has good reasons for having telephonic communication with the officers named.

Mr. MULOCK. That may be the Minister's opinion, but I see no reason at all. I see no more reason that the judge of the Exchequer Court should have telephonic communication with the Government, than for the judges of the Supreme Court, for if any one is entitled to a telephone they are.

Mr. WATSON. Are these telephones supposed to be private, or are they in connection with the central office?

Mr. FOSTER. In connection with the central office.

Mr. WATSON. Will the hon. gentleman explain this first item under the Agriculture Department: Office of Minister and Deputy Minister, 12 months, June 30, 1890, $70; residence of Minister and Deputy Minister, 12 months, June 30, 1890, $75. There is a difference in the price. Now, why should there be two sets of telephones connecting the Minister and Deputy Minister? Certainly one telephone in each residence should be sufficient without two.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see how the Deputy Minister is to communicate with his officers in the buildings when at his house, unless he has a telephone in his office as well. He must have one at each end of the line.

Mr. CAMPBELL. For the Agriculture Department the telephones cost $161 a year; for the Finance Department, $150; and for the House of Commons, $265.

Mr. FOSTER. Would you go in for striking these off?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then we would have to employ so many more messengers.

Major's Hill Park..... $5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a reduction from $6,000 to $5,000. I earnestly hope a further reduction will be made, and that eventually the item will be wiped out.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very nicely kept.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes. But it really is an imposition on the people of Canada that they should be called on to keep up a park for the benefit of the people of Ottawa. There is quite enough benefit secured to Ottawa by this city having been made the seat of Government, without furnishing it with parks.

Heating Dominion Public Buildings....$60,000

Mr. MULOCK. Is the work let by tender?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. The contracts are all the results of tenders. The prices, of course, vary at different points.

Mr. WATSON. Is there any system of renewing old contracts, as was the case with Mr. Heney's contract?

Mr. FOSTER. Fresh tenders are called for each year.

Mr. MULOCK. Who has the contract for fuel at Toronto.?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Burns had the contract last year. Tenders for this year have been received, and are being considered, but they have not been awarded. I will furnish the price paid to Mr. Burns.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there a caretaker for every Dominion building?

Mr. FOSTER. Sometimes for a small building the postmaster acts as caretaker, but in most of the public buildings, there is a caretaker.

Mr. McMULLEN. At the Orangeville public building there is a caretaker, receiving $400 a year. It is not necessary to have such a man permanently, but the postmaster might be allowed a small sum.

Mr. WATSON. We have been discussing to-day the relative cost of coal and wood for heating purposes. For the Winnipeg post office the Government use coal which costs $9.45 per ton, while wood costs only $4 per cord. Why does the Government use coal at Winnipeg where wood is $4 per cord, when they use in Ottawa wood which costs more than coal for heating purposes?

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any difference in the quality of the wood?

Mr. WATSON. Tamarack can be obtained in Winnipeg at $4 a cord.

Lighting Dominion Public Buildings...$40,000

Mr. MULOCK. Does this include lighting public buildings at Montreal ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and all through the Dominion. The price of coal in Toronto is $5.70, and $5.45 for anthracite and bitumen. The contracts were entered into in July.

Mr. MULOCK. I had to open tenders for certain supplies of coal at that time, and I think that this price was a good deal higher than we paid.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see how we can avoid it if we ask for tenders.

Sundry supplies for caretakers, engineers, firemen, &c., Dominion Buildings.....$5,000

Mr. CAMPBELL. I see in the Chatham post office we have a caretaker there to whom we are paying $400 a year, and he does nothing towards the caretaking of the building at all. He is, however, the secretary of the Conservative Association. The engineer of the Chatham post office is Mr. Dunn, a first-class man, and a very competent man, who takes care of the building. His salary is only $450 a year, and he is employed for nine months. We have Mr. Mitchell getting $400 as caretaker of the building, while Mr. Dunn, the engineer, does the work, and they divide up, and Mr. Mitchell pockets half the amount and does nothing at all. The Government might save $200 a year there by making the engineer the caretaker as well, and increasing his salary a little and letting the one man do the work.

Mr. McMULLEN. But the secretary of the Conservative Association would not be paid for this work.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Government I take it look after the interests of the country as well, and as Mr. Dunn is also a good Conservative he deserves a little more support from them. He only gets $450 a year, and that is not enough to keep him and his family. Mr. Mitchell receives $400 a year and does nothing at all for it.

Petty repairs in connection with Dominion Buildings.....$5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to draw attention now to a matter in connection with the Lieutenant Governor's residence in the North-West. I see that last year he spent $4,185 in repairs about the House, and he actually expended $1,960 in making a conservatory. Amongst the items I notice, photograph of Sir John Macdonald, $25 ; one of Hon. Edward A. Morris, $15; Hon. David Laird, $15; Hon. Edgar Dewdney, $15, and one of Hon. Joseph Royal, $15, while I find that a photograph of the less important Lord and Lady Stanley only cost $7.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very modest picture gallery.

Materials for repairs in connection with ventilation and lighting public buildings, Ottawa.....$4,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we got very little value for our money as far as the ventilation of this chamber goes. Time and again I have come into this chamber in the morning and I have found the atmosphere positively foul after a long session ; but there may be reasons for that.

Mr. SPEAKER. It might be on account of the gas that escaped the previous night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that it is within the resources of mechanical ingenuity to contrive that these windows shall be thrown open. I hope we never shall be condemned to any more summer sessions ; I thoroughly hate them, with all due respect to the City of Ottawa ; but I cannot see why these windows cannot be made to open in such a fashion that we shall get this cockpit thoroughly ventilated.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid that the people in the galleries would feel the draft on their heads.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am speaking of the time while we are out of the chamber. Unless you get the windows thoroughly opened, it will never be ventilated. It is a serious matter to some of us who have to spend a great many hours here.

Public Buildings, Wellington Street, Ottawa—To complete payments....$96,000

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to drop the "9" before the "6." The vote will then pay the claims that are now due and acknowledged.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask what is the amount of the claims still pending against that building.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the amount here, but that has been answered by the Minister himself from his place several times this session, and if the hon. gentleman will refer to *Hansard*, he will find it.

Mr. WATSON. We were told a couple of years ago that Mr. Charlebois had made the modest demand of some $400,000 for extras on that building. The late Minister of Public Works then told us that he thought he would be able to settle with Mr. Charlebois for $250,000. I would like to know if that claim has been settled ?

Mr. FOSTER. We are not asking for the money now, and the Government cannot settle without coming to Parliament for the money.

Mr. McMULLEN. You can tell Mr. Charlebois that he will be a bright boy if he gets any such claim as that through a Committee of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I am informed that there was a report in Council against allowing the claims of Mr. Charlebois, with the exception of the small amount I am taking.

Mr. WATSON. Does this, then, settle all the claims ?

Mr. FOSTER. This settles all the claims that have been recognized.

Mr. WATSON. What is the total cost of the building ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will have that hunted up.

Cape Tormentine Harbour..... $93,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is being done there ?

Mr. FOSTER. The vote is a revote. The work is under contract and is now approaching completion, and this vote, the chief engineer estimates, will be required for completing the harbour works, and to

afford the accommodation that was intended in connection with the terminus of the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway.

River St. Lawrence—Improvement of ship channel between Quebec and Montreal.....$50,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is this for?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a part of the $100,000 which a year ago was stated to be necessary to complete these works, and it is believed that the estimate will not be exceeded.

River Kaministiquia—Turning basin, &c..... $15,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There ought to be added to that a clause containing an apology to Mr. Mackenzie for all the abuse that was lavished on him for having selected the Kaministiquia River.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Last summer, when the department were advertising for tenders for the work in that river and on the bar, it was stated in the advertisement that plans and specifications could be seen at the Public Works Department, in Ottawa; but, when those who wished to tender for the work came down here, they could not find any plans or specifications at all. One of our dredging companies in the town of Chatham informed me, that, when their manager came down here and went to the Public Works Department to look over the plans and specifications, there were no plans or specifications to be found at all.

Mr. FOSTER. After the advertisements were out?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes. The tenders were to be in on the 18th of July, and Mr. Martin, the manager of the Chatham Dredging Company, came down here a few days before that date for the purpose of putting in a tender, and he went to the Department of Public Works and saw Mr. Coste and the Deputy Minister, and asked for the plans and specifications, and he was informed that there were no plans or specifications. He then asked to see a map of the locality, and he was informed that there were no maps of the locality at all. He then went up to the engineer's office and asked there if he could obtain a map of the locality so that he could find out the nature of the soil, the distance that he would have to carry the material to dump it, and the depth of the cut in the bar and in the river; and he was there told that the map had been taken away. He found a map of the whole Dominion, but just the section that he wanted, showing the location of the work to be done, was removed, and he could not obtain any information at all. Now, it seems to me that it is useless altogether to advertise for tenders unless the necessary information can be given to those who would tender. I may say that Captain Murray, who was in the department when Mr. Martin went there, had the full run of the department. And he advised Mr. Martin that there was no use in his putting in a tender, because, he said, you will not get the work any way and will only hurt me. However, Mr. Martin did put in a tender. Captain Murray told him he would have to take the dredging seven miles to dump, but he afterwards found that he would only have to carry it a mile. It seems to me such a state of affairs should not be allowed to exist. The officers of that department should be severely brought to task if there is any such work as that going on, and I have the authority of Mr. Martin, who is one of our most respectable citizens, that the facts are as I have stated. If there is any such work as that going on in the Public Works Department, every man from the top to the bottom who had a hand in it should be at once dismissed.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I am familiar with that work. I know the locality and the circumstances, and I tendered for it. If Mr. Martin informed my hon. friend that there was no specification in connection with that work, he was probably perfectly correct. There was no specification whatever necessary, and, as far as the material is concerned, you could only learn about that on the ground. With regard to hauling the material dredged out of the cut, it is necessary to dump that material some place where it will not be washed back and interfere with the cut. As far as the tenders were concerned, I bid for that work, and I was the second lowest tenderer. I think Captain Murray was the lowest tenderer, and, consequently, I did not get the work; but I am satisfied that the letting of the work was a fair and square letting, and I do not think Mr. Martin has anything whatever to complain about, as far as the specification is concerned and the dumping of the material. If he was deceived by Captain Murray, who was a tenderer, by Captain Murray telling him the stuff had to be hauled seven miles, that was his look-out. He probably was deceived, and if so, Captain Murray did that for the purpose of having a better chance to get the contract himself.

Mr. TROW. It is necessary, on all such occasions, that proper specifications should be furnished to the general public. It should be also made known whether it was the débris that came down the Kaministiquia that had to be removed or a new cutting that had to be made, because the latter would be much more expensive. All these things should be explained in the plans and specifications, as otherwise the party tendering would not have the proper information on which to base his tender. The distance necessary to carry the dredging also should be given. I presume the distance is a mere matter of form, and that the stuff had only to be removed sufficiently far to prevent its returning to the cut or impeding navigation.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I may say that when any work, such as dredging, has to be done, and advertised for, the department always prepares a map of the locality. Here is a map which was prepared for a little work done in the River Thames, in the County of Kent, for which there was only $4,000 appropriation. Here is a plan prepared by the Public Works Department, showing the depth of water all along, the length of the cut, the length of the bar, the depth of water every few feet, and all the information any contractor could desire. A contractor will know from this exactly what he has to do. Will any man say that in the case of a work which it was estimated would cost $25,000, in the Kaministiquia River, there was no drawing such as this prepared? It is nonsensical to say so. There is no work ever done by the Department of Public Works without the department first preparing a sketch or drawing of the work required and the depth that has to be cut. Now, the advertisements calling for tenders stated that all necessary

information would be furnished at the department at Ottawa. Here is a letter that I received from Mr. Martin in reference to this matter :

"CHATHAM, ONT., 19th May, 1891.

"A. CAMPBELL, M. P.

"MY DEAR SIR.—Your letter of the 15th instant, with enclosed copy of *Hansard*, came duly to hand. In reply to your letter, I beg to say that you were correctly informed as to there being no plans or specifications of the Kaministiquia River dredging worth speaking of. I went to Ottawa last summer in response to an advertisement from the Public Works Department to examine plans and put in a tender, and the only information I could get was a few remarks contained in the form of tender. Mr. Coste, the engineer in charge, treated me very courteously and kindly, and said he knew of no information about the work, only what the form of the tender contained. Captain Murray, a competitive contractor, kindly informed me in the matter; he told me about the depth of face a dredge would have to cut, and that the tow or haul would be about seven miles. Evidently this gentleman spoke only from memory, and had forgotten, as I understood afterwards that the distance was only about two miles. However, I put in my tender by random, with the necessary deposit. I got my deposit back, but never heard anything more about the work. I am glad you have asked for the papers on this matter and I shall anxiously watch the report.

"Yours truly,
(Sgd.) "S. T. MARTIN."

From this letter, it is clear that the information which the department had was not given to those who tendered for the work. I am quite certain that the department has a drawing of that work similar to the one in my hand. If it has not, then the officers of that department did not do their work properly. There must be a drawing of that work, and that drawing will show the face of the cut, whether the dredge had to cut seven feet, or three feet, or one foot, and all the other information the contractor requires in estimating for the work. Another information the tenderer is entitled to is the distance he must carry the material before dumping it. If proper information had been given this work would have been done a good deal cheaper than it was. There is no use in advertising for tenders if you are going to withhold from the parties tendering the necessary information which they must have. This is a matter which ought to be investigated, and if the facts are as I have stated the officers of the Public Works Department should receive severe censure from the Government.

Mr. TROW. If the department had not the proper plans and specifications when calling for tenders that certainly was a great omission on the part of the Government, because it cannot be expected of any party tendering that he should travel a thousand or two thousand miles to examine the ground. He might be living in this city, and could not be expected to go out and measure the locality for himself, but would be guided entirely by the plans and specifications in the department.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Mr. Martin got exactly the same information that I or anyone else did in the department who was tendering on that work. The plan and specifications shown by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) is for new work. There is no doubt that the plans and specifications are absolutely necessary in the case of a new work. In the Kaministiquia River this has been going on for a number of years. I think it was started in 1875, and portions of it have been done each year since that time, with a short intermission of a few years, when no dredging was done. Anyone in the habit of doing that kind of work will readily understand what I mean when I say there is no necessity for a plan or specification, because the contract is made to remove a certain amount of material in the bottom of the bay and the river, amounting to 150,000 yards. That is the information that was given at the Department of Public Works. A dredge goes there and digs the cut through, as directed by the official in charge. There is no specification necessary for that, because it is simply digging with the dredge, and no plan is necessary, because the dredging is done under the supervision of an engineer, who stakes out the work you are to do. Whether it be a cut of 100 feet or a cut of 50 feet, you are expected to do that work, and you get paid by the yard for the material you remove.

Mr. WATSON. It appears to me that is a very loose way of letting contracts, and that is one of the complaints which contractors should have against the Government; because, if it is left entirely with the Government inspector, as to where he shall remove the earth, where it is to be dredged from and where it is to be dumped, certainly a favourite of the Government would be able to get the ear of the department and the sympathy of the inspector, and an honest contractor outside, who was not ringing in with the inspector, would have no opportunity to get the work at all. Evidently Captain Murray had more influence and greater confidence as to how he would be handled by the Government inspector than the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Macdonell), or the gentleman from Chatham, to whom my hon. friend has referred. There should be no trouble in making plans and specifications as to the amount of work, the distance, the channel to be dredged, and where the stuff is to be dumped; and, after a gentleman comes here in consequence of having seen the Government advertisement, he ought to receive that information. Evidently, the member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) was not able to get the information. He had better opportunities for obtaining the information than the gentleman from Chatham had, but he was unable to compete successfully with Captain Murray. If Captain Murray is a friend of the department and can get the right kind of inspector to lay out the work and inspect it, no doubt he will make a good thing out of the contract, where another man might lose money on it.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). The insinuation of the hon. gentleman that there might be any collusion, not between the inspector, because there is no inspector, but between the engineer in charge, who is a trusted officer of the department, is utterly unfounded—and the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat (Mr. Watson), nor anyone else, would not dare outside to impute to him such motives as that. He has been in the Department of Public Works and connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway for years, and I defy anyone to cast the slightest suspicion upon him. In the first place, the work is staked out to be done. The whole thing is comprised in probably 1,000 feet laterally. Then the work is to be taken out to a sufficient depth to allow large steamers to go up the Kaministiquia River to the elevators which are built there. The engineer has measured the work to be done, and he knows how much excavating has been

done by the dredge, and on the strength of that they are paid; but the breath of suspicion has never been cast against the engineer in charge of that work and of the other Government works in that district. I venture to say that no cheaper dredging was ever done in the Dominion of Canada than this which we are now talking about. Captain Murray's prices were the smallest prices I have ever known to be paid for dredging in the Dominion.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What were the prices?

Mr. WATSON. I do not know what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonell) means by saying that I made certain charges against the engineer.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). No; I said you insinuated that there might be collusion between an engineer and a contractor.

Mr. WATSON. I still say so.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I say that you will not say that in reference to that engineer outside of the House.

Mr. WATSON. I do not know or care who the engineer is, but I will not say anything in this House that I would not say outside of this House in reference to the engineer or in reference to the hon. gentleman himself. I say what I mean, that there was a possibility of collusion when the plans and specifications were not furnished as to where the work was to be done and where the material was to be dumped. We find that this gentleman who has the contract has done work in other places in Canada. We know from reports we have had he was a contributor of $500 to the testimonial to the late Minister of Public Works, and from evidence we have had in the last few months in a room in connection with this building, we have reason to doubt the honesty of these inspectors. I do not know who this engineer is, and I do not care who he is; but it is quite possible that Mr. Murray might enter into collusion with that gentleman, might secure the contract and make money, even at the low prices you have read. I do not know the gentleman from Chatham or his company, but from the letter which has been read by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) he is evidently of the opinion that the work could be done for less than Captain Murray is getting for it. Plans and specifications should be furnished, especially in view of the distance the work is from Ottawa. The information should be furnished to all contractors, and every contractor should have a fair opportunity to obtain the fullest information from the Public Works Department.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This work was not the old work, but was a new work. It was advertised for last summer. It was not a continuation of the old work, but was advertised for as dredging to be done in the river and on the bar. Therefore, the plans and specifications would be required for this work. The House can easily see that this might take place. I venture to say now that there was a sketch-drawing of this work. There is no work done of this kind without there being a tracing showing the depth of water, the channel to be made, the depth of the place of the cut, &c. All this information is always furnished. Here is a little work of only $4,000, and yet full details are given. But the Chatham Dredging Company, when their manager came here, could not get these drawings at all, and it seems the hon. member for Algoma was in the same position. I have not the slightest doubt the drawing was there, and it was withheld, I believe, purposely, in order that Captain Murray might get the inside track. The hon. member for Algoma and the manager of the Chatham Dredging Company both agree that when they came there they could not get any information at all, they could not see any drawings or tracings for this work, and I have no doubt they were withheld for that purpose. Now, as to Captain Murray's contract being the lowest for the work in the river, I believe it was much higher than some of the others, although on the bar it happened to be a little lower than some of the others. If I am not mistaken, I think that his work was 19½ cents a yard in the River Kaministiquia, and that is a pretty good price. Then I am also told that Captain Murray has not a dredge of his own there at all, that American dredges are doing the work, and they are paying Captain Murray a commission on it. I am not positive as to that; perhaps the member for Algoma will know more about it than I do. But I have it on good information that Captain Murray has not a dredge of his own in that river; that the dredges that are doing the work are American dredges, and they are paying him a commission for doing it. Now, after the disclosures that we have had during the last month or two as to the way the Public Works Department has been conducting its affairs, we have reason to be suspicious that something of that kind is going on in reference to this job also. I do not know who the inspector was, but there were two inspectors on another work carried on under the Public Works Department in another part of the Dominion, and both of them were in the employ of the Government, as well as in the employ of the contractors.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I repeat what I said before, that this is not a new work; it is the continuation of an old work, as I stated, from 1875.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It was advertised for.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Certainly, and I will explain that to you. There was $25,000 worth of dredging to be done in the Kaministiquia River for the Department of Public Works, and tenders were asked for, to give every contractor an opportunity of bidding on that work. It is the same old work that has been done year after year in portions, and this was the last portion of the work that was required to be done in that particular place. Now, with regard to the prices: Capt. Murray had 7 cents a yard for dredging on the bar, and 19 cents a yard for dredging in the river. The whole contract, I think, amounted to $22,500. I certainly knew the value of the work, and I think that my tender was only $500 above that of Capt. Murray's; consequently, being the lowest tenderer, Capt. Murray got the work. Had I been $500 below him, in spite of the remarks made about the Department of Public Works, I am satisfied I would have had that contract. Now, with regard to the dredges: the same dredges are working there now that have been dredging on the bar and in the Kaministiquia River for the last four or five years. Who owns the dredges I do not know.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They are American dredges, I am told.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I do not know whether they are or not; I do not know whether it is American plant or Canadian plant. However, that is of no consequence. If Capt. Murray bids on that work and puts in the lowest tender, and he gets the work and does it honestly, it is immaterial whose plant does the work. If American dredges are doing it they have got to pay duty when they come into our country, so I do not think it makes any difference who owns the dredges, provided the work is properly done.

Mr. BARRON. Last year a sum of $3,000 was placed in the Estimates for dredging at Lindsay, and I have been asked several times to make some enquiry about it. I would like to ask, in regard to that $3,000 that was appropriated for excavating at Lindsay, in the Scugog River—and then I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he has yet come to any conclusion as to the jurisdiction exercised with regard to the water there, and whether this Government pretends to control the waters there, or whether it is the Ontario Government, because, by reason of the conflict of jurisdiction, a good deal of trouble is occasioned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not remember the question arising about any particular locality, but there has been a controversy between the Provincial and Dominion Governments as regards some localities which raised the question as to the ownership of the rivers in Canada. We undoubtedly claim the property in the rivers, excepting in so far as the beds of the streams were granted before Confederation. Some of the Provincial Governments claim that the property is vested in them, and disputes have arisen as to the construction of the British North America Act on that point. The matter is not one remaining for my opinion. I have given the opinion in so far as I can, and the Attorney General of Ontario is agreeing to a case which will raise the question for settlement in the courts, and I think the Province of Quebec has agreed to join in the case also.

Mr. BARRON. The Minister does not understand this particular locality. As it is now, this Government exercises a sort of control, its officials there exercise control right up to the lock itself, and yet the lock itself, within the town of Lindsay, appears to be exclusively under the control of the Dominion Government. At the same time, the Ontario Government is, to a certain extent, exercising control over the water too, so there is a conflict of authority. The Ontario Government does not like to go on, at least its officials do not know what to do, although they have latterly gone on, and the town, in the meantime, as the member for South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn) could state if he were here, is suffering by reason of this $3,000 not being spent because of the conflict of authority.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In what way are our officials exercising jurisdiction?

Mr. BARRON. In regard to the fisheries; but that is not where the trouble is occasioned. You have to-day an officer in the Public Works Department, Mr. Rogers, and he exercises control over the waters. It seems to be his duty to keep the water clear of logs for steamboats.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That refers to navigation. I am sure that question as regards that place was not submitted to my department. The question has been raised as to the ownership of the Southampton River, but that is the only one.

L'Ardoise Breakwater..... .....$10,500

Mr. FRASER. Is this amount to complete the breakwater?

Mr. FOSTER. It is towards the construction of a new breakwater, which will cost $4,000 more than this vote, and what has already been voted. No amount has yet been expended. The total estimated cost is $18,000. The breakwater will be 400 feet long.

Cribbin's Point Wharf $6,900

Mr. FRASER. How does the Government arrive at a conclusion in regard to these particular wharves and breakwaters? What is the rule that guides them in building these wharves?

Mr. FOSTER. I find that petitions are sent praying for the works. Surveys have been made, plans have been adopted, and it has been decided to build the work and contracts have been let. This is the method of procedure.

Mr. FRASER. What number of petitioners is required; or what is the inducement that leads the Government to make these particular appropriations?

Mr. FOSTER. It is based on the necessity for the work.

Mr. FRASER. I will give a case where there seemed to be some necessity. In 1879 or 1880 an amount was voted to build a breakwater at New Harbour, in Guysborough County. The vote was made at the request of the member for the county. It was dropped, and never was thought of since. A very strong petition was sent from that place this year. I should like to ask if it is strong enough, or does it want more names to bring about the same result as other petitions. The vote passed long ago is the best indication that the work is needed, and if it was needed in 1880 it is more required at the present time. What should be done in order to put this particular place in the same position as the others?

Mr. FOSTER. I leave that to the hon. gentleman's well-known ingenuity.

Mr. FRASER. I would not like to state that the Minister is going to be guided by anything but the wants of the people. My ingenuity might suggest several reasons, some of which would not be complimentary. I have asked the Minister for information as to whether there is any chance of this place obtaining what is required—and it requires expenditure more than any of the places named here—or any way in which the Government could be induced to consider the matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will take it under advisement.

Mr. FRASER. My case might become old, as the revote became, and the vote struck out. There should be some means of ascertaining the real wants of the people. As the Minister of Finance is not able to give any rule or principle that guides the Government, I suppose my ingenuity could devise for them a reason, and I can only consider, when the hon. gentleman's suggestion is followed by the kindly remark of the Minister of Justice, that there is only one reason, the reason I did not want to give, because I did not want to be uncivil

to the Government. There is a new steamer making the trip from Halifax round the shore to various places between Halifax and Canso and Guysborough County, and then going on to Prince Edward Island. At Sherbrooke the people sent in a large petition for a small wharf. The petition came here, but met with no response. As there is a large trade along the shore, a wharf is a necessity and should be built. If my ingenuity is asked to suggest a method by which to decide the question, I would ask the Government to build the wharf. That trade, I repeat, will be a large one round the shore, and a wharf is much more necessary than a breakwater at L'Ardoise, where there is not so much need now for a breakwater since the Cape Breton Railway has been built. Throughout the 200 miles between Halifax and Canso there is great difficulty as regards breakwaters. Beckerton is a flourishing place, although I was told that it was not found on the map when I asked that a breakwater should be built there; but it is a place easily found at election times, because it is a thriving place. Breakwaters are more required along the southern shore of Nova Scotia than elsewhere. Take New Harbour. Here is a large settlement, and the fishermen have no protection whatever for their boats there. It is with the greatest difficulty that they can get in with their boats, and the Government have recognized the claim of the people, and have made an appropriation for the work, but it has not been carried out. A sum of $6,000 or $7,000 would build a breakwater for that large section of the country, which would be of service not only to New Harbour but to people surrounding other fishing places. I am sure if I can appeal to the best sentiments of the Government—and there is a latent sentiment of good, if I can only get at it—I would succeed in this just demand. I would like to appeal to them in the most kindly way on behalf of these fishermen that a breakwater should be built there. I see that the Government are building breakwaters in other places where there is no such great necessity for them as there is here. The whole dependence of these people is on the sea; their little frail boats are exposed, and they ask that their case should be taken into consideration, not on account of their political principles, but on account of the justice of their claim. I say that in the district of New Harbour there are about an equal number of both parties in that section, but I appeal to the Government, are not the lives of the Liberals and Conservatives equally worth preserving in that county, even though they should return an opponent to the Government? I am afraid that when the Government is going to take this matter into consideration in the future it simply means that they will consider it until such time as the people will send a supporter of the Government. If I am to understand that, then it is not dealing fairly with the people. May I ask that the Government will establish some rule, not in the interest of a representative of a county nor even in the interest of the men who support the representative in the county, but in the interest of the people of Canada who live on the sea shore, and have to encounter all these difficulties in making a livelihood, that these works should be built in places where there is absolute necessity for them. I do believe that the lives of the people should be taken into consideration rather than their political leanings. I claim that not one of these breakwaters that the Government are building now, and for which the Government is unable to give a reason for building, is as necessary as the breakwater at New Harbour.

Digby—New pier at the Raquette.....$41,300

Mr. FLINT. I would like to ask the Minister, has a final decision been arrived at as to the location and plan of that pier? I believe, if I am correctly informed, that the plan and location had been decided upon, but subsequently doubts were raised by persons interested in the project as to whether the site was most advisable. It would be interesting to know if a decision has been arrived at.

Mr. FOSTER. A final decision has not been arrived at yet. Representations were made against what appeared to be the decision of the department as to the place where the pier should be built, and these representations have been taken into consideration, and are being carefully looked into; but a decision has not been finally given yet.

Mr. FLINT. I am glad to hear that, because from my knowledge of the locality, and the representations that have been made to me, and the great importance of a wise decision being arrived at, I trust the department will delay this until the fullest information can be obtained.

Repairs of Piers and Breakwaters—
Prince Edward Island..... $6,000

Mr. PERRY. I would like to know if that is the whole amount that is to be placed at the disposal of the Government for the repairs of piers and breakwaters on Prince Edward Island, because it seems to me that it is a very small sum. Last year an amount of $12,000 was voted for the same purpose, and I find by the returns that only about $7,000 were spent. What became of the balance?

Mr. FOSTER. It lapsed.

Harbours and Rivers—Prince Edward
Island—Miminigash..... $1,000

Mr. PERRY. Last year $3,500 was voted for improvements on the Miminigash breakwater, and about $1,000 was expended last year. In the spring tenders were asked for and the contract was let, but the man who had the contract, I understand, gave it up. I would like to know whether the contract has been re-let; if so, for what amount, and what work is to be done. The people there are suffering and nobody seems to be looking after the interest of the public works at that point.

Mr. FOSTER. The work was let, but the successful tenderer, I find, declined to sign a contract unless the time for the completion of the work was extended; and this revote of $1,000 is called for to make provision for completing the work in 1891-92.

Mr. PERRY. Is the contract let now?

Mr. FOSTER. No; the new contract is not let. We must have the vote first.

Mr. PERRY. That is not satisfactory to me. How was it that the Government were able to let the contract in the spring with the balance of last year's vote left? The late Minister of Public Works informed me, and his answer is here in *Hansard*, that the contract was signed, sealed and delivered to a gentleman of the name of Macdonald, and

that a month or six weeks after he got the contract he gave it up, and new tenders were asked for. The Minister says that a contract cannot be entered into until this $1,000 is voted. How could they enter into the contract in the spring without it?

Mr. FOSTER. We had the vote at that time, but the vote lapsed at the end of the year, and the contract was not signed. The Minister of Public Works may have stated that the contract was let; he may have been under the impression that it was signed, because it was sent for the signature of the successful tenderer; but the man refused to sign it unless he got an extension of time, and it fell to the ground.

Mr. PERRY. After Macdonald gave up the contract in April last, I am sure that the Government had plenty of time to advertise for tenders, and the work might have been going on now; but it is not going on, and there is nothing there to prevent the Miminigash breakwater being carried away by the fall storms.

Repairs to Breakwater at Negro Point, St. John Harbour..... $15,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What on earth is the total cost of that Negro Point breakwater?

Mr. FOSTER. The work was badly injured by storms a year or so ago, and this is to repair it. The total amount expended so far upon it is about $400,000. It is almost the sole protection of St. John harbour.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 27th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ANDRÉ SENÉCAL.

Mr. LISTER moved that André Senécal, the witness named in the report of the Public Accounts Committee submitted to this House this day, do attend at the Bar of this House on Tuesday next, the 1st September, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

THE MEMBER FOR EAST NORTHUMBERLAND.

Mr. FLINT moved:

That Thomas Barnard Flint, the member representing the electoral district of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, in this House, having stated from his place in this House, that he is credibly informed and verily believes:

1. That Edward Cochrane was, during the last Parliament, and now is the member for the electoral district of the East Riding of the County of Northumberland.

2. That while he was such member it was corruptly agreed to by and between the said Edward Cochrane and John D. Clouston, William Johnson, William Brown and Robert May, respectively, that if each of them would pay to him, or to certain other persons for him, or for political purposes, the sum of $200, he would procure for each of them the position under the Government of Canada, of attendant or keeper of one of the swing bridges over or across the Murray Canal.

3. That in pursuance of such corrupt agreement the said several sums of money were paid, and the said persons were so appointed to said positions.

4. That while he, the said Edward Cochrane, was such member as aforesaid, it was corruptly agreed by and between the said Edward Cochrane and one Henry May, that if the said Henry May would pay the said Edward Cochrane, or to other persons for him, or for political purposes, the sum of $200, he would procure for the said Henry May, the office or position under the Government of foreman or overseer of employés under the Government.

5. That in pursuance of the said corrupt agreement the said sum of $200 was paid, and the said office or position duly received by the said Henry May.

That the foregoing statement be referred to the Select Committee composed of Sir Adolphe Caron, Messrs. White (Shelburne), Tisdale, Skinner, Mulock, German and Cameron (Huron).

Motion agreed to.

THE CENSUS RETURNS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to the Printing Committee that they be kind enough to have the statements affecting the census which were laid on the Table last night, and those which I understand from the Postmaster General will be laid on the Table to-night, printed as soon as possible for the convenience of the House. They are exceedingly interesting and extremely important.

Mr. BERGIN. The clerk has had notice to have a meeting of the Committee called for to-morrow morning for that purpose.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 168) to encourage the production of beet-root sugar.—(Mr. Foster.)

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication:—

"OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY,
"OTTAWA, 27th August, 1891.

"SIR,—I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Mr. Justice Strong, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber on to-morrow (Friday) afternoon, at 3.30 o'clock, for the purpose of giving assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"C. J. JONES,
"*For the Governor General's Secretary.*

"The Honourable
"The Speaker of the House of Commons,
"&c., &c., &c."

LAND SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 169), further to amend the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 4, to authorize the granting of subsidies in land to certain railway companies. He said: I promised the other day to lay some papers on the Table which were asked for in reference to land subsidies generally. I left them in my office, but I can bring them up when this

other subsidy Bill comes up to-morrow, or the day after. I refer to the Calgary and Red Deer Railway.

Mr. MULOCK. When that Bill came up I was going to make a suggestion. The company is not a purely railway company, but one of its objects is to carry coal, and it is proposed to make a land grant to this company, to enable it to build a railway into coal lands, and a large portion of which, or some portion of which, at all events, is the private property of the railway company. Now, once this railway obtains access to this coal district, whether it owns the coal lands or not, it will be the only railway company to carry the coal of that district, and, therefore, all the owners of coal lands will have to pay tolls to this particular company. You will observe that the Railway Act, therefore, will not give relief to the owners of coal lands. The Railway Act does require railway companies to treat general shippers in the same way, but, in this particular case, it is a matter of indifference to the railway company what rate they impose upon coal, because, so far as their own coal is concerned, the tolls will be simply transferred from one pocket into another. They can, therefore, under their powers and under the present Railway Act, impose any tariff they like on coal, being their own coal, and that same tariff imposed on the coal of strangers would practically be a prohibitory tariff, and, therefore, will place all coal lands at the mercy of this particular company. Therefore, I was going to suggest to the hon. gentleman, before he gives effect to this Bill, giving of a grant to this railway, that there should be a special stipulation in connection with this gift to the railway company, that it shall be liable to change its rates from time to time as the Governor General in Council may deem proper. The hon. gentleman, a few days ago, when we were discussing these resolutions, mentioned that the Railway Act granted such relief. I do not know whether he quite understood me at the time, but I meant to say that the Railway Act is not applicable so far as granting relief is concerned. If he looks at the clause in the Act enabling the Governor in Council to cause a reduction of tolls, he will find that that Act will give no practical relief to the section of the country in question, having regard to the particular nature of this company. This company, not being a purely carrying company, but being a trading company, ought not to be entitled to all the privileges of the railway law, which is only applicable to common carriers. This is a trading company that is asking this Parliament for a grant of land, for a bonus, for a present, to enable it to develop its own mineral lands, not for the benefit of the community, but for the benefit of the company itself. This Bill, I say, ought to have a condition attached to it giving the Governor General in Council jurisdiction to affect the rates charged to the general community. Unless you do that you are simply making every acre of coal lands that is going to be served by this railway practically the private property of this company, for the coal land is of no value to the owner unless the mineral itself can be marketed, and if this company has the only means of transport to market, you are practically handing over the whole coal belt to this company. I make that suggestion now, hoping that the Minister will adopt it so as not to make it necessary for me to move a formal amendment to the Bill.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is no clause of that kind in any of our charters. I do not know that this will be essentially a road for the purpose of carrying coals to the point where it terminates, because in the near future it is expected that the road will be continued in a north-westerly direction towards Battleford, and that it will be a portion of a very extensive line of railway. I think I mentioned, when the Bill was up before, that I understood that the rates could be settled at different times under the Railway Act. Does the hon. gentleman think that is not the case?

Mr. MULOCK. I take it that there is power in the Railway Act, under certain circumstances, whereby the Governor in Council can cause a reduction of rates, but I say that these circumstances are such as would never exist in connection with this company so as to give practical relief. If you look at the section you will find that the Governor in Council can only interfere when the railway company has declared a dividend of 15 per cent. upon its share capital. In this case the share capital is only nominal, but it is paid up by some system of book-keeping. The Governor in Council cannot exercise his power to reduce the rates until 15 per cent. has been paid upon the book-keeping capital. That is the practical working out of that section. You will see that this company, being a trading company, ought not to be simply under laws that are not applicable to it. The Railway Act is only devised to meet the case of common carriers, companies the object of whose existence is to make money by carrying freight. If you look at the Act of incorporation of this company you will find it its empowered to do what common carriers are not empowered to do, that is, to enter into trade and to operate mines. It is, therefore, not a purely common carrier, it is a trading corporation, and, therefore, when it asks Parliament for a gift of land, what I suggest is that we should attach such a condition to that gift as will make it in the public interest. It will be no satisfaction to the people of Calgary to be compelled to pay high rates for coal simply to enrich this company. The coal lands are not for the company, they are for the people.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand that there is no dispute that this company will be subject to the provisions of the Railway Act. I understand that what the hon. gentleman desires is, that there should be a provision inserted in the Bill that the company's tariff should be subject to the approval of the Governor General in Council. Is not that provision in the Railway Act?

Mr. MULOCK. Not properly. A coach and four could be driven through it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SLAUGHTER OF AMERICAN CATTLE IN CANADA.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Is the Government prepared to answer the question I put yesterday respecting the slaughter of American cattle within the Dominion of Canada, which is a matter of considerable interest?

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say that an application has been made

by a company with a view to manufacturing materials out of cattle imported into this country, and exporting the balance. The proposition is, I believe, to import cattle from a foreign country, the United States, and have them slaughtered in this country, and no part of the material will be used in this country, but it will be exported. It is proposed to be done under regulations as stringent as those in force at present in regard to cattle being taken through this country. The proposition is under the consideration of the Government. We have not come to a decision on the matter, but if it in any way endangers our cattle trade with England no concession will be granted.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the Minister kindly lay the regulations on the Table, if any are made?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. MARSHALL. I fail to understand what advantage it will be to the House for hon. members to have a copy of the regulations laid on the Table, after they are settled between the Government and the Three Rivers Dead Meat Company. It is the duty of the representatives of the people to know what is being done before the transactions are completed. In the early part of the session I placed a notice on the Paper asking for a copy of all documents and communications between the Three Rivers Dead Meat Company and the Government to allow American cattle to be slaughtered by the company. I was informed that no such action had been taken or would be, and I allowed the matter to drop. I think this House is entitled to further information on this important subject, and I will take the first opportunity of moving in the matter and protesting against anything that would interfere with the Canadian cattle trade.

Mr. HAGGART. I will state to the hon. gentleman that all the documents and papers in regard to the matter will be brought down to the House.

Mr. DAVIN. This is a most important question to us in the North-West. I hope the suggestions of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Marshall) will be acted upon by the Government.

SUPPLY--GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I desire to call the attention of the House to a question of very practical moment affecting our mode of administration. As every hon. member of this House knows, and I presume every hon. gentleman, not excepting the Ministry, will be willing to admit, the very A B C of our parliamentary constitution is this: That no money shall be expended by the Government of this country without the previous sanction of Parliament. I need not waste words, I hope, in this House in elaborating so simple and well known a proposition as that; but, owing to the necessities of the public service, we have by law established a certain exception to this fundamental rule, and it is to the very great abuse of that provision, which in itself was a fair and not unreasonable proposition, I desire to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House today. The exception to which I refer is defined in our Audit Act. Whenever any extraordinary accident occurs to a public work, or whenever some extraordinary event happens, which could not be reasonably foreseen and which required an outlay of public money under penalty of great injury to the public service, then under certain protections and provisions, which I will presently enumerate, the Governor General is allowed to issue his warrant, provided Parliament is not in session, and under this warrant the Government are allowed, without first obtaining the concurrence of Parliament, to spend what sum may be deemed requisite. I do not object to the fair exercise of this provision under the conditions and safeguards laid down by Parliament and to be found in the Audit Act. But I do object, and object very strongly, to the manner in which this provision has been abused, and systematically abused, during several years past. Sir, it was my duty some four or five years ago to call the attention of the House to the manner in which Governor General's warrants were issued for purposes which I then contended were in no way contemplated by Parliament when it gave them that power, and which were in direct evasion, if not in direct defiance, of the plain terms and plain meaning of the Audit Act. These complaints were recognized even by hon. gentlemen opposite, and then it was promised, and the House may judge that the Government must have felt that they had stepped far outside all reasonable and ordinary bounds when I say that no less a person than Sir Charles Tupper was foremost in making the promise that there would be an amendment in that respect, and that the evils of which we complained would not again occur. Unhappily Ministers (no doubt owing to the absence of Sir Charles Tupper), have fallen from grace, and committed the very evils which I had occasion to denounce pretty vigorously from this side of the House at that time. The present year appears to be a particularly bad one. As I said, I do not object to a reasonable use of the discretion conveyed to the Government. But when I find that from 30th May, 1890, down to 28th April, 1891, and I call the attention of the House to the latter date, which was just one day before Parliament met, Government took authority by Governor General's warrants to demand no less than eighty-seven separate sums, aggregating $1,680,317. I cannot but feel that there is danger of all due parliamentary control being disregarded, and that there is very great danger that this House will lose entirely all effective control of the expenditure of money on the part of the Government. I do not think that at any time before, with the exception of the instance to which I called attention in 1887, has so large a sum of money been expended in this fashion; and when I come to examine these various items it appears to me that a very large number of these warrants have been issued under circumstances which in no way warranted their use. I have not time to go through them all in detail, but I will instance one which was issued on 28th April, 1891. That was a grant of $75,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for post office expenditures under a certain Order in Council passed on 10th February. I submit that in no shape or way did that particular item come within a fair construction of the clause in the Audit Act, which alone gives power to issue Governor General's warrants. That was not caused by any sudden accident to

a public building, nor was it one of those classes of expenditure which required urgent and immediate action as contemplated by that Act. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company were abundantly well able to wait for their money until Parliament had voted it, and there was in that case as in many others, no reason, no excuse, no justification whatever for paying this sum of money over without the consent of Parliament. That, however, is only one case. The worst case, in my judgment, and the one to which I am going to call special attention to, is the one which regards a sum of about $300,000, expended for the service of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways. But before I proceed to deal with that in detail I desire to say this: That when it is found necessary to issue eighty-seven Governor's warrants in the interval between two Parliaments for a sum of money covering collectively nearly $2,000,000, it indicates very slovenly preparation of the Estimates, and it indicates also that the departments which have sent in their requests must have been guilty in many cases of very gross carelessness. Perhaps, judging from what we have seen and heard in other places in this House, the departmental officials were otherwise and more profitably engaged than in ascertaining what were the needs of the public service. Now, Sir, I can hardly conceive an instance in which all the proper rules and regulations which ought to govern in the expenditure of public money have been more openly and outrageously violated than in the case of this expenditure of $300,000 for the service of the Intercolonial Railway in the year 1890. Consider the circumstances of the case. Parliament that year sat until the 16th May, until within six weeks of the termination of the fiscal year. Now, what sort of business management, what sort of departmental management must the Intercolonial Railway have been under, if it were indeed the case that when Parliament rose on the 16th May, they did not know, within $300,000, how much money they would require to spend before the end of the fiscal year terminating in six weeks? Sir, it is hardly necessary to add one word to these facts. They carry their condemnation on the face of them, but lest peradventure there might have been some recondite reason which ordinary mortals cannot understand, I took occasion before the Committee of Public Accounts, to cross-examine the chief engineer of the department with respect to these unprovided items of $302,958, which evidence was reported by that Committee to the House. It appears perfectly plain from the evidence which was then given, and which was published in the public prints, that the department had the most ample means of ascertaining that this sum of money would be required, several days at any rate before Parliament rose. It appears, moreover, from the evidence of Mr. Schreiber, that the character of the items which caused this excess were ones which could most easily have been foreseen, seeing that the bulk of the expenditure had been incurred in the months of March and April; and furthermore—and this is a very extraordinary thing—although he declared that he was not aware that this amount of money would be required, that it had in some extraordinary and some mysterious way escaped his attention, and that his officers had not called his attention to it. Mr. Schreiber, in response to a remark from me, that he ought to have brought down another supplementary estimate, stated: "That he was not aware during the current year he could have two supplementary estimates;" showing plainly, that he was perfectly well aware, after all said and done, that the money would be required, but that he did not take the trouble to make himself acquainted with the state of the law, and preferred, I fear, to take the chance of getting the money provided in this irregular and improper way, to asking Parliament for the extra vote. Now, Sir, I need hardly say to any assembly of business men, that it is utterly impossible with any sort of proper management whatever that the department of the Intercolonial Railway should not have known before the 16th May, that their expenditure would be increased by $200,000 or $300,000, and knowing that and Parliament being in session, it was most undoubtedly their duty to have moved the Government, and the duty of the Government to have moved the House to provide the requisite sum. I strongly suspect, Sir, that the reason was simply this: A good deal had been said in that session about the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and no doubt it was perfectly obvious to all concerned that if a special supplementary estimate for the sum of $300,000 on account of extra expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway had been brought down, that it would have accentuated the dissatisfaction which existed with the management of the road, and would have probably led to a disagreeable debate on the floor of Parliament. That, I have not the slightest doubt in my own mind was the reason which induced the Government, or induced the department for which the Government is responsible, deliberately to neglect their plain duty and to have recourse to this evasion of the true meaning and intent of the Audit Act, and to rely, when the need arose, on a Governor General's warrant, instead of obtaining as they ought to have done the sanction of Parliament to that expenditure. The language of the Act is quite plain, and I will read it for the information of the House:

"If when Parliament is not in session any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof; or any other occasion arises when an expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good; then, on report of the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared for the purpose of supplying this."

It is scarcely necessary for me to point out that the obvious meaning of this clause is, that when any occasion arises when any expenditure which cannot fairly be foreseen by the department or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required; then and then only, is it intended that such a warrant should issue. Now, Sir, I say it is an evasion, and it is a most dangerous evasion, of the principle intended and of the meaning of this Act, for the Government, or a department of the Government, first of all to neglect their duty; first of all to neglect to take proper precautions to inform themselves of what money would be required and to apply to Parliament; and then afterwards, to plead their own deliberate neglect of duty as an excuse for having recourse to this extraordinary provision and obtaining the use of the Governor General's warrant. Both sides of the House ought to be at one upon this question, both sides of the House ought to feel, that whether they

have confidence in the Ministry of the day or not, it is their duty as members of Parliament, it is their duty above all as members of the House of Commons to insist that the Government do not put their hands into the Treasury or use large sums of money without the previous sanction of Parliament. Unless that principle is laid down, unless that principle is enforced, it is obvious that it is utterly hopeless to have any proper control over the acts of Government. Government might, if this construction which is attempted to be put, and is practically put on the Audit Act is allowed to prevail, Government might at any time—let us say before a general election—take one, two, three, or four millions of money out of the public chest, and might distribute it in a thousand ways calculated to promote their political interests. Now, it is not my intention at present—I do not want to distract the attention of the House from the question more immediately at issue—to discuss the various remedies that might be adopted, short of striking this provision entirely out of the Audit Act, and compelling the Government, as I think used to be done formerly in similar cases, to apply to Parliament for a formal Act of indemnity, when from any cause they are obliged to spend money without the authority of Parliament. That may be done more fitly hereafter. My present purpose is to call the attention of the House to the facts which I have stated—facts which I think admit of no dispute. Sir, it appears to me that the purpose of the Act is clear. I do not think any man can fairly contend that Parliament, when it allowed this extraordinary provision to be made for extraordinary accidents, for extraordinary and unforeseen circumstances, ever for one moment contemplated that two or three millions in eighty-seven different sums should be taken out of the public chest under Governor's warrants. Such a thing might conceivably occur in the case of an invasion or in the case of a popular outburst, when Parliament was not sitting; but that it should occur in time of peace is a thing utterly indefensible and unreasonable, provided that anything like decent care is taken by the different departments in the preparation of their estimates. Now, in the particular case to which I allude and which I thought fit to emphasize, the negligence is clear. There is not a shadow of doubt on my mind, after having listened to what Mr. Schreiber had to say, and after having examined the evidence, that the department were perfectly aware while Parliament was sitting, that this money was wanted, and that they deliberately allowed Parliament to rise without taking it into their confidence, and getting the proper sum from it, trusting by this misuse of the Governor General's warrant to obtain whatever sum was requisite for their needs. Now, I trust that the House will do its duty in this case without fear or favour. As I have said, this is a matter which does not concern one side of the House more than the other. This is a matter that goes to the root of all parliamentary control over Government expenditure. If you are going to allow our constitution, founded as it is on British practice and precedent, to be torn up in this fashion, if you are going to allow the Government to spend millions of public money without the slightest reference to Parliament in the fashion that I have now indicated, I say there is an end to all proper parliamentary control over Government expenditure; and in order that the sense of the House may be tested on the subject, I am about to place in your hands, Sir, the following motion:—

That by chapter 29, 49th Victoria, the Governor General in Council is empowered to issue warrants authorizing the expenditure of money not previously voted by Parliament, under the following circumstances:—

"If, when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then, upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount estimated to be required."

That on or about the 25th day of June, and 16th day of October, 1890, His Excellency was advised to issue his warrants for the expenditures of $281,606 and $16,000, for the service of the Prince Edward and Intercolonial Railroads, during the fiscal year 1890, which terminated on the 30th day of June, 1890.

That Parliament remained in session up to the 16th day of May, 1890, being within six weeks of the close of the said fiscal year.

That no accident had occurred upon the said railroads, nor was there any reason whatever why said expenditure should not have been foreseen and provided for by Parliament.

That under such circumstances the issue of a Governor General's warrant for the said sums was a gross abuse of the power vested in the Governor in Council under the said Act, and that the conduct of the Government in neglecting to apply to Parliament in due time for the said sums, indicates great laxity of administration and deserves the censure of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose that there will be much disagreement between my hon. friend and myself on the theory which he has just laid down as regards the source of supply for money expenditures made in the country. There is no doubt—of course we all know that—that Parliament is the source of supply, and that to Parliament we must as a Government or an executive body look for authority for expenditures. The clause of the Act which the hon. gentleman has recited, however, gives a discretionary power to the Executive upon certain occasions, in certain exigencies; and I have no doubt as well that when that power was given, although the wording of the Act is broadly drawn, the spirit and intention of the Act was to provide only for those expenditures which came to be considered as absolutely necessary and urgent, so far urgent as to make it a matter of public service and public utility that the expenditures should be made. It is true as my hon. friend has said, that with reference to the item he has specially mentioned and about which the discussion so far is mostly proceeding, it ought to have been foreseen and ought to have been provided for by Parliament. My hon. friend will recollect that evidence was taken on this matter in the Public Accounts Committee, and that the engineer of the department, Mr. Schreiber, in giving his evidence, recited the reasons for the omission; and although the evidence is not very fresh in my mind, the two chief points in it, if I am not mistaken, were these: First, that the major portion of that expenditure by Governor General's warrant on the Intercolonial Railway was due to re-railing with steel rails, and that, as a usual thing, this expenditure falls in the succeeding year, the re-railing being chiefly done at the very end of the one fiscal year and the beginning of the other. In this instance, however, a larger part of that re-railing was made earlier than usual, and as it was

not anticipated that it would have been made so early, considerably over $100,000 of that which was required by the Governor General's warrant became necessary from that unexpected and unforeseen circumstance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it was in April and March he said that sum was paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, in March, It is true that sum was expended in the latter part of April and March, but, in explaining the transit of estimates and accounts from the officers upon the road to the department, Mr. Schreiber showed that the statements of these expenditures would not come to his knowledge in the department for some six weeks or two months after they had been made, the accounts taking a certain amount of time in their adjustment and transit. I think he also mentioned that in that year he was absent for some time, and, consequently, that was an added circumstance which led to this escaping his attention, when estimating what was necessary for the service. The other part was mostly made up, I think, from the over-expenditure in connection with the increased trainage upon the Intercolonial Railway between St. John and Halifax, the chief engineer having been led to suppose, from the preceding year, that no perceptible shortage would be made by the arrangements which would be necessary for that extra trainage. These two reasons were all he could give to account for this expenditure having escaped his attention, and for his not having drawn the attention of the Minister of the department to it. The point then I wish to make is this, that this did not come to the attention of the Government until it had been impossible to ask Parliament or to receive from Parliament any supply; that it was overlooked by the officer of the department, who, in his evidence stated that, and took the whole responsibility, and who, when questioned by my hon. friend, stated that he had not brought it to the attention of the Minister of the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He said he did not remember.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, he did not remember having done so. That then is, of course, an instance of a lack of foresight and a lack, to a certain extent, of proper outlook on the part of the principal officer of the department. But what I wish to say is this, that when, in the course of the succeeding year, it came to the attention of the Government that the appropriation was insufficient by that large amount—and it was a large amount—and that the Intercolonial Railway and its system had to be kept running, it was then impossible, in the interest of the public service, to have stopped the traffic of the road or interfered with its trainage. It was, therefore, a matter which fell under the powers the Government have, under the Act, of taking Governor General's warrants for unforeseen and necessary expenditure. The Government certainly could not take the responsibility of allowing the operations of these railways to cease. The trouble arose in the department itself; the reasons were given, and very frankly given, by the engineer himself, and I suppose the best of men and most careful of managers will sometimes make mistakes, in this respect; but when the matter came to the attention of the Government, there was no other way open to us than to take the Governor General's warrant and keep up the service of the country in this regard. In looking over the list of Governor General's warrants, I find that quite a large number of them are to make up balances that have lapsed. Clearly, the distinction must be drawn between these and appropriations by Governor General's warrants for entirely new services. Here were sums—and in the case of the railway a part of that, I think, was a lapsed balance—that were voted, but, owing to circumstances not foreseen, it became impossible to spend them for the services for which they had been voted during the currency of the year; and under the present ruling and the state of the law, it is impossible to pay out of balances that run over any expenditure incurred for services during the year for which the money was not voted. Formerly, and up to within two years, it was possible to use the lapsed balances for services which had not been expended up to the end of the fiscal year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For three months.

Mr. FOSTER. For three months. But now, under the rule which has obtained for the last two years, and the practice of the last year and a half, I think, this has not been done; so that every dollar remaining over on the 30th of June for the service for the year which it had been voted, can only be applied for services which have actually been performed during the year for which they were voted, and not for new services beginning in the year into which the lapsed balances ran. So that in the case of public works, it happened over and over again that a public work had been appropriated for by Parliament, that the money had been voted by Parliament, that the contract had been let and that the works were under operation, but, owing to circumstances, the works had not proceeded with that rapidity with which it is thought they would have been proceeded, and consequently, when the end of the year came, it was found that a much smaller expenditure had been actually incurred and a much smaller liability, than had been provided for. Now, it is clearly impossible to stop a public work in the middle of the contract, in the middle of the work itself. It is clearly impossible to do that, and having in view the exigencies and the utility of the public service, I think in those cases it is not at all an unwarrantable stretch of power, under the authority given the Government by this clause, to carry on the work by Governor General's warrant. A large amount, then, of the sum which was called for by Governor General's warrants is of that kind which was required to keep on works which had not proceeded with the rapidity expected and for which lapsed balances went over into the next year, but which were made available, or an equal sum was made available, by Governor General's warrants. My hon. friend has spoken as to the number of these. Of course, the number varies. It may be perfectly legitimate that there should be forty, or fifty, or sixty Governor General's warrants. The number itself could not be made a charge against the Government as to the improper use of Governor General's warrants. An accident occurs at a breakwater, or a wharf, or a pier owned by the Government. This accident may take place at any part of the coast or of the lakes where these Government works are going on. There are

hundreds of them—I was almost going to say thousands—and wherever these accidents occur they come within the line laid down for the issue of Governor General's warrants, and in order to keep these works serviceable and to prevent further destruction taking place it is perfectly right that Governor General's warrants should issue. I do not agree with my hon. friend at all that this Intercolonial Railway appropriation was retarded by the officers of the department, and certainly it was not by the head of the department or by the Government, in order to keep this large sum from being asked for in Parliament, and so precipitating a discussion. That course could not avail anything. The discussion must come sooner or later, and if it were simply put off for a few months the Government does not thereby escape the responsibility of the discussion—in fact, it would be rather heightened than otherwise by the delay.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How often do the officers report to the Government as to the state of the revenues?

Mr. FOSTER. The officers are in more or less continual communication with the heads of the departments with reference to the works that are under their charge.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But they make formal reports as to the revenues of the railway, do they not?

Mr. FOSTER. The head of the department, no doubt, keeps track of the revenue and expenditure, so far as he possibly can.

Mr. MILLS. (Bothwell). But the report is made monthly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know it used to be.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know what the rule is in that department. I was going on to say that I did not agree with my hon. friend in imputing that motive to the officer of the department. He admitted the error that had been made, and was perfectly frank in the evidence he gave. As to the intimation that it might not have been agreeable to the Minister or to the Government to bring down the information, there is nothing in that. As I have said, it could not inure to the interests of the department or of the Government to have the discussion kept off for a few months so that it might come on later.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why not? It might be better after an election than before.

Mr. FOSTER. If it were on the eve of an election there might be something in it, but as a member of the Government I can say that I had no thought or idea of an election coming on, particularly when these estimates were being put through last year. As to the general principle which the Government ought to pursue in regard to these expenditures, I thoroughly agree with my hon. friend. A Governor General's warrant ought not to be used except for an urgent and necessary purpose, but if an error occurs, and a branch of the public service must be stopped unless appropriations are made which Parliament would have given but for the error, there is no choice between the two alternatives. The warrant must be issued, and the money must be made available. I think I need not go over all the warrants which are referred to. The resolution seems to have been almost entirely based on the case of the railway, and that is a branch of the service which must go on. Whether from error or from any other reason, an insufficient appropriation has been made by Parliament, whenever the Government comes face to face with the lack of money sufficient to carry on the service, and the alternative is between the service stopping or going on, the Government has no other course to pursue than to keep up the traffic and to keep up the business in this great branch of the public service for the benefit of the people of this country.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Finance has presented a most extraordinary defence for his Government on this occasion. He admits the gravity of the situation, he admits that the Government is bound to offer an excuse, and what is the defence? The defence is, that the department, or the administrative side of the Government, is so broken down that it failed to make known to the Government, the representative part of it, the needs of the department, and thus he asks Parliament to do away with the whole representative system and to throw the blame upon those who are not amenable to Parliament at all. He asks Parliament to transfer the blame from the responsible representatives of the people to the irresponsible servants of the Government. That is not responsible Government. It is a system which it is being attempted to introduce here now. Whenever a fault is discovered, it is said by the head of the department that it is not he who is in default, but it is the deputy or the officer of the department who is in default. I say this is not a Government of deputies, though my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) once said it was. The persons responsible to Parliament are the heads of the departments. Of course, accidents will happen, and, if the Administration do all they should, if they discharge their bounden duty, then we must be reasonable in regard to them, and hold them responsible only for what might reasonably be expected. But here, what is the excuse? The Minister does not defend the transaction itself. He admits that the necessity for this fund arose while Parliament was in session. He admits that the Government ought to have known that the account was overdrawn. He does not contend that the action of the Government was really within the spirit of the Audit Act. He simply pleads: You must not blame me because of the short-coming of one of the servants. I submit that the Administration, if they had given the first bit of attention to the affairs entrusted to them, would have known, when Parliament was in session, that there would be a default. On the 30th June, within six weeks after Parliament rose, they found there had been a default of $533,000 in the working of this road, and we are to be told that, within six weeks of that time, the Government were so uninformed that they did not know on the 16th May whether or not there was a surplus. This road had been carrying on its operations from the 1st July preceding, that is, for ten and a-half months, and yet within a month and a-half from the end of the year the Government say they did not know there was a deficit. They can only shelter themselves from the dilemma in which they are placed now by pleading

that they were blind and would not see. They had monthly returns made to them, or, if not, whose fault was it? My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says it was always the custom to make monthly returns to the Minister of Railways as to the working of the Government railways. Were these returns looked at? If so, the growing deficit was known every month. It did not begin on the 16th May. We may assume that it began on the 1st July, 1890, when the Short Line Railway began operations, and the Government say they began to lose from that time. If that be so, they had daily, weekly and monthly notice of a gradually accumulating deficit until the 1st July following, when the total amount of that deficit was known. But they must have had notice, if they were attending to the department at all, month by month, of this accumulated default, and therefore it was nothing but the grossest negligence on the part of the Administration if they did not know. I therefore say, whilst I would be reasonable and excuse want of knowledge if there was a reasonable ground for excuse, that in a case like this, where they had the documents before them, and had only to look at them, and read them, and know there was a default, you cannot accept the plea of ignorance as a defence in this case. Although this motion is confined to one item, what do we find the Government doing? Parliament prorogued on the 16th of May, 1890. The month had not closed before they began to issue Governor General's warrants, first one for $2,000 for the Department of Justice; and on the 30th of May another warrant issued for $99,000 inconnection with legislation. From that time on they went thick and fast and made expenditures of money that was never voted by Parliament, issuing warrants amounting in the aggregate to $1,310,000. The Finance Minister says we must draw a distinction between warrants issued for lapsed balances, and warrants issued for moneys never authorized by Parliament. I agree with him there is a difference, but even that excuse will not get him out of this dilemma, because of the total amount of warrants issued only $450,000 embraced lapsed balances therefore, they issued warrants during that year for $860,000 in excess of all the lapsed balances of the year. Therefore, at best, he has to account for warrants to the extent of $860,000 never before submitted to Parliament, moneys taken out of the treasury without the sanction of Parliament. Sir, I think that the Government could not in any other way better manifest their indifference to the supreme power of the people than by taking their money without authority. There is no higher crime that an Administration can commit in a country such as Canada, where the people are supposed to control their own funds. The very aim and object of our parliamentary system, the very aim and object of requiring Parliament to assemble once a year, is to control the public expenditure, and the very clause of the Act which says that all balances shall lapse on a certain day is in order to compel the Government to come before the people's representatives and give an account of their stewardship, and then, and then only, receive a renewal of confidence by a renewed vote of Supply, if they are thought worthy of it. But here we have a new system set up. I remember well when the hon. gentleman issued a warrant a short time ago for $20,000 to pay a bill of law costs, as if that was an unforeseen expenditure urgently necessary in the public good. But you want no better argument to prove the careless laxity with which these warrants are issued than this one fact, that the Government issued warrants for $1,310,000 on the ground that that whole expenditure was urgently needed, and could not be deferred until Parliament assembled; and yet it does not appear that they spent it all. It is not often I have to complain of the Government not having spent all that they could legally spend, but that is no excuse for that part of their action. Therefore, the fact that they did not spend it all is another proof that their action was wholly unwarrantable. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to dwell upon the language of the Act, because the Finance Minister has not ventured to defend the transaction under this Act. The Act says that these warrants can only issue under certain circumstances, namely, where there has been an accident to a public work, and that repair is necessary. That is not the case here—also, where some unforeseen circumstance arises, which is not before provided for, and which the public good demands shall be provided for. Now, when you may see, but won't see, is that "unforeseen." The Act must mean that where a demand for some expenditure exists, and that with reasonable diligence the Government have not been able to anticipate that need, then the power of this Act may be invoked, but not until then. Why, Sir, if the construction the Minister of Finance has placed upon the Act is admitted all he has got to do, if this action is condoned by the House, is to tell his officers: You need not make reports to me of deficits, there need not be any mention of them; as long as I do not know I can come to Parliament and say I issued a warrant because my officer below me did not tell me anything about the default. Why, Sir, it is offering a premium upon negligence; it is proposing that there shall be an absolutely irresponsible system of administration, the servants not being responsible to the Government and the Government not being responsible to Parliament. Now, I think that if we are to get back to a healthy state of affairs we must emphatically condemn the action of the Administration on this occasion. The Minister of Finance has stated from his place in this House that even the communications submitted to His Excellency the Governor General did not disclose the reasons for these warrants issuing. It certainly is contemplated by the Audit Act that the Governor General can only be requested to exercise his extraordinary prerogative of handing out the people's money after he has been fully advised of all the circumstances, and so that he might be enabled to see that they brought the case within the Act. Yet, Sir, we have the Minister of Finance saying here that the papers submitted to His Excellency the Governor in Council on this occasion disclosed no such state of affairs—gave no information whatever. Well, Sir, if that is the case, where is there a safeguard for the people's money? If a member of the Government can simply certify that he wants so much money, without assigning reasons to his colleagues or to His Excellency, if he can get it under those circumstances, then I think it is high time for the people to see that this lax system is changed. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we must hold the Government

responsible for not knowing what was their duty to have known. Mr. Schreiber says that part of this money was required for rails; he says that the rails were ordered eight months before the 1st of January; he says that in May there had been expended $107,000 for rails, that the expenditure began on a contract given eight months before the 1st of January; so that the order for rails which occasioned a difference of $107,000 was issued nearly a year before the warrant was issued. Under these circumstances, it seems impossible to understand how this default could take place and not be known by the head of the department. Is it the case that Mr. Schreiber can order $107,000 worth of rails without the authority of his superior officers: that all the vast supplies of the Intercolonial Railway can be purchased by the chief engineer without the previous sanction of the head of the department? Now, if the purchase of those supplies had been made with the knowledge of the head of the department, then the department had notice that this money would be required. I ask the Minister of Finance again, and I would be glad to have him tell the House upon that point, whether the engineer had power to order those rails without the authority of the chief of his department—because he tells us they were ordered eight months before the 1st of January, 1890, and, therefore, either he had to order them without authority, and under a lax system, which ought at once to be changed, or he ordered them with authority, and in that case the Administration had notice of the claim. Under these circumstances, I feel we must hold the Government responsible for the transactions, even if they take shelter behind a servant. We must hold them either not having knowledge of what they ought to know or as being negligent. I presume it is our duty to impute to them knowledge they should have: and under these circumstances the authority taken by the Government was, in my opinion, contrary to the Audit Act, against the interests of the people, unwarrantable, except as unauthorized by unwarrantable authority—unwarrantable, in fact, and therefore deserving the censure of this House.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am very glad to know that the Minister of Finance has the grace and good feeling not to differ from the view put forward by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He declared he had no quarrel with the view my hon. friend put before the House This is comforting, because if there is one principle of responsible Government more firmly established than another, and if there is one principle more necessary to the success of representative institutions than another, it is the principle that no money shall be spent without the authority of the people's representatives. Then the Minister of Finance admits that the intent of the Act was to prevent the occurrence of such acts as are now complained of. So far, the Minister of Finance agrees with the mover of the amendment. But then he pleads that these expenditures, from certain causes, came to be necessary: he pleads there should be exceptions allowed under such circumstances as those under which the expenditure in question was made. Let us look at the circumstances, and it does not require much research to discover the facts, and see whether there is any real excuse for the expenditure or not. It will have been observed that the Minister of Finance does not pretend to defend all the warrants issued. He confines himself to one instance, that of the large expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway. Let us look at that expenditure, and see if the Government were justified in their extraordinary course. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has laid down that these warrants are only to be used in case of accident or necessity, under circumstances that could not be foreseen when the Estimates were submitted to Parliament. The Minister of Finance says the greater part of that expenditure was necessary for renewing rails, for re-railing, as he calls it, a part of the Intercolonial Railway, and for the drainage of a part of it. I appeal to common sense if those are not matters that might have been foreseen a year or two before, if they are not matters that ought to have been foreseen by any Government exercising even ordinary care. Surely one of the principal duties of the manager of a railway is to watch the wearing of the rails on the road: and I repeat that not only could it have been foreseen, but it ought to have been foreseen a year or two before this expenditure was necessary. Then there is the other point with respect to drainage.

Mr. MULOCK. It was extra train service to compete with the Short Line.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I always thought competition was supposed to diminish traffic on a road and to reduce the cost. If it has had the effect of increasing the traffic on the road, and the necessity for increased service and increased railway plant, then the best thing we can do with the road is to put another one alongside of it. The hon. gentleman fails to show that the case falls under the Act. What excuse, therefore, has he to offer for the action of the Government? The hon. gentleman first tries to evade the responsibility. He says the Government are not to blame, but the servants of the Government are culpable. Is that a valid excuse that either the House or the country should accept? If there is one principle that should be insisted on more firmly than another it is the responsibility of the Government for the conduct of public affairs. There is no justification in shifting the responsibility on an underling, for the first principle of Government is that the head of a department is responsible, and not a subordinate. Then the Minister of Finance, in order to extricate himself from the dilemma, throws himself on the mercy of the House. He admits, in effect, that the Government did wrong; yet he does not promise that they will not err again. We might be disposed to grant pity, but we have a duty to perform. The Government is a Committee of the House to give effect to the will of the House, to execute what the House orders them to do, and it is the duty of the House to hold the Government to a strict account. That is the theory of responsible government. When the Minister of Finance asks for the pity of the House, I say the House has no right to extend pity to him. The Government have done either right or wrong. According to the hon. gentleman's own confession, they have done wrong, and there is no excuse, because the necessities should have been foreseen long ago and provided against. So there is no reason why the House should extend any leniency to the Government under the circumstances. There is another

reason why the House should not show any leniency. This is only one of many circumstances constantly coming to the knowledge of the House, showing the utter demoralization of our system of ministerial government. This is another case showing the utter incapacity of, and want of care shown on the part of the heads of the department; and the only cure for that is that this House as representing the people should pass upon the Government its most severe censure. I apprehend that hon. members of this House will show great neglect of duty if they condone this offence now under consideration.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Hargraft,
Allison,	Harwood,
Amyot,	Hyman,
Armstrong,	Innes,
Bain,	Landerkin,
Barron,	Langelier,
Beausoleil,	Laurier,
Beith,	Lavergne,
Bernier,	Leduc,
Borden,	Legris,
Bourassa,	Lister,
Bowers,	Livingston,
Bowman,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brodeur,	Mackenzie,
Brown (Chateauguay),	McGregor,
Brown (Monck),	McMillan,
Cameron (Huron),	McMullen,
Campbell,	Mignault,
Carroll,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Monet,
Casey,	Mousseau,
Charlton,	Mulock,
Choquette,	Murray,
Christie,	Perry,
Colter,	Préfontaine,
Davidson,	Proulx,
Davies,	Rider,
Dawson,	Rinfret,
Delisle,	Rowand,
Featherston,	Sanborn,
Flint,	Savard,
Forbes,	Scriver,
Fraser,	Semple,
Gauthier,	Simard,
Geoffrion,	Somerville,
German,	Tarte,
Gibson,	Trow,
Gillmor,	Truax,
Godbout,	Vaillancourt,
Grieve,	Watson,
Guay,	Yeo.—82.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bergeron,	Macdonald (King's),
Bowell,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Burnham,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Burns,	Mackintosh,
Cameron (Inverness),	McAllister,
Carignan,	McCarthy,
Carpenter,	McDonald (Victoria),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDougald (Pictou),
Chapleau,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cleveland,	McKay,
Coatsworth,	McLean,
Cochrane,	McLennan,
Cockburn,	McLeod,
Corbould,	McNeill,
Costigan,	Madill,
Corby,	Mara,
Craig,	Marshall,
Daly,	Masson,
Davin,	Miller,
Davis,	Mills (Annapolis),
Denison,	Moncrieff,
Desaulniers,	Montague,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	O'Brien,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Ouimet,
Dewdney,	Patterson (Colchester),
Dugas,	Pelletier,
Dupont,	Prior,
Dyer,	Putnam,
Fairbairn,	Reid,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Robillard,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Roome,
Foster,	Ross (Lisgar),
Fréchette,	Ryckman,
Gillies,	Skinner,
Girouard,	Sproule,
Gordon,	Stairs,
Grandbois,	Stevenson,
Haggart,	Taylor,
Hazen,	Thompson (Sir John),
Henderson,	Tisdale,
Ingram,	Tupper,
Jamieson,	Tyrwhitt,
Kaulbach,	Wallace,
Kenny,	White (Cardwell),
Langevin (Sir Hector),	White (Shelburne),
La Rivière,	Wilmot,
Léger,	Wood (Brockville),
Lépine,	Wood (Westmoreland).—97.
Lippé,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Barnard,	Mr. Welsh.
Mr. Earle,	Mr. Fauvel,
Mr. Macdowall,	Mr. Paterson (Brant).
Mr. McKeen,	Mr. King,
Mr. Pope,	Mr. Frémont,
Mr. Curran,	Mr. Devlin,
Mr. Kirkpatrick.	Mr. Sutherland.

Amendment negatived.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Three Rivers Pier..... $10,000

Mr. LAURIER. Where is that pier?

Mr. FOSTER. It is between the Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners' and the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company's wharves. This vote is to carry on works during 1891-92.

Mr. LAURIER. Does this complete the work?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it will require $5,000 more to complete. The entire sum will be $15,000.

Lévis Graving Dock..... $7,500

Mr. AMYOT. What is this for?

Mr. FOSTER. This is to make provision for works to be carried out during the fiscal year in connection with the graving dock, according to the following estimate: The erection of a dwelling for a dock-master, dredging required at the entrance of a dock, repair to the ferry wharf, superintendence and contingencies. The total estimated cost of the improvements was $11,500, and $7,500 is asked now. The other $4,000 is not asked for, because I believe it is not intended to build a dock-master's dwelling this year.

Mr. AMYOT. Is that work to be done by day work or by contract?

Mr. FOSTER. The dredging will be done by the Government dredges.

Mr. AMYOT. I would like to enquire if there is much more work to be done at that graving dock, because it has cost a great amount. There were first some $300,000 to build the dock to a certain length; then thirty feet were taken away from the stipulated length, but the contractors found means of being paid about $41,000 for work which they did not do, though they were obliged to do it by the contract. That part of the work was given up as impossible, and then

extras were paid coming from that. I want to understand what part of the dock requires repairs now, because it seemed to me the last time I was there to be in a perfect state of repair. I want to know this, because there has been more than lavish expenditure on this work.

Mr. FOSTER. The estimate here is for dredging required for the dock. That, I believe, is on account of some vessels of large draught having touched, so that some dredging is required there to make it perfectly accessible to some vessels. That is to be done by our own dredges, and will require $2,500, while the repairs to the wharf are estimated at $3,000.

Mr. AMYOT. Would the hon. gentleman tell me which wharf?

Mr. FOSTER. The ferry wharf.

Mr. AMYOT. Surely the ferry wharf has nothing to do with the graving dock.

Mr. FOSTER. The ferry wharf belongs to the Government.

Mr. AMYOT. Does the Government charge anything for the steamers plying there?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know, but I think not. The dock is entirely completed, and these are small expenditures required for the purposes I have mentioned.

Mr. LAURIER. It will be important to understand exactly where this dredging is to be done.

Mr. FOSTER. At the entrance to the dock.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not very familiar with the locality, but I think there must be a mistake.

Mr. LANGELIER. It must be a mistake, because the water is very deep at the entrance of the graving dock.

Mr. FOSTER. A bar forms on the Quebec side.

Mr. LANGELIER. It is all on the Lévis side. On the side towards Quebec the water is 150 feet deep.

Mr. FOSTER. It is on the western side.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not object to this expenditure, but I hope the Government will not use these works to persecute citizens who do not share their views in politics, or who decide to change their party allegiance. I put a question to the hon. Minister some time ago about a gentleman named Captain Giguère, who has been working for the department and for the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec. I hold in my hand certificates coming from the Department of Public Works and the Harbour Commissioners at Quebec, and from certain captains of ships, showing that he has always been recognized as a most competent man. Last year he was employed by the department and fulfilled his duty perfectly, and if my information is correct his services were retained for the present season. At the last general election, for reasons best known to himself, he decided to change his party allegiance; and he voted against the candidate of the Government for Quebec West. The matter was immediately reported to Ottawa, and a few days afterwards the order was sent to Mr. Bourchier, the engineer employed by the department, to dispense with the services of Captain Giguère. Captain Giguère, who had been engaged for the whole season, was not employed after that, and he suffered damages. It is no use for him to sue the Government for damages by petition of right, because very likely the expense and trouble that this would entail upon him would be more than a petition of right would bring to compensate him. But I say it is mean for officers belonging to the Government to persecute with the people's money those who exercise their freedom of franchise, and it is not right for the Government to sustain their action. It is a small affair, it is true, but a Government backed by a majority so large as that which the present Government has, or had, to have recourse to such paltry, mean ways of sustaining it, as persecuting poor seamen or labouring men who earn their money by honest industry, is unjust and unfair to the public. To resort to these, I will not say tricks, but to this breaking of faith in carrying out a contract, is wrong in small things as in great. A man who respects himself does not fail to carry out his contract, and the Government should act like a private individual in that respect; and any Government that intrenches itself behind the dignity of the Crown, where it cannot be reached, is unjust and unworthy of its position. I am sorry to have to say this, but this is the fact; and if the Government were a private individual Captain Giguère might say: You engaged me last year for this season, and you will pay me for it. The Government were satisfied with his services, and it is only because he did not vote for the ex-member for Quebec West—and he was quite right, as the withdrawal of that hon. member has proved since that the Government deprived him of his season's work. Now that the Government are informed of the fact they should at once see that this injustice done by the late member shall be repaired.

Mr. FOSTER. Did you say you had asked a question and had not received an answer?

Mr. AMYOT. I had an answer that was not satisfactory, and was not in accordance with the facts as I have them. It was denied that his services had been engaged. Let me read this letter:—

"QUARANTINE STATION,
"GROSSE ISLE, P.Q., 12th May, 1891.

"SIR,—Yesterday at Quebec I gave you verbal notice that your services will not be required in connection with the diving operations at this place. I have now the honour to intimate to you the same fact in writing, and to tell you that the Government has dispensed with your services, and those of your divers.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"GEO. L. BOURCHIER,
"*Engineer-in-Charge.*"

"CAPTAIN CLAUDE GIGUÈRE,
"757 Champlain Street, Quebec, P.Q."

On the 12th of May, 1891, it is too late to say to him: The Government dispenses with your services. It is too late, after the Government by its officials had employed him in the preceding year and had retained his services for the next year, as those services were very valuable. I state these facts to the Government, and I hope that they will see that justice be done at once, and that they will start a new era, and undo the great injustice which has been done to Captain Giguère.

Mr. FOSTER. If I understand the case rightly, this man of whom the hon. member has spoken was not employed at the graving dock, but at Grosse Isle.

Mr. AMYOT. He was employed by the Government at divers places to dive; but the year previous

he was employed by the Government at Grosse Isle, and his services were retained for the present year. But as soon as he had voted against Mr. McGreevy, this fact was reported to Ottawa, and from Ottawa was sent the order to discharge him, and this order was communicated to him by this letter; and so the Government has broken faith with him.

Mr. FOSTER. I have listened to the hon. gentleman, but not being the Minister of the department I cannot give full information with reference to the matter. I will have it looked into, and the answer will be given. I understand that this man was a diver, and, as my hon. friend says, was employed in divers places; but when his services were ended, he was not wanted any longer. I should not think that he was deprived of his pay and taken from his work for any such reason as my hon. friend has given, simply because he voted for some person supporting my hon. friend opposite.

Mr. LAURIER. This case, according to what has been stated by my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), seems to be one of these many cases in which the nefarious influence of the late member for Quebec West was exercised.

Mr. FOSTER. Don't strike a man when he is down.

Mr. LAURIER. This man has been employed for several years, but because at the last election he seceded from his allegiance to the Conservative party and voted for the opponent of the late member for Quebec West he was dismissed summarily and no reason given. He was told that his services were no longer required, without any reason whatever being given for dismissing him. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to say that a man who has been employed by the Government several years, and expects to be continued in its employ, can be dismissed from the service, even if there be no formal engagement, without cause, or reason assigned? The true reason is, no doubt, what has been stated by the hon. member for Bellechasse, that it was because he changed his politics.

Mr. FOSTER. I will try and find the reason for his dismissal, but I cannot subscribe to the doctrine that because the Government employ temporary help the parties employed have acquired a vested right to be continued in office. The Government may dispense with their services for reason at any time. I am not conversant with the reasons in this case.

Mr. AMYOT. I have certificates from the department of the harbour commissioners at Quebec and from divers sea captains as to his great ability, and I will privately give to the Minister the name of the party who came to Ottawa to obtain his dismissal. I do not like to bring the name of that party before the public, because he is not here to defend himself, but will give the information privately to the Minister.

McMULLEN. Under whose certificate is this appropriation made? Who is the engineer in charge? It is rather singular that an hon. gentleman on this side, who is quite conversant with that section of the country, is prepared to challenge the necessity of the expenditure. I would like to know what engineer recommended the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Valiquette.

Mr. AMYOT.

Mr. LANGELIER. This is not for the entrance of the dock, but for a certain distance above the entrance, where there is a sand bar.

Mr. GUAY. As there is no French Minister present to give the information, and as I live in that locality, I may state that this money will be well and properly expended, as it is really needed for the accommodation of the small boats which ply between the Island of Orleans and Quebec.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If my hon. friend can assure us that the money will be properly expended, he will give us an assurance we have not had for some time.

Mr. LANGELIER. Who is in charge?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Valiquette, I believe: a very competent engineer.

Mr. LANGELIER. It came out before the Committee that Mr. Laforce Langevin had been employed as an engineer. Is he there still?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Valiquette is the engineer.

Mr. GUAY. Why was Captain Bernier, who was there before Mr. Valiquette, dismissed?

Mr. FOSTER. The information my hon. friend desires was asked for in a motion for papers which are now being prepared and will be down in a day or two.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not much to be wondered at that we should criticise expenditure in connection with graving docks, because they are institutions in which we have buried a great deal of money.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not go into the docks.

Mr. McMULLEN. No; it is the graves I refer to. We have never been able to exhume any of the money we have buried in those institutions.

River St. Louis, the municipality of St. Clement providing $400..... $2,000

Mr. SCRIVER. Will this be sufficient to complete the works?

Mr. FOSTER. The total estimated cost of the improvements is $4,400, so that it will require $2,000 more to complete.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, —and my remarks are intended as much for your ears as for those of the acting Minister of Public Works and the House, this work being in your own constituency—that very many complaints have reached me from constituents of your own as to the manner in which the money heretofore appropriated has been expended. I have been told—I do not know on what grounds, because I have not made personal examination of the work myself—but I have been told by more than one, apparently well-informed constituents of your own, that the money expended has not been judiciously expended, and that it has been expended under the care of men who are incompetent to supervise the work. The greatest good that might have been obtained from the appropriations has, therefore, not been obtained. If you are not aware of all the facts, I would suggest the propriety, when you next visit your constituency, of giving this matter your personal attention.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is some truth in what the hon. gentleman has just said. The work was commenced by dredging; there was very

low water at the beginning of the work, and I believe myself that the Government, not being perfectly *au courant* of the work done there, some money may have been misspent. Still the work done has been of great importance: and the vote asked now is required simply for this reason: that the Government having deepened what is called the feeder between Lake St. Francis and River St. Louis, some work had to be done last year between the end of the feeder and the parish of St. Louis de Gonzague, to put the water at the same level as it is above. It is asked to-day to continue such work. I say the Government have not put a large enough amount in the Estimates, but still we have to take what they give. The municipality of St. Clement is giving $400. I think the Government should pay the whole cost, because it was the water that carried away the two bridges which it is sought to repair; but the Government have forced this municipalitiy to pay its share. The money at the commencement may not have been spent properly, but the work is a very important one and must be finished.

Coteau Landing Pier $1,500

Mr. MOUSSEAU. How much was spent last year on that wharf?

Mr. FOSTER. The vote was $4,000, and up to 31st December $2,139 was spent.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. I am not opposed to the voting of this sum, but there is an injustice done to the inhabitants of this county. There is a wharf there, and there is a freight shed built on the pier by the Dominion Government, but only one company has the right to use that freight shed. There are two other companies that stop at this wharf, but the steamers, the *Garnet* and the *Chaffee*, have no right to go in there and place their passengers and goods in that freight shed. Last May I complained of this, and the Minister of Public Works told me that he would look into it. A month after I spoke to him, and he said he had not thought of it. Now, I would like the Government to promise that the use of this freight shed shall not be confined to the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, because it was built with public money, and I think the other companies who have a right to stop there should also have a right to use that freight shed in behalf of their passengers and their goods. When it is raining, the passengers by the other lines, I believe, can get damages on account of being exposed to the inclemency of the weather.

Mr. FOSTER. I find the facts are partly as stated by my hon. friend, that the wharf is owned by the Government and the shed was built by the Government. The key was given by the foreman in charge by mistake to the officers of the Richelieu Company, but when representation was made in regard to this the key was taken away from their officer and the shed was used by any person who wanted it. That wharf is now being transferred from the Public Works Department to the Marine Department, under whose management it will be, as all the wharves along the river are after they are built. Then it will be carried on for public purposes entirely, and everyone will have an equal right to use it.

General repairs and improvements, harbours and rivers, Quebec..... $10,000

Mr. LAVERGNE. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to certain works which were begun about eight or nine years ago in Black River, in the County of Drummond. In February last I transmitted to the Minister of Public Works a demand from the inhabitants of the place in question asking that a certain appropriation be made for the purpose of completing the works begun on that river. According to the ground laid down by the Minister of Finance, when a work is begun there should be no objection to its completion. The Minister of Public Works solemnly promised me to send an engineer to visit the works and make a report. In July following I wrote to the department, calling the attention of the Minister to the fact that the engineer had not gone there and made a report. I understand that, the session having lasted until the end of June, the Minister had not had time to attend to the matter. In December last I wrote again, calling his attention to the fact, and so far I have only received from the department an acknowledgment of the reception of my letters. Now, I must say that in this matter we have not been treated fairly. I recollect that a few weeks ago the Minister of Justice, speaking in a debate on the timber limit question, stated that whenever members had occasion, on behalf of their constituents, to do any business with the department, they were always treated courteously and with the greatest impartiality. I must say that the hon. Minister who made that statement has, so far as I am concerned, always verified it by his conduct in all dealings that I have had with the Department of Justice. But I think the Department of Public Works, in this instance, has not acted with the same promptness and impartiality. I think the least any department could have done was to send an engineer, as had been promised. I hold in my hands three letters acknowledging receipts of my communications, calling the attention of the department to that fact, and I say the least the department could have done was to send an engineer and make a report, and if the officer reported that my request could not be complied with there would have been an end of the matter. Now, I was told during my election that it was no use sending me to Ottawa, that these works would never be completed, and my constituents were told that they ought to send here a supporter of the Government. As matters have turned out, it seems to me that that view was nearly correct. Perhaps if the hon. gentleman who preceded me in this House for nine years had still been the representative of my county he might have succeeded better than I have done. But I do not think it speaks well for the justice and impartiality which ought to characterize the dealings of the Government that such things can occur, and that people may be able to say to the electors that unless they send a supporter of the Government to Parliament their county can obtain no justice. However, I do not think that consideration weighed much with my electors, since they sent me here by a large majority. Now, I would ask the Minister to give us the particulars of this item of $9,000 for general repairs and improvements of harbours and rivers. I do not suppose that it includes any grant for the river in question: still, I would be very glad if he would give us the particulars.

Mr. FOSTER. This vote is to provide for the repairs and improvements which have been undertaken every year in connection with the piers, breakwaters and other harbour and river works

in the Province of Ontario, as necessity arises. The engineers visit the place, and whatever repairs are considered necessary, the expenditure therefor is made out of this vote. But there is not any list of places for which estimates have been taken. This vote is for whatever may turn up during the course of the year.

Mr. LAVERGNE. Then I would ask the Minister to take note of my applications which were sent to the department, one dated 26th February, 1890, another one on the 10th of July, 1890, another one on the 12th of December of the same year, all setting forth these demands. I believe this work is just as necessary as any other work; at least, I believe that the promise which was made to me by the Minister of Public Works ought to be fulfilled, and that an engineer should be sent there to examine these works, which have cost several thousand dollars already, and they should not be allowed to become useless.

Mr. FOSTER. If that promise has been given to my hon. friend it will be carried out, and an engineer will be sent to make a report.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I would like the Minister to put $600 in the Estimates to repair the wharf at Berthier, in my county. The works were begun last year, but were not finished.

Mr. FOSTER. That could be taken out of this vote.

Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Cobourg Harbour, Lake Ontario..... $2,000

Mr. FOSTER. Drop.

Mr. BARRON. Why is this item dropped?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not necessary. I hope the hon. gentleman does not want to increase the expenditure.

Kingston Harbour, Lake Ontario..... $6,000

Mr. CHARLTON. How is it proposed to expend this money?

Mr. FOSTER. This vote is to be applied in continuing the improvements at Kingston during 1892, by proceeding with the removal of Point Frederick shoal, to give 15 feet depth at low water, as recommended by the chief engineer.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is that the shoal at the mouth of the harbour?

Mr. FOSTER. It is in the harbour.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the depth of the water on it now?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a continuation of the work going on in 1889-90.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it to dredge a channel through the shoal?

Mr. FOSTER. The shoal was 1,015 feet long and 35 feet in its greatest width, and had only 9 feet of water at its highest point. Work was commenced on this shoal, because it was deemed more dangerous than Carruthers' shoal, both of which block the harbour entering from the lake, and in storms and fogs vessels often strike there and remain until relieved.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is this expenditure to remove it entirely?

Mr. FOSTER. It is to be removed to that depth.

Mr. CHARLTON. When was the report made with respect to this work?

Mr. FOSTER. During 1890-91, 2,000 cubic feet of rock were removed, and in 1889-90, 233 scow loads.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is the excavation all rock?

Mr. FOSTER. In the chief engineer's report, a comparison is made between this shoal and Carruthers' shoal; and it was decided to proceed with this work first. The chief engineer's report of 14th February, 1883, is referred to.

Mr. CHARLTON. Was it on that report the work was decided on?

Mr. FOSTER. On that shoal rather than the other shoal.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then, on the other shoal nothing has been done?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing. The estimated total cost of removing 19,729 cubic feet of limestone under water to obtain 15 feet on the shoal is $59,000. The expenditure up to the 31st December last was $49,000 odd. It will require $2,000 in addition to this vote to complete.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the contract price per cubic yard for the removal of the limestone rock?

Mr. FOSTER. It is done by our own dredging plant and our own officers.

Mr. CHARLTON. The cost is about $2.50 per yard.

Mr. MULOCK. What was paid for the removal of the rock last year?

Mr. FOSTER. It was done by our own dredges.

Mr. MULOCK. Did they drill and blast rock?

Mr. FOSTER. There is submarine blasting.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that done by the department on day work?

Mr. FOSTER. It was all done by the department on day work.

Mr. MULOCK. There is no contract work about it?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MULOCK. In regard to the previous item for Cobourg harbour, I understood the Minister to say that it was dropped because no more work was required to be done at the harbour.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Who so advised?

Mr. FOSTER. I find that work has been under way there, and that $169,803 had been spent on Cobourg harbour. It has been decided not to make any further appropriations at present.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman said the money was not required; and I asked him whether it was because the work is not needed.

Mr. FOSTER. No further work is needed there.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say on what advice that statement is made?

Mr. FOSTER. I am stating that before the Committee. I think that should be satisfactory.

Mr. MULOCK. I presume it is on the advice of some person. The Minister has not been there himself.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not been there.

Mr. MULOCK. On whose information is it given to the Committee?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government have decided to make no appropriation for work there at present.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister has said the work was not required. On what evidence is that statement made?

Mr. FOSTER. I have been kind to the hon. gentleman in allowing him to go back to an item not under discussion, and I have answered his questions. He should be satisfied.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not satisfied. It is a matter of courtesy to let me speak to the item. The Minister said no further work is required. I ask whether that statement is based on evidence furnished the department. On what evidence of experts is this statement made?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think my hon. friend can ask anything more than that the Government do not propose to continue this item in the Estimates.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the withholding of the item because the work is not required in the interest of the public?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is inconsistent with the ground that has been held very strongly this afternoon by hon. gentlemen opposite—that is, that the Government must be responsible, and that they cannot put their responsibility off on the shoulders of subordinates.

Mr. MULOCK. You would not accept that doctrine.

Mr. FOSTER. When the statement is given that the Government has come to the conclusion that they do not intend to spend any money this year on that harbour I think it is quite sufficient.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister has not made a candid statement. The Minister made a statement which, to me, is misleading, and I want to know whether a Minister of the Crown can make a misleading statement of the kind?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

Mr. OUIMET. I think the hon. gentleman is not in order. He has no right to say that any hon. gentleman in this House is making a misleading statement.

Mr. MULOCK. I said it was misleading to me.

Mr. OUIMET. That is contrary to the rules of this House. It has always been held as an unparliamentary expression, and as the hon. gentleman has been called to order, I would like to have your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MULOCK. I stated that the Minister had made a statement, and that it was to me misleading. That was the statement I made, and I repeat it, and I say that statement is perfectly in order. It may not be misleading to the general public, but to me it was misleading, and that is why I allowed the item to pass without any comment on my part.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I am perfectly in order to say that I was misled by the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. I supposed that the hon. gentleman meant to say that the Minister misled the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not make that statement.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). You qualify it.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not qualify it. I repeat what I said, that the Minister made a statement which was to me misleading.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not responsible for your action of mind.

Mr. MULOCK. I know you are not, but the statement that induced me to allow this item to pass was misleading to me, and I say it for this reason: The Minister first of all said that the item was dropped because the money was not required, and the meaning that he desired to impart, or that any reasonable person would draw from that statement was, that the public service did not require it. That was the conclusion that I drew from his statement, and I now learn that this conclusion was not correct. I am informed by the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Hargraft) that the harbour is in need of dredging, and that being the case, I simply asked for some accurate information as to whether the Minister in making that statement based it upon evidence furnished to him, that the harbour was not in need of dredging, or whether he was simply dropping it for some arbitrary reason. On that point I asked the information. Is it being dropped just from the arbitrary decision of the Government, or is it not required in the public interest?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has had the courtesy extended to him of asking a question that was not under discussion, and, as he has had my answer, I think he might drop that.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister got the item passed on information which has misled me.

Some hons. MEMBERS. Order; chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should remember that this item has been struck out of the Estimates. We were discussing the next item, and I do not understand how the hon. gentleman can get any other answer than the one given by the Minister, namely: that the Government find it proper not to carry on that amount in the Estimates. I do not see that any other answer could be given, and I would like the hon. gentleman not to continue the discussion further.

Mr. HARGRAFT. I know that the work is required there.

Mr. MULOCK. I move that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. The Minister cannot get an item passed in this way——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot move that.

Mr. MULOCK. Oh, yes; I can.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman moves that, he should not discuss it, but we should take a vote.

Mr. MULOCK. I have a right to speak to the motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I propose to speak to the motion, and it is quite in order. We have arrived at a stage in the Estimates at which an item was allowed to pass because the Minister made a statement which struck me as an uncandid statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman wants to speak to the motion that the Committee do rise, he must give the reason why he wants the Committee to rise, and not to speak to an item that has already been passed.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman. I always understood that a motion to rise to report progress and ask leave to sit again gives the utmost latitude of debate. On the Franchise Bill of 1885, in Committee of the Whole, the utmost latitude was given to the speakers, and that is the rule, in my opinion, with reference to a motion of this kind.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. On a motion of this kind the hon. gentleman making the motion cannot talk upon anything else than the item we are discussing, and the item under the consideration of the House now is the appropriation of Kingston Harbour in Lake Ontario.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Chairman, the Committee is asked now to rise and report progress, and the reason why I make that motion is this: We have passed an item owing to a representation made to the Committee which, at all events, as far as I am concerned, caused me to come to a different conclusion as to the reason of the Government dropping it than that which ought to have been drawn.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to submit this matter to the consideration of the House.

An hon. MEMBER. Speak to the question.

Mr. MULOCK. I am speaking to the question. I say we have been induced to advance in the Estimates——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is not the question.

Mr. MULOCK. It is a reason for not proceeding further. I maintain that in passing these Estimates we are entitled to have a full and clear statement, so that the reasons assigned cannot possibly be misconstrued. If, for example, a Minister of the Crown assigned other than the real reason——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; chair.

Mr. MULOCK. I am perfectly in order. I say that a Minister's conduct in that regard is open to comment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. You are not discussing the question before the Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. I am discussing what is correct, and I say that unless Ministers make correct statements they cannot be allowed to pass their Estimates here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I see the point the hon. genteman wants to arrive at, and the same thing happened to me the other day. I was under the impression that the Government were going to——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Order, Mr. Chairman. You are out of order in referring to a past debate.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. I am giving an explanation of what I am coming to. The hon. gentleman was perfectly satisfied when the item was first struck off, and he accepted that decision.

Mr. MULOCK. Because of the statement made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We were discussing the item for the Kingston harbour, and it happened that the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Hargraft) came into the House and instructed the hon. gentleman, when he began to refer then to an item which had already been passed. The hon. gentleman may do that on concurrence, but he is out of order in discussing it now.

Mr. MULOCK. I will accept your ruling, but I wish to make, at the same time, this observation: That I shall not be able to accept the representations made by the Minister of Finance upon all occasions.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I heard the Minister of Finance say that he had extended a courtesy to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in answering a question on an item which had already been passed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for North York was discussing that item, and then he made an appeal——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; chair.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He asked the House to discuss that matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has heard the decision, and I hope he will abide by it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. True, I have heard the decision, but I want to speak about the reference to the question. It was thought desirable that my hon. friend should be allowed the privilege of making what observations he had——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. It has been decided that we cannot go back to that item.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then I do not think that the hon Minister of Finance should claim any credit for being courteous to the hon. member for North York.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. If we expect to make progress in our Estimates, I think it would be well to allow a little latitude in these matters, and not draw the line too strictly.

Mr. McMULLEN. In connection with this Kingston item, I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance how it is that we pay so much money for diving there. Three or four divers are employed continuously. What is the reason?

Mr. FOSTER. All this shoal about which we have been talking is submarine, and is limestone, which has to be blasted by submarine blastings, and divers have to go down to carry on these operations.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that there is a charge of 14 days' hire of a tug at $4 a day, from W. R. and S. Anglin. What is that used for?

Mr. FOSTER. To attend to the dredge. When the rock is raised it is taken away, and the tug is used for that purpose.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is the engineer in charge of the Kingston harbour?

Mr. FOSTER. Captain Fall.

Owen Sound Harbour.....$16,000

Mr. CHARLTON. I notice that the appropriation last year was $20,000. I would ask the Minister if that sum was all expended?

Mr. FOSTER. $17,000 was expended up to December 31st, 1890. This vote of $16,000 is to provide for completing the harbour works. The municipality contributed $20,000 towards the work.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it supposed that this will complete it?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the character of the work for which this money has been expended?

Mr. MASSON. Perhaps I may explain to the hon. gentleman. The contract which this sum of $16,000 is required to complete, and which was let some two years ago, is for dredging a portion of the west bank, which extends the accommodation of the harbour to a uniform width of about 350 feet. The first vote taken was to pile the west bank. That was delayed on the report of the engineer that it would be advisable to straighten it before it was piled, as the extra accommodation would be soon wanted. Therefore, it was delayed for a year. The town contributed $20,000. A certain portion of land had to be purchased, which caused some delay, and the work was started a year and two months ago, and it is now just about completed. The dredging is all complete, and the piling work I think is also about complete. There is some little work still to be done.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the amount of land purchased, and what was the purchase price?

Mr. MASSON. I cannot give the exact figures.

Mr. CHARLTON. Can the Minister give the figures?

Mr. FOSTER. The land and buildings were estimated at about $22,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. What was the character of the buildings on this land?

Mr. MASSON. There was a tannery and a pottery which had to be removed.

Mr. CHARLTON. Was that tannery in operation at the time?

Mr. MASSON. I think at the time of the expropriation it was in actual operation. At the time the scheme was inaugurated it was not, but it was leased.

Mr. CHARLTON. It struck me, when I visited Owen Sound before this land was purchased, that the buildings on this property were not very valuable. Property must be very valuable in Owen Sound if that small strip of land was worth $20,000.

Mr. MASSON. I am happy to agree with the hon. gentleman that land is very valuable in that portion of Owen Sound.

Mr. CHARLTON. Who was the owner of this land?

Mr. MASSON. The tannery belonged to a man named Griffith, the pottery to a man named Lemon, and there were other persons whose names I do not remember.

Mr. CHARLTON. What course was taken in the expropriation of this land? Were arbitrators appointed?

Mr. MASSON. I think half a dozen business men of the town were asked to value it, and they put in separate valuations; these valuations were placed in the hands of the Minister, who, on behalf of the Government and the town, negotiated the purchase.

Mr. CHARLTON. Who was the solicitor?

Mr. MASSON. John Creasor, now judge of the county.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We had an instance the other night in the case of a small village in the constituency of the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), where the revenue was $400 or $500, and where the Government both paid for the site and erected the building.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am quite in order. We had the case also of Laprairie, which is not quite so important a place as Owen Sound. But the Government bought the site there and expended a lot of money erecting a building, while in Owen Sound we have to expend our own money; and moreover, in the County of Grey we have to build our own railways and donate to the public money the public should donate to us. Still, hon. gentlemen opposite are satisfied.

Mr. CHARLTON. Were the council of Owen Sound satisfied with the price at which the property was purchased?

Mr. MASSON. I think they were pretty well satisfied with the prices, except that of Griffith. The general impression was that Griffith's was perhaps too high. Of course, there was no definite consultation with the council, as a body, as to the various purchased properties; but before the money was paid by the town to the Minister of Public Works the town, of their own accord, had an estimate made, and it was on their estimate that the $20,000 was paid as an *equivalent* for the purchase of all the land. The town could not expropriate for that purpose, and for that reason paid the sum of $20,000 into the hands of the Government, the Government agreeing to expropriate if necessary, and by threatening expropriation they were enabled to cut the prices first demanded down about 50 per cent.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the depth of water now in the harbour?

Mr. MASSON. Sixteen feet.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it supposed to have capacity enough for the future wants?

Mr. MASSON. It depends on how the wants of the place increase. It has enough for the present. All the harbours on these waters have of late years been suffering a great deal through the lowering of the waters in Georgian Bay and Lake Huron. We have been caused a good deal of trouble in the Sound on account of the gradual yearly decrease of water. At present the water is some 3 feet lower than it was three years ago, and that lowering is general over all the ports of the lake and Georgian Bay. I made personal enquiry, and found the

decrease universal over these two waters. Many reasons have been given. At first the old settlers thought nothing of it; they said that the water rose and fell in a cycle of about seven years. But when it has come to a continual gradual falling off for ten years, the cycle theory seems to be falling through. Another reason has been given, which, if true, is one that will demand attention later on. That is, that the straightening and deepening of the channel out of Lake Huron has caused the outflow of water to increase to such an extent that it is getting out much easier than it did before and the water is gradually lowering. If that is the case, it will, perhaps, have to be met by obstructing the channel in that locality.

Mr. CHARLTON. With a fall of 3 feet, have you still 15 feet in the harbour?

Mr. MASSON. Yes; because we have increased the dredging there.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would the Minister give any information he has with regard to the negotiations between the Government and the city council concerning this contribution?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no information on that point. This work has been going on for a number of years and votes have been taken, and those explanations have probably been given before.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a recent arrangement.

Mr. MASSON. The arrangement was made in 1888.

Mr. FOSTER. In 1888 there was a small appropriation, and every year since appropriations have been regular.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. gentleman bring that information down to-morrow?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In Owen Sound the people have to contribute their own money in order to get public buildings. We find the same thing in the town of Orillia. These are important growing towns, and the Government compel them to furnish sites and money to aid public works, but in the less important places, such as those we were discussing the other night, the Government buy the sites and equipment and put up the buildings. Upon what principle is the Government guided? Is there one system for one district and another for another?

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that we paid last year about $5,000 for the purchase of land for increasing the harbour. What rate per acre was paid? The Minister said we spent $15,000 last year, and I see that there is included in that amount $6,280 for the purchase of land, and $768 for law costs in that connection. What amount of land is included in the purchase?

Mr. MASSON. The amount paid last year would be the balance of the original purchase. It was all made at the same time; but, owing to defects in the titles of certain properties, on account of infancy, payment of these was delayed.

Mr. McMULLEN. What increase of acreage have you by the purchase made?

Mr. MASSON. I cannot give you the exact size, but it is about fifteen hundred feet frontage on the river, and has a width of one hundred feet, which is about the length of a municipal lot. We had, therefore, to pay frontage price all down the river.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it west or east?

Mr. MASSON. It is west of the river, immediately opposite the Canadian Pacific Railway station.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can easily understand that, when people are selling out property of that kind to a Government, they try to get all they can. There were a number of valuators appointed, and I see that we spent $150 in commissions to valuators for the purpose of making an estimate in this case. Were those valuators chosen by us, or were they chosen mutually by the two parties concerned?

Mr. MASSON. They got their appointment, I think, from Mr. Creasor, who was acting for the Government, but he appointed them on the recommendation of the Board of Trade. I think all but one were recommended by the Board of Trade.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did the other parties pay their share of the expense, or did the Government pay it all?

Mr. MASSON. The Government paid the expenses.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know a good deal about the Owen Sound harbour, and I think this is a very proper appropriation. Still, I think it would be in the interest of the Owen Sound harbour and the country for the Government to make a thorough and searching investigation as to the reason for the filling up of that harbour. I have spoken to a number of gentlemen about Owen Sound harbour, and they all agree that, until some change is made in regard to the creek which comes down from the hill, and washes down a lot of sand and stuff like that into the harbour, it will be very difficult to keep it clean. That is the most important harbour on the Georgian Bay, and Owen Sound is improving and becoming an important place, but I believe it would be wise for the Government to get some experienced engineer to make a searching and exhaustive investigation of the surroundings of that place, and to see if something could not be done in the matter, perhaps by turning the stream by a circuitous route. I am told that the difficulty in keeping that harbour open and the reason for this expenditure is largely owing to the sediment which is carried down by that stream into that harbour. My hon. friend, who comes from Owen Sound, will, no doubt, be able to speak in regard to that. It is highly desirable that this harbour should be looked after; and, while I admit the necessity of increasing the accommodation there, I think the price paid is large. If, however, it has been settled by arbitration, the country cannot complain, and I know that a number of the men who are arbitrators are honourable men, and would simply do what is right in the interests of their town and of the country. I would like to know whether the Government have made any recent investigation as to the cause of the filling up of the Owen Sound harbour?

Mr. MASSON. I am very glad my hon. friend has given me the chance to say that the charge in reference to the filling up or the harbour has been long ago exploded. That was an old slander which was introduced and formulated against the harbour by rival places. The idea got possession of the officers of the Public Works Department, and when

I first had to press the claims of the Owen Sound harbour I was met with the statement that it was a place which the town itself should keep clear, because the filling up was a yearly occurrence, and was caused by débris coming down the river. I knew that was unfounded, and I represented to the municipal authorities that it was necessary that that should be proved to be incorrect, and that the town should have a careful survey made of the harbour. A survey was made, and it appeared that where the dredging had been done some twenty years ago, far up the river, up to the swing bridge, and down to the harbour bar, the turning places at the extremity of the harbour were wider and deeper than they were below, and that the dredging done twenty years ago had not filled up, except to a very trifling extent. Dredging has been done since. A contractor did some dredging about twelve years ago, and it was supposed that he had left a certain depth of water, but a vessel grounded there, and it was said that the channel had been filling up. A careful survey of that spot showed that this was a hard part of the channel, and that the contractor had taken his dredges on one side of that hard spot, and to make up for it had dredged elsewhere 20 feet instead of 16 feet. This is a small stream which is fed from springs which issue from the solid rock. Immediately above the harbour is a mill-dam which dams the water back for three-quarters of a mile or a mile, and that is sufficient to keep back any débris which might come down in the river. From Ingall's Falls down there is no débris at all, so there is no filling in of the harbour to speak of. Of course, all rivers will bring down some débris, but I have known of none that bring down so little as this.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to hear this statement of the hon. gentleman, because, as I have said, Owen Sound harbour is the most important harbour on the Georgian Bay. In fact, I believe that the other harbours on the Georgian Bay coast will have to be abandoned for any extensive trade, but the Owen Sound harbour, if the North-West trade increases, as we hope it will, will be a very important harbour. I am glad to learn that the Grand Trunk is trying to reach the harbour as well as the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that will increase the trade there, so the harbour should be kept in a proper condition. I am glad to hear the statement of the hon. gentleman in reference to the water. I have no doubt, as the hon. gentleman has stated, that there has been a good deal of rivalry between Owen Sound and other points on the Georgian Bay, but I am glad to learn that the condition of the harbour in reference to the débris is what the hon. gentleman says it is. I hope the money voted to-night will be properly and judiciously used, and that the harbour will be very much improved by this expenditure, because it is a very important harbour.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister has not yet given the information which was asked for as to whether the council for Owen Sound, who have contributed towards this improvement, were consulted as to the selection of a site and the cost of it. When I asked him to answer that question awhile ago he said that anybody in the House who had the information might give it. Now, we expect the information, and are accustomed to get it from the Minister, but of late the hon. the Finance Minister has fallen into the habit of refusing or neglecting to give information, and occasionally it has to be supplied by one of his supporters. I think he would find that, on the average, it is to his advantage, to the advantage of the Government, and a saving of time to the House, if he will at once, on being asked a question, either give the information required, if he has it, or if he has not got it, to say so, and tell us when he can get it. Of course, this not being his special department, he cannot be expected to have everything at his fingers' ends, but if he will admit that, and make enquiry, most of the information can be obtained on the spot from the deputy in attendance on the floor of the House, and the rest of it can be obtained in a short time from the department. He will find that that course will facilitate him in getting through with his Estimates, and he will not facilitate the business by making catch answers, such as he made to me when I asked him to answer this question. It is not becoming to his dignity, or to the dignity of the House, to answer in that manner. Now, I think it is of some importance to know whether the council of Owen Sound were consulted about this matter. It is natural they should be consulted, seeing they bear part of the expense, and they are also more likely to be able to judge as to the proper selection of a site and as to the cost. The information given by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson) appears to be pretty full, but it should have come in an official way from the Minister. This particular question can only be answered properly and officially by the Minister himself. I think the Minister will see that it is proper for him to give that information. Is he prepared now to give it, or to say that he does not know?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not clearly understood my hon. friend's question. He took so much time in reading his lecture that he forgot to ask his question.

Mr. CASEY. I did not know the hon. Minister was hard of hearing. I have stated the question very distinctly. The question is, whether the Government consulted the council of Owen Sound, who, I understand, contributed something towards the cost of these works, as to the site and the price of land bought?

Mr. FOSTER. I think, on that point, my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) received his answer and was perfectly satisfied with it. In addition to that, I promised him that all the papers would be brought down, and I told him, as my hon. friend may recollect if he was in the House, that this item of expenditure having commenced three years ago, at that time, and in previous sessions of this House, that information was given to the House, and that matter was discussed. But as the member for North Norfolk does not recollect it, I promised to bring it down, and it will be on the Table to-morrow.

Mr. CASEY. Certainly I did not hear the Minister give any answer to that question, otherwise I would not have asked him again about it.

Port Hope Harbour—Repairs..... $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. It is proposed to apply this vote in continuing the works of repair commenced in 1889 on the superstructure of the railway or central wharf, and to make general repairs to the east and west of the piers in the harbour of Port

Hope. The total length of the crib-work and superstructure is 1,200 feet. Previous to the 1st of February, 1891, $5,482 have been expended in connection with the work, and this vote is to continue. It is a work of repair.

Mr. CASEY. Is this work being done by day's work?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Why is it not done under contract?

Mr. FOSTER. It is entirely out of repair; it is tearing off and replacing the superstructure, and it is difficult to estimate for that.

Mr. CASEY. Even in repairs you can give the work to be done by contract.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not easy, at the inception of the work, to stipulate what is to be done and what is to be paid for it.

Mr. CHARLTON. How much has been spent here altogether?

Mr. FOSTER. $89,000, not including the present vote.

River Ottawa—Improvement of steamboat channel through Narrows at Petawawa, above Pembroke..... $1,500

Mr. SPEAKER. I want to suggest to the Government, whoever may be the Minister in charge of this department, that whatever engineer is charged with the expenditure of this small sum should put himself in communication with the owners of steamboats in that particular locality, so that the greatest advantage may be derived from the expenditure of this money. Of course, it will be impossible, in a small appropriation such as this, to make an extensive survey: but I think that if the engineer who is charged with looking after this expenditure will put himself in communication with the owners of steamboats running on that particular route, the places where dredging is most required can be pointed out, and the greatest advantage can be derived from this small expenditure.

Mr. CHARLTON. What depth of water is required there?

Mr. SPEAKER. The depth of water required to be obtained is about 8 feet at low water.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is considerable dredging necessary to be done to obtain that depth?

Mr. SPEAKER. The dredging provided for in this vote is in that portion of the river which is studded with islands. Small shoals are required to be dredged out, so as to make the channel an uniform depth at low water.

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not object to this vote; but is it for the purpose of deepening that portion of the river?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have intimated to the hon. member for North Norfolk that the object to be obtained is this: My hon. friend will know that 5 or 6 miles above Pembroke there commences a series of islands, and that the river is studded for three or four miles with islands, more or less rocky. The channel is somewhat intricate for about 4 miles between the Lower Narrows and Petawawa, and it is for the purpose of taking out some of the shoals, and thereby straightening the channel, that this expenditure is needed.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. DEVLIN. The suggestion I was about to make may not be altogether pertinent to the point, but it is pertinent to the River Ottawa, and it is this: I understand that on the north shore of the Ottawa River, a little below this city, the channel is rapidly filling up, owing to the fact that the Government dredges which are employed on that part of the river usually dump the earth in the north channel, and, as a consequence, in a very short time, perhaps in a year or two, that will have to be dredged out again. I called the attention of the Minister of Public Works, at the beginning of the session, to the fact that it might be well to give a little consideration to the demand made in connection with the channel between Aylmer and Pembroke. The channel is filling to such an extent that the wharf at Aylmer cannot be reached.

Belleville—To complete harbour works.. $3,900

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the character of this work?

Mr. FOSTER. This is for the proposed dam, 825 feet long, from the island in the River Moira to the mainland on the eastern side, on condition that the local authorities undertake the protection of the island shores with crib-work.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the object of the work?

Mr. FOSTER. To increase the scour through the channel, dredging the mouth of the river, especially at low water, to keep it clear of sawdust and débris.

Mr. CHARLTON. By heading the water off?

Mr. FOSTER. By directing it down one channel.

Toronto Harbour Works. $75,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This item had better stand.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; this will stand.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister says this item will stand, and I have no objection to it standing. Will the Minister let us have notice when he will bring it up? These debatable items are allowed to stand and then brought on unexpectedly, when it may suit the convenience of the Government. This is an item of very great importance, and one on which a good deal will be said. Will the Minister mention, a day in advance, the time it will come on? I propose to discuss it fully.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the hon. gentleman is right in his imputations that we are trying to get through the debateable items by bringing them on when certain persons are not here. It may be that some items go through when the hon. gentleman is not here to discuss them. It is impossible to slip this item through. I do not propose to do that.

Mr. MULOCK. All I want is to know the day before.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I have no doubt there will be discussion.

Mr. MULOCK. Then it will be mentioned the the day before?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt there will be a discussion. It has come up now in the ordinary course at a time when we would have a

very fair opportunity of discussing it. My hon. friend's request is a reasonable one, that due notice be given.

Mr. FOSTER. I have asked it to stand to-night, and it is quite right I should give notice when it is coming up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If it is understood that notice will be given, or in event of the hon. gentleman bringing it up suddenly, that he will not object to let it stand if our friends are out of the way, it is all right.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the Minister says it will be mentioned the day before it is brought up?

Mr. FOSTER. I will actually go so far as to send my hon. friend notice the day before.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I also suggest that notice be sent to the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn).

Mr. FOSTER. He is always here.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He is engaged in the Quebec railway investigation, and until he gets through that investigation it will be scarcely fair to bring this item on.

Mr. McMULLEN. I ask the Minister of Finance if he will kindly lay on the Table a report which the Minister of Public Works had prepared, under the inspection of engineers, two or three years ago, at the time the breakwater was erected there. The hon. gentleman will remember that I moved for papers with respect to blind-bolts used in connection with the breakwater. The different portions of the work were to be thoroughly bolted together with bolts going through. In place of that, when the work was inspected, after the contractors had been paid, they were found to be blind-bolts, a head at one side with a piece of bolt, with a nut added, at the other. The Minister of Public Works stated that he would make a thorough investigation, and lay it before the House. I should like the Minister to obtain that report, so that we can ascertain the amount of loss sustained at that time.

Little Current..... $10,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What is this work?

Mr. FOSTER. This vote is called for to make provision to continue during 1891-92 the works to increase, by certain submarine blasting, the width of the steamboat channel at Little Current to 15 feet at ordinary low water, and 14 feet at extremely low water, so as to enable vessels to pass through with safety at all times.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the width of the channel?

Mr. FOSTER. 300 feet.

Mr. CHARLTON. How much is it proposed to make it?

Mr. FOSTER. 500 feet.

Southampton—To complete..... $1,500

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the nature of the work being done?

Mr. FOSTER. This is to complete the work under contract there in connection with the proposed extension of the landing pier.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Southampton is a harbour of refuge, is it not?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a harbour, anyway.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not wish to raise any particular objection to the vote on the expenditure for the harbour at Southampton: but I just wish to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that Southampton is a port where there is very little business done. The fact is that, I believe, it is one of the smallest ports as regards business on Lake Huron. As I said before, I do not wish to object to the expenditure, because even a small place ought to be looked after and proper provision made for doing safely the business that is done: but I want to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that there ought to be something like equality and fair-play in making these appropriations, and that while these small harbours are attended to, that larger and more important ones ought not to be neglected. Now, Sir, it has come to my knowledge that the harbour of Cobourg, on Lake Ontario, one of the most important harbours on Lake Ontario, and a harbour on which a very large volume of business is done, is in a very unsatisfactory condition. I am credibly informed on the best of authority that vessels entering and leaving, bringing in coal and taking out grain, are pretty frequently running aground. I am told that on the best authority, and I say that while we should not neglect the small places, yet it is surely a matter of importance that such a large and important harbour as that of Cobourg should not altogether receive the go-by, but that sufficient provision should be made for doing safely the business there.

Mr. MULOCK. What amount has been expended by the Government on Southampton harbour?

Mr. FOSTER. This amount of $1,500 is to complete, and the expenditure so far has been $35,000.

Mr. MULOCK. How was the $8,500 voted last year expended?

Mr. FOSTER. Up to 1888, $24,230; in 1888, $1,400; in 1889, $1,800; in 1890, $3,000; and last year a vote of $8,500 was made, of which $4,366 was spent up to the 31st September. The object was to make this proposed extension of the landing pier and a basin 15 feet deep at low water.

Mr. MULOCK. Who was the contractor?

Mr. FOSTER. Nicholson & Bates, of Toronto. They were the lowest tenderers.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was not there a portion of that harbour washed away?

Mr. FOSTER. I am informed that there was a small portion of the breakwater washed away.

Mr. HARGRAFT. I understand that there is only about one vessel goes into that harbour every year.

An hon. MEMBER. That is not so.

Mr. HARGRAFT. I heard so, and if the Government is spending money on small harbours like that, which are not of much importance, they should consider the necessities of the large and important harbour of Cobourg. I know that the harbour of Cobourg is full of weeds, and is badly in need of dredging.

Georgian Bay—Removal of Robertson Rocks in main passage between Clapperton and Croker's Island..... $2,500

Mr. CHARLTON. What is this for

Mr. MASSON. It is for removing a rock between Mudge Bay and Gore Bay. Vessels formerly had to go around Clapperton Island, but they discovered a passage inside of the island, which is very narrow and dangerous, and this appropriation will make it a safe harbour.

Mr. CHARLTON. How much will it shorten the distance?

Mr. MASSON. About two hours.

Beaverton Wharf.....$5,000

Mr. ALLISON. I would like to ask is this the Beaverton that is located on the south-east corner of Lake Simcoe?

Mr. FOSTER. This is the Beaverton in North Ontario.

Mr. ALLISON. Beaverton is a very rich little town, and it certainly cannot be for the purpose of charity that you are building this wharf, and Beaverton is on the lake, and this cannot be for a refuge. There are a few boats sailing on that lake; I think two small steamers, some skiffs, some canoes, and a few little sailing boats, and a scow. I would like to ask who represents that county? Is he a Conservative or a Reformer?

Mr. FOSTER. A Conservative represents that county.

Mr. ALLISON. Oh, then, it is no use to oppose the item.

Mr. CHARLTON. I doubt the necessity of going into river and harbour improvements at Beaverton, when the shipping, as represented by my friend from Lennox (Mr. Allison), consists of some scows and a few canoes. I think you had better take this appropriation and transfer it to Cobourg, where there seems to be some necessity for it.

Mr. BARRON. I have a communication here in connection with this work, which I had better read, and if the Minister of Finance wishes, I will let him know the gentleman who writes to me. It is as follows:—

"In the above connection you have probably heard something before, but in placing this matter before you for information I do so for the purpose of ascertaining, if possible, in the public interest, why this work has cost between three and four thousand dollars more than the original estimate, why a political partizan of the rankest type was appointed as inspector, without possessing the necessary knowledge of such work, and if it has been passed by the Government inspector why it was so, seeing that the work was in anything other than a satisfactory state. The question why the original survey was departed from is one of considerable importance to this community, for it in point of fact has the result of defeating, in a great measure, the intent and purpose of the wharf as at first projected. The wharf was to have been placed at the north side, the entrance to the Beaver River. I understand the engineer and surveyor located it there, an excellent bottom being found on which to build, profiles being made for this location. Had it been placed there the Midland Railway would have gained access to it and it would greatly have facilitated shipping at this point. Some mysterious influence was brought to bear in the matter, however, and its location altered to the south side the river mouth, with the result that the railway will not now approach it, and for most purposes other than pleasure it is practically worthless. The village gave a bonus of $1,500 towards this work, with the hope that it would prove of great benefit to the public. Again, its present location has given a very insecure foundation. Even before the cribs were finished several of them settled out of level several feet, and instead of being raised and properly placed, the superstructure was built on the inclined plane by the assistance of a few wedges on the low side. I understand the contractor stated he was guaranteed a solid bottom, and when it was not there it did not concern him how the job went, or something to that effect."

Mr. CHARLTON. Now, this letter, I will ask the House to take my word for it, is written by a gentleman, a most honourable man, who is not at all inclined to find fault where there is no ground for fault being found. If my information is correct, the change was made from one locality on the lake shore to another, whereby a great advantage was given to the contractor, and he was enabled to put in a claim for extras which he otherwise would not have been able to put in, and was thereby enabled to recoup himself for what he would have lost by taking the original contract at too low a figure. That brings us back to this Government's method of doing business, so far as public works are concerned. The habit of this Government is to grant contracts to favourite contractors for low sums to the detriment of honest contractors, and then to make up to them the deficiency in the way they have done in this particular case. If there is any truth in this statement, a most serious wrong has been done, simply for the purpose of putting money into the pockets of a favourite contractor. I would not read this letter but for the fact that it is written to me by a gentleman of undoubted integrity, who has the confidence of the community in which he lives, and who I know would not write that which he did not believe to be true.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman's letter has gone on record, and I will see that it is considered. The allegations in it may be true or may be not. I am informed that the site was chosen because of the convenience of being on the side where the town of Beaverton was situated. If it had been placed on the other side it would have been necessary to have had a bridge at an additional expense. I am told that the contractor is one of the most reliable that the Public Works Department have had to deal with—I think, Mr. Porter. I believe he feels that he has been put to very large expenses which he had not contemplated, and he has made a claim for extras, which is now under adjudication.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. gentleman has not yet answered the statement of facts that I have made.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot do that. I would have to refer that to the officers of the department.

Mr. BARRON. Then ought we not to have some person here to give us information?

Mr. FOSTER. We give all we can.

Mr. BARRON. Any person can do that.

Mr. FOSTER. I have always found that it is easier to ask questions than to answer them.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. member has not told us why the change was made at all.

Mr. FOSTER I have told you why the change was made.

Mr. BARRON. Oh, no. The hon. gentleman told us why the site was selected, where the wharf was finally built, but he has not told us why an improper site was selected in the first place. If I am informed correctly, the change is a detrimental one. The railway cannot get to the place at all, if the statements in this letter are correct, and it is written by a man who has no political feeling at all, but merely from an independent standpoint. But if the hon. gentleman will change places with me, and let me take his place, I will tell him why the change was made.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be too costly.

Mr. BARRON. The reason was to favour a favoured contractor, and no other reason in the world. The fact is, honest contractors cannot get any show with this Government at all. Here is one right in front of me (Mr. Gibson).

Mr. FOSTER. He says he has had a contract.

Mr. BARRON. You could not help yourselves, because he got it when the favoured ones did not tender; and what was the result of giving him a contract? You had good work done, and not a dollar of the public money was lost. That is the effect of giving a contract to gentlemen on the Reform side. But in this case, to use a vulgar expression, there has been a "nigger in the fence," there is no question about it; and if the hon. Minister of Finance undertook to find the real facts, he would perhaps be astonished and ashamed himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Send me over the letter. I will not divulge the name of the writer, and I will have a categorical answer made to each of the statements contained in it.

Mr. BARRON. Will the hon. gentleman let the item stand?

Mr. FOSTER. I will bring down the answer, and I will not wait till concurrence.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for North Victoria states that the original site for this pier was changed, and I can only express my surprise that such a material change as that should take place in connection with a simple work of this kind. I should like to know on whose recommendation the original site was chosen?

Mr. FOSTER. I am informed that the first site was chosen and recommended by the chief engineer of the department, and that, as between the two sites, there is no difference as regards their fitness for a wharf. Either of them is a valuable site; but, on representation of the townspeople that the site first chosen would necessitate the building of a bridge, and consequently increase the cost, it was changed to the site upon which the town is, and that change was made on the recommendation of the chief engineer.

Mr. MULOCK. It appears to me that the best position should have been chosen before inviting tenders. Was the contract let before or after the change?

Mr. FOSTER. Before the change.

Mr. MULOCK. Did the change give rise to a claim for extras?

Mr. FOSTER. There has been no change in the contract. The site was simply changed, and the contractor put the wharf upon the new site.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the contractor make any charge for extras by reason of the change of site?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. BARRON. The information which the Finance Minister gives is not exactly that which was given by the late Minister of Public Works. In reply to questions put by me that hon. gentleman said:

"Contractor, David Porter. Contract price, $7,500. Additional work was asked for by the Government, being the filling between the two outer blocks of the structure, for strengthening the same, and adding to the protection of vessels lying there. The same contractor got the additional work. In the case of additional works, arrangements are always made with the contractor for their execution."

So that additional work was asked for and done on the first site, and the site was afterwards changed.

Mr. FOSTER. There was no work done on the first site, and the answer of the Minister does not say there was.

Mr. BARRON. The letter says work was done on the first site.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not responsible for the letter.

Mr. BARRON. You are responsible for the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. I am giving you the facts.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the amount of the original contract and the contract for additions?

Mr. FOSTER. The total probable cost of the wharf is estimated at $8,000. There was no work done on the first site chosen. A contract was let for the building of a wharf of certain dimensions and in a certain way, and when the site was changed, exactly the same kind of a wharf was to be built on the new site, and there was no change in the contract. It was simply a transfer of the work from one site to an other. It was then found that in addition to the plan, some filling in between the sides was necessary. This filling in would have been necessary on the first site just as well as on the second. All that the extra work amounted to was $500.

Mr. MULOCK. How is it this filling in was not mentioned when letting the contract?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend no doubt finds it often happens, when he gives contracts for erecting buildings himself, that some improvements will suggest themselves afterwards.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the precise reason for our undertaking to construct a wharf in this inland water? We have a vast number of lakes in Ontario, over a thousand, I believe, and a good many of the surrounding inhabitants would like to have wharves built on these lakes, no doubt. Why, in particular, was this little inland lake selected to have a wharf provided for it?

Mr. FOSTER. It is with a view of enabling a large fleet of steam vessels, tugs and passenger and freight boats on Lake Simcoe and Lake Couchiching to call at Beaverton. In 1889, Parliament appropriated $2,000 for this work, on the condition that the locality would appropriate an equal sum. Before proceeding with the dredging, the chief engineer reported that in order to get seven feet in depth a channel of 1,300 feet would have to be opened at a cost of $23,000. The chief engineer therefore advised that the construction of this wharf be undertaken instead of going on with the dredging and protecting the channel as asked for by the inhabitants.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has any other work of a similar kind been done on this lake, or is this the solitary case?

Mr. FOSTER. I think this is the only wharf of the kind.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This lake is of very considerable extent, about thirty miles square, and there is a considerable local traffic upon it, and the side of

the lake on which this wharf is constructed is exposed. The inhabitants have repeatedly built wharves at their own expense: but, owing to the action of the ice, those wharves have been washed away. If the Government is justified in making any expenditure of this kind and placing wharves of this description on waters of this description, this expenditure would be justified.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. gentleman ought to admit that no expenditure of this kind is justified.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I did not say so.

Mr. BARRON. The Minister of Finance should agree to that, and the Minister of Justice also, because this brings up the question of the jurisdiction of the Ontario Government.

Mr. O'BRIEN. How does the hon. gentleman prove that? Lake Simcoe is a navigable lake as much as Lake Ontario.

Mr. BARRON. That is a question to be settled in the courts in a very short time; but the inland waters are controlled by the Provincial Government. We have perhaps as large lakes as this in the county in which I live, and the control of the waters belongs to the Ontario Government. This is a place where the Ontario Government have exercised control over the lot, but the gentlemen opposite are exercising control, through their officer, Mr. Rogers, over the navigation. It is not wise on the part of this Government to make these expenditures until the question of jurisdiction is settled one way or the other. The Minister of Justice said last night that the question was soon to be settled.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not in regard to any lakes.

Mr. BARRON. In regard to the inland rivers. These lakes are only an enlargement of the rivers.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The building of a wharf does not affect any question of jurisdiction.

Mr. BARRON. You cannot build a wharf except on the edge of the lake, and the title to the land is in the Province of Ontario. That question is to be settled by the courts, and until it is settled you have no right to build wharves or any other structure on other people's property, and that land is reserved in all patents to the Province of Ontario. If my information is correct, the Government, if they had built this wharf on the first site would not have been put to the expense of filling in between the outer and inner parts of the structure.

Mr. FOSTER. This filling would have been necessary just the same on the other side.

Mr. BARRON. Then the engineer must have known that, and I should like to know why the filling in was not included in the contract at first?

Mr. FOSTER. If the engineer had been of the same mind at first as he was afterwards, and had believed that was necessary, he would have recommended it, and it would have been placed in the contract; but, after the contract was given, the engineer came to the conclusion that it would be necessary to have this filled in instead of leaving the open work.

Mr. BARRON. Second thoughts are very nice things for the contractors.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; but in this case the structure when completed will be more valuable and more durable than it was before.

Mr. BARRON. Who was the engineer?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Graves.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the wharf a pile wharf or crib-work?

Mr. FOSTER. Crib-work.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did the chief engineer recommend a crib-work at this point on that lake?

Mr. FOSTER. All recommendations, I suppose, ultimately come from the chief engineer. He makes up his mind, either from personal visitation or from the reports that he gathers from his officers and his knowledge of the situation.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are to understand, I suppose, that it was Mr. Perley who made the recommendation with regard to this wharf. Now, he sends out some special engineer to make an inspection. My hon. friend states that after they had proceeded with the work some time, a portion of the crib-work gave way, and they added to it by putting in beams like wedges in order to level it up. That proves conclusively that the erection of crib-work there was a mistake. Had they put in a pile wharf and filled it in by putting in cedar piles and facing it, they would have made a more permanent job than by putting crib-work on such a miserable bottom.

Mr. FOSTER. That would have done very well, but I am informed it is a rock bottom.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then there has evidently been a great mistake made in not going to the rock bottom at the start, and erecting your crib-work on a sound foundation. The crib-work has gone over to one side a little.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the engineer say this is a rock bottom?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know how the engineer explains the upsetting of the crib-work. If it is a rock bottom and the crib-work was set on the rock, I cannot see how it got into that condition.

Mr. FOSTER. The rock might have been covered with some soil.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is only treating the matter lightly to say that the rock might be covered with soil. I mean that if the crib-work was set upon the rock, if they had commenced the erection of crib-work by laying their sleepers on the rock first, and had then added thereto, it could not possibly upset or veer over to one side.

Mr. CHARLTON. I want to ask the Minister when this work was first determined upon?

Mr. FOSTER. It was after 1889, because in 1889 Parliament appropriated the sum of $2,000 for this dredging about which I read a moment ago. Then it was found that it would cost so large an amount that it was determined to build this.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a singular thing that the Government should decide to expend money upon an inland lake of this character, that they should do in this one instance what they have done in no other instance, almost, of the kind. It strikes me that possibly we might enquire into

the probable motives of the Government in this matter. Is it possible that the expenditure of this money might benefit the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Madill)?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Mr. CHARLTON. That hon. gentleman, I understand, was in rather bad odour with his constituents on account of his vote on the Jesuit question. It is possible that this expenditure may have been promised to make things easy for him. I do not know that there is anything in the antecedents or character of the Government to warrant that suspicion.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. It seems to me singular that an appropriation of this kind should be made on Lake Simcoe in the riding of that hon. gentleman, an appropriation calculated to benefit that gentleman, and perhaps secure his election. I am afraid this is an appropriation of a character that I hardly feel like justifying.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it was sympathy. They say that three wharves have been built there before by private enterprise, and have been carried away by the ice.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Government is not in the habit of exercising that degree of sympathy with private individuals whose wharves have been carried away. There are many other cases in Ontario where wharves erected by private enterprise have been carried away, and the Government does not feel itself under obligation, out of sympathy, to reconstruct those wharves. I believe that this appropriation is out of the usual line, it is not a justifiable appropriation, and it is one of the numerous instances where the Government have made a public appropriation for the purpose of influencing an election in a riding. I cannot help considering that this is the true solution.

Mr. McMULLEN. After making some enquiry with regard to the cause of the veering over of this particular wharf, I have come to the conclusion that the engineer did not make that searching and thorough investigation, as to the bottom upon which he was to start his construction, that he should have made, or it would not have sided over. Now, it appears that the rock bottom is not a level one, that in some places there is a kind of hard pan upon the rock. It is a pity that a proper start was not made, because if he had started as he should have done, by removing everything in the way of hard pan and got right down to the rock, he would not have had the difficulty he has now by this work upsetting. I do not know very much with regard to the need of a wharf at that particular point. I have learned that since the construction of the railroad, there is virtually nothing done there, unless some pleasure boats are kept on in the summer time. But outside of that I do not know of anything that would necessitate the construction of a wharf. I agree with the remarks of my hon. friend with regard to the propriety of spending this money. An hon. gentleman has mentioned to me that the City of Toronto were going to take their water supply from Lake Simcoe, but after making an investigation they came to the conclusion that if they did, they would drain it dry. It must be a very small lake, if that is the case.

Mr. FOSTER. They are heavy drinkers.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is no compliment to the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), and perhaps he will defend his constituents. This is another sample of the policy of the Government, who believe in supporting their friends and doing nothing for the constituencies of their opponents. It is well that the country should know that this is the way the public money is expended. It is to be regretted that such is the case, and we have examples of it both in the erection of this wharf, the case of Colbourg harbour, and the dismissal of a poor man in charge of a bridge.

Mr. BARRON. Was any other inspector employed besides the inspector, Mr. Grey?

Mr. FOSTER. There was a local inspector.

Mr. BARRON. My information is that he was utterly unfit for that purpose, that he knew nothing about the work.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood I was to get categorical answers to the points in the letter read by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the amount paid to the inspector?

Mr. FOSTER. $2.50 per day. He was employed a little over 4 months.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I notice in the Estimates that an item for $1,500 for McGregor's Creek has been dropped. The sum was voted last year, but was not expended. Why does that item not appear in the Estimates this year?

Mr. FOSTER. I will get the information.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The reason should be furnished, and it must be known to the officers of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. The officers cannot remember the thousands of details, and the reports on all the works.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not care personally in regard to this matter, but I know the item was for protecting the banks of McGregor's Creek in Chatham. The Government went to work a few years ago, without anyone asking them, and dredged the creek at a large expense; and the buildings are coming down. There are large elevators and mills there which the protection works were supposed to save, and, unless this is done, there will be heavy claims for damages against the Government for property going into the creek. Last year $1,500 were voted by this House, but nothing expended. This year the item is dropped, although the necessity for the work is even greater than before. There must be some reason why the item is dropped from the Estimates.

Parry Sound Narrows..... $6,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is to provide for deepening to 18 feet the inner or north channel to Parry Sound, next the Georgian Bay at points two and seven miles to the southward of Parry Sound.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think I can give an explanation to the hon. gentleman in reference to this matter. This channel is what is called the inside channel by which all the coasting vessels between Parry Sound, Penetanguishene, Collingwood and Parry Sound pass up the lakes. All the tugs going up and down and all the smaller coasting vessels

use this channel. Owing to the fall of water in Lake Huron, which has already been discussed, the water in this channel has been gradually growing less, until, during the last two or three years, the low water has made it impossible for ordinary vessels to pass this channel, and the Government very properly made an appropriation to deepen this channel, so that the vessels which were in the habit of using it may be able to use it in future. I may say that I was glad to find in the newspaper published at Parry Sound, a strong Reform paper, a very commendatory notice of the way in which this work is being conducted by those who have it in charge.

Rondeau Harbour—Repairs..... $3,500

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask the Minister what this money is to be expended for?

Mr. FOSTER. For repairing the remainder of the old superstructure of the east pier 135 feet in length at the outer end where the lighthouse stands, and making slight repairs to the west pier.

Mr. CHARLTON. What amount of money has been expended on that harbour?

Mr. FOSTER. $217,216.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are the works in a good state of repair now, or will they be put in repair by this appropriation?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe the works are not in the best state of repair.

Mr. CHARLTON. Rondeau Bay is of considerable size, but the water is rather shoaly, being not more than eight or ten feet deep, and some years ago, I believe, the Government dredged a basin of about 15 acres inside the pier. It would make a magnificent harbour of refuge if the work were properly done, but owing to the small sums expended, this basin is partially filled up. I have visited Rondeau harbour and had occasion to go in there with vessels for refuge, and the piers, when I saw them last, were in a very bad state of repair. The work was well done originally, but it has been allowed to fall into a bad state of repair, and it is a question in my mind whether the Government would not be justified in making a more liberal expenditure at this place for the purpose of putting these piers in good repair and dredging the basin on the inside.

Mr. FOSTER. In the meantime this is for necessary work.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is this work being done by days' work or contract?

Mr. FOSTER. It is done by days' work. The superintendent is Mr. William Blight, who receives $3 a day, and the engineer is Mr. Grey.

General repairs and improvements—harbours and rivers (Ontario). $10,000

Mr. CAMPBELL. I want to bring before the attention of the Committee the condition of the River Thames. Some work was done there and the Minister of Public Work in his report for last year states, that "difficulties being experienced by vessels entering and leaving the river, owing to the bar off its mouth at Lake St. Clair, a dredge operated in opening a passage there this season." I may say that $4,000 was appropriated two years ago for this purpose, but the $4,000 was not enough to open the passage through the bar, and the passage was made for only about one-half the distance, when the appropriation ran out and the work was stopped. I have a map here, and it shows the depth of water on the bar in the narrowest point to be only eight feet five. The bar is 4,300 feet long. This work has been brought before the attention of Parliament for a number of years, and it has been promised almost every year by the Minister of Public Works that an appropriation would be put in the Estimates for it. The necessity for the work has been admitted, year after year, by the Minister of Public Works in his reports and in his remarks on the floor of this House: but, as I have stated before, only $4,000 was voted for it, and, before the passage was open, the money ran out and the dredges were ordered to stop. The work that was done on the bar was simply thrown away, because it did not open the passage through the bar. The great importance of this work is such as to commend it to the attention of Parliament, and the Government ought to consider this matter and put in the Supplementary Estimates about $5,000 to complete the passage. I may say that one of the engineers who was sent up to report there, reported that it would be necessary to have crib-work on both sides of this passage, and that it would cost about $80,000 to complete this crib-work, to make a permanent way through. In my own opinion, as well as the opinion of those who know this channel, the erection of crib-works at such an enormous expense would not be a wise proceeding, because the interest on the money would more than clear the passage out every year, if that were necessary. It is generally believed, and I have no doubt it is correct, that, if this passage were dredged out now, it would give an opening to the vessels for five or six years to come. I see that there arrives and departs from the town of Chatham 250 vessels a year, which shows that there is quite a large business done there. The river, for 18 or 20 miles from its mouth, has a depth of 18 or 20 feet of water, and the only obstruction is the bar 4,300 feet long at the mouth of the river, which prevents vessels from entering and leaving. It is an enormous expense to the people of that part of the country to get in their lumber and coal and to get out their shipments of grain. All the vessels that go out have to be guided over this bar, and considering that this is a navigable stream, and that the Government are building works all over this country which, in my humble opinion, are unnecessary, I think it is a scandalous shame to allow this work to remain in its present shape. I think it is time the Government appropriated a sum of money to remove this obstruction to navigation in that river. I am sorry that the acting Minister of Public Works takes so little interest in the matter, which is one of very great importance to the people of that part of the country; but I hope that the Government will give it their attention, and will recognize the justice and propriety of the work by placing a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for this purpose.

Mr. HARGRAFT. I would like to ask if it is the intention of the Government to devote any portion of this vote of $10,000 to repairing the Cobourg harbour. There was $2,000 in the Estimates for that purpose, and when that was put there, the hon. Minister must have thought that the work was required, and I should like to know

what has changed his mind since that time? It looks to me very much as if it has been dropped for the same reason that the Government cut down the item for commencing the construction of the Cobourg, Peterborough and Northumberland Railway, that is, that they hope to have a by-election this fall, and they expect to carry out the idea that they tried to convey to the people during the election, that if they did not send a supporter of the Government here, they need not expect anything from the Government. In justice to the town of Cobourg, I think they should at least send an engineer there to look at the harbour, and if the hon. gentleman thinks the work is not required, the engineer will tell him that he has been misinformed. It is an important harbour on that part of the lake, being used a great deal as a harbour of refuge, and the work should be done.

Mr. McGREGOR. I feel like my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell), that something should be done to remove the bar at the mouth of the River Thames. A very small amount would do the work, which would be greatly to the advantage of the town of Chatham and the surrounding country. The town is growing rapidly; there is no portion of Canada which is growing more than the two counties of Kent and Essex, as you will see by the census returns, and the principal products of those counties, corn and wheat, are shipped very largely by that river. Several passenger boats also pass up and down it. With a very small expenditure the bar could be removed, and we hope the Government will see their way to place a small amount in the Estimates for that purpose.

Mr. BARRON. I would like to ask if the hon. Minister of Finance is going to pay no attention to the remarks of the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Hargraft). The item for the Cobourg harbour works was called this evening sharp on time, and nobody had a chance to discuss it. I asked why the item was dropped, and the only information I got was that it was not necessary. This seems a very unsatisfactory answer. If it is not necessary now, when West Northumberland is represented by Mr. Hargraft, surely it was not any more necessary when that riding was represented by Mr. Guillet.

Mr. FOSTER. We can scarcely discuss that item now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We can fairly do so on this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. This vote is to provide for repairs and improvements generally in harbours and rivers in the Province of Ontario, for which no special appropriations have been made by Parliament, and also for the salaries and travelling expenses of engineers.

Mr. HARGRAFT. I asked if it was the intention of the Government to devote any portion of this vote to Cobourg Harbour?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell, because these general votes are for whatever may occur. It is not impossible, if anything were found necessary to be done at Cobourg, that the cost would be taken from this vote; but no plans have been laid down as to what may be taken from this vote. As its name implies it is for what may arise, for which no appropriation has been made.

Mr. BARRON. There has been no appropriation made for the Cobourg works thus far. I think we ought to know why the item was dropped. We find in the Estimates, as they are brought down, a large sum for a specific work.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is discussing an item that we have long passed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Strictly speaking, it is quite in order on this item, if you follow the technical rule; but I have never known when an item of this kind has been passed in the absence of the member specially affected, that the information has been refused.

Mr. FOSTER. The information was given.

Mr. BARRON. The only information given was that it was not necessary. If it is not necessary now, surely it was not necessary when it was put in the Estimates. But if the hon. gentleman wants to know what the public mind is seized of as to why this item has been dropped, I can tell him that it is supposed to be that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues are so regardless of the true interests of the country that they are willing to drop a work that is necessary simply because the constituency returns an opponent of the Government. I ask if that is fair-play, or if it is serving the true interests of the country? We want to have works done in the true and real interests of the country, regardless of whether a Reformer or a Conservative is returned. Surely, it is not right to measure the need of public works by the political complexion of the riding, but that is what the hon. gentleman is doing. I am sure that when he said it was not necessary, his real meaning was that that was because my hon. friend at my left had been returned for the riding, and not the late member. We should know why the Government have changed their minds.

Mr. MULOCK. The resolution does not appropriate this money to any particular harbour, and the Minister says it may be found that one of the works on which a part of it will require to be expended will be Cobourg harbour. It is, therefore, in order to discuss the requirement of that harbour. When the Minister states that the harbour does not need the expenditure of public money, it is due to Parliament that he should give us the information on which he bases that statement. The representative of that place, who knows more of its requirements probably than the Finance Minister, says that the channel is filling up and needs dredging. In the face of that statement, the Finance Minister allows his assertion to remain and will not withdraw it. I have before now seen Ministers of the Crown refuse votes of money for various reasons, which they chose to consider sufficient; but this is the first time in my political life that I have heard a Minister of the Crown give such an excuse as the Finance Minister has given for the withdrawal of this item. It is an excuse from which he desired afterwards to recede. He said first that the money was not required, and afterwards that, for some unassigned reason, the Government did not propose to attend to the harbour in question. I have that regard for the honour and the obligations of Cabinet Ministers that I consider they are bound, especially when dealing with the finances of the country, to state the absolute, unvarnished truth, and to exercise the very best faith in their dealings

with the people's representatives. I would ask him whether, in view of what has fallen from the hon. member for West Northumberland, he still feels justified in adhering to his statement that the harbour is not in need of expenditure. In view of the more reliable statement of the hon. member for West Northumberland—I do not use the word in any offensive sense, but from the nature of the case that hon. gentleman must have more accurate information—I ask the Minister of Finance whether, as a man, he still adheres to the statement he made when he withdrew the item from the Estimates?

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend takes rather untenable ground when he concludes that because the representative of a place desires an appropriation and considers such an appropriation necessary, it must be provided. Hon. gentlemen who represent their constituencies have their ideas, which may be correct ideas, of the wants and interests of their localities; but it is impossible for the Government to agree in every case to provide appropriations to carry out what these gentlemen may deem necessary. Cobourg harbour has certainly not been neglected. I believe that $160,000 or $170,000 have been expended there; and although it is a harbour of some importance, the expenditure of that amount does not show any ungrateful treatment of it at all. Those works are in a condition which, in the opinion of the Government, do not require at present further expenditure. This vote is for whatever may be necessary in general works that are not provided for; and if at any time during the year it becomes patent to the department and the Government that repairs or improvements are necessary in Cobourg harbour, in consequence of accidents or storms, this vote will be available for that purpose, intended, as it is, to meet unforeseen and unestimated expenditures in general.

Mr. HARGRAFT. It seems to me rather strange that the Minister should say that because $160,000 have been spent on the harbour, nothing more should be done. It is a Government harbour, and surely the Government intend keeping it in repair. What is the use of having a harbour if vessels cannot get into it? You might as well spend a lot of money building a house and then let it go to ruin for want of repair. Repairs are certainly needed there; and the Government must have thought so, or they would not have put the item in the Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not an unusual thing to drop or lower an estimate. It has been done on several occasions.

Mr. BARRON. The Finance Minister has made the case out worse. He admits that the sum of $170,000 has been spent. Now, when this additional appropriation was put in the Estimates, it must have been put there so that every possible advantage might be derived from that expenditure, and although so much money has been expended on that harbour, the Government are not willing to spend the small sum of $2,000 additional to protect the works. No doubt the reason for this is that which I have mentioned. Take the whole facts of the case. Do not we find, with regard to the time for the construction of the railway there, that since the return of the hon. gentleman who now represents that constituency, the time has been shortened—a most unusual thing, and the only instance of it in this Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. You are not discussing the question.

Mr. BARRON. A sum was put in the Estimates for this harbour, and, therefore, it must have been put in on the recommendation of some engineer. Who was the engineer? If it was dropped, why was it dropped? Was the dropping of the item recommended by any engineer, and if so by what engineer?

Mr. FOSTER. We are not on that item now.

Mr. HARGRAFT. Would it not be possible for the Government to allow an engineer to go up there and examine that harbour? I am sure he would impress on the Government that something should be done there.

Mr. FOSTER. I will communicate that to the acting Minister.

Mr. BARRON. Does the Finance Minister say he will not give us the name of the engineer now when we are discussing this item?

Mr. FOSTER. We are not discussing the item. I have informed the hon. gentleman already that the Cobourg harbour does not come under this item. It is not specially estimated for, and cannot come under this item unless during the year it becomes evident that work is necessary there.

Mr. BARRON. Then there is a contingency that it may be within this item, and, therefore, we are in order in discussing it. I, therefore, ask the hon. gentleman if he will answer the questions which I have asked him?

Mr. FOSTER. It makes no difference at all to this item. We may have reports of engineers by the basketful.

Mr. BARRON. Then, it is to go out that the Finance Minister will not give this information?

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think it is courteous for the Finance Minister to treat members on this side as he has done this afternoon and to-night. I remember the courteous manner in which the First Minister, who is now no longer a member of this House, treated the Opposition in passing items in Committee. There was scarcely a question put to him that he did not answer, whether it bore directly on the item or not, and I would recommend my friend the Finance Minister to take a lesson and cultivate that courtesy which is so becoming in members of the Government, and on the part of a young man, inexperienced as he is, towards those on this side of the House who put questions to him. My hon. friend laughs. He thinks he is a Solomon, but I am afraid he will find out after all that he has a good deal to learn as well as the rest of us. I do not think he treated the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) courteously this afternoon, and, although the item had been passed, in former years we were allowed to refer to any of the items which were within the vote, though this year we have carried out the principle that, when one item is passed, we do not refer to it again. It is a pity that my hon. friends should show so much bitterness, and that they should withdraw the paltry sum of $2,000 from Cobourg harbour because the county which has so long supported them did not see fit to send a member to support them at the

last election. That may not be the reason. If any other reason has actuated the Government in wiping out that item, that would relieve them of the charge that they have acted in this way, but as the Finance Minister will not give any reason, we can come to no other conclusion than that it is done because my hon. friend (Mr. Hargraft) happens to be the representative of that county. I think he has made a very fair and courteous proposal to the Government, and that they should accept his proposition and send an engineer there to examine the wharf. He could go and come in 24 hours, and then the Government could submit a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for this harbour.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Owing to the absence of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) who is attending to public business in another part of this House, I have to bring before the Committee the question of the River Sydenham which runs from Lake St. Clair to the town of Dresden. Last year I think the Government did some work at Dresden, but it is almost useless on account of the river having become filled up with sunken logs, and snags and rubbish, so that vessels cannot get up or down. I hope that out of this $10,000 a small sum will be spent on the River Sydenham. Though that is not in my constituency, I know the importance and necessity of the work, and that it would be of great assistance to the people of the county, because they ship a great deal of lumber and grain, and that is the only way they have of getting it out.

Mr. FOSTER. I will have that noted.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I want also to mention the River Thames. I know the Minister is not personally acquainted with the Public Works Department, but, as he has charge of these works now, I have to address myself to him. This is a work of very great importance, and I am sure that the amount of $5,000 or $6,000 that would be required to open up that channel would be well expended. The amount that has already been spent on this bar has been thrown away, it is of no use; because the channel was not open through the bar, and vessels cannot get across at all. I think a small expenditure, of not more than $5,000 or $6,000, would open up a channel 100 feet wide and 12 feet deep, and would enable vessels drawing 12 feet of water to have ready access across the bar in and out. As it is now, every lumber vessel that comes in, every coal vessel that comes in, all the grain that is shipped through there, every vessel has to be unloaded partly, and part of the cargo removed in order to get the vessel over. I know of one man that made a sale of one million brick that they are making on the banks of the river for Port Arthur, and the contract had to be cancelled because vessels could not get in, and it was too much expense to lighten the vessels. I only mention this as an instance of the great loss that it is to the people, not only to the town of Chatham, but to the whole County of Kent and the County of Essex as well. Inasmuch as this work has been promised for a number of years, I think it is the bounden duty of the Government to put a small sum in the Estimates to complete it. I hope the Minister of Finance will make a note of it.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make a note of it.

Mr. BARRON. There is an item of $3,000 for the town of Lindsay, which has never been spent. It has been put in the Estimates now for several years, and if the member for South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn) were here, I am sure he would back me up in saying that the money ought to be spent. I sent word to him, but I find he is not in the House to-night, because I know he is anxious to have this $3,000 expended. The item appears here, but it is an old vote. The Finance Minister knows it was put in the Estimates just before a by-election, and it answered the purpose, because it made the people believe it was going to be spent. I should like to have the Minister say why it has not been expended?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell.

Mr. ALLAN. Before this item passes I desire to make a few observations with respect to the bar at the mouth of the Thames River, and in doing so I fully endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) and the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) as to the necessity of this work. It is a work of considerable importance. At the mouth of that river the water is only 8 feet deep, above it the river is navigable, and considerable commerce is done upon it. Now, I think it is very important, seeing that the Government has expended a sum of $4,000 in previous years, that the work should be completed. As that sum has been deemed sufficient to construct a part of that work, I think an appropriation should be put in the Supplementary Estimates to go on with it. I cannot understand how, when a vote for expending money on such a work as the Tay Canal succeeds in passing through this House, a work of this importance is overlooked. The Thames River drains one of the most important sections in this country. The western part of Ontario is probably as rich in agricultural resources as any other part of Canada, and a small appropriation would suffice to make that river navigable for pretty large crafts. The town of Chatham is a very important town of about 9,000 inhabitants, with a very large trade, and an appropriation for this purpose should be justified and supported unanimously by this House. In reference to the town of Cobourg, the position taken by the Minister is a little singular. Here is a constituency represented by a Liberal: an appropriation, I believe, was put in the Estimates, and now it is allowed to drop. According to the admission of the Minister, a large expenditure has been made in that harbour, and the fact of withholding the appropriation of $2,000 will be a loss to that section of the country. Everyone knows that harbour works like that must be kept up, and if the Government neglect to do so, they become a loss to the country.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) on behalf of the improvement of the navigation of the River Thames. Everyone knows the important service that that river is calculated to perform, and the rich section of country that is served by it demands that that highway should be utilized to its fullest extent, bearing in mind how trifling would be the expenditure in comparison with the returns. When one thinks of the perils incidental to navigation on Lake Ontario, and thinks of the few harbours there are on the north shore, it is, to my mind, incomprehensible that any person charged with the responsibility of looking after the navigation of those waters,

should for a moment imperil commerce, aye, and life too, for any narrow views, when only a trifling expenditure is required. Cobourg harbour, for example, is the only harbour between Port Hope and Presqu'Isle, a distance of thirty-five miles or thereabouts. It is a harbour of refuge, and was so constructed with public money, not so much as a local harbour in the first instance, but because of its general character, because it is specially designed to be a harbour of refuge. When we think that governments in the past have taken a large view of the requirements of the country, and have expended public money in the general interest of the country, it is with some disappointment, if not surprise, that I find these great interests are now being jeopardized for undisclosed reasons, and to save the paltry expense of a few thousand dollars. It may be that the powers that be may withhold their consent to such an item as this; but I venture to say they will do so at very great expense to themselves, not only to themselves, which would be a trifle, but to the trade and perhaps the lives of the people; and let them bear in mind this warning, that if disaster is the outcome of this narrow policy, if I can so much as designate it by the title of policy, this action of puerility is not fair, and is not right, and is unworthy of the people's representatives.

Repairs, Harbours and Rivers, Manitoba. $3,000

Mr. WATSON. Where is it intended to expend this money?

Mr. FOSTER. This is a vote for general repairs and improvements such as we have just passed, and wherever it may be required in the course of the year so far as it goes it will be expended.

Mr. WATSON. Does it include an item for dredging White Mud River?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it is for general repairs and improvements.

Mr. WATSON. There was a vote last year for $2,000 for Red River survey, which I suppose was for St. Andrew's Rapids, below Winnipeg. Will anything be done this year respecting that survey? The attention of the Government has been called on several occasions by deputations to the fact that these rapids, if improved, would not only give communication for lake-going boats from Lake Winnipeg to the City of Winnipeg, but would create an immense water power. The Government have led the people of Winnipeg to believe they intend to improve these rapids; but that has not been done. Promises were made in my hearing to deputations by the late Minister of Public Works, that these rapids would be improved, either by making a canal, or putting in wing dams sufficient to hold the water and give a draught of six or seven feet. I should expect to hear from the members for Winnipeg and Lisgar on this question. This should receive the attention of the Government and the improvements should be carried out. The Government spend large sums, as has been done on the Tay Canal with poor results, when this valuable improvement could be carried out for one-tenth of the money which we know has been practically stolen from the country by contracters. This work should receive the attention of the Government, not only as one benefiting Winnipeg, but the whole Province of Manitoba. On the shores of Lake Winnipeg there is an immense supply of firewood and a large lumber trade is done there every year; but as the rapids are not improved, all the traffic has to be trans-shipped at Selkirk and transported to Winnipeg by rail, with the effect of increasing the cost of firewood $1 per cord. There are also valuable stone quarries that might be developed. Then, as Winnipeg is a railway centre, it would cheapen the cost of all materials that can be procured on the shores of Lake Winnipeg to the whole Province of Manitoba. I am surprised there is not an item this year in the Estimates for this work. The Government have kept the people of Winnipeg in suspense, expecting from year to year the work would be carried out; but it appears that sufficient influence has not yet been brought to bear on the Government by the people of Manitoba. I am of the opinion that if the representatives of that province were not servile followers, as they are, of the Government, they would yield to the demand of the Province of Manitoba and the people of Winnipeg, and get a reasonable amount of money for the purpose of improving the navigation of Red River.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Denison). The hon. gentleman should take back the word "servile." It is improper to use a word of that sort.

Mr. WATSON. If it is unparliamentary, I suppose I shall have to say they are not servile; but, as I have some regard for the truth, I am sorry to make the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman should take it back in a gentlemanly manner.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman is called upon to withdraw an expression, he should do so according to the rule.

Mr. WATSON. I shall have to comply with the rules of the House, and withdraw the expression.

General repairs and improvements, North-West Territories..... $4,500

Mr. MULOCK. What is proposed to be done; are there any works in view?

Mr. FOSTER. General repairs. No works are estimated for.

Victoria Harbour, B.C..... $6,000

Mr. PRIOR. It seems to me this sum of $6,000 is an absurdly small sum to be voted for the improvement of Victoria harbour.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You want to be careful or the Government will drop the item.

Mr. PRIOR. I had the opportunity, a few days ago, of showing this House, by statistics, the importance of Victoria harbour. I showed that one million and a quarter of tonnage entered the harbour during the year. Up to the present we have had a small sum voted every year, $6,000, for that purpose; and I must say, for the amount voted, good work has been done; but the sum has been altogether inadequate for the purpose intended. The dredging plant used was very old and out of date, and, therefore, not so much work could be executed as might have been done with modern plant. Lately there has been a report made on the requirements of the harbour, and it has been shown that for $75,000 the harbour could be made

as good as any one would wish it to be, considering its size. I only hope the Government will see their way, before the Supplementary Estimates are brought down, to put a good round sum, say $25,000 this year, in the Estimates for Victoria harbour. The British Columbia Board of Trade has brought this matter to the attention of the Government time and time again. When the Ministers have visited Victoria they have had their notice called to the matter, and have promised to give it their attention. The members representing Victoria have repeatedly shown the advisability and necessity of a good amount being given for that purpose; and I trust that before the Supplementary Estimates are brought down, the Government will take this into consideration and will see their way clear to give a sum of money that will be of some benefit and will make the harbour as good as it should be.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a small vote which is for the particular object of carrying on the work, which has already been commenced there in the removal of rock, but it is inadequate for the larger and necessary works which have been spoken of by my hon. friend (Mr. Prior), and which the Government have under consideration at the present time. I think my hon. friend is perfectly right in stating that the dredge which has been at work there for some years, is not suitable for that harbour, and whatever work is done in future in that harbour will be done with a dredge of a better class.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much has been spent on this harbour?

Mr. FOSTER. $106,002.01.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this work done by contract?

Mr. FOSTER. The work is done by our own dredge, under the supervision of Mr. Gamble, the engineer.

Mr. MARA. The dredge belonged to the British Columbia Government before Confederation.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the engineer there during the whole progress of this work?

Mr. PRIOR. Victoria is his headquarters. He sometimes goes to other parts of British Columbia, but the majority of the time he is in Victoria. There is a foreman over the work.

Mr. MULOCK. Foremen may be very necessary, and no doubt they are if they do their duty; but if they do not they are not, as we have had reason to know. I find that in Toronto harbour we have been expending a large sum of money for what are called inspectors; men overlooking the work, in fact literally overlooking it.

Mr. FOSTER. The captain of the dredge is foreman here.

Mr. MULOCK. There is no man with a spy glass.

Mr. PRIOR. I may say that the captain of the dredge, Mr. Robert Dexter, is most capable of taking charge of the work, and I am perfectly certain that not a dollar is expended under his supervision that is not spent in the best possible manner.

Fraser River..... ..... $20,000

Mr. CORBOULD. I may say that the work commenced by the Government on the Fraser River has already been the cause of very beneficial results. The channel from the mouth of the Fraser River was very crooked and shifting, but the improvement that has been made there has apparently made it straight, and deepened the water at low tide to 14 feet and at high tide to 28½ feet, so that already very large ships are able to enter the mouth of the Fraser River. The river in former years was difficult of navigation, but the result of this work has been a great improvement. It has been found better that the work should be done yearly than all at once. The engineer, Mr. Gamble, who is in charge of the work, is a very capable engineer, and the money, I am sure, has been very well spent. The foreman in charge of the work is Capt. Robinson of the dredger, who is quite capable of carrying on the work.

Harbours and rivers generally, British Columbia..... ..... $6,000

Mr. GORDON. Before this item is adopted, I would like to make some enquiries of the Government with regard to some improvements in connection with the rivers in Vancouver Island, and also in regard to the Nanaimo harbour. Applications have been sent to the Government urging very strongly some improvements on the Cowichan River in order that the large milling interests now developing there may have access to their timber limits. Last autumn a very heavy flood occurred in that part of the province, and destroyed the Nanaimo railway bridge, carrying it entirely away, destroying all the works which the Government had constructed in that river, and blocking it up completely with drift timber from the mountain. A large milling company have built their mills near the mouth of the Cowichan River and they depend largely upon their supplies from the interior. Unless they can induce the Government to make some improvements in that river their timber trade will be almost worthless. In addition to the damages caused to the river works, the flood has diverged and destroyed a great quantity of Indian lands, the alluvial soil being carried away. There was also an application for some works at the junction of the Courtenay and Tsolan Rivers in the district of Comox, a very important and necessary improvement, to which I wish to call the attention of the Government. I wish to point out to the Minister and to the Government, that Nanaimo harbour is a harbour of considerable importance. A portion of Nicol Rock was removed from that harbour, but part of the rock remains and is dangerous to shipping, and it will require perhaps a sum of ten or twelve thousand dollars to finish the removal of the rock and perform some necessary dredging at the entrance to the harbour. I may say that at the entrance of the harbour a number of our ships have grounded with cargoes, and although no absolute damage was done, the ships were for a time in very great danger. I cannot urge too strongly on the Government the necessity for making improvements in this harbour. If I am not intruding too much on the time of the Committee I will read a statement which will show the importance of the trade of the port of Nanaimo:

FISCAL YEAR ENDING 30TH JUNE, 1891.

PORT OF NANAIMO, B.C., EXCLUSIVE OF COASTING.

—	Number of Ships.	Tonnage.	Crews.
Arrived	498	289,780	9,992
Cleared	553	470,151	13,041
Totals	951	859,931	23,033

COASTING TRADE, SAME PERIOD.

Arrived	1,398	168,548	13,325
Departed	1,416	175,164	14,560
Totals	2,814	343,712	27,885

EXPORTS, SAME PERIOD.

Products of the Mines		$2,501,589
do	Fisheries	245
do	Animals	12
do	Forest	3,095
do	Manufactures	1,918
Total		$2,506,859

The Government will see, from this statement, that in asking for these necessary repairs and improvements, I am not going beyond the limits of reason.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to say to my hon. friend that the representations that have been made with reference to the harbour, especially with reference to the removal of what remains of Nicol Rock, and also with reference to the Cowichan River, where the improvements were swept away, are being carefully considered by the Government.

Harbours and Rivers generally..... $6,000

Mr. FORBES. Will the Minister tell me whether this item has been appropriated to any particular work yet?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it is for whatever may come up in the way of improvements and necessary works in harbours and rivers throughout the Dominion.

Mr. FORBES. Then it will not be out of place for me to offer the Minister a little advice on this matter. There are one or two places in the Province of Nova Scotia needing repairs, one in particular on the coast of the County of Queen's, to which I would like to direct his attention. The harbour of Liverpool is about three and a-half miles in length, and near the eastern end is what is called Coffin's Island, behind which is a very nice cove. This cove has been formed into a harbour of refuge and safety by means of a line of piers or breakwaters constructed at an expense to the country of some $5,000 or $6,000. One of these piers has partially sunk, which renders the harbour there quite unsafe. For very little expense this pier could be repaired and the harbour made quite safe for fishing vessels. I have made application to the department to have a dredge put at work on this harbour, as the sand or wash from the ocean has filled it up in the neighbourhood of those piers in consequence of the sinking of the middle pier, thereby rendering the harbour comparatively useless. I hold in my hand a letter from one of the residents of that locality. It is quite true, he is an official of the Government, but he speaks with authority the views of the people of that neighbourhood. He says:

"I herewith enclose a petition handed to me to be forwarded to you for presentation and explanation to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or the hon. Minister of Public Works. The copy sent you sets forth the wish of the petitioners quite distinctly, and I may say it is a work that is very much needed, and would not only be a great accommodation to the people of the whole eastern shore, but would, in a great measure, benefit Brooklyn and Liverpool as well. Some of our young men would build small fishing schooners and sail them if they had a harbour short of Liverpool or Port Medway, to which they could run, or in which they could leave them for a few days, and yet have them near to their homes where they could look out for them. Such a harbour could be made here with very little expense."

The distance from this harbour to Liverpool is 3½ miles, and to Port Medway 7 or 8 miles. These are the only two available harbours for fishing schooners making an entry into Liverpool; and this shows the necessity for the improvements to the harbour to which I refer. It is a work which would require very little expense on the part of the Government, and I would humbly request the Minister to give the matter his earnest attention. We have had it exemplified, in the returns brought down to-day, that a large number of our young men have left the Province of Nova Scotia. I like to have every opportunity given our young men to induce them to remain at home. A small portion of this item would give these people better fishing facilities and make this place a second Gibraltar to them. The records of the Public Works Department will show exactly the locality of this breakwater and the necessity for dredging the harbour. Plans are in the possession of the Government, the engineer has reported, and the Government are in a position to order immediately that the repairs be made, and save from destruction the works that are there.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). A most important breakwater in Prince Edward Island is the harbour of Souris. Certain repairs were made last year, but a further sum is required to complete them. There is also another very important harbour for fishermen, on the north coast of the Island, where they have no natural harbour whatever. It is formed by a very necessary work built by the Dominion Government at a place called Campbell's Cove, the most important fishing section on the north shore, and is the only refuge the fishermen have for their boats. It stood exceedingly well until last fall, when the great gale and enormously high tide were the means of carrying it away to some extent. It now requires repairs to prevent its being washed away by the storms next fall, and I trust the Government will see their way clear to place a vote in the Supplementary Estimates to cover those two works, if there is not sufficient in the vote before us.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not wish to detain the Committee, but merely to call the attention of the Government to the fact that in the earlier part of the session I spoke about some improvements on the Grand River. I wish the Minister would take a note of it. I understand that two or three years ago a survey was made of the improvements which might be required. They are very much needed, and I do not think would cost very much.

Mr. BORDEN. I would like to call the attention of the Government to a matter I brought up last year with reference to a harbour in my county,

called Hall's harbour. In 1884 a large portion of the breakwater there was carried away. A survey was then made by an engineer from Ottawa, and surveys have been made on several occasions since at considerable expense, as I discovered by the papers which have been brought down. I suggested last winter that I thought sufficient surveys had been made, and that it would be a good plan now to vote a little money. I called upon the Minister at his office and was treated with a great deal of attention. He sent for one or two engineers, and impressed me with the idea that I was going to succeed in getting the grant. In fact, he went so far as to say he would recommend it to Council; but the other members of the Administration must have been opposed to this grant, since none has been made. Therefore, I take this opportunity to see if I cannot induce the Government to consider this most important matter. The breakwater was carried away in 1884, and the department is in possession of all the information required on which to base a grant for the work. The town is quite an important one, and at present is suffering severely from the effects of the loss of this 100 feet of breakwater, which prevents vessels of any size coming into that harbour, and is most disastrous to the trade of the place. It may not be necessary to make a special grant, as I do not think a very large amount is required, and the money might be taken from the grant now under consideration. There is also another harbour in my constituency, called Morden harbour, to which I called the attention of the ex-Minister of Public Works. I endeavoured to make him understand that what is left of the pier at Morden is in danger of being carried away by the storms in the Bay of Fundy during the fall. A very small grant would make that pier secure, whereas, if it should be carried away, it will cost $10,000 to $15,000 to rebuild it. The Minister of Justice will know about these matters, and I hope will insist on his colleagues agreeing to provide for the necessary repairs required in these two harbours.

Mr. McMILLAN. I brought up the question of Bayfield harbour before the Minister of Public Works both last session and this session, and I was led to believe that a sum would be placed in the Supplementary Estimates this session to repair that harbour. Three years ago a part of the pier was carried away, and the Government contractor, instead of building on the crib-work, put in pile-work, which did not take a proper hold, and the first storm that came swept it into the river. I think it is too bad that this harbour should be allowed to go entirely to decay. The people went to a large expense themselves, and contributed nearly $30,000 towards the building of it, and the fishermen who used Bayfield harbour cannot now get in there at all. A small sum of money would be enough to put on a little cribwork and to clear out the deposit in the river, so that there would be a good harbour. I hope the Government will take this into consideration. I have been waiting patiently to see the Supplementary Estimates, and I understand there is a report in the Public Works Department as to what this harbour would require.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) When I was speaking, I forgot to mention another important breakwater in St. Peter's harbour. It is not exactly a breakwater, but is a structure to confine the water at the entrance of the harbour so as to deepen the water on the bar. It is an important place for fishing, and is a harbour of refuge. The work was carried away by the storm to which I refer, and probably it will be all carried away next autumn if it is not attended to. I hope the Government will not lose sight of this important work, especially important to those people who earn their living on the sea, and I hope something will be done before the autumn gales come on.

Mr. PERRY. My hon. friend from King's County (Mr. Macdonald) complains that he has harbours in his county which are not accessible to fishermen, and that the fishermen are suffering, that the water is shoal, that the breakwaters are carried away, and that not enough money is expended there to keep up the public works. I have no doubt that he is quite right in regard to King's County, and I am sure that the same thing could be said in regard to Queen's County and Prince County and all parts of the Island, under the penurious administration of the Government, as far as Prince Edward Island is concerned. Last year the sum of $12,000 was appropriated for breakwaters, piers and wharves, under the charge of the Dominion Government in Prince Edward Island. I find, from the returns of the Public Works Department, that only $7,000 was expended. What has become of the other $5,000? The hon. the Minister of Justice stated the other night that this amount was lying over. Why should it lie over? What is the good of voting money and leaving it there while these public works are going to destruction? The Minister of Justice will shiver in his boots when I tell him that the people of those districts have to take their axe and their auger and go out themselves to repair the wharves, in order to save the lives of their horses and their fellow-creatures. I find that less than half the breakwaters, and piers, and wharves in Prince Edward Island, are reported on. What has become of the others? The hon. gentleman kindly gave me the names of the wharves on which money had been expended, and the whole amount was $7,000. Is there no wharf, or pier, or harbour, in the Island on which the balance of $5,000 could be expended? I could name fifteen places where the money might be well expended for the benefit of the fishermen. Take the breakwater at Miminigash. Last year the Government were kind enough, I believe through a mistake, owing to the persistent efforts of my colleague at that time and myself, to pass an item of $3,500 for repairs to that breakwater. There was a sum of $800 or $900 expended in repairing the outer block. That breakwater was commenced under the late Administration of my friend, Mr. Mackenzie, and I have no fault to find with the way in which the money has been expended; but the Government have allowed the whole winter to pass without doing anything to enable the contractor to get the stones and timber at the proper time and make his arrangements. *Tempus acceptabile*—the Minister of Justice will understand what I mean. Tenders were not asked for until after the election. I believe they intended to keep that as a lash over the electors of Miminigash to compel them to vote for the Government candidates. However, in April, I think, a contract was signed between the Government and a Mr. Macdonald to do a certain amount of work. I have asked for the tenders, and for the amount of money which was to

be expended and how much work was to be done, but I have not had the information. However, Macdonald, when he had the contract, found it was not a very good paying matter. I suppose it would not pay as well as the Lévis dock or the works in Kingston. He gave up the contract, and the Government slept over these things, and after awhile they woke up, and I believe they have asked for new tenders. The summer is nearly over, the contract is not let, the fishing is nearly done and storms may carry away the breakwater, and the Government are still sleeping. Is that fair? Yet we are told that Prince Edward Island gets more money than it is entitled to. These amounts look very well on paper, they look very well in the Estimates, but they are not expended, and any money that goes there is not expended very judiciously or very properly. In the harbour of Cascumpec, in my county, tenders were asked for some time last spring for new buoys to be built and placed there. A certain gentleman got the contract. The buoys were placed. The contractor got a certified account from the harbour master. This was done, I think, in June. This Committee will be astonished when I tell them that this amount is not yet paid. Is that fair? Is it honest? Is it right to keep this man four or five months out of his pay? I will go bail that the Ministers of the Crown will not wait so many months for their pay, they will not wait so many weeks for their pay, they will not wait so many days for their pay. I am doubtful if they would wait so many hours—perhaps I may put it down fine enough to say minutes. I do not blame them for getting their pay, but there ought not to be so much red tape used. If this man in Cascumpec wants to send his complaint to the Department of Marine, a lot of red tape has to be used to send it to the agent at Charlottetown, the agent there sends it back to Cascumpec, Cascumpec sends it back to Charlottetown, and Charlottetown sends it to Ottawa, and all this red tape costs as much as the buoys in Cascumpec harbour, and this poor man has not got his pay yet. I will go bail that if there was a favour to be given here in Ottawa, if the Government wanted to give to a private individual a piece of ground to pack his wood on without fees, it could be done in one minute; a telephone would be made use of at the public expense, from the residence of that gentleman up to the department, and the favour would be granted at once. If slide dues were to be remitted to any favourite of the Government it could be done in a few minutes; but when the smallest province in the Dominion, the gem of the Dominion, that the Dominion fought so hard to get into its claws, and having it now in its claws it disowns it—it is unpatriotic, it is inhuman for a parent to disown its child in that kind of way. If that is the way the Island is to be used, I say the sooner it cuts adrift from the Confederation the better. It is not afraid to go on its own hook, it lived and prospered before it was humbugged by the Dominion into Confederation, and it can live yet. Cascumpec harbour has been neglected. In that harbour the present Government thought proper to expend $17,000 in blasting rock. They blasted that rock, and allowed the refuse, or the stones that they took out, to fall right back where they took them from, and where the rock stood about 8 or 9 feet below the level of the water, when this refuse was thrown back, it gave 18 inches or 2 feet less water than there had been before. I remonstrated with the Government a year or two ago, and notwithstanding these remonstrances the same practice was allowed to go on till last year. Last year they took the blasted rocks and carried them out in a dredge. This year I see in the Estimates $2,000 for blasting in the harbour, and so far not one dollar has been expended. Why not make use of this money? What is the use of voting the money if the department do not intend to expend it? The dredge, instead of being in Cascumpec, is in Summerside. I want to tell you that the dredge is now doing good work in Summerside. I thank the Government for these small favours. I thank them that they woke up, in a moment of weakness, and sent the dredge down to Summerside, in order to dredge the harbour and give the new steamer *Northumberland* room enough to lay at the warf. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works where the dredge was this spring. She did not go there until late in July. Let me tell the Government that this dredge does not work more than three months at the outside in the whole season, and the rest of the time she lies idle. They pay the captain of that dredge $90 a month, whether the dredge works or not. Now, why should the captain of that dredge be paid such a large amount of the public money for doing nothing? Why, Sir, when that dredge was wanted to work in the spring, it was said she was not fit. We were told by the department that the dredge was under repair. Now, why was not that dredge repaired in the winter? Why not compel the captain to see that the dredge is kept in repair, in the room of paying him $90 for doing nothing, for walking the streets of Charlottetown with his hands in his pocket, and canvassing all he could—and I suppose making use of some little boodle, for all I know—in favour of the Government candidates. That is the work he was doing in the winter; he was doing nothing in return for $90 a month he was getting from this country. Now, if the Government intend to do what is right they would get another dredge. One dredge is not sufficient for Prince Edward Island. My hon. friend from King's County complains, and rightfully complains, that the Island is neglected. I make no doubt that his word, his voice, his eloquence, his influence, will be heard in this House at the present time by the Government. The Government will acknowledge his words a great deal sooner than they will mine, because they expect a vote from him, but they do not expect one from myself. I can tell him this: that in my view the Government has no right, now that the dredge is in Summerside, to take her away from there where she is required, and send her somewhere else, spending nearly one-half the dredging season running from one port to another. Some gentlemen, perhaps Mr. Hunt in Summerside, or some other friend of the Government, will wire over and say that the dredge is required in a certain place, and if there is an election coming on she will be sent there in order to make a show. I see by one of the Ontario papers to-night that we are on the eve of an election. Then some influential man in the Government will send back a message that the dredge may be used for a political purpose. Then some one else may wire up to Ottawa: Send the dredge here if you want to get the votes of the people. They may take it into their heads to order the

dredge from where she is now working to go somewhere else, and the work that she is doing now would be left unfinished, and would be altogether useless for the public benefit. In Cascumpec harbour, as I said before, the Government have spent nearly $20,000, and what good has it done? So far, not more than 5 per cent. of the work has been completed—because if there are 500 feet in the bar, and only 300 feet of that on each side taken away, the rest is in the way, and the vessels cannot get over. The work is commenced, and it is badly needed. We know very well that Cascumpec harbour would be one of the best harbours of refuge if this rock was blasted and dredged in the outward bar, on the north side of the Island. It is a harbour of refuge, for the most part, of the fishing vessels from Nova Scotia; it is the only refuge of the American vessels, which have to come in there very often when they are not prevented by the Government cutters. The harbour is also wanted for the inhabitants of Prince Edward Island. We have a lot of large fishing boats from New Brunswick, from Caraquet, from Shippegan, from Tracadie, and all along there—all these boats have to come across in a storm, and they must get into that harbour. I do not hear one word spoken by the representatives of that part of the Dominion asking for justice and fair-play for their constituents. Why? Because, I suppose these people are only fishermen. Why, we are told to believe that fishermen in the days of old were very much respected; fishermen were taken up by High Authority, and were made companions. But it appears to-day in the Dominion of Canada that fishermen are looked upon by the Government as a body of men of no account, except for their votes on election day. The votes of the fishermen count as much at elections as do the votes of Ministers. I advise the Government, if they wish to do right and give justice to the people, that to-morrow morning a cheque will be sent to Cascumpec by mail in order to pay this man the debt the Government owe him. The dredge *Prince Edward* should be left at Summerside until she completes the work, so that a steamer can come up to the wharf. We know that Summerside is not to be trifled with. A million dollar's worth of produce is shipped from that one harbour. I hope the Government will not neglect the public service of Prince Edward Island, but will see that these suggestions are carried out. The dredge, I repeat, should not be taken away from my county until it has finished the work, for, if it is half done, the public money will be wasted. I do not think one dredge sufficient for the Island. The harbours are in a bad state; we hear complaints daily, not only from Grits, but from Conservatives. The member for King's is complaining, and I am willing to give him my influence to get justice to the county. Although the Grit was defeated at the last election, I have not lost faith in the people of King's, and, no doubt, they will redeem the county at the next election.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. member for South Victoria is now present, and I should like to ask his assistance in regard to the expenditure of $3,000, in addition to the placing of a light at the entrance of Sturgeon Lake.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. I am very thankful to the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) for his kindness and sympathy, and for the very great interest he has taken in South Victoria. As the representative for South Victoria, I know that if the Government have made any promise they will fulfil it. We need not charge the Government with spending all the money, but we can charge some of it against the Opposition for keeping us here so long. I have faith in the Government, which I am proud to support, that they will carry out any promises made. I am thankful to the hon. gentleman for watching the interests of my county so faithfully, but still I have greater confidence in the Conservative Government than in him, and I hope in the future he will look after the riding he is the representative of, and leave South Victoria to the care of the representative whom the people of that riding have sent to Parliament.

Mr. BARRON. I ask the hon. gentleman if his patience is not exhausted, as the Government have already taken three years about the work.

New dredging plant..... $30,000

Mr. ALLISON. Before the item for new dredging plant is finally passed, I should like the Government to comply with the promise made by the late Minister of Public Works. In the first Supplementary Estimates there appeared an item of $6,000 for the building of new dredging plant. During the discussion I asked the Minister of Public Works three questions: First, where was the plant built; second, by whom was it built; and third, who has the plant now in possession? In answer to my question, the Minister of Public Works spoke as follows:—

"As these are purely and simply the balance of accounts voted last year, I would ask the hon. gentleman to defer his questions until we come to the item in the main Estimates for new dredging plant for the current year, and I will then be in a position to give the information he requires. In the Estimates for the current year there is an item of $24,200 for dredging plant, and if the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to put me his questions when this comes to be voted I will give all the information then."

That time has arrived. We are now considering the Estimates for new dredging plant, and I now ask for answers to the questions I submitted. It is true the same Minister is not now in charge of the Public Works Department; but he has a successor, and I suppose it is his duty to comply with any agreement entered into by the late Minister. You will find the item to which I refer appearing as No. 53 in the Supplementary Estimates, the amount being $6,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That item, of course, was in the Supplementary Estimates, which have been already passed; but I will have the explanation here in a little while.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When the Minister of Finance comes down and asks $30,000 for new dredging plant, instead of the hon. gentleman crying "carried," it is his duty to give explanations to the House, without being asked to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. No one objects.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I object to that mode of carrying through Estimates. It is the bounden duty of the Minister of Finance to offer explanations of all moneys voted.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. The hon. member for Lennox

(Mr. Allison) has asked me for an explanation of an item in the Supplementary Estimates which was passed two months ago. This is not the Supplementary Estimates we are passing, and I have not the book here. I have sent for it, so as to give the hon. gentleman that explanation to an item which we passed six weeks ago. He is satisfied with that and while I am waiting for it I propose to go on with this vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to that, but you should state the reasons in detail when you are wanting money.

Mr. FOSTER. This vote is for $30,000 for new dredging plant for the *New Dominion*, the *Canada*, and the *St. Lawrence*, and it includes a new crane, a new bucket, and other machinery.

Mr. WATSON. Are these goods manufactured in Canada or the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. So far as possible, we get them in Canada and by contract. All the articles that are required in this item are got in Canada. We have a ship-yard of our own, and the workmen are making the buckets. The crane is under contract by Convery, of St. John, N.B.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You say you have a ship-yard at Sorel?

Mr. FOSTER. We have a sort of a ship-yard, where repairs are done during winter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was not aware that there was any Government establishment of that nature.

Mr. WATSON. What number of men do you employ?

Mr. FOSTER. There are 19 men engaged there at the present time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I never heard of this before, and if the Government are starting a sort of ship-yard of that description, some sort of permanent staff has to be paid and some buildings to be rented. We ought to be able to ascertain what the cost of that establishment is. It certainly is news to me, but I was not aware you had it.

Mr. FOSTER. When we took over the plant from the harbour commissioners, who were deepening the channel, the establishment at Sorel came into our hands. That is three years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So you have practically a kind of ship-yard for three years.

Mr. FOSTER. They have done all the repairs of dredging plant there.

Mr. CURRAN. When the Montreal Harbour Commissioners carried on the work of deepening the channel they had blacksmith shops at Sorel for the repairs of the dredges. This dockyard at Sorel, which was on the old McCarthy property, has been in existence for fifteen years, and two years ago it was taken over by the Government, when they took over the plant from the harbour commissioners. The establishment at Sorel was well known during the Mackenzie Administration, and it has been there ever since.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I want to know is, where I will get the details of the expenditure of this yard?

Mr. FOSTER. I should think it is to be found in the Auditor General's Report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Auditor General's Report shows that there has been an expenditure of $121,000 under the head of St. Lawrence ship channel.

Mr. FOSTER. That vote has been taken for two years. This year's vote finished it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In that amount I see such items as mechanical staff, $26,686. Are we to understand that it is the policy of the Government to maintain a regular ship-yard?

Mr. FOSTER. I think not; but it has to be maintained, I suppose, so long as this work is to go on. When that is done, it will be a question for consideration as to how to dispose of the plant.

Mr. MULOCK. What is done at this place?

Mr. FOSTER. All the dredges, vessels and scows are repaired.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many dredges are under repair at that place?

Mr. FOSTER. Six dredges, seven tugs and scows.

Mr. MULOCK. There are in all 18 vessels.

Mr. FOSTER. They do the whole of the work on the channel during the summer season. In the winter time the dredges are repaired, and when the season opens for work on the channel they are ready.

Mr. McMULLEN. Judging by the statements in the Auditor General's Report, our dredging costs a very large amount of money. I think it would be almost better to dispose of all our dredges and let out the work of dredging by contract, even if we have to pay McGreevy prices. My impression is that we are paying that much now, when we consider that we are keeping up two staffs and this expensive plant. I think the Government should consider the propriety of parting with the whole dredging plant and letting the work out by contract.

Mr. CURRAN. I think it will be admitted by those who are taking an interest in this matter that the work done under the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal in deepening the channel of Lake St. Peter has been done at remarkably low prices—as low as 12½ cents.

Mr. MULOCK. What depth?

Mr. CURRAN. Twenty-seven and a-half feet.

Mr. MULOCK. Cheaper than that done at Quebec.

Mr. CURRAN. In some respects. When they took out rock it was not so cheap as that. That is the cheapest. But the work has been carried on with very great skill and success, and the plant now owned by the Government is as fine as anything on the continent of America. Mr. Kennedy, the engineer of the harbour works, is a man of eminent ability, as everybody knows, and the staff of men under him are all picked men. The work carried on since the harbour commissioners have ceased to have authority has been merely trimming the channel at certain points where there were projections, and it is understood that during the present season the work will be absolutely finished, so far as a 27 foot channel between Montreal and Quebec is concerned. The sum mentioned in the Estimates is for the dredging as well as for the other works carried on by this staff of men, who were transferred to us at

the same time as all this plant; and I am satisfied that anyone who will take the trouble to read the reports of the harbour commissioners of Montreal—the chairmen of which have been such men as Sir John Young, Mr. Cramp, the late Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bulmer—will agree that the works have been carried on in such a manner as to reflect credit on the harbour commission.

Mr. McMULLEN. Notwithstanding the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I must say that our experience with regard to dredging has pretty well established that the dredging companies have not taken out the amount they declared they had. We spend enormous amounts on dredging. We keep a big staff roaming around the different channels doing dredging work, and every year we get extensive and detailed reports, but when we come to the test of experience we find that the work has not been done. It would better if the Government would let the work by contract and then see if the contract was properly carried out. I can easily understand why the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) should advocate a continuance of the present system, as he has no doubt many friends interested in the operations of the dredge.

Mr. CURRAN. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I have no earthly interest in the dredging, but I do know that the criticisms which have been made have no application whatever to the work carried on by the Montreal Harbour Commissioners. These gentlemen are deeply interested in seeing that the material is all taken out and proper navigation secured between Montreal and Quebec. It is a matter of vital importance to the port of Montreal that vessels of a certain draught should be able to come up without an accident or hindrance. Every vessel that comes up is watched carefully by those who are jealous of the trade of Montreal, and it became of paramount importance to those carrying on the work that it should be effectively done. The only work required to be done now is to clear away any slight encumbrance there may be in the channel. We know that when the ice leaves in the spring, frequently boulders on either side are moved into the channel and require to be removed. It is absolutely necessary to keep constant supervision of a work like this, in order that the Dominion may get the full benefit of the expenditure made, and in order that the sea-going vessels may reach the furthest point inland with their cargoes, thus saving cost of transportation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I accept, of course, the hon. gentleman's statement; but there is a division of responsibility, and the harbour commissioners may consider it rests on the Government to see that the work is properly done, while the Government may depend on the harbour commissioners. When we look back at the amount of money we have expended in enabling vessels of considerable draught to reach Montreal it must be patent to anyone that we are paying more for the work that is done than it is worth, and it appears to be a perpetual drain on the resources of the Dominion to keep up this dredging. If we were to let it at even prices in excess of what we are paying it might be better. It is desirable, no doubt, from a Dominion standpoint, that Montreal should be kept an open port, but at the same time the amount of dredging we have done is something enormous, and I have no doubt that the Montreal Harbour Commissioners will agree with me.

Mr. McMILLAN. Are the men engaged by the year, or only during the summer?

Mr. CURRAN. Those who are working on the dredge work only during the summer, and are only paid during the summer; but those who work in the repair shops are kept going all the time.

Mr. McMILLAN. How many men are engaged altogether?

Mr. FOSTER. The 128 would not be on one dredge, but would be distributed among the different dredges, barges, tugs, scows, and so on.

Mr. McMULLEN. What does it cost per yard to remove the dredging that we do?

Mr. FOSTER. It is impossible to give an answer to that, because the cost is very different in one place to what it is in another.

Mr. CURRAN. It costs from 10 cents to $1.50 a yard.

Mr. MULOCK. Where is the dredge for which this crane, which is to be made at the St. John foundry, is required?

Mr. FOSTER. In the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MULOCK. Where are the other repairs to be made?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to the new dredging plant. The new crane is to be made at St. John, and it is for the dredge there.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the price of that?

Mr. FOSTER. The estimate is $1,200. The bucket is to be made at the Sorel yards, the only place where it can be made. That is for the *Canada*. The new boiler is for the *St. Laurrence*, and as that dredge is in the Maritime Provinces, the boiler will be constructed at the nearest and best place in those provinces, if the most available tender is from those provinces. The contracts for the steam winch, boilers, and so on, are not given out yet.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose you advertise for tenders for all the works you do not do yourselves?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN. Is this item for the board of the men on the dredges? I suppose the mechanical staff would board themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. They are paid so much a day and they are boarded.

Iron bridge over the Grand River at York.....$12,100

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish to correct a misstatement made in error by the Minister last year when I was unfortunately unable to be present. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) asked if this bridge had been built, and the Minister answered in error, "Yes." The hon. member asked where the bridge was, and the Minister said, "At Cayuga." That is an error.

Mr. MULOCK. What was got at Cayuga?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Nothing at all.

Mr. MULOCK. Only a post office?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is to be the total cost of this bridge?

Mr. FOSTER. The total cost, when completed, with the approaches and trestle work, will be $26,282. The sum asked for here is to be reduced to $7,300, as we find that this amount will not be required.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Government pay the full amount for the construction of this bridge?

Mr. MONTAGUE. It does, in consideration of our giving up the claim against the Government of $18,000, with interest since 1871, upon one bridge, and the claim established before the commission upon this bridge. It is a very good thing, as the hon. gentleman's friend, Mr. Colter, who is not here now, would tell him, because, as solicitor of the council, he advised the county council to enter a petition of right and sue the Government in the Exchequer Court for this.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is this a navigable stream?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No; at one time it was connected with a system of navigation of which the late lamented member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) was the president, but since that time the canal works have been allowed to go to decay and the Grand River Navigation Company no longer exists.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose this was under contract?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. How much has been paid for inspectors on this work?

Mr. FOSTER. Two dollars a day during construction.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I heard the inspector himself say that it was something like $500.

Mr. MULOCK. How much has been paid out for the work of the inspector amounted to?

Mr. MONTAGUE. He gets $3 a day for the number of days he is at work. I think he worked ten months less nine days. He claimed a month which the Government would not pay.

Mr. FOSTER. Three dollars was his allowance.

Mr. MULOCK. For how many days was he paid?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not that information; I have taken a note of it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The member for Haldimand said he was employed for ten months.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think I must be wrong in that, because I am almost positive the amount was $540.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the work completed now?

Mr. FOSTER. It is all completed now. We asked for $12,000, and that has been reduced to $7,000.

Mr. MULOCK. Who had the contract for the iron bridge?

Mr. FOSTER. The Hamilton Bridge Company. They tendered, and their tender being the lowest, was accepted. There were no extras at all.

For the construction of a free bridge over the Old Man's River at Fort McLeod..... $15,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT What is the cost of this altogether?

Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. FOSTER. $10,000 of this is a revote. The contract has just been let—about six weeks ago. The total cost of the bridge will be $28,000, and it will require an additional grant of $8,000. All the material is of wood. The length of the bridge proper, including abutments and centre pier, is 322 feet. The contractors are Smith & Heney, of Ottawa.

Resolutions reported.

THE CENSUS RETURNS

Mr. HAGGART laid on the Table the census of Canada for 1891, by electoral divisions, and the census of cities, towns and villages in comparison with the census of other years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.10 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 28th August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS—INVESTIGATIONS.

Mr. SPROULE presented the Twenty-first Report of the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. BARRON. I would ask the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee why it is that the evidence given by the Auditor General a day or two ago, in regard to the Post Office Department, has not been printed? I see the evidence given on the same day by Mr. LeSueur and by Mr. White has been printed, and I do not see why the evidence of the Auditor General, in regard to certain witnesses, which evidence was undoubtedly aimed at the investigation then going on in regard to the Post Office Department, has not likewise been published.

Mr. WALLACE. I will make enquiry of the Clerk of the Committee.

TRADE WITH THE WEST INDIES.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the other business goes on, I will take this opportunity of making a statement to the House on account of its importance, not only to the members of the House, but to the country generally, especially those portions of it more particularly interested in the West India trade. It will be remembered that we had some discussion the other day with reference to the recent arrangement between the United States and Spain, with regard to our trade with the Spanish Antilles. It will be remembered that I then expressed my opinion that Canada would have, until the 30th of June, 1892, privileges equal to those accorded to the United States in products of a similar kind. I am happy to be able to inform the House that I have to-day received intimation from the Governor General that such is the case.

Mr. LAURIER. And what after?

Mr. FOSTER. That remains to be seen.

LAND SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 169) further to amend the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 4, intituled: "An Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in land to certain railway companies."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman explain what the real meaning of that Bill is? We cannot understand by reading it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I explained it when I first introduced it, and I explained it again the other day. The Bill proposes to give a land grant to 56 miles of railway from Calgary to Red Deer. The original charter allowed the line to be built either from Blacken, a point 45 miles east of Calgary, to Red Deer, or from Calgary to Red Deer. The land grant was given to the portion from Blacken to Red Deer, a distance of about 55 miles. We now ask for the land grant to be transferred from the Blacken and Red Deer line to the Calgary and Red Deer line.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the Minister laid a statement upon the Table covering the amount of land grants to various railways, which was promised a few days ago?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I promised to do that when next this Bill comes up. I have got it already.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MULOCK. I find that I was somewhat in error yesterday when referring to the Railway Act, and therefore part of my remarks, yesterday, have really no application to the Bill before the House. But now we come to the question of granting this land to this particular company. The Minister of Finance will remember that when the resolution in question was under discussion I asked him to tell us what the financial basis of this company was, and he referred me to the Act of incorporation. On reference to the Act of incorporation it appears that among the names of incorporators, some of them, one, at all events, out of the five or six, is a man of no substance whatever. We are told by the Minister that the road has passed out of the hands of the original promoters and is now in the hands of someone else. Now, it appears to me that before we grant a large tract of land to a company we ought to know who are the persons interested in that company, what money of their own they propose to put into it, whether it is really a grant to a private individual for private advantage, or whether it is of a public character; whether the public interest is being considered, or whether it is a private gift in fact. Now, whatever laxity may have obtained in the past ought to be a warning to us not to be lax now. Large tracts of public lands are being handed out to corporations with a good deal of freedom. I very much doubt if any individual would part with his property on any such terms. In this particular instance, if what I gather from the remarks that fell from the Minister of the Interior and the member for Alberta (Mr. Davis), when the matter was before the House a short time ago, is correct, then it would appear that this is purely a speculative concern. Certain persons, said to be persons of means, are anxious to obtain a grant of land for the promotion of an enterprise purely of a private character, a purely private enterprise. It is a proposition to grant land to enable an individual to develop coal lands for his own private gain, having no regard to the public being benefited, further than by being able to purchase coal or by the railway service. Now, this is not the sort of a company, in my judgment, that ought to be aided out of the public exchequer, or out of the public domain. If it is aided, if there are no guarantees of *bonâ fides*, then there ought to be other stipulations, other safeguards cast around the enterprise for the benefit of the public. This is not merely aid to a railway; that must be borne distinctly in mind. A railway, if one is built, serves the public, no matter if it is entirely controlled by private individuals, or even if it were an enterprise of speculators. But this is not an ordinary case of a common carrier, but it is the case of proprietors of coal lands obtaining grants of land for the extension of a railway to a coal district to enable them to market their own coal to special advantage. There is a wide distinction, therefore, between aid to an enterprise of this character and aid to a purely railway enterprise. That being the case, the Railway Act does not, in my judgment, furnish the guarantees to to which the public are entitled. It is true, as the Minister of Justice kindly pointed out to me yesterday, that section 228 of the Railway Act enables the Governor in Council to revise, and I presume that means to reduce, the rates. But when you bear in mind that the principle will only be affected if you can show a discrimination, and when you remember that in this particular case the carrying of coal will be the main enterprise, and that being the coal company itself, it is clear that the question of discrimination will never arise, and therefore the power under section 228 is not likely to be exercised. The company might impose the most excessive tolls on coal and still not discriminate against the public, and yet those rates might be so excessive as to render valueless the coal lands of others than those controlling this road. They only want to carry their own coal, or to get possession of other coal lands, and therefore may say, "We charge $1 a ton for a given distance." It may be an exorbitant rate, but this company has fixed it, and they charge themselves at that rate as well as the public, and thus the company will say, in answer to an application to reduce the tolls, there is no discrimination. It is immaterial to them as owners what rates they charge for carriage—it is a mere matter of book-keeping; and therefore the provisions of the Railway Act will be a dead letter, because it will never be possible to show any discrimination. This company as customers of themselves will never be prejudiced by any excessive rate on coal. No matter how excessive the rate is it will not hurt this company, because whatever they charge themselves for carrying their coal they recoup themselves. The general public are, therefore, left entirely at the mercy of the company in this case. The power of revision is never likely to be exercised, and therefore, when private individuals are coming here under cover of a railway charter and are asking for a grant of land to develop their own private property for their own private ends, the case demands safeguards not to be found in the Bill. I maintain there should be a maximum limit placed on rates for coal carriage or other safe-

guards : I suggest that as one of the safeguards. I ask the Minister of the Interior if he has any objection to such a provision going into the Bill? The company cannot take this gift without attendant conditions. It would be as reasonable for owners of a timber limit to apply to Parliament for a grant of money to extend a railway into their own limit. It is true that there might be other limits all round, and the timber of others might be carried by the road as well, but the company would have an advantage unless they were limited in regard to the rates they should charge their neighbours. If you do not limit, then you practically establish a monopoly for the benefit of the company in regard to timber limits in the vicinity of that road. And the same result would follow in the case of coal and mineral lands. Therefore, when these individuals under an Act of incorporation come here as a company, a purely private speculative company, for private gain and not for the public good, and ask for public aid, for a gift, we should attach proper conditions to that gift. If they do not think proper to take the gift on those conditions, others will. I ask the Minister if he considers it desirable to fix a maximum rate for the carriage of coal? That is the article they are engaged in carrying, and therefore there is no real competition ; nothing is going to reduce the price, and the company will be able to exact the most excessive rates for the carriage of coal in order to make the coal lands in the country their own private property in fact. It is exceedingly important that these safeguards should be imposed. Take the town of Calgary, which is not far distant from this district. If Parliament fixes a maximum rate for the carriage of coal it will be infinitely better for the district as a whole. The coal will come out at a fixed rate ; everyone will be benefited, not only the people who own coal lands, or the Government if they own them, but also those who buy. Why, therefore, should there not be proper safeguards inserted in the Bill at this stage? I hope the Minister of Interior will consider, and accept with favour, the suggestion I make on this point.

Mr. TROW. The proposition of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is quite reasonable. The lands in that locality are quite valuable, and for a distance of 55 miles we are giving away lands to that company for the construction of the road, or a total of about 352,000 acres. It is not in the interest of the settlers, or of the Government, or of the country at large, that this company should acquire those lands in this locality, and it would create a monopoly in the carrying of coal to Calgary and other points on the road.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think hon. gentlemen opposite have taken a very unreasonable course in regard to this company. I do not see why this company should be made an exception. It does not own an acre of coal. It is building this road for settlement as well as for the carriage of coal, when the coal mines are worked there. I do not anticipate that the building of this road will create a monopoly in the coal business for the whole of the country. Calgary is being supplied from coal mines worked in its immediate neighbourhood. I do not see, therefore, any reason why this company should affect the prices of coal in that locality. I think the provision in the Railway Act is quite sufficient to guarantee that no excessive rates will be charged. The Act gives power to the Government to regulate the rates from time to time. So far as this company is concerned, it is no more speculative, and not so much so, as others, but it is one that is now being formed on a business basis, with men of capital at its back who will ensure the construction of the road. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) states that the land grant given to this company will be some 3,000,000 acres. He has made a slight mistake there, because the land grant is 352,000 acres, or 6,400 acres per mile for the 56 miles. I may say that I cannot agree to the proposition of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and I would much sooner withdraw the Bill than agree to such a clause being inserted in it. If I should be forced to do that, the hon. gentleman must take upon himself the responsibility of preventing a *bonâ fide* undertaking in the west ; and probably that is the object he has in view.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I wish to say one or two words on this matter. I know nothing personally of the enterprise itself, but I have a very strong objection indeed to the insertion of that clause in a particular Act, when we have a complete provision in the Railway Act ; a more complete and effectual provision on that very subject than we can insert here. There can be no object in repeating that provision in this Act. We must select some other mode of arriving at the object, and it seems to me that the mode suggested by the hon. gentleman is not one that will commend itself to the House. What is the grievance that he apprehends may arise? It is: That an exorbitant rate may be charged on the coal carried by the company for other persons than the company itself. I would point out to the hon. gentleman and to the Committee that, under section 227 of the Railway Act, no toll whatever, exorbitant or otherwise, can be levied by this company on the coal of any person or any other company, until that toll has been approved by Order in Council. Section 227 says :

"No tolls shall be levied or taken until the by-law fixing such tolls has been approved of by the Governor in Council, nor until after two weekly publications in the *Canada Gazette* of such by-law and of Order in Council approving thereof; nor shall any company levy or collect any money for services as a common carrier except subject to the provisions of the Act."

Now, what is the next greviance that he apprehends will arise? That the tolls, although perhaps reasonable in the first instance, may be found unreasonable as time goes on, and he apprehends that the Governor in Council has not the power to modify the tolls so fixed if this discrimination exists. Under section 228 of the Railway Act :

"Every by-law fixing and regulating tolls shall be subject to revision by the Governor in Council, from time to time, after approval thereof; and after an Order in Council altering the tolls fixed and regulated by any by-law has been twice published in the *Canada Gazette*, the tolls mentioned in such Order in Council shall be substituted for those mentioned in the by-law, so long as the Order in Council remains unrevoked."

So that no toll can be charged until there is an Order in Council approving of it, and then, when we find they are too high, they can be reduced by Order in Council without the consent of the company at all. Under these circumstances, we have complete control, as complete as can be given by the Act ; and what purpose would be served by inserting a provision that there should

be a maximum rate? I think that would be very unwise, and certainly the House would not be disposed to fix an unreasonably low maximum.

ROYAL ASSENT.

A Message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:—

"His Honour, Mr. Justice Strong, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of your Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate."

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber; and having returned, Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Deputy Governor had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to amend the "Bills of Exchange Act," 1890.
An Act further to amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.
An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Jay Spencer Corbin.
An Act to amend chapter seventy-seven of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Safety of Ships.
An Act respecting the Intercolonial Railway.
An Act to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Oshawa Railway and Navigation Company, and to change the name thereof to "The Oshawa Railway Company."
An Act further to amend an Act to incorporate the Great Eastern Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.
An Act to amend the Act te incorporate the Montreal Bridge Company.
An Act further to amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.
An Act further to amend chapter one hundred and thirty-eight of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.
An Act to amend the Copyright Act.
An Act to amend the Act respecting Government Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters.
An Act further to amend "The Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act."
An Act to incorporate the Montreal and Atlantic Railway Company, and for other purposes.
An Act to incorporate the Macleod Irrigation Company.
An Act to incorporate the Great West Life Assurance Company.
An Act to amend "The Patent Act."
An Act further to amend "The North-West Representation Act."
An Act further to amend "The Customs Act."
An Act to amend "The Petroleum Inspection Act."
An Act respecting the Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company.
An Act further to amend "The Steamboat Inspection Act."
An Act respecting the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.
An Act in restraint of Fraudulent Marking.
An Act further to amend "The Fisheries Act," chapter ninety-five of the Revised Statutes.
An Act further to amend "The Indian Act."
An Act further to amend "The General Inspection Act."
An Act to amend chapter ninety-six of the Revised Statutes, intituled: "An Act to encourage the development of the Sea Fisheries and the building of Fishing Vessels."
An Act to make further provision respecting Weighers of Grain.
An Act to authorize the sale of the Carleton, City of Saint John, Branch Railroad.
An Act to authorize the conveyance to the Quebec Skating Club of certain Ordnance Lands in the city of Quebec.
An Act respecting grants of land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-West.
An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

LAND SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We would not feel disposed to adopt a maximum which might be found on investigation to be too severe; and if we adopted a liberal maximum, in all probability it would be found that a lower rate would be a fair rate, while parliamentary sanction would be given to a higher rate than would be charged under other circumstances. It would be simply an invitation to the company to charge a higher rate of toll than the Governor in Council might be disposed to sanction, and, besides, it would be putting this company in an exceptional position. We know that rates of tolls are subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and I think it would be in the public interest that this company should be left to be dealt with in the same way as other companies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to point out to the Minister of Justice that this company stands in a wholly different position from almost any other company that comes before us. In the first place, it is not a railway company at all. It is a coal company that is seeking, in order to promote its coal trade, to obtain railway powers and large grants of land; and, under these circumstances, stipulations and conditions may be justly imposed by Parliament which would not be advisable in the case of other railway companies. It is a coal company first and a railway company after. There is a great deal of force in what my hon. friend says as to the probable objects of the speculators—I believe they are nothing better—who control this road. However, my purpose was not so much to deal with that aspect of the question as with others and much more important ones. One of these is the extremely reckless and mischievous prodigality with which the Government have been dealing with land subsidies in the North-West. I turn to page 90 of the Public Accounts, and I find that, wholly apart from the huge grants which we have given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, we have, largely within the last two or three years, promised away over 24,000,000 acres in the North-West to a variety of railway companies, some of which may have some grounds for receiving them, but a great number of which are speculative companies. Now, 24,000,000 acres, the House must understand, is nearly 4,000,000 more than the whole occupied area of the Province of Ontario. I must say, for my part, that I have protested very often in this House against this practice, and I shall not allow a single subsidy to pass now without again calling the attention of the House and the country to the scandalous and shameful waste of our resources which is going on under the pretext of grants to these railway companies. Every man knows that the management of the North-West lands from first to last has been a scandal and a shame—that the pledges to the people of this country have been impudently broken, that of the huge sums of money promised us, not the first farthing has been realized; that, on the contrary, there are heavy deficits; and that the colonization of the country shows results the most deplorable. Under these circumstances, I am opposed in principle to granting one acre of land to these companies in future. I think we ought to call a halt, and this is a very good occasion for commencing it. And I have another thing to say: there has been no greater source of corruption than the grants of railway subsidies which have prevailed, contrary to our remonstrances and our

opposition in this Hou e, for a period of ten or twelve years back. dW have innumerable cases of the most gross an iu famous corruption practised by members of the former House and practised by members of the other Chamber with respect to railway subsidies : and it does not matter one straw whether they are subsidies in land or in money—before we grant another subsidy, in view of the facts as we now know them, in view of the disclosures with which this country is ringing, as to the way in which railway subsidies are used, we ought to insist on having the most perfect and absolute proofs of the *bon fides* of the projectors, of their honesty and probity, and of their ability to carry out, largely from their own resources, the railway projects which we are asked to assist. Now, we have not yet had any evidence as to who the projectors of this company are, or as to their means of building these 55 miles of railway ; and I think we ought to have that clearly established by the Minister of the Interior. We ought to be perfectly satisfied as to the character and the means of the men who are asking for 352,000 acres of land from the public : and, wholly part from that, we ought to consider very carefully what we are doing in thus further—I will not say plundering, although that has been the result in many cases—but in thus further depleting the public domain, under the circumstances. These are important points which the House should consider very carefully, and they are wholly apart from the point raised by my hon. friend, which also deserves separate discussion. Before we go on, I want the Minister of the Interior to state explicitly who these people are, what they have done to the present time, what amount has been subscribed by them, what amount they have paid in, and what warrant the hon. gentleman has—when he comes down to Parliament to ask for an area equal almost to two ridings in Ontario—that these men will build this railway in a reasonable time if the grant is given. Having established that point, it will become him to show that there are urgent grounds in the public interest why this great tract of land should be given to them ; and then we can discuss the other questions which have been raised by my hon. friend.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think that, when this Bill was up before, discussion of a similar character took place, and requests were made of the same nature as those made by the hon. member who has just spoken. I think I told him then who the old incorporators were. This is not a new company. It is a company which was organized and given a charter two or three years ago. A land grant was then given by this Parliament, and all we ask is to transfer the land from one branch to another. I then stated that the present owners of the charter had made arrangements with English financial gentlemen to go on with the work, and I mentioned that Mr. Alexander, of Calgary, a gentleman who is largely interested in financial operations in the West, had assured me that he and his friends were in a position to go on with the work of the road, and that the money was on hand for that purpose. A gentleman who was on his way back to England but had been to Calgary on some other business, looked into this work and agreed to take it up, and this is the letter I received from him, dated 12th May :

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

" SIR,—Referring to my interview with you yesterday morning, I have the honour to state that in the event of the necessary extension of the above charter being obtained in the present session of Parliament, together with the required alteration in the terms of the Order in Council, dealing with the land grant, the syndicate in England whom I represent will proceed at once with the construction of the line. The amount necessary for this purpose, which I at present estimate at $500,000, will be available as and when required. In case you should desire to satisfy yourself further as to this, I may mention that the solicitors to the syndicate are Messrs. Ashwest, Morris, Crisp & Company, of Throgmorton Avenue, London, who are in a position to supply any information on this point.

" Should you desire to know the *personnel* of the syndicate, Mr. George Alexander, of Calgary, will, I am sure, be happy to supply it.

" I have the honour to be,

" Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) " J. GODOLPHIN OSBORNE."

This letter I had when the objection was raised by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and I promised that I would get further information if he desired it. I then telegraphed Mr. Alexander that I thought it was advisable he should come down. He replied that he was just starting for Vancouver and would not be able to do so, but he cabled to his English partners, and I received from him this despatch :

" Have cabled London : reply received guaranteeing construction : financial ability absolute."

I subsequently got the following despatch from Mr. Alexander, giving the names of those who were interested with him :—

" Colonel Baldwin, of Lancashire, whose solicitors are Freshfields & Newman, of Bank of England : Surgeon General Whitla and Colonel Bassett, whose bankers are Cox & Co., Dr. Fyfe and Osborne : cable address, Avernment, London."

I felt quite satisfied from the conversation I had with Mr. Alexander, when he waited upon me with Mr. Osborne, whose letter I have read, as to the financial ability of the company, that the money, to the extent of $500,000, was waiting the passing of this resolution in order that the work might be at once commenced.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have seen a good many of these companies floated. These men may be solvent, respectable men, but I know how these matters are apt to be manipulated, particularly in the case of men residing in England, who go into these matters as a pure speculation. You may have very excellent men making just such communications as the hon. gentleman has read to us, and within a year, or a day, or a week, or a month, you may find that these same respectable, honourable gentlemen have sold out their interest to a company of speculators, to use a very mild term. I do not believe there is any security at all in such statements, unless they are accompanied by a handsome deposit in hard cash to be placed in the hands of the Government and forfeited in case of non-compliance.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Of course, the hon. gentleman knows that they do not get an acre of land until they finish the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that well enough. I know that the work must commence, but the practical result is that these lands are locked up, and that a kind of lien or claim is established, which may run from three to six years before it is finally demanded at the hands of the Government. I am not speaking now of the other question, as to the advisability of giving these huge

tracts of land to railway companies at all. That is a separate question. I am speaking now of the communication the hon. gentleman has read. From what I have heard of Mr. Alexander, I have reason to think, as far as my slight knowledge goes, that he himself is a man of some means, and probably a respectable person; but I object entirely to the principle of allowing these persons to obtain the control of these Orders in Council until some substantial deposit is put up. These things, we all know, have been hawked about, not merely in Canada and England, but in other countries; and the Order in Council gives them the power of selling the charter, as has been done time and again, with a grant of this kind attached, for a very considerable sum of money. And by various means and devices, which the hon. gentleman can easily understand, the promoters can entirely escape all responsibility. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that there has been an immense deal of traffic going on inside and outside this House in precisely such charters, with railway subsidies in money or railway subsidies in land attached. And although it may be true enough that, two years ago—before the eyes of the people were opened to the rights of Canada as fully as they are now and to the pranks that have been played with the aid of railway subsidies—this land grant was made, the time has come to turn over a new leaf and exact a penalty in case of failure, before we part with any more of our public domain to these companies.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I opposed the granting of this charter when the proposition to incorporate the company first came up, and I have seen no reason to change my views since. I do not think it is in the public interest, looking at the moneys granted to railways that were built in the North-West Territories, to undertake to stimulate railway construction further at present. I have never held to the view that it was proper, in cases where land subsidies were granted to railways, for the Government to part with control over the lands. Those lands, as soon as it was thought necessary to give them in aid of railways, ought to be retained in the control of the Government in order that they might be put on the market for settlement, and in order to prevent settlers being excluded, by speculative prices being fixed by railway corporations. Whatever views may have been entertained by hon. gentlemen on either side of the House years ago, with regard to the importance of giving land grants to railway companies for the purpose of securing the colonization and settlement of the country, our experience, during the past ten years, has gone far to show that the railway corporations which acquire lands are not necessarily excellent colonizers of these lands. Look at the immense tracts of land now held, as the hon. gentleman for South Oxford has already mentioned, by the various railway corporations to whom these lands have been granted, and see how very little has been done by them to secure the settlement of the country. Why, we were told that when large grants were made to the Canadian Pacific Railway we would not require immigration agents in Europe, that the best immigration agent we could get would be the railway company itself; that the company, in order to secure settlement of the land which had been granted to them and to convert their real estate into cash, would put forth extraordinary efforts to secure immigration and the occupation of their lands in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Will any hon. gentleman on that side of the House say that these expectations have at all been realized, that this colonization has gone forward, and that the lands of the railway company have been occupied, and that we have added large numbers to our population in consequence? The census which was recently brought down shows that that is not the case; it shows that these companies have not taken special pains to secure the settlement of the country, and it is not too much to say that if these grants had not been made there would have been a larger population there than there is at the present time. In fact, while a very much smaller territory might have been occupied by the settlers who went into Manitoba and the North-West, a very much denser and more satisfactory colonization would have taken place than that which has taken place under the existing arrangement. One of the things which I object to is the policy of scattering our population over an immense area. You can never advantageously occupy 700,000 or 800,000 square miles of territory with a small population. The attempt to do so will seriously affect the value of real estate throughout the Dominion, and will continue to do so as long as you pursue a policy of that kind. You have only to draw a small number of people from the older provinces, and you will immediately affect the value of real estate, because you have taken away the people who would be expected to buy up the local lands when they were put on the local market. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes to stimulate colonization at the foot of the Rocky Mountains. That is the meritorious object that the hon gentleman submits to this House, and he proposes to take 350,000 acres of land for the purpose of attaining that object, and these lands he assures us are not only well adapted to agriculture, but contain immense coal beds: the finest coal fields to be found in the Territories are to be found in those limits. I pressed upon the House, when the hon. gentleman first proposed this measure, and I press upon the House again, the importance of retaining control by the Crown of the minerals below the surface. So far as the actual settlement of the country is concerned and its occupation by an agricultural population, those mines may not be of any very great or immediate advantage to the farming population, but it is of the first consequence that these coal fields—hundreds of square miles of them—should not pass into the hands of speculative companies. Why, one of the most important things to the agriculturist and to the urban population of those territories is cheap fuel. How are they to have cheap fuel if you provide for the constitution of monopolies, if you make provision in advance, before these coal fields have acquired a great monetary value, that they shall go into the hands of a speculating class of the people, few in numbers, who are capable of combining and keeping up the prices enormously, as the prices are kept up at the present time? With the abundance of coal in the North-West Territories, there is no country in the world that ought to be furnished with fuel within reasonable distance of the railway cheaper than the people of the North-West Territories. There is no country in the world where fuel is so abundant, and at the same time so dear, as it is in those

territories. How can you expect to secure the colonization and settlement of those territories when you make it almost impossible for the agriculturist to produce enough from his fields to purchase sufficient fuel to prevent himself and his family from being frozen to death in the winter time? That is the policy which has been pursued for ten years, and that is the policy which I hope this House will at once put an end to. It ought not to be continued any longer. In Ontario and other provinces we derive large amounts of revenue towards the Provincial Administration, from our forests. There is nothing of that kind in the North-West, but there are large beds of coal. If the Crown retains control of these, and, when provinces are established there, passes the royalty in these mines over to the Provincial Governments, they may from a moderate charge raise a considerable portion of the revenue required to carry on their affairs. But you throw that away; you abandon it without any advantage to the country, and at the same time you impose great burdens on the population, because you give it to men who are enabled, because it is a necessity for the people, to charge exorbitant prices for it; so that, instead of their ownership being an advantage to the people, it becomes a serious detriment to the settlement of the country. I think the time has come when we should cease to look after the interests of monopolists and those who are simply seeking their own interests, and when we should give some little attention to the well-being of the people at large. If we do that, we must change our policy. We must make a change which is little short of revolution. If you find it necessary to grant lands in aid of railway corporations, retain control of the land and give them the assurance that the proceeds up to a certain amount shall become the property of the company, but do not give them control of the lands and allow them to charge exorbitant prices and so exclude settlers for years. That is what you propose to do. But, if you part with the lands at all, retain control of these mines. They ought not to be in the hands of the railway corporation, but should be free to anyone who chooses to invest capital to acquire an interest in, and work them for the general benefit of the population that may settle there. You give up all control, you abandon all right, you pass both lands and mines over to a corporation that puts none of its own money into the business, but simply undertakes to raise the amounts for the purpose of constructing the roads out of the amount of capital that you have in this form placed at its disposal, and which it can pledge to those from whom the money is obtained. And so you do serious injury to the country. It is infinitely better that that country should not have a settler for years to come than that it should pass into the hands of men who will do nothing to promote settlement, or will do so only in order to make enormous gains for themselves. Let us see that the lands are occupied where railways are already built and the lands are already opened to settlement. There are hundreds of square miles and millions of acres near the railways now waiting for settlement. Why should we waste the lands of the country in order to obtain more roads, when you have so many lands lying waste along the roads already built? Why go on imposing additional burdens, diminishing the population and the value of real estate, and impoverishing the people? Look at the census. Will not the ten years' experience of the census teach the members of this House something? We should change our policy, and it is of the utmost importance that we should make no further grant to railways out of the public domain without a careful consideration of the whole question. The hon. the Minister of Justice has said that, so far as the rates and charges are concerned, the public are sufficiently protected by the power which the Governor in Council possesses. Well, Sir, in some portions of this Dominion parties are charged five, six, and as high as seven cents a mile for travelling on railways. We had it argued here not long ago that half a cent, or less than half a cent, per ton per mile on freights, was a paying rate on the Intercolonial Railway, and yet you have as high as five cents a ton per mile charged on some of the roads of this Dominion. Why has not the Government interfered? Why have not reasonable rates being fixed? Why has not an Order in Council been passed? Because the power that the Governor in Council possesses is not adequate to meet the requirements of the public in this particular. I say, Mr. Chairman, that if the hon. gentleman carries out his threat and withdraws his Bill for this session, at least it will be to the general advantage of the country.

Mr. WATSON. I think this is a matter for the serious consideration of the House and the Government. We are told by the Minister of Justice that the Governor in Council, or the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, have power to regulate the rates charged by railroads. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he can point to any one instance where the Government have interfered with the rates submitted to them for consideration? I have never learned of a case. But I would inform the hon. gentleman that the Canadian Pacific Railway is allowed to charge 1½ cents a ton per mile for carrying coal on the long haul in Manitoba, for about 450 miles. I certainly think, with the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that when we are making a land grant to this company this House should ask for a cash deposit as a guarantee of good faith that they will go on and construct that work. The Government have already had two or three instances where they would find it very convenient if there was some deposit made, or some penalty provided, to compel railway companies to operate their roads. Take the Great North-Western Railway, a railway whose charter and history this House is familiar with, a railway which has been before this House for the last ten or eleven years; 50 miles of this road was built years ago, and it is not operated to day. The farmers through that section of country have abundant harvests, they had an abundant harvest last year, but there was no locomotives run over that track, and not a car load of freight was taken over that road. Still, we give a large land grant to that company. No penalties are hanging over them that they would have to pay for not operating the road. I do think, at this particular time, with these evidences before us, we should guard ourselves against giving any other company such privileges as the Great North-Western Company have received, when we gave them large tracts of land without taking some guarantee that they would build and operate that road. Then

we ought to fix the maximum rate. We are told by the Minister of Justice that the Government have that power. Well, I would be liberal with this company and would give them a much better paying rate than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated was a paying rate over the Intercolonial Railway. It can be clearly shown that these companies who have received land grants from this Government have not given back to the public the expected benefits for the gifts they have received. Take, for instance, the Galt Coal Company. We subsidized a railroad from Dunmore to Lethbridge for the purpose of encouraging that company to open and develop the coal region of that section, and what has been the result? I asked this House to fix a maximum rate on coal over that line, but such was not done, and what do we find? We find that the coal is simply held as a monopoly, and although there may be some who get coal in this region of the Lethbridge coal mine, still we have no advantage from it. That railway in the west simply gives the Galt Coal Company a monopoly over the line upon which that coal is carried, a road subsidized by this Government. Now, in looking over the Auditor General's Report it will be interesting to see the prices of coal at different points on the railroad. You will find, Mr. Chairman, that the price of coal from the west is only regulated by the competition of coal from the east. For instance, I find at Calgary the price of hard coal is $19.35 a ton. This price is paid by the Government for coal for the use of the Mounted Police. Why they should ship hard coal into a coal region is something I cannot understand. I think the coal in that region should be sufficiently good for the use of the Mounted Police. We find that at Calgary, for soft coal, they pay $8.50 per ton. Now, you would naturally suppose that in coming east to Regina coal would be dearer. The distance from the Lethbridge coal mines to Calgary is about 150 miles, and coal is $8.50 per ton. The distance from the Lethbridge coal mines to Regina is about 375 miles, and the price at Regina is $8.25, or 25 cents a ton cheaper than it is on the short distance to Calgary for the same quality of coal. Then we find in Winnipeg, a distance of about 800 miles from the Lethbridge coal mines, the same coal is sold for $7 per ton, or $1.50 cheaper than at Calgary, which is only about 150 miles distant from the coal mines, showing clearly that we are practically giving a monopoly of the coal mines to this railway enterprise, and we are actually giving them a land grant to assist in maintaining that monopoly. I do say that this House should fix a maximum rate for carrying coal. If we are to give them a land grant, in the first place, I should ask some guarantee from the company to which we give that land grant, that they should build that road, equip it and operate it within a given time, as we are giving them a large franchise, we are giving them a valuable tract of country. I am informed that the section of country through which this road is going to pass from Calgary to Red Deer is a level prairie. Now, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated the other night that coal could be carried at a profit from Springhill coal mines, in Nova Scotia, to the Londonderry iron works, at a rate of half a cent per mile, where they have snow to contend with and other obstacles of the kind; but where this road will run they have little or no snow. I question if they will be bothered once by a snow storm during the whole season. I do think we should fix a maximum rate: I think we ought to ask that guarantee, and certainly if we give this land grant we should ask the Government to fix a maximum rate. I beg leave to move that the following provision be added:—

Provided always, that in consideration of such grant of land the railway company shall not be entitled to charge more than one cent per ton per mile for each ton of coal carried over this road in car lots.

I think that is a fair proposition, and a fair condition to be attached to this Bill, when we are informed that coal may be carried over the Intercolonial Railway for half a cent a ton per mile at a profit. Although we have given a practical monopoly to the Galt Coal Company, there is no reason why we should follow that up by giving a monopoly to this other company. We know what the results have been of giving a monopoly to the Galt Coal Company: they have exercised their full monopoly, and charged more for their coal, close to the coal mines, than they do seven or eight hundred miles distant. This coal company will do the same thing if they have the power, and will probably combine with the other company. We should guard against giving any corporation such extensive powers as this corporation will obtain, to whom we are granting so large a tract of the public domain. From the description of the country I have obtained I believe the land grant alone will be sufficient to build the road. If that is the case, we are practically building the road for the company, giving it the coal lands, and also a monopoly. It is the bounden duty of the House, and particularly of the members from Manitoba and the North-West, for we in Manitoba are as much interested in coal development and cheap coal as are the people in the North-West, to carefully consider this a question, and I expect before the debate closes to hear from the members from the North-West, particularly the member for Calgary, who knows exactly what the people pay for coal and knows what it would cost to deliver. I question whether coal cannot be teamed by cart from Lethbridge coal mines to Calgary and delivered successfully in competition with coal laid down by rail. If such is the case, the members from the North-West should bring their influence to bear to lead the Government to adopt the amendment which I have moved to be added to the Bill.

Mr. TISDALE. In all the numerous charters granted for the development of the North-West, and of all the numerous charters that have been granted in the territories in the United States, the hon. gentleman will fail to find a parallel to the clause he proposes to be added to this Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will find plenty of such clauses in Acts of the Ontario Legislature—such clauses having reference to the carrying of cordwood.

Mr. WATSON. You will find the legislation passed, not in Manitoba, but in Ontario, that where bonuses were given to a railway company the company were compelled to carry cordwood at certain rates. If that is the case in regard to the carrying of cordwood in Ontario, why should not such a condition apply to the North-West Territories in regard to coal rates? That is all we desire to accomplish. We have had experience in the North-West in regard to this matter, owing to conditions not having been attached to charters in the past.

We have in my country a railroad that received $6,400 per mile, whose charter was before the House for years, and was at length proceeded with by a company that succeeded in obtaining the land grant for over 450 miles—I refer to the Great North-West Central. Although the road has been constructed two years, not a bushel of wheat was carried over it last year, and although we have the promises of the promoters, it is very questionable whether the road will be able to carry the crop out of the country this year. With that experience before us, we should be guarded as to the future. Now is the time to act, when a company is coming here and asking for a land grant, and when certain conditions can be attached to it. If the Minister of Marine was correct in his statement the other day, and I have no reason to doubt its accuracy, coal is carried on the Intercolonial Railway in Nova Scotia at half a cent per mile, and if that can be done over the Government road, and under more difficulties than are met with by a railway in the North-West running through a prairie country, we are not imposing too severe conditions when, in giving a land grant, we provide that the company shall carry coal at a rate equal to double the rate charged by the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman, if he had examined the laws of Ontario, would find that when any such conditions were imposed they were imposed under different circumstances and for different reasons than have been suggested. The only cases in which such were imposed were those in which the request was made by the promoters to help them in getting money from municipalities, or as the result of a bargain with municipalities for money grants upon such conditions. In not a single case in Ontario will the hon. gentleman find that the Provincial Government imposed, or desired to impose, any such conditions. Further, if the hon. gentleman will inform himself respecting the territories of the United States, where hon. gentlemen opposite frequently claim they are more intelligent in regard to promoting settlement and making favourable terms to settlers, what will he find? He will find that in addition to these grants, special powers are given, exempting the companies from the ordinary railway Acts, and authorizing them to charge 4, 5 or 6 cents per mile for a certain number of years. I do not suppose the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) will go the length of proposing that no aid be given to these railway lines for the development of the North-West Territories.

Mr. WATSON. I will go that far, unless you impose conditions.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman is against making land grants to railways in the Territories?

Mr. WATSON. Unless they are going to benefit the general public.

Mr. TISDALE. So the hon. gentleman is in favour of them under certain circumstances. He may accept whichever horn of the dilemma he pleases. What is the hon. gentleman's proposition? I know that as regards all the charters heretofore granted for railways to be built in the North-West Territories, no such condition as is suggested has been imposed. Further, I will tell the hon. gentleman that the means whereby the price of coal is reduced is by competition. This is the first time that a railway receiving Government aid is attempted to be burdened by impracticable conditions. If the hon. gentleman knew anything about financing and constructing railways he would be aware that such conditions would prohibit the building of the proposed road. It is all very well to say that other people stand ready to build the road with such conditions attached. The proof that the contrary is the case is that no such road has ever been built with such conditions attached; no sensible men would under such circumstances build a road, and no sensible capitalist in any money market would purchase bonds with such conditions, because you cannot look into the future and tell what their effect would be on the road. The adoption of such conditions would simply mean that the road would not be constructed. If the hon. gentleman desires to obstruct the building of this road in the interests of a rival scheme, very well. I am speaking in entire ignorance of anything connected with the road except the charter and the charter of similar roads granted by this Parliament; and I am aware that a number of such companies have had land grants given to them, but the roads have never been constructed, for they were unable to build the lines even with the assistance of such grants. I believe that most of the members from the older provinces support these Bills for railways in the North-West on the ground that they promote settlement and prove advantageous to the Territories. It is very difficult for the Territories, as the hon. member for Marquette should know, to obtain capital for such enterprises. I am quite sure he would be one of the last to invest in the undertaking now under consideration if it were burdened with the onerous conditions he suggests, conditions that no Legislature in this country, or in the adjoining country, has ever imposed on a pioneer railway. Such action simply means the obstruction of the undertaking to such an extent that I do not believe responsible men would enter upon it or be able to float their bonds, and the attachment of such conditions, therefore, practically amounts to a rejection of the scheme. Unless the hon. gentleman can give some better reason why these conditions should be imposed his amendment should be rejected. What has been the result of railways getting into the coal lands? It has been to make coal cheaper. I know that the price of coal in the North-West has fallen more than 50 per cent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. TISDALE. I hold that this House should give fair-play and justice to these railway enterprises. The people of the North-West are interested in seeing that they are placed on such a basis that there is a reasonable chance of the roads being constructed. That is really the object of making these grants, and if we load them up with conditions that are unfair and unjust, the roads cannot be built; and surely it is rather early in the day, when these roads are necessary to the development and settlement of the country, to needlessly throw obstacles in their way, for it must be remembered that, unless there is something different in our North-West from other countries, the more railways constructed in the coal regions the cheaper coal will become. That has been the effect in the United States. The Government, states, counties and cities, have assisted the mining roads and

those roads owned by mining companies. Has not the result been to make coal cheaper every year in the United States? Has coal ever been cheaper there than it is to day? If we want to have our coal mines opened we must aid the building of railways into our coal regions, and not impose conditions that will obstruct their building or operation.

Mr. DALY. I desire to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) and as to his amendment. I think his amendment is ridiculous on the face of it. This line of railway is only 56 miles long, and he proposes to impose this restriction on that railway, in favour, he says, of the interests of the people of Manitoba. He tells us that coal cannot be got from Calgary to Winnipeg unless it travels 800 or 900 miles over the Canadian Pacific Railway: and I would like to know, under the circumstances, how any portion of the people of Manitoba could be benefited by this. The people of Calgary at the terminus of the 56 miles of railway might be benefited, but there would be no benefit conferred on any others. The imposition which the hon. gentleman wishes to put upon this railway of 56 miles would not benefit anybody except those living at the terminus of the road. It would not lessen the freight on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, therefore, as I said before, the proposition is ridiculous on the face of it. It is ridiculous to pretend that you will cheapen coal in the Province of Manitoba by imposing a restriction on this line of railway. I do not wish to follow the hon. gentleman in the very rambling remarks he has made, or to reply to the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), or to the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), because the people of Manitoba know too well the opinions these hon. gentlemen have of our country, and the efforts they have made to injure it, session in and session out, for the last five years in this House. I can tell these hon. gentlemen that their remarks will be received by the people of the territories and Manitoba with all the weight they call for. I am perfectly satisfied, so far as our people are concerned, that, as the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has said, when our railways increase and the country develops so the coal will become cheaper. We can get coal to-day at $10 per ton cheaper than we could buy it in Brandon eight years ago, and so, year after year the prices will become less. The proposition of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) would simply apply to a railway 56 miles long, and to get coal to the town I live in, it would have to be carried some 800 miles over another line of railway, so that the imposition he seeks to impose could not in any way cheapen the coal.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) says that he does not wish to follow me in my rambling remarks, and probably the less he says about this matter the better for himself among his constituents. The hon. gentleman admits that coal has got to be carried over a distance of 800 miles to Winnipeg, where I have shown that coal is sold at $7 per ton, and I would like to ask him what freight the Canadian Pacific Railway gets on that coal coming from the west, when it is delivered at Winnipeg at $7 per ton? It is the rates which the coal company take advantage of on their own line of railway, in delivering that coal to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which increases the price of coal; and because we find that the Canadian Pacific Railway must carry that coal 800 miles over their road at a rate of about half a cent per ton per mile coming east. The coal at Dunmore would only be worth about $3 per ton, and then it is delivered in Winnipeg for $4 more, which is a rate of about half a cent per ton per mile. I think that will clearly show that the extra dollar, if there is an extra dollar charged, is charged by the company which has a monopoly of the coal mine, and of the railway which delivers that coal to the Canadian Pacific Railway. It may seem inconsistent to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway charged 1½ cents per ton per mile from Port Arthur west, but they do charge that; and if we get any advantage at all from the fact that we have coal mines developed in the west it is because there are a large number of merchants in different towns along the Canadian Pacific Railway who bring in American coal, and that coal is sold in competition with our coal and reduces the prices. I say that we are deriving no benefits from the land grants we have given to assist these coal companies in the North-West. I may state to the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) that I am opposed to granting any public aid to any corporation, unless the public are to receive some benefit from it. I am not here as an advocate or champion for railway corporations. I am here to advocate the interests of my constituents and the general public. I take it for granted that the railway companies have men at their head who are quite able to take care of themselves, and it is our business as representatives of the people to see that the interests of the general public are looked after, and to see that the public domain is not given away without doing any good to the country. It is our duty to prevent that our valuable lands in the North-West shall not be given away to private individuals for the purposes of speculation. The hon. gentleman has stated that railways cannot be built even with the land subsidies now received, but that is simply because the original promoters of these companies who have got the land grants want too much of a bonus from practical men who would build the road. We very well remember the old story of the boodle boy Beaty. He wanted too much for the "boy," and would not leave anything for the men who were actually building the road There has been too much of that kind of thing going on in this Dominion; there has been too much speculation going on by individuals at the public expense. I am elected in this House for the purpose of advocating what I consider the interest of the general public and the interest of my constituents, and that is the course I intend to pursue here. I believe that the amendment now before the House is fair and just, and I believe we should ask this railway company to carry that coal at a rate not exceeding one cent per ton per mile. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) says that this is a short line of road, but I point out to him that it is not as short as the road between the Springhill mines and the Londonderry iron works. That is a road of only 27 miles, I think, and yet we were informed the other night that even that short piece of road carried coal for the Londonderry iron works at half a cent per ton per mile, and that the rate paid. If a road 27 miles long can carry coal at half a cent per ton per mile, surely a road 50 miles in length can carry it for that rate and

make a profit; but still I am generous enough to propose that the maximum rate shall be one cent per ton per mile.

Mr. SPROULE. It must be apparent to any one, and especially to the people of Ontario, who use railways extensively, that the proposition made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) is absurd. If we compare the rates which he proposes to subject this railway to with the rates that are being paid in Ontario at the present time, it will be seen how absurd his proposition is. Let us take the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I think it will be acknowledged that we can make a fair comparison on it with respect to the rates in the Province of Ontario. In that province, where they have so much freight to carry, they are charging in my own part of the country from $20 to $22 a car for 92 miles; whereas, the rate proposed by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) would be only $6 per car for 50 miles.

Mr. WATSON. What kind of freight is that?

Mr. SPROULE. Wheat, if you like, or coal, or any freight of that kind. It is $20 to $22 per car for 90 miles; and yet the hon. gentleman proposes to allow only $6 a car for 50 miles. That would be about one-third what they charge in the Province of Ontario, where railway competition is so active compared with the North-West. If this were a long haul I have no doubt that the proposition of the member for Marquette would be a reasonable one, but for a railway 50 miles long in the North-West it is absurd. The hon. gentleman said that bonuses or support was given to railway companies in Ontario, and that a similar provision was inserted in their charters. We made a provision of that kind in our county, but our experience was that the provision was practically no good. We found that the railway company did not live up to it, and that, although it was made, we might just as well have never attempted to have it enforced, because it was impossible to enforce it, and the railway company entirely ignored it. The railway company assured us that if they were compelled to carry out that provision they would never have built the road. I believe that the case would be similar in the North-West. If you impose such restrictions upon a company, which must raise money to build the road, they would simply withdraw from the project altogether, and the people of that country would be left without a road for perhaps a long time to come. In view of the urgent necessity for railroads in the North-West, it is important that we should impose as few restrictions as possible, because if any restrictions of this kind are imposed, people will not put their money into the enterprise, and the North-West will have to do without the railways. I think if this amendment were adopted there would be no railway built in the present case. More than that, I believe that one cent per ton per mile would never pay on a short road like this.

Mr. WATSON. What rate do you think would pay?

Mr. STEVENSON. The Grand Trunk charges 60 cents a ton for 30 miles.

Mr. WATSON. That is a monopoly.

Mr. STEVENSON. If it is a monopoly, you have it all over.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. CHARLTON. The system of granting railway subsidies which the Government have hitherto pursued is well illustrated in the case we are discussing here to-day. The position has frequently been taken on this side of the House that the granting of speculative charters to companies for railways that would not be built till some time in the future was an abuse. Now, it may be, as the Minister of the Interior represents, that the promoters of this railway—this Mr. Alexander and those associated with him—mean in good faith to go on now and construct this railway. But I have here the original charter of this Red Deer Valley Railway Company, which was granted by this House a little over two years ago, and assented to on the 26th day of March, 1889; and I should judge from the names of the incorporators that the charter was of the character that we have so often condemned—one obtained by these parties without any intention of building the road. They have now parted with their franchise for some consideration or other, and possibly the people who have purchased the charter from these speculators may intend to build the road. Who were the original incorporators of this railway? I find their names in the charter, 52 Victoria, chapter 52. We have first the name of Joseph Ick Evans, a saloon keeper, I believe, of the city of Toronto.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He is dead; leave him alone.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, he was not dead when our friends on the other side of the House gave him the charter. Then there was Daniel McFarlane. I do not know him; he may be a capitalist or a railway constructor. Then there was J. T. Johnston; this may be the man who figured here before a committee the other day as having sold wares to the Printing Bureau.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. If he did so, it would be as legitimate a business as that of charter brokerage. Henry Percy Withers was another incorporator; John Bain, a Toronto Tory lawyer and a defeated Government candidate, was another. These were the incorporators; and what kind of a company is this to have a railway charter and 6,400 acres of land a mile given to it? Had the Government any assurance that these men would build the road?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; they spent $20,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. They could not have had any idea that they would build the road; but they were friends of the Government, and they were placed in a position to control the charter, and to make the best terms they could at such time as men would be found willing to buy the charter and build the road. We are told that the men now controlling the charter intend to go on and construct this road. If so, it is for us to consider what restriction we ought to place upon them in the public interest in making them this grant. This road, I understand, is to be built through a prairie country where its cost will not exceed in all probability $10,000 a mile, without the cost of equipment; so that we are proposing to give them a grant of land, the value of which, at $2 per acre, is more than sufficient to compensate them for building the road. If we are to give the company the means of building the railway, I think it behooves us to consider care-

fully what conditions we had better impose for the protection of the public interest in making the grant. My hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) pointed out that this was a mere trading company, a company owning coal lands and mines, and having power to acquire other coal lands; and as they might find other coal lands in this land grant, it was necessary to impose some restriction as to the rate which they might charge for carrying coal, because if this is not done they will be able to freeze out all competitors in the coal-mining industry. It does not matter whether they do this by charging undue rates for carrying coal over their line, or by raising the price of the coal at the pit's mouth; it all goes into their own pocket. It does not matter whether they rob Peter to pay Paul, or rob Paul to pay Peter, so long as they are the owners of both Peter and Paul. Therefore, if we give this 352,000 acres of land for the purpose of enabling them to develop their coal lands, we should profit by the experience that we had in the case of the Caraquet Railway, which we endowed for the purpose of enabling my hon. friend from New Brunswick to develop his timber limits, and we had better impose some restrictions in the public interest. The question is, what will be a fair rate for the transportation of coal over this road? If a cent a ton a mile is not enough, make it a cent and a-half; but if we can ascertain what will be a fairly remunerative rate, in my opinion, when we are investing the company with all the means they will require for constructing the road, it is necessary and proper in the public interest that we should restrict them as to the rates they should charge; and I think that the Minister of the Interior ought not to object to a proper restriction being placed upon them. In addition to this, I believe another restriction should be imposed. It is the interest of all the people of the North-West that the lands which we are proposing to grant to this company should be sold at such a rate that settlers will buy them, and settle upon them. If the railway company hold these lands at a price above the rate at which settlers can afford to buy them for the time being, and wait for settlers to settle on the even sections, and thus make valuable the odd sections held by the railway company, the settlement of the country will be retarded. Therefore, in addition to fixing a maximum rate for carrying coal, we should fix a maximum rate at which these lands shall be sold, say $3 an acre, which would give the company a handsome profit over the cost of the construction of the road and the cost of selling the land. The Government should take proper precautions and require the proper safeguards in this matter for protecting the public interest. When a land grant is made, there should be restrictions as to the maximum rate at which the lands may be sold and as to the rates of freight to be charged. Having taken these precautions, we will have done what may be required of us by the settlers and the people. If we fail to do that, we endow a speculative company with the means to build lines and leave the settlers unprotected against any excessive rates that the company may charge for carrying freight or for its lands. The hon. gentleman who represents the division in which Calgary is situated is present, and perhaps that gentleman will speak on behalf of his constituents and urge upon the Government, as he ought, the necessity, in the interests of his district generally, of their imposing restrictions on this company, both as to the rates of freight they may charge for transportation of coal over the line and the prices they may demand for their land. I am sure the hon. member for Alberta will urge upon the Government the propriety and necessity of protecting the interests of the people he represents.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It is quite evident that in this House there is a sufficiency of advocates of railways, but rather a deficiency of those who understand the feelings of the public with regard to what they are now called on to pay for the benefit they derive from railways. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) was slightly unfortunate in his reference to the Western States, because he must know well that the railways there, which were largely aided by Government assistance, charged such exorbitant rates upon the productions of the farmers that the people rose in rebellion and brought about a complete revolution in railway matters in the United States, and these matters are to-day regulated there by a commission. That is a system I devoutly wish we had in existence in this country. All this talk about railway competition is pure theory; experience has shown that it has no practical existence. We have two great railway corporations in this country, and I would like any hon. gentleman to mention a single instance in which the competition between them has been of any benefit to the public as regards their rates of freight. The evil is a crying one, one we are beginning to feel every year more acutely; and, when certain questions now greatly exciting public attention have ceased to occupy the position they do in the public mind this question of railway rates will come before the country as one of paramount importance. The day is not far distant when it will be forced upon the attention of this House, just as it was forced on the attention of Congress by the people of the Western States, where a complete rebellion broke out against the power which the railways had enjoyed under the old system, which had been productive of the most baneful results. Of course, the case under discussion is a special one, and I think the arguments of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) are reasonable. We have had a good deal of experience, up to the present, of the management of railways; that experience has not been altogether satisfactory, and the time has come when we should entirely revise our system of granting railway charters. I hope the Government will take this matter seriously into consideration. It will be well for us, supplied as the country is now with railways, to consider, in granting future charters, whom we are granting them to and what are the prospects of those who have these charters in their hands of doing more than make a mere speculation out of them. This matter requires special attention, more particularly as regards the North-West. Railway charters are not so much now asked for in the older provinces, but even there a great deal of careful revision is required; and in the North-West Territories, where we have expended a very large portion of our lands by means of grants every year, we ought to be exceedingly careful as to the parties to whom we make further grants, to the manner in which they are to be used. Certainly

in a Bill of this kind, dealing with a railway specially intended to carry an article of such general use as coal, in which for many years there will be an absolute monopoly, it is not unreasonable that we should, when giving these people aid to build the road, take every precaution to see that they will not use the monopoly in an unreasonable manner. The proposition is a reasonable one, and one the Government ought to accept.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to be able to agree thoroughly in the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. Any railway charter is, in the nature of it, more or less of a monopoly, because it necessarily monopolizes for some years the transportation in the district it serves; and in a thinly-settled country, which the railway is intended to develop, the monopoly may be looked upon as absolute for at least a long time. I think, therefore, we will be justified in making provision to protect those who are necessarily subject to this monopoly. I think more, we would not only be justified in doing so, but it is our duty to do so. The very franchise creates a monopoly, and the creation of that monopoly brings about on our part the responsibility, to see that the monopoly we have granted is not injurious to anybody interested. But in a case like this, where there is a treble monopoly, our duty is very much clearer and stronger than an ordinary case. This company not only are to own the railway, but they own the coal mines whose product is to be carried by them, and they are to own a very large proportion of the land on both sides. They will have a complete monopoly of the transportation of that coal, and a monopoly in the possession of half the land adjacent to the road. Under all these circumstances, our duty to restrict the operations of the monopoly becomes very strong indeed. The hon. member for North Norfolk thinks that we ought to restrict also the rates to be charged for the land. This is a very salutary and reasonable proposition, although it is not directly involved in the motion now before us, but it is reasonable to suppose that when the Government grant to a railway, and the railway accepts, so many acres of land, the value attached to that land at the time by both parties being accepted as a sufficiency, and being that on which the company base their calculations, it would not be unreasonable to provide that should the land acquire a higher value that increase in value would go, not to the company, but to the Government or to the settler. It is unreasonable when we give a railway company practically all the means of constructing the road, that the company should have all the profits arising from the land itself. In fact, the land grant should be looked upon rather in the light of a guarantee of a certain sum on the part of the Government than in the light of an absolute gift. This principle has been applied—I may say, turned round and applied—in the terms arranged between the Government and the Calgary and Edmonton and Regina and Long Lake and Hudson Bay Railway, in which the Government, after making a land grant, have agreed to advance certain sums to these companies on the security of that land grant and resume the land if the company is not able to pay the advances. This shows the intention on both sides to regard the land grant rather as a guarantee that the company should be put in funds to construct the road than as a clear present to do what they like with afterwards. I think we should establish the principle that, when we give land grants to companies, they should be looked upon as a trust or a guarantee rather than an actual gift. The late discussions as to giving land grants and as to the commutation of grants in different provinces call our attention more strongly to this matter and would lead us to believe that on the whole the most advantageous arrangement for the Government and the one most calculated to promote the settlement of the country would be to substitute cash grants for the land grants or to give a guarantee which would allow the company to float their bonds, reserving to the Government the right to dispose of the lands at such increased prices as they might bring, or, if they saw fit, and believed it would be more for the benefit of the country, to give them away to settlers. It is a very grave responsibility which the Government assumes when it surrenders forever the right to say what the policy shall be in regard to the disposal of these lands and at what prices the public domain in any district is to be disposed of. By adopting the suggestions made, that of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson), that the company should be restricted from pushing their powers of monopoly beyond the bounds of justice, and that of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), by which either the Government might secure any profits which might be made upon these lands or the settler might be assured of having them at a certain fixed rate, we would be doing what is right and just in dealing with a company so favoured as this is. As to the actual price at which freight rates for coal should be fixed, I am not in a position to speak, but one thing is clear, that this company must be able to carry the coal much more cheaply than any ordinary railway company. Of course, a company which has the monopoly of the production of coal and the monopoly of its transportation, which burns its own coal and uses its own locomotives and cars in moving its own coal, must be able to do it cheaper than an ordinary company that has to buy its coal from the mine owner for the purpose of transporting other coal. If we ascertain the prices at which other companies carry coal at a profit and fix that as a maximum, we are not only doing no injustice to the company but leaving them a considerable margin of profit. Under these circumstances, I shall vote for the amendment of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson), and I would urge most strongly on the Government the necessity of considering this whole question of monopoly in connection with railway charters. It has become a very grave and serious question, not only in the United States, but in Canada. We have only two main lines in Canada for purposes of competition. Monopoly is felt all over the country, and it is contrary to the genius of the age, and to the genius of Canada in particular, to allow monopoly to exist unrestrained. I think it is one of the most serious questions which should engage the attention of the Government, in dealing with railways, how far they can restrain the exercise of monopoly powers by them, and more especially by such as receive Government assistance.

Mr. DICKEY. I think it is admitted that this company has the monopoly of the mine as well as the railway, and, therefore, I think the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) will take nothing by

the amendment he proposes. It is a mere matter of book-keeping, when the company has a monopoly of the supply of coal.

Mr. WATSON. There is a lot of coal all round there.

Mr. DICKEY. I understand that there are four coal mines there, but no company is operating them at present. I think there is a good deal in what the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) says as to monopoly, but it must be evident that that is a matter which can only be dealt with after careful consideration, and only by treating all railways in the country alike. If a land grant to this railway is right, by all means let the House grant it. If it is wrong, let the House refuse to grant it. But, if we give it, let us give it fairly and honourably, and not put a stigma on this railway which is not put on any other railway in the country. The United States has been referred to. The hon. member for Muskoka knows that the system adopted in the United States was only arrived at after a commission had carefully considered all the points and had received the evidence of experts. The hon. gentleman does not know whether one cent a ton per mile is sufficient. The gentleman who spoke last (Mr. Casey) admitted that he did not know what the rate should be, and yet I suppose he will vote for a proposition, of the reasonableness of which he knows nothing. That shows that the proposition is unfair as applied to this railway alone in Canada. It should only be moved after consideration by experts who would decide what is a fair rate and what are fair regulations. I, therefore, think the Committee should not seriously consider this amendment.

Mr. DAVIN. This is a very small question in itself, but a very large question has been raised and to some extent discussed. That question is the relation of railways in this country to public convenience and even to public liberty. I will deal for a moment with the question as it affects the North-West. I am very much interested to see the extreme sympathy that is always shown in this House for the poor railways and the poor railway projectors. Sir, there is an element of great danger for all Canada in what is always manifested in this House and in committees of this House whenever a railway question comes up. I should like, in order that the people of Canada would have a moral picture of what this House is, to have the men who are connected with railways, who are solicitors or prospective solicitors for railway companies, or who are shareholders in railways or directors of railways, eliminated, and, if you eliminated them I fancy you would have a very small residuum indeed of men who could apply their minds without bias to such a large question as has been raised here to-day. I should be very glad indeed if I could persuade myself that, if parties crossed the House and my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) were occupying the place of the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Dewdney), and if he were proposing the scheme which has been proposed to day by the member for Eastern Assiniboia, if I could lay the flattering unction to my soul, and, what is much more important, to the soul of the people of this country, if I could persuade myself that my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), and my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson), would then stand up and criticise with the same adverse insight the proposal of the hon. member for Bothwell as they have criticised the proposal of the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Dewdney). Now, Sir, my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) is a very old friend of mine, but when a railway question comes up he invariably takes the side of these poor railway people. What is the experience, after all, in the North-West? Sir, I may say that I will qualify my statement by saying that there is no admiration too high, in my opinion, for the patriotism shown by Mr. Van Horne towards the country and towards his line. As a fact, he has not taken advantage of the monopoly that he possesses. Farmers have admitted to myself, when we have been discussing it, that he has run that line as near as ever he could in the interest of the North-West. But, Sir, the fact that he, a very wise and far-seeing man, a man of forecast, a man who has had large experience in western railways—the fact that he has behaved in that way is no reason, when we are discussing a question of this kind, why we should not take safeguards against mismanagement, against avarice and greed. The member for South Norfolk points us—it is a standing argument that I am utterly sick of; we hear it on all hands—we hear it in the press, we hear from all sorts of benches—to the experience of the western states. In the name of Heaven, Sir, has not the schoolmaster been abroad for a sufficient length of time, that when we are dealing with a large question affecting the interests of Canada we cannot apply our reason to the conditions that exist without asking ourselves what is done in the western states of America, or what has been done in Canada? I rather think that what has been done in the past in Canada is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. I rather think that what we should do now is to look to our past in order, not to imitate that past, but to take the honey out of the dead lion, to take the honey out of the carcass that lies there on the road of our history, and learn from the better experience of the past a lesson for the future. Why, Sir an original idea, a new idea, a fruitful idea, from a prominent politician in Canada would almost strike one like lightning from a summer sky. Read the history of the Administrations of Canada; take the men who composed those Administrations; take the plans they have given us for the benefit of the country, and I say that if you found one fruitful scheme dealing with any question of public interest it would strike one as a marvel in itself. Sir, I am not to be led off the question right before us by being told what they do in the Western States. Let me tell my hon. friend who is so well acquainted with what takes place in the Western States, that they give grants to railways, not directly from the Federal Government, not even when they have territories, but they give grants through the legislatures of those states and territories, and in that way the legislatures have kept a lien on the railways. Now, what is the fact in regard to the price of coal in the North-West. Every word that is said by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) about the price of coal is perfectly correct. We have given a franchise to the Galt Coal Company, we have given them a mine of great value, we have made them rich men, merchants and princes and kings in the land—that is what we have done with them. I might quote the language

that is applied to the merchants of Tyre to show what our country does for these men, and ask what will they do for us. They simply look at the matter in the coldest and most calculating way, as to how they can make the most out of their coal. And is not that human nature? Do we not know that men will always act that way? And in regard to this little 50-mile railway, I am not fain to discuss the immediate proposition of my hon. friend, because, after all, the question immediately before us is a small one compared with the large question. I may parody what a great man said of Italy in time of her lethargy—"Would to God," he said, "that I had my hand in her hair," meaning that he would be glad if he could put his hand in her hair and wake her up from that lethargy. And I would fain wake up the people of Canada to the danger that is imminent, because a danger is at hand when a railway magnate may actually dictate to the people of Canada who shall rule them. If the thing goes on as it is going on at present, what will happen in regard to this railway? That will infallibly happen that has happened in regard to the Regina and Long Lake Railway—I am not objecting to it from the point of view of efficiency—it will pass into the hands of the great railway corporation that has with so much skill, so much enterprise, with so much energy, constructed an iron road across this continent. And much as we are pleased with what has been done, much as we are pleased with the fact that this iron band put across the continent with so much skill has given a guarantee to the world and to ourselves of our national development, we cannot close our eyes to the danger that the day may come, the day may be at hand, when the whole railway system of this country may pass into the hands of one great corporation, or of two great corporations, and the man who controls that corporation is practically the director behind the Throne. I will just tell you the experience I have had since I became a member of this House. A man came to me with three of my constituents, and proposed that I should go in as one of the projectors of a railway. He explained it all. It was as plain as A B C, and at last, after telling me how the line would be bounded and how guarantees would be taken to the line for a year and a-half, he concluded by saying: "We will step out with $20,000 apiece"—that was $80,000. I said to him: "What will the public of Canada get for the $20,000 I am getting?" "Oh, well," he said, "if I am not talking to a practical man, there is no use in going further." And that is the way these railways are built that my hon. friend from South Norfolk sympathises with. They must have running rates; they must have this, that and the other thing. But the fact is, we find that these men are very prosperous people. They have everything they want; they are elevated to a very high position, commercially; they have everything that can be given to them in Canada. Now, the proposition of the hon. member for Marquette is not an extravagant proposition. The Grand Trunk Railway takes freight from Suspension Bridge to Jarvis, 60 miles, at $1.10 per ton, and that is less than 2 cents per ton a mile; that is to say, this company, having no such advantages, running merely on commercial lines, takes for a distance of 60 miles coal at a rate of $1.10 a ton. Now, here you have a coal mine, and you have other mines there. The argument made by my hon. friend from the Maritime Provinces was a perfectly cogent argument, if there was only one mine, but we have other mines there, and with our experience, and in view of the rigid Shylock measure dealt out to us in regard to the price of coal in the North-West hitherto, I say that when we are chartering another railway, when we are giving another company 6,400 acres of land per mile, we should take proper garantees. Remember, that 6,400 acres per mile means, for 50 miles, 320,000 acres. If that is worth $5 an acre, you have $1,600,000, and we know very well that over a prairie country you can build a railway for $6,000 a mile, so they could build a railway at, say, $300,000, or to put it at the very utmost, $500,000, and then they would actually have a profit on the land. But not merely have they a good margin to go on as regards the land subsidy, not merely have they to go on velvet from the point of view of the land grant; they may charge what they like for carrying coal, and in that way I hold they are given an advantage larger, greater, wider and more sweeping than should be given them. I say the proposition of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) is not an extravagant proposition. If you give this company that land grant of 6,400 acres per mile, it is not too much to say to them: You must carry coal along the railway at a certain rate. We have had an experience of the conduct of the Northern Pacific line in reference to the Galt mine. That railway, built by the public money of the United States, refused to carry Galt coal. Why? They said: We have mines of our own, and we are not going to help you. A corporation has neither a soul to be saved, nor is there any means of effective punishment available. We must remember this, when we are dealing with a railway corporation, that we are dealing with a body of men who will get the most they possibly can out of the franchise we give them; and I say this, that it is the duty of men who have no interest but the public interest to serve, to alarm the public mind on all occasions like this into watchfulness, so as to secure that we will take care in the future to minimize the dangers of railway power to the progress and the liberty of Canada.

Mr. CASEY. Hon. gentlemen opposite think there is no danger of monopoly in this case because there are other coal mines in the neighbourhood. But it must not be forgotten that if we leave to this road the unlimited power to charge what they like for coal they will charge such a rate as will give them a monopoly, not only of transport, but of the sale of coal. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), the company may refuse to carry coal altogether, unless we make a condition that they shall carry it, and at a reasonable price. The hon. member for Assiniboia said that the time might come when railway monopolies might dictate who should rule in this country. I fully agree with that sentiment. I only differ from the hon. gentleman by thinking that the time has come already; that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the creation of this Government, has become the ruler of the Government already; that at the last election that powerful organization did all it possibly could do, and no doubt it will continue to do all it possibly can do in the future, to return this Government to

power. That company naturally comes to Parliament, after carrying the Government into power, to ask for favours. As a matter of fact, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company does rule the Government at the present time in regard, at all events, to all questions concerning that company. The company does not care what the Government do about other questions. I took the liberty some years ago to allude to the president of that company as King Stephen the First. That gentleman has been getting along rapidly as regards promotion since that time. He has not yet been officially recognized as king, but he has got as far already as being made a member of the peerage, and I do not know what will be his title in the near future. At first, we had one of the most prominent mountains in the Rockies named after that gentleman, and now we have that gentleman called after the mountain. What may happen in the future we do not know. It reminds me of an old woman in the country who said she had had a vision in which she learnt that her eldest son was to be a prophet. She said: He is not that yet, but he is an elder now, and an ornament to society, and there is no knowing what he may be yet. I may say the same thing in regard to the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He is, no doubt, the ruler of this country in railway matters, not only those concerning his own railway, but with other railways, and he is able to enforce his will and obtain Government assistance in building feeding lines and gobbling up all the new roads started for the purpose of securing competition.

Mr. CAMPBELL. After the able speech delivered by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I am surprised that the Government have not at once acceded to the proposition made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). Looking at this matter from a business standpoint, I think we have a right to provide certain conditions. We are giving this company a valuable tract of land, 6,400 acres per mile of road. It has been estimated that this land is worth about $5 per acre, and 6,400 acres at $5 per acre gives $32,000 per mile for building the road. I am stating the value of the land as given by the hon. member for Assiniboia.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). He did not say so.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. gentleman has far better knowledge than the hon. member for South Leeds.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). No; because I have been on the ground and he has not.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You never were there.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Yes; I was there before you were in this House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; you were medical officer to the Indians. Suppose we say the land is worth $3 per acre; that would give $19,000 per mile for the building of this railway, that can be built for at least $7,000 or $8,000 per mile. So we are actually paying to this company far more than the whole road will cost. Then, when the proposition is made that the company should carry coal at a certain rate per ton per mile objection is raised by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) that this is a new departure and there is no precedent for it. Well, if there is no precedent, let us establish a precedent now. If we have made mistakes in the past, let us learn a lesson from them and avoid them in the future. I believe, in giving such a valuable franchise to this railway, we should insist on certain terms being charged for carrying freight. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Sproule) stated that the Grand Trunk charged $22 a carload for carrying wheat 90 miles. Wheat is of much more value than coal and always take a higher rate. But the hon. gentleman was simply quoting a little freight rate between two points. I know as a fact that the Grand Trunk to-day is carrying coal at 1 cent per ton per mile. You can get coal shipped from any of the mines of Ohio to Ontario at $2 per ton. It is an established rule that the great bulk of the freight carried over the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific roads will not average the companies 1 cent per ton per mile. Now, we know it is a fact that the Intercolonial Railway is carrying coal for $\frac{3}{10}$ of a cent per ton per mile, and I believe it has been established that at that rate they are not making a loss. I believe it is admitted by all railways that they can carry most freight for $\frac{5}{10}$ of a cent per ton per mile. If that be the case, then what objection can there be to limiting this railway to 1 cent per ton per mile, which is surely a paying rate. I, therefore, think that the proposition of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) is a reasonable and fair one and should be accepted by the Government. For my own part, I am of the opinion that we are making a great mistake in locking up such large tracts of our territories in the hands of these railway companies. We have made great mistakes in this direction in the past, and as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) put it, we should call a halt and stop locking up so much land to build railways, thus depriving the settlers of their rightful territory.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This question is a very important one, not so much on account of the Bill itself as on account of the principle that is involved in it. We have had several years experience, as I have already stated, with regard to the effect of this policy on the progress of the country, and it is time that we should now stop and seriously consider that policy. I have already pointed out incidentally the importance of controlling the lands granted to railways, if it is thought desirable that this policy of grants should continue. I have also pointed out in the few remarks I addressed to the House the importance of separating the ownership of the mineral resources of the North-West from the granting of the soil, in order that some source of revenue may be retained to the population of that country. There is another very important question involved in this charter and one deserving the serious consideration of the representative of the district in which this railway will be located, and that is, the parties to that charter. It must be borne in mind that persons coming to this House seeking to control a railway charter, and who are without capital, cannot put that charter upon the market without entailing for all time to come very serious burdens upon the population, over and above what would have been imposed upon them if the road had been constructed directly by the parties who furnished the money. What is the object of getting this charter? It is precisely that stated by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr.

Davin). The object is to make gain without the investment of capital of any sort whatever. We have had parties coming to this House within the last ten years obtaining railway charters and going to New York and to London seeking to dispose of these charters; and if large sums of money are paid for a charter there will of course be a larger tax upon the population in order that the persons in whose hands the charter ultimately comes may make a reasonable profit by it. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has informed this Committee that it would be unprecedented for this House to fix a rate of freight upon coal, or upon any other article of merchandise that is being sent over the railway. Now, we ought to consider for one moment the fact that, although a railway company may become the owner of valuable properties, a railway company has at the outset no property whatever. It possesses certain franchises which are conferred by this House, and among these are certain sovereign rights which are necessary to the calling of the railway itself into existence. You do not give to any individual the right under the law to expropriate the property of other people and to appoint parties to determine the value of the property so taken; you confer that power upon a corporation, and in so doing you are conferring upon it certain sovereign powers; you are conferring upon it powers that belong to the State or to Government rather that to a private corporation. You can most assuredly stipulate upon what conditions these extraordinary powers will be conferred. Now, Sir, experience has shown us that it is not enough to depend upon competition for the regulation of rates of charge, because in many cases there is no competition, and so you have given to the Governor in Council the power to regulate the freights from time to time. I would like to ask the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) whether there is any difference in principle between conferring that power upon the Executive of the country, or actually exercising that power directly by Parliament itself? It is an act of Parliament that confers the power upon the Executive; it is not an inherent power, and we therefore assume that it is right and proper that such powers should be vested somewhere, and we say that experience shows that it is not effectively exercised by the Executive authorities, or at all events that it would be right and proper for Parliament in the first intance to fix a maximum rate which ought not to be exceeded. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) would not object to the present practice of regulating the rates of cab-hire. Upon what theory do you interfere with the cabman and say to him: You shall not charge more than a certain rate. You would think that it was very unreasonable to leave the matter to the discretion of the cab-man, although at most stations in towns and cities there is an active competition amongst cabmen. If the hon. gentleman were to find a solitary cabman at night, and he had occasion to drive to his home or to the railway station, and it was a stormy night, he would not like to be compelled to pay four or five dollars, and I will venture to say that he will argue that the law which regulates the cab fare is a reasonable law. Experience shows that it is right and convenient to interfere and to regulate the rates charged by cabmen, and does not experience show——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not wish to interupt the hon. gentleman, but we do not want to waste much more time over this Bill to-day. I thought of moving that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have no objection to that.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Dredge Vessels, repairs..... $34,700

Mr. McMULLEN. There was some further information which we expected in connection with this.

Mr. FOSTER. That was for new dredging plant. This is a different item. It is to cover the cost of repairs to dredge vessels, in the different provinces, recommended by the chief engineer. In the Maritime Provinces the vessels are the *St. Lawrence*, the *Canada*, the *New Dominion*, the *Prince Edward* and the *George Mackenzie*, and the amount for repairs is estimated at $13,500. In Quebec and Ontario the vessels are the *Challenge*, the *Trudeau*, the *Nipissing*, the *Queen*, the *St. Louis*, the *Ontario* and the *Octopus*, and the amount for repairs is estimated at $13,200. In Manitoba and British Columbia the vessels are the *Winnipeg*, the *Priestman*, the *Pacific* and the *Samson*, and the amount for repairs is estimated at $8,000—making up the total vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. Could the hon. gentleman give us any idea of what it costs us for dredging, compared with what the dredging costs which we let by contract? That would enable us to form some idea as to whether it is prudent to keep on hand a number of dredges and do the work ourselves, or whether it would be better to let it out by contract.

Mr. FOSTER. One difficulty, I suppose, in the way of the letting-out system would be to find a service that would be requisite. Suppose we were to throw this plant all aside, it would be impossible to get done by private dredges the amount of dredging that is required; there would not be enough of them. As to the cost of dredging, we know the length of time a dredge vessel is at a given piece of work, and the cost during that time; and if you take the amount she excavates, and take the cost for the time being, you get at the cost per cubic yard. As my hon. friend knows, everything depends on the nature of the soil that is to be dredged, whether it is sand or clay, or shale or hard rock; so that it would be very difficult to get at an average. I find that the dredge *Canada*, at Barrington, N. S., dug 8,460 cubic yards at a cost of $3,276. At Cow Bay 3,225 cubic yards were dredged at a cost of $1,892. In St. Peter's Canal

270 cubic yards were dredged at a cost of $156. In Prince Edward Island, at the Red Point wharf, 2,442 cubic yards were dredged at a cost of $861. These results will give some idea of the cost.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can quite understand that it is necessary to provide for the dredging in the interest of the trade of the country; but if the Government were to intimate their intention of dropping the business of dredging, I have not the slightest doubt that it would be very easy to form two or three joint-stock companies that would be willing to take up the work. My reason for making that suggesion is that I believe a very large amount of the work done in this way is done very expensively. The expenses in connection with the working of the dredges, boarding the men, furnishing supplies, and making repairs, are all sources through which large amounts of money are frittered away, I am afraid; and unless a very careful supervision is kept over the dredging, and every expenditure in connection with it, I am afraid that the cost will grow upon our hands. Can the Minister say what is the entire value of the dredging plant we have now?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not got the information. I can get it, however.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). What is the name and the value of the dredge engaged at Barrington?

Mr. FOSTER. It was the *Canada*. I do not know the value. If my hon. friend wants to pursue the question of the cost of these excavations he will find a very comprehensive table in the report of the Minister of Public Works for the last fiscal year, page 148. That report shows the work done in the different provinces and the cost per cubic yard in each case.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). What is the depth of water where the dredge was working at Barrington harbour?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not that information. That would be simply given on the votes for the harbour.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). According to the hon. gentleman, there were 8,450 yards of dredging done at a cost of $3,256. That does not include the cost of the dredge or the interest on the investment.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is simply the cost of doing the work.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). We have had the evidence of experts under oath that the cost of dredging ranged from 17 to 35 cents, according to the depth of water, say from 15 to 25 feet. The dredging at Barrington harbour cost 40 cents per yard. It would seem to be more economical to employ contractors than for the Government to do the work.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend does not know the depth of water or the kind of bottom or the nature of soil taken out, whether rock, or part rock, or what it was; and he cannot form a conclusion without knowing all this.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am assuming it was the ordinary kind of dredging and that the depth of water ranged from 15 to 25 feet. In that case, we should have had the work done at from 17 to 35 cents per yard. I presume you do not take out rock with the dredge. It must have been clay of some kind.

Mr. MULOCK. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that rock excavation is done by dredging?

Mr. FOSTER. It is sometimes.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), who is an expert, says dynamite is necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. So it is, if the rock is of a certain kind.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Under whose direction is this dredging done? What is the system followed?

Mr. FOSTER. It is this. Take, for instance, the Provinces of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. There is in the City of St. John Captain McCordick, who has charge of the dredging operations in that district. Any dredging required to be done is done on the report of that responsible officer, approved by the department. He is responsible for the operations of the dredges in his district, and the same system is followed in other districts. With reference to dredging in a place like Barrington, on a coast like the Atlantic, it must not be forgotten that storms and heavy winds often prevent the dredge from working; and during the time she is not working, the expense runs on pretty nearly the same. This does not occur in inland waters to anything like the same extent. That would make the average cost of the dredging higher.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not think that the Government exactly follow the system explained by the hon. gentleman. I have a letter in my desk from a leading mill-owner of Port Albert in my county, where the Government dredge was employed last year. The dredge got out of repair and was sent to Kincardine to be put in order, which is fifteen miles away from Port Albert, instead of going to Goderich which is ten miles away. The captain of the barge went to Kincardine and lost two weeks. My correspondent reports to me that if the captain had gone to the foundry at Goderich, he could have had the dredge repaired in twenty-four hours, but unfortunately for the Goderich foundry, it is owned by people who are on this side of politics, while the owners of the Kincardine foundry are supporters of the Government. The gentleman who has reported this to me is the largest proprietor in the place, and does more shipping than all the rest put together from the little port of Port Albert. I apprehend that the captain of the barge, if he had not the authority, assumed it to have these repairs made how and when he liked.

Mr. FOSTER. The system is as I have described it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My hon. friend seems somewhat surprised that two weeks should have been taken to repair a dredge, but if he wants to know how the system is carried on in the Maritime Provinces, I will tell him. In 1888, at the close of the season, the dredge *Prince Edward* was found to be out of order. She lay in the ice all winter without a stroke of work being done to her, and the captain was kept on wages doing nothing. When the spring came, when she ought to have gone to work, she was placed in the hands of the agents of the Government in Charlottetown, who gave out the contract by days' work to a supporter

of the Government. She was hauled on to a slip in the early spring, and remained there the whole of the summer of 1888, and was launched on the 7th of November when the season closed, and the scows which were repaired at the same time, were launched on the 22nd and 23rd of November, so that the winter went by, the dredge being frozen up and the captain remaining on wages doing nothing, and she only went to work in the spring of 1889.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Was she frozen up both summers?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) She was frozen up both winters, and in the summer, when she ought to have been at work, she was hauled up on the slip and repaired by days' work, rebuilt at the cost of many thousand dollars.

Mr. PERRY. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) is comparing the climate of Prince Edward Island to that of the County of Inverness. I suppose that county may have frost in July and August, but that does not occur in Prince Edward Island. I can corroborate the statement of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) in reference to this dredge, because I was present when she was launched from the blocks. She was kept idle all the winter. The captain was getting $90 a month for doing nothing but walking up and down with his hands in his pockets. She was laid on the blocks in the month of June and it took the whole summer to repair her, and then she was launched in November, and, of course, was of no use for that year. The information the House has in regard to these dredges is very small and unsatisfactory. It only goes up to the end of June, 1890. I do not see why we should not have the report from the Department of Public Works for the fiscal year ending with June, 1891. There are plenty of officers in that department to do all the work required. It is now about nine months since the dredging of 1890 was finished, and yet we have not a line to show what was done by these different dredges during the summer of 1890. The Minister of Finance, speaking for the Minister of Public Works, states that he does not know what it costs per yard to dredge throughout the whole Dominion. I find, in the report of the Public Works Department, for the fiscal year ending June, 1890, there is an estimate made of the cost per yard of dredging by the different dredges in Canada. First, as to the *St. Lawrence*, the report says the total quantity of work done during the year was 59,676 cubic yards, at an average cost of 25 cents per cubic yard. The dredge *Canada*, during the year, removed 29,855 cubic yards of material, at an average cost of 37¾ cents per cubic yard. That is very near the Quebec price. Then, the *New Dominion* did work amounting to 42,880 cubic yards, at a cost of 19¼ cents per cubic yard. The dredge *Prince Edward* removed 31,422 cubic yards, at a cost of 31½ cents per cubic yard. The dredge *Geo. Mackenzie*, during the year, took out 15,440 cubic yards of material of different kinds, at an average cost of 26¾ cents per cubic yard. The *Nipissing* dredged materials of different kinds amounting to 37,185 cubic yards, at an average cost of 16 cents per cubic yard. The dredge *St. Louis* did work to the amount of 13,975 cubic yards, at an average cost of 27⅜ cents per cubic yard. The *Queen* removed material during the year amounting to 4,035 cubic yards, of which 2,502 were boulders and 478 hard-pan, which had to be loosened with dynamite. The average cost per cubic yard was $1.31¾. The dredge *Ontario* removed 45,910 cubic yards, at an average cost of 13 cents per cubic yard. The dredge *Challenge* did work amounting to 44,775 cubic yards, at an average cost of 20⅝ cents per cubic yard. The *Winnipeg* removed material amounting to 65,880 cubic yards, at a cost of 14.047 cents per cubic yard. I think, if the Government desired to give the information asked for by my hon. friend from Huron it would be easy to ascertain the average cost of the dredging. If that report is correct, and I have no doubt it is, it would be easy to ascertain the average cost per yard of the work done by the Government dredges and compare it with what is let by contract to other parties. Referring to the dredge *Prince Edward*, I find here, and my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) has already stated, that the captain was paid $90 a month, and $180 of that was charged to repairs and plant. That would represent about two months of the year according to the wages he gets, and one would think, if he was not pretty well acquainted with the dredge, the country and the captain himself, that the dredge had been working for ten months, when, in fact, she had not been working for four, so there is another account falsified. This represents $918.83 for twelve months, $900 for dredging and the rest for repairs and plant. One would think the dredge had been working for twelve months, when she was not actually working for four months. Why these accounts are kept in this way, I do not know; the Minister of Finance ought to be able to give an explanation. If the dredge only worked four months in the year, then she must have been eight months idle, and the wages of that man should have been under the head of plant and repairs. But this is to cover up the wrong way that the business is done by paying this man for twelve months when he only worked four months. Last winter this dredge was in Cascumpec harbour and remained there all winter, fast in the ice. She was in need of repairs, but no repairs were made. This spring she moved to Summerside, where I believe she is doing very good work, but she might have commenced a month sooner than she did if the orders had been given properly. If the department had their minds made up last fall to dredge in Summerside, why did they not send her there last fall where she might have undergone repairs and have got to work a month sooner than she did? There are several other places in Prince Edward Island where a lot of dredging needs to be done. Now, I have not heard any reason why this man is allowed $90 a month for doing nothing: I supposed he must be a friend of the Government. In fact I do not know what is the use of having him there at all. I find that dredges in different parts of Ontario work without any captain, and I believe those dredges are of more importance than this one. From the quantity of work that they are doing and the quality of it, they seem to be getting on just as well as the dredge *Prince Edward*, which has a captain that the Government is paying $90 a month. I say it is ridiculous, it is robbing the country to pay this man wages for doing nothing. Even the Ministers themselves will not dare to take pay without earning it, and no other man should. This country is not able to stand such a wrong as this. I contend that Captain Doyle has no right whatever to be paid when he

does not work. Now, I hope and trust that the dredge will not be disturbed from Summerside until she has completed the works that she ought to do there. Summerside is a harbour of great importance for a large portion of the Island of Prince Edward. We have there now a fine steamer called the *Northumberland* making daily trips, and we have other steamers that are put on when they are required in order to carry freight. This steamer draws more water than the old steamer used to draw before her. She has some difficulty in getting up to the wharf, and this dredging is done in order to allow this new steamer to be able to lie at the head of the wharf. I hope the Government will leave the dredge there until this work is all completed. There is a middle ground in the harbour which requires to be dredged, and I think the dredging is easily done, the material being either mud or sand. I see no need for the Government keeping this captain on the boat at all. When the engineer is there to look after the boiler and look after all the material on the vessel, what is the good of having a captain there? In fact, he does not stay there, he goes home to Charlottetown and lives there, and perhaps he does not see the dredge once from the time she is laid up until she goes to work again.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is an enormous discrepancy between the cost of dredging. In the year 1888-89, according to the report submitted here, some of the dredging cost, per cubic yard, as much as $2.57.

Mr. FOSTER. And some as low as 13 cents.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not in that year. I see the *New Dominion* dredging cost 21 cents per cubic yard, the *Prince Edward* cost 63 cents, the *St. Lawrence*, 39, the *George Mackenzie*, $2.57. They vary from the *New Dominion*, 42; the *Canada*, 27; the *Prince Edward*, 31.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a different kind of dredging.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No; the same dredging, the same character of soil exactly. Last season she was dredging at Summerside in the same character of soil. It seems to me very extraordinary that the cost of dredging per cubic yard is less than one-half in 1890 what it was in 1889 by the same boat, digging the same soil, and at about the same depth.

Mr. McMULLEN. What particular officer registers the amount of work done by each dredge?

Mr. FOSTER. The chief officer.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is danger that, in order to make a fair showing of work done, an excessive quantity may be recorded. I dare say many of the captains are very honourable men; but there is danger in this respect. The reason I make these remarks is that after dredging had been done on certain points on the St. Lawrence, and an enormous number of yards taken out, some soundings have shown that much work was still required. About what is the average cost of a dredge?

Mr. FOSTER. It is shown in the Public Works Report.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the number of years a dredge is supposed to last with ordinary repairs?

Mr. FOSTER. Eight or ten years.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice the repairs on the *Canada* amounted to $2,600; this is a large sum. Did anything particular happen that necessitated those repairs?

Mr. FOSTER. New buckets were required.

Mr. BOWERS. In regard to dredging in Nova Scotia, I may say that a certain sum was put in the Estimates for the dredging of Weymouth River in the county I have the honour to represent. I understood the Minister of Public Works to state, at the beginning of the session, that the material to be removed was found to be of a very hard character, and the dredge did not seem to make much impression at the mouth of the river. Do the Government intend to provide any other means of removing the obstruction? The village of Weymouth is becoming quite a shipping port, and the river is tortuous and requires dredging. I do not think the public money could be spent to better advantage than to provide a dredge or two to be employed all the time in the Maritime Provinces. This place should be looked after, as at present the water is very shoal and vessels cannot enter until high tide. I notice that dynamite is used on certain occasions to remove obstructions, and it might be used at Weymouth River.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that we had a dredge at work at Weymouth last year.

Mr. BOWERS. When the dredge came there last year it was pretty late in the fall. That is a poor time to do work in open harbours, as there is so much windy and rough weather it would be dangerous for the dredge to venture outside when loaded with mud to discharge same into the bay. It is better to send a dredge in the summer season.

Mr. FOSTER. Every season some place must be the last visited.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who purchases the supplies for the dredges?

Mr. FOSTER. They are purchased under the supervision of the district officer. He has entire supervision in all these respects.

Mr. McMULLEN. In looking over the items in connection with the Fisheries Department, I was surprised at some of the prices paid for supplies. As the items are not given as regard supplies for the dredges, I ask if there was proper supervision exercised?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Is the account for repairs included in the item $5,316, total annual expenditure for *Challenge?*

Mr. FOSTER. No. That includes the maintenance and wages while the work is being done.

Quebec and Ontario $40,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How many dredges are employed in Toronto Harbour?

Mr. FOSTER. It is under contract, and none of our dredges are employed.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the number of dredges in Ontario, and where are they; and what is the number in Quebec?

Mr. FOSTER. The *Challenge* was at work at Kincardine, Southampton, Port Elgin and Goderich. The *Nipissing* was at work at St. Basil, Quebec.

The *Ontario* was at Port Hope, Bowmanville and Brighton. The *Queen* was at Kemptville.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is the machinery and outfit of the dredges furnished in Canada or in the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. Everything that can be bought in Canada is bought here. The majority of the supplies are furnished in Canada.

Dredging, Manitoba..... .. $15,000

Mr. WATSON. How much is to be spent on the White Mud River?

Mr. FOSTER. Last year there was $5,329.25. There is no estimate this year.

Mr. WATSON. The work at the White Mud River is going on very slowly and I have received a letter from a gentleman interested in shipping there, from which it appears that the work is not proceeding as it should. The letter is dated on 4th July and it says:

"You are aware, I think, of the very slow way in which the dredging has been done at the mouth of the White Mud River here. But this season there has been nothing done so far and there is little prospects of anything being done for at least a month. The people in charge of the dredge are now repairing it, and have been so engaged for two months, whereas three weeks ought to have been sufficient for these repairs."

Mr. FOSTER. The best answer to my hon. friend is that you have not given us the money.

Mr. WATSON. Are the dredges standing idle for the want of money?

Mr. FOSTER. You remember I got a tenth of the estimates to keep it going.

Mr. WATSON. But it would not be stopped in July?

Mr. FOSTER. That is just the time: the appropriation would run out in the last of June.

Mr. WATSON. I suppose it would be just as expensive to repair them as to operate them. This letter which I have referred to, goes on to say:

"I am interested mainly in getting a good channel to come in by as soon as possible. As it is now, my steamer has to lay out sometimes for two days waiting for a change of wind to come in by, and on the average it costs me as much to come in and go out of the river as to make the trip to Fairford for a load of lumber. This dredge was built in 1884 and began operations in 1886, and there has been a crew of from 10 to 14 men kept up on her every season since. The draught of water on the bar is 8½ feet at the shallowest place, and it is not a fourth of a mile across, and yet with a south wind we cannot get in through the channel for want of water with a draught of 4 feet 4 inches. The material, as you perhaps know, is sand, mud and clay; mostly mud. If no change is made, we will not have a suitable channel for five years yet or perhaps more, and this has a most depressing effect on the lake trade."

It appears to me that if this is the only distance, and from my knowledge of the locality I believe it is, then the dredge must be doing very little. Last year they only dredged 15,318 cubic yards, at a cost reported here of 28¾ cents, but I find there are other expenses connected with the dredging that brings the actual cost up to 28¾ cents. It is quite plain that something should be done by the department to hurry on the work there, and to have more dredging accomplished during the season. The material dredged is not carried away in scows, but they are simply lifting it out of the channel and dumping it on the edge of the bank, which is not a very good way of doing work, because it is not piled, and it seems to me that if any flow of water was to come the material would be swept back into the channel. I wish to call the attention of the Government to the particular course in which the engineer has seen fit to lay out that work. The prevailing winds there are from the north-west direction, but this channel is surveyed and the dredging is going on in a north-easterly direction, and consequently it being a very narrow channel, sailing vessels, particularly, find it very difficult to get into the White Mud River on account of the northerly winds. There is a large steamboat there which carries lumber, and that vessel has often to lie outside, even when the wind is from the north, on account of the channel being very narrow and the vessel is driven on to the south channel. I am informed by gentlemen who are acquainted with the navigation of the lake that a much better channel could have been secured in a north or north-westerly direction. The engineer was advised by gentlemen who knew all about the navigation of the lake of this fact, but he paid no attention to them and persisted in having that channel in a north-easterly direction. I think the Government should now call the attention of the engineer to this matter, and they should also order the work to proceed more rapidly in the future than in the past. If that bar is only a quarter of a mile in width, and if the dredge *Priestman* has been working there so long, it seems to me she is making very slow progress. I know that last year this dredge was very late in starting work, and this year she apparently has not been working for a month previous to this date. I hope that the Government will see to it, that the work is done more expeditiously.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that John S. Smith, master of the dredge *Priestman*, gets $75 per month, while the master of the dredge *Winnipeg*, gets $120 a month. How do you account for this difference?

Mr. FOSTER. It is on account of the size of the dredges, and the work done by them.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is rather a singular thing that the size of the dredge should have anything to do with the wages of the master. Are they paid by a percentage of the work done?

Mr. FOSTER. They are paid by the month.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know how it is that the man on a smaller tug is paid $75 a month when the man on the larger one is paid $120 a month, if both are equally skilled men?

Mr. FOSTER. That often happens. The captain of an ocean steamer gets more that the captain of a smaller vessel.

Mr. WATSON. The same is the case with the engineers.

Mr. FOSTER. The more complicated the machinery, the better man you should have: but these are both good men.

Mr. BOWERS. The captain of one of our full-rigged ships hardly gets more than $75 or $80 a month to cross the Atlantic, and I think that for the captains of dredges on our inland waters these wages are exorbitant.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the difference in the capacity of these two vessels?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know their capacity, but they are very different one from the other. The larger dredge requires a skilled man to operate it. The other is smaller, and does not require the same capability. That is the reason the wages differ.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that we pay $7 a ton for the coal used and 50 cents a ton for transshipment.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think $7 is a high price for coal there. The hon. member for Marquette can speak as to that.

Mr. WATSON. That is about the ordinary price of coal there. That shows what we have to suffer out there. I see that the caretaker on the dredge *Winnipeg*, I suppose only a common labourer, is paid at the rate of $80 a month.

Mr. FOSTER. He is the same man. He is the master for eight months at $120 a month, and for three months during which the dredge is laid up he has charge of the dredging plant.

Mr. WATSON. A man to be a caretaker only requires to be an honest man, and to protect the property.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another circumstance. If this man is a skilled man, he does not wish to be out of work for three months every year, and we probably could not keep him if for three months in the year he had to be out of labour or employed at a very low rate.

Mr. McMULLEN. Could the hon. Minister explain why a portion of the wages are charged to dredging and the other portion to repairs and plant?

Mr. FOSTER. The men are at work during the season dredging, and when the season is over, a number of them are employed at repairing the dredge. In the general report you will see these expenses divided into three departments—expenses, ordinary repairs, and extraordinary repairs.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears that the captain was only actually at work six months, and was virtually idle for two months when repairs were made, during which he received the same rate of wages.

Mr. FOSTER. If he is a skilful engineer, he will no doubt find work to do. West is the master of the dredge and also a skilful engineer, so that during the three months that he is paid $80 a month he is not walking around with his hands in his pockets.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is he in charge of the engines when the dredge is at work?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I suppose these men have to be kept all the time, but it appears to me that there ought to be some arrangement made that when they are not actually at work, they should not be paid the same amount.

Mr. FOSTER. To get good men you must pay them what will be a fair wage for the year.

Dredging, British Columbia..... $15,000

Mr. CHARLTON. Where is that to be spent?

Mr. FOSTER. It is for the two dredges, the *Pacific* and the *Samson*. $15,000 was voted last year, and the dredges were at work on the Fraser River and in the Victoria harbour.

Mr. CHARLTON. What depth of water have you at New Westminster?

Mr. FOSTER. Twenty-eight feet at high water. Some of the heaviest draught vessels come in there for loading lumber.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the difference between high and low water?

Mr. FOSTER. Fourteen feet low water up to twenty-seven or twenty-eight feet high water.

Mr. MARA. Vessels drawing twenty feet can go in since the improvement has been made. A new channel has been made that allows vessels of large draught to go up to Westminster.

Dredging, general service $10,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What portion of this was used?

Mr. FOSTER. There was a vote of $10,000, of which $5,400 was used up to the 21st of December.

Slides and Booms..... $10,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is required to carry out works not definitely determined upon, but which may become necessary in the different lumber districts during the fiscal year 1891-92. During the first nine months of 1890-91, expenditures were made at Madawaska, Lake St. John, Saguenay, and Ottawa River, amounting to $1,762.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the revenue from these?

Mr. SPEAKER. In the Ottawa district, the revenue from the works last year was $96,542, and the expenditure would be very much below that.

Mr. FOSTER. Of the appropriation for 1889-90 the following has been applied:—Ottawa river works, $64.97; Newcastle district works, $134; St. Maurice works, $104.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has anything been expended at the Quinze Rapids?

Mr. SPEAKER. The work there was done by a private firm to whom the appropriation was paid—I think the firm of McCoomb & Co.—They did it under the supervision of the engineer in charge of these works. I am inclined to think that the works are not of so extensive or complete a character as perhaps they ought to be.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it possible to pass logs over them?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have a handsome revenue, no doubt, from the Ottawa slides and booms, but I notice that in the Saguenay district, where the expenditure for maintenance is $3,139, not a farthing appears to have been received of revenue. In the case of the St. Maurice district, the expenditure was nearly $20,000 and the receipts not quite $7,000. In the case of the Ottawa district the receipts were $98,000 and the expenditure only $4,000. In the Trent there are no receipts at all.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Trent works have practically gone out of use, and very little timber passes through them now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But they cost $2,915. Why should we pay $3,000 a year and not get a sou?

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I can learn, on the Saguenay there has been a certain amount of business done on which dues have accrued. There is a counter-claim made by the lumbermen for some works they have erected, which they declare to be necessary for the working. That is now being considered by the department. In regard to the Trent River, the trouble, I think, is that the collections have not been made, but I am informed that a new collector has been appointed and that he is now at work making the back collections and looking after the operations of the present year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to be a bad way of doing business to expend $3,000 when not a farthing is collected, and I should think the department should have some better explanation than that to offer. What department is this under?

Mr. FOSTER. The Public Works Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So there is nobody to pitch into.

Mr. FOSTER. You can pitch into me and I will transfer it.

Slides and Booms, Petewawa River.....$3,000

Mr. SPEAKER. What is proposed to be done with that $3,000?

Mr. FOSTER. It is to be applied in reconstructing, during this year, such portions of the dilapidated works built some thirty years ago between McDonnell's Chute and the mouth of the river to facilitate the descent of timber as may be required.

Mr. SPEAKER. I call the attention of the Minister in charge of these Estimates to the utter inadequacy of the appropriation for this particular river, and, if the Committee will bear with me, I will give the authority on which I make that statement. I find in the report of Mr. Brophy, the superintendent engineer of these works, the following:—

"On this river, the works have a long range from the mouth to the outlet of Cedar Lake, and mainly consist of booms and piers at the mouth, single-stick slides, with their necessary dams and guide booms, at First, Second and Third Chutes, Bois Dur, Crooked Chute, Lake Traverse, and McDonnell's; together with large retaining dams at Thompson's Rapids and Cedar Lake, and a great number of piers and flat-side dams at points between these stations. As many of these improvements have been built upwards of thirty years, and often repaired, they cannot be depended on for further service. The same remarks that apply to a section of the Madawaska works, in regard to their not having any great strength to withstand the pressure due to the spring floods and the movement of ice, may be considered as having more force when the Petewawa works are spoken of. Last spring, they received very considerable damage and will soon have to be extensively reconstructed. During the winter months, such temporary repairs as could be done, were carried out."

I am informed, on the best authority possible, that it will require at least $20,000 to put these works into an efficient state for the passage of timber and logs through them. I am also told that mere patching up of the old works will be a very ineffective way of dealing with these works. They were constructed originally for the passage of square timber, and the slides are, as Mr. Brophy says, single-stick slides, but the character of the operations on that river, as well as on most of the tributaries of the Ottawa, has almost entirely changed, and the operations now are conducted in the shape of sawlogs instead of timber. The result is that wider slides are required because there are so many more pieces to be passed through, that unless you have a large space to pass them through, the whole summer will be consumed in getting down the timber through these works. I would suggest that, instead of spending money uselessly in repairing the old works, the department should make a substantial appropriation for reconstructing the works on that river. I suppose my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would say this will be an expenditure solely in the interest of the lumbermen, but I think I can show that that is not the case, because I find that the tolls on that river on the timber passing through last year amounted to $17,763, while the whole cost of repairs and maintenance was only $2,081, leaving a net revenue to the Government of $15,682. I do not think the people who are operating on that stream are asking too much from the Government when they ask, in return for the large amount of tolls the Government exact from them, that they should put the works in an efficient state so that they may be used to the greatest advantage of the lumbermen.

Mr. CHARLTON. What it the rate of tolls?

Mr. SPEAKER. The rate varies. The rates are graded according to the stations. At each of the series of works a different rate is imposed, so the whole rate is high. The report of the collector upon that is this:

"This river flows from the south into the Ottawa, at 112 miles above the City of Ottawa. The improvements, which were commenced in 1857 and gradually extended from time to time since, are more numerous, and the cost vastly greater than the works on any other tributary of the Ottawa, owing to the short intervals at which rapids, swift currents and chutes are encountered. The tolls on timber passing through all the works on this river are the highest to be found in the tariff; they amounted to $1,260 in 1858, $5,006.25 in 1864, and $17,763.36 in 1889."

Mr. CHARLTON. If the works are in the state the Speaker represents and are paying such a revenue to the Government, I think the claim that there should be a larger sum spent and that the works should be put in an efficient state is a reasonable one.

Mr. FOSTER. The report corroborates the statement of my hon. friend, but the chief engineer's estimate of the cost of putting the works into a thoroughly efficient condition runs up to $38,000, which is a pretty large estimate. This year the expenditure in the St. Maurice district has been largely cut down, as it has been almost unprofitable and it is the intention to reduce the staff to reasonable proportions. Some $3,000 have been taken off there this year. I will draw the attention of Council to the representation the Speaker has made, and also the attention of the acting Minister.

Experimental farms, buildings, fences, &c..... $20,000

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to have an explanation as to why this large sum is put in the Estimates. Last year when $30,000 were in the Estimates the Minister stated that that would complete the buildings on all the different experimental farms, and that it would require but a very small sum annually after that. I want some explanation of how this large sum for buildings and fences comes to be in the Estimates this year?

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister started out with the intention of fulfilling the promise that he made in bringing the cost of the buildings within his estimate, but he found the experimental farm idea so popular and there was such pressure brought upon him, from both sides of the House, to put these farms into the very best possible state that the estimate has been slightly exceeded. I will commence, however, my remarks by saying that this is to complete, and when this sum is expended all the farms will have their buildings, fences and the like of that, completed and in first rate order; so that whatever else will be required will be for the maintenance of the farms. There is a balance of $2.386 due on works let by contract on the farm at Brandon, together with $99.86 due for superintendence, making $2,485.86. There is due for work on the farm at Nappan, Nova Scotia, $200; Indian Head, $100; buildings, fences, drainage, roadways, required in connection with the experimental farms in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia and at Ottawa, requested by the Minister of Agriculture, total amounting to $25,000. Then for contingencies a sum of $1,000, which makes up the estimate asked for. The detailed estimate is as follows:— At Nappan farm, structure required for implement house; at the central experimental farm, extension of the poultry building, fence for yards, &c. The chickens are accumulating at such an extent as to require more room, and we must take care of the Canadian hen under the present circumstances. Then, for wages, repairs to buildings, wages of carpenters, lumber, hardware and other materials, making $2,500 for the experimental farm. At Indian Head there is required an implement house with room for vehicles and workroom for men during winter months, and fencing, enclosing pasture for cattle, on all of which it is proposed to expend $3,500; at Agassiz there is required to build a house for the superintendent, $3,500; barns, stable and fencing, making a total of $5,000.

Mr. McMILLAN. When these experimental farms were established it was expected that they would lead the farmers, instead that they would be lead by the farmers. I find that on this experimental farm at Ottawa there is not a single fence equal to what is being put up by the most advanced farmers of Ontario. The new fences are hedges of a certain description, and they are being adopted all over the country, whereas the experimental farm is behind the times in this. If we are to have an experimental farm it should be for the purpose of teaching the farmer and not for the purpose of being taught by the farmers. I hold that the experimental farm here should adopt these new fences. There is a company which prepares the land, plants the hedge, takes care of it for four years, and at the end of the four years these fences will turn animals of any description. That has been adopted all over the western part of Ontario, and I do not see why the experiments should not be made here. I would ask the Minister is there any intention of experimenting with those hedges on the central farm here?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has got me at a disadvantage. I have no means of giving him the information now, as none of the officials of the experimental farm are here. If the hon. gentleman states the information he wants, I will see that the Minister of Agriculture reads it and he will get that information.

Mr. McMILLAN. That has been the way every year with the experimental farm. It was the same way for the last two years, we could not get the necessary information and it will be the same way this year if we pass this item. Some person ought to be here to give that information and the Committee should be in possession of it before the item is allowed to pass.

Mr. HAGGART. The two items of "immigration" and "quarantine" were allowed to stand on the understanding that this whole question would be discussed when they come up. My hon. friend will get all the information possible when these items come before the Committee.

Mr. McMILLAN. Then let the item stand until we get the information.

Mr. FOSTER. I have given my hon. friend the information as to what has been expended and what this vote is for.

Mr. McMILLAN. I want the information about last year. There was $900 paid for the site of a building on this central farm, what building was that for?

Mr. FOSTER. That is information in connection with the past expenditure. My hon. friend has a perfect right to ask for that information, and he will get it when these other items come under discussion.

Mr. McMILLAN. I do think this item should be allowed to stand until we get proper information about it. We were told when these farms were to be established that $240,000 would be sufficient to complete them all, buildings and everything else; but if we pass this item we find that over $700,000 have been already spent on the farm. When the Minister gets the item passed he will give me just such information as he chooses. The same thing was done last year.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will have a perfect right to ask the information when the item comes bofore the House, and it cannot be smuggled through, because it has been allowed to stand on the distinct understanding that the whole question will come up on it.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am going to keep my position. Last year I got the item to stand over, and why should not the item stand over this year if the information cannot be given now. The first year the item was allowed to pass, I was told I would get the information, but I never got one single sentence of an explanation afterwards. This is the only opportunity we will have of criticising this item, and when the opportunity is past there will be no other opportunity given.

Mr. FOSTER. But you will get an opportunity, of course.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have not received the information. I allowed the item to pass on a previous occasion, and I am not going to do so now.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the hon. gentleman is quite within his rights when he makes that request. If he has sought for this information ineffectually three times, it is imposing on his good nature to ask him to allow the item to pass without it. If, during two years, he has made this request and it

has not been complied with, the least the Government can do is to defer its further consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. I rather suspect the hon. gentleman did not get the information he was supposed to wish because he was not in his place when the item came up last time. If he had been here he certainly would have been in a position to have forced the information, as he appears to be determined to do to-night. If the hon. gentleman has any regard for the experimental farm he must not take the ground of obstructing the passage of an item to put the buildings in repair, simply because he cannot get the information respecting past expenditure, especially when the Government assures him he will have an opportunity to obtain it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be a strong argument in favour of my hon. friend, that he should get the information when he can. Members cannot be expected to sit here at all hours, and a very considerable number of items are passed between one and two o'clock in the morning. We cannot expect hon. members to stay here until one or two a.m., except in the case of the Minister of Finance, who is paid for it.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a suggestion to make. I take the responsibility of saying that the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to put all his questions and get all the information when the two items yet remaining, spoken of by my hon. colleague, come before the Committee. I promise that; and as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would no doubt be willing to accept that promise himself, will he be good enough to use his persuasive powers to convince his hon. friend that he will not be deceived this time?

Mr. McMILLAN. The Minister is deceiving himself. I never was out of my place when this item came up.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman was here when every item in regard to the experimental farm was passed. I gave him the amount on capital expenditure, and other expenditure, on all the farms, and we had a whole evening's debate on it?

Mr. McMILLAN. When did you give it?

Mr. HAGGART. When the items were up?

Mr. McMILLAN. This is the first time I have heard that the papers containing this information were brought down. I have never seen them.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not referring to papers. I made a statement as to expenditure. I told the hon. gentleman the total cost, and I made a comparison between the total cost of the experimental farm here and the Government farm in Ontario.

Mr. McMILLAN. That was last year.

Mr. HAGGART. It was this session.

Mr. McMILLAN. I was present when the experimental farm was discussed. Those matters were mentioned, and I got all the information I asked then. But the information I ask now is very different information. If hon. gentlemen are prepared to give me this information I am prepared to go on; but if the information is not forthcoming I will not.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has had the total expenditure. I agreed with him in his figures and showed the cost, and that it agreed with the statements of officers here.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman should allow the item to pass. He will get the information.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is as to the buildings we are talking now. I hold Ministers should not come here and say they have not the information ready. It is as easy to get the information now as two or three months hence.

Mr. FOSTER. I have given the information in the item before the Committee.

Mr. McMILLAN. Then I have to let it drop.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman will obtain all the information when the item comes up. By an understanding with the leader of the Opposition all the items were passed with the exception of two, on which the fullest discussion will be allowed on all questions in regard to the experimental farm, immigration and quarantine. The Minister of Finance representing the Public Works Department shows to the fullest extent what this appropriation is for. The information asked for by hon. gentleman is outside this appropriation, and it will be given to him when these items in connection with the Agriculture Department which have been allowed to stand over, come up for discussion.

Mr. McMILLAN. At one time when I allowed the item to pass I brought it up on another item in connection with the farm, and I was told that it belonged to the Public Works Department, and for that reason got no information. However, as I have got the promise of the Minister of Finance and the Postmaster General that all the information will be given, I am willing to allow the item to pass upon that ground.

Mr. HAGGART. Would you be kind enough to state what information you desire?

Mr. McMILLAN. If you will go over the Auditor General's Report and see what has been done with respect to buildings last year, you can give me the information. I want all information with respect to whether the buildings were erected by contract, and whether the contract was kept to with respect to the plans and specifications. I want all that information.

Miscellaneous works not otherwise provided for..... $7,500

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose some of this is intended for the Cobourg harbour.

Mr. MULOCK. I would remind the Minister of Finance with regard to the Cobourg harbour that I understood a Cobourg paper, in which the hon. gentleman has great confidence, has, in the issue which arrived in town to-day, contradicted what the hon. gentleman had stated in his remarks last night, which remarks, of course, it could not have time to learn when the paper was issued. It stated, as I was told, that the harbour was grievously in need of repairs in question, and that in consequence of the neglect of the Administration to do its duty, the people of the town this year would be obliged to bear a rate of taxation that they never had been called upon to bear before. It is, therefore, quite clear that the town had in some way advanced information as to the decision which the House was only advised of when the item was reached last night. I should like to know whether the country

is taken into the confidence of the Government on an item like this, in advance of the House?

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Finance cannot do any good by any such observation. I would like to know how the town of Cobourg came to know the decision of the Government before the House did?

Mr. FOSTER. Then you will have to find out.

Mr. MULOCK. I am here to find out.

Mr. FOSTER. Find it out here or elsewhere.

Mr. MULOCK. I will try.

Mr. FOSTER. It will take you some time.

Mr. MULOCK. I dare say it will take me some time, but if I cannot find it out perhaps we can turn the Minister out.

Mr. FOSTER. You have been trying that for some time.

Mr. MULOCK. We will succeed probably too when you are found out.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not discussing the question.

Mr. MULOCK. I am quite in order, I am speaking to the question.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister will please keep order. Will you please, Mr. Chairman, see that the Minister of Finance keeps order. I am now discussing the item of Cobourg harbour, and I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that the item before it is quite large enough to meet the case of the Cobourg harbour. I wish further to state that the Minister of Finance informed this Committee, last night, that the item of $2,500 was not required for the Cobourg harbour, and he made a statement which is not in harmony with a statement made by a journal in that town, which knows what it is speaking about, I presume. In fact, the withdrawal of the item was not apparently for the reason assigned to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes. I say it was apparently withdrawn not for the reasons given to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I say it, and the Minister may say "order," but he will not say it is not a correct statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I would waste a great deal of breath if I criticised every one of your statements.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister will not venture to say on the floor of this House to-night that that item was withdrawn from the Estimates because the public interest did not demand the expenditure of the money. If he wants to take the responsibility of saying that, then he must admit that he was guilty of an error at least, when he made the statement last night. I ask him now if the reason he gave last night was the correct one.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly it was.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the Minister sticks to the statement that the item was withdrawn because the condition of the harbour did not require the expenditure of the amount in question. How did he come to put the item in the Estimates, or on what information was the suggestion given to the Minister that it should be withdrawn? My own view upon it is, whether the Minister will admit it or not, that that item was withdrawn as part of the —I cannot dignify it by the term of a policy——

Mr. FLINT. Scheme.

Mr. MULOCK. "Scheme" is a more fitting word. My own view is that it was withdrawn as part of a scheme to make public works depend upon political action on the part of the electors. Now, we have been told that the Government are about to inaugurate a new policy, that hereafter public money is to be expended on public works according to their merits, and that constituencies are no longer to be debauched by the giving or withholding of public works. If that is the case I would like to know how an action like this can be said to harmonize with the professions of reform made by this Administration.

Mr. DEWDNEY. You will see.

Mr. MULOCK. We do not expect anything from the Minister of the Interior in the way of reform.

Mr. DEWDNEY. You do not want reform.

Mr. MULOCK. I hope we shall never have to depend upon him for the application of such a principle. It is a disappointment to me, because I was in hope that the Government were in earnest——

Mr. FOSTER. Is this in order?

Mr. MULOCK. I should like to know if it is not in order to discuss the Cobourg harbour?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In the Committee of the Whole House we have to follow the Rules of the House, and the hon. gentleman is referring to a past debate; secondly, we are not dealing with the item of which he speaks; and, thirdly, my impression is that if he spoke twenty-four hours, he could not get any other answer from the Government than the one he got last night.

Mr. MULOCK. I will not controvert your statement, Mr. Chairman, but I have no recollection of any past debate in which this Government declared that they were actually to turn over a new leaf. I was referring to utterances which, I understand, were given to the public to try to make the people believe that this Administration——

Mr. FOSTER. Order. The hon. gentleman has been called to order.

Mr. MULOCK. I am perfectly in order. The Minister of Finance seems to think that by saying "order" he can put people out of order. He will be good enough to keep in order himself. I am perfectly in order in expressing the hope that the Government will do justice to the section I refer to and to every other section of Canada, and not exercise the arbitrary power they temporarily enjoy by giving or not giving as they may perhaps serve a political exigency. Is that in order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is not in order; but I suppose the hon. gentleman will come to order very soon.

Mr. MULOCK. I am begging the Government to do justice; surely that is in order. I am begging them to be true to the trust they have taken; is that not in order? I am begging them even in the case of this small vote of $7,500 to

make an honest application of the fund; is not that in order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Not on this item.

Mr. MULOCK. If it is not proper to ask the Government to spend this money where it is applicable, what is this Committee for? I think Cobourg is entitled to it, and to expend it——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I rise to order. You have given a decision on this question, and the hon. gentleman cannot discuss a question after it has been decided to be out of order.

Mr. CHARLTON. What are we talking about? Miscellaneous works not otherwise provided for. If Cobourg has been otherwise provided for, I would like to know it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not a miscellaneous work.

Mr. CHARLTON. If it is not, I would like to know what it is.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I decided that the hon. gentleman was out of order, and I thought he was finishing. The question is entirely out of order.

Mr. CHARLTON. We may get into a position where we cannot discuss anything. The Cobourg harbour is a work which we claim requires attention; here is a vote not specifically devoted to any purpose; and, if it is out of order to suggest that a portion of this money should be used on the Cobourg harbour, it is astonishing to me. If it is distasteful to the Government to have that question brought up, as to the nature of their motives——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A question of order cannot be discussed after it has been decided.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What my hon. friend has stated is, I think, correct enough. This is a general appropriation, and my hon. friend is suggesting that a portion of it be employed in a particular way. Surely the Minister of Justice will hardly say that that is out of order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That must be the hon. gentleman's impression of what he was doing, but he was not doing that at all. He was discussing an item which had been dropped some days ago, and the propriety of dropping it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Even supposing that was dropped from its specific place in the Estimates, you cannot contend that a member may not suggest, on a vote which distinctly covers such uses of the money as I understand this does, that it be employed for that particular purpose, or for any particular purpose.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I can easily understand how it would be in order even to raise that question; but the hon. gentleman was ingenious enough to get out of order by discussing another question.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hold that in this matter we have taken a perfectly legitimate course with regard to the dropping of a vote, which we believed was dropped for reasons not creditable to the Government; and if we choose to urge the Government to retrace their steps in this matter and do justice to the town of Cobourg, I believe we have a perfect right to do that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you are going back to an item that was disposed of.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Government dropped it, it is true, but you cannot say that my hon. friend cannot discuss the desirability of applying this vote to the purpose he suggests.

Mr. CHARLTON. I understand the right of a member of this Committee with reference to this matter, and if the Government choose to call on the Chairman to declare a thing out of order that is clearly in order, I think the Opposition had better stand upon their rights. It is absurd that a miscellaneous vote——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to make a suggestion to him? The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has suggested a mode by which he can put himself in order and discuss the Cobourg harbour; but surely the hon. gentleman does not want to discuss a past ruling of the Chair, or to discuss an item that has been decided?

Mr. CHARLTON. I understand the Minister of Justice suggests that if I do not call into question your ruling in this matter, I may be allowed to say a few words as to the proper application of this vote. Am I permitted to say something on this subject?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. CHARLTON. Very well. I would suggest that through an oversight of the Government the claims of Cobourg harbour have been overlooked; and inasmuch as the Government have been under a false impression as to the wants of that important point and the interests of the public at large in this matter, they should use part of of this vote of $7,500 for necessary repairs on the Cobourg harbour.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I said a moment ago that this question of Cobourg harbour was disposed of yesterday after an hour's discussion; and in my opinion—I give it with all modesty—it is out of order to discuss it now.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice will admit that possibly a part of this money, or even the whole of it, may require to be expended on Cobourg harbour, and that, therefore, we have a right to impress on the Government the necessity of making repairs to that harbour.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot agree at all with the proposition that on a general vote such as this, we have the right to discuss the merits of every harbour and river in Canada, under the pretext that some of this money might be properly expended there. The item, under such circumstances, would never be passed. All that is open for discussion is the propriety of passing a vote for expenditures not otherwise provided for. I would suggest, however, that we should agree to hear what the hon. member for North Norfolk has to say, although, in my opinion, your ruling, Sir, ought to stand.

Mr. CHARLTON. I thank the hon. Minister for his courtesy in allowing me to say a few words about this as a matter of privilege, if he does not conceive I have the right to do so. I notice that in a Cobourg paper to-day, the public of that riding are warned of the great mistake they made in sending a member to this House who was not a supporter of the Government, the result of their

course being that the harbour would be neglected and they would be under the necessity of paying heavy taxation. I do not know whether that statement made by the local Tory paper is correct or not, but the fact that a vote was first put in the Estimates and then dropped gives colour to it; and, under the circumstances, the Government can scarcely remain under the imputation of having been actuated in this matter by a desire to punish a riding for having sent to this House a gentleman opposed to them, thus making political capital by leaving the people of that riding to suppose that in the future, if they wish to have appropriations made, no matter how necessary they may be, they must send a member here supporting the Government. I believe that the character of the works in the harbour render it particularly necessary that an appropriation should be made, and the Government, by unjustly withholding it, are liable to the imputation of doing so for a sinister purpose. Therefore I think it advisable they should use a portion of the appropriation devoted to miscellaneous work in providing for the works which require to be done in that harbour.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to have a distinct understanding, Sir, as to the position assumed by the Minister of Justice and by yourself. I said a little while ago that this appropriation, being general in its terms and presumably covering any possible case, if any member chooses to suggest to the Government the advisability of carrying out any particular expenditure in any particular direction, he has a perfect right to do so. That, I think, is the natural inference to be drawn from the general terms in which this item is clothed. That may lead to great delay, and that is one of the reasons why it is not expedient for the Government, as a rule, to take votes without specifying the particular purposes for which they are to be applied. If, however, they do not do so, but ask for a general vote, I do not see how you, Sir, can possibly prevent members from pressing the claims of their constituencies on the Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course, if a member merely suggests that something ought to be done in a certain locality which he represents, the point would never arise; but, it is quite inconsistent with a general vote, not taken for substantive works but for incidental purposes merely, to proceed, with regard to a substantive work such as Cobourg harbour for which there was an item dropped, to discuss the policy of dropping the item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You do not object to a member pressing the desirability of spending money there, but to his discussing the policy of not spending any.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the reason I ask that the point of order be not pressed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Last year there was a vote taken for $1,500 for some work on Macgregor Creek in the town of Chatham. I see by the Estimates that that sum is not to be revoted this year, although it is highly desirable that the work should be done. There is even greater necessity now than there was last year for it. I may say that the necessity arises on account of some work the Government did a few years ago in dredging the creek, thereby endangering buildings along the bank of the creek. To prevent their falling into the river, the Government found it necessary to sheet-pile one side of the creek, and on the opposite side there are some large mills and warehouses which are in danger on account of the creek being narrowed up by the sheet-piling. This appropriation was made last year for the purpose of protecting the mills on the other side, and they are being undermined actually and eventually will fall into the creek. I believe one large woollen mill there belonging to Mr. Taylor is already cracked, and his warehouse is in great danger of being undermined by the action of the high water in the spring, and an appropriation was made last year for the purpose of protecting this by sheet-piling. Although nothing is done, yet certainly it was wrong to drop the item this year because the necessity exists all the greater now, and, unless something is done, undoubtedly these buildings will be greatly in danger and a good cause for action against the Government will exist. I, therefore, think that a small appropriation ought to be made and the work proceeded with this summer in order that the greater damage may not occur, and it might possibly be taken out of this item.

Mr. FLINT. I have called the attention of the Public Works Department formally by representation in writing to the necessity of repairing certain breakwaters and wharves in the county I represent. I understand that in two or three instances the delay which has occurred has been detrimental to the public interest, and, if the winter is allowed to pass, I fear the storms and the ice which accompany that season will damage these works and the consequent expense to the Government will be very much greater than a small expenditure on repairs would be now. I, therefore, press this upon the attention of the acting Minister of Public Works.

Surveys and Inspection $16,000

Mr. MULOCK. What is this for?

Mr. FOSTER. This is to pay the costs of surveys and inspections. A demand is made for dredging or for a wharf, and, if it is considered to be worth while, some officer is despatched to the place and makes a report, and on his report the action of the Government is based.

Mr. FLINT. I think that might apply to the works to which I have referred.

Mr. MULOCK. I see there is an increase from $15,000 to $16,000, which would appear to show that the Government have something definite in view, and, therefore, we should have the details.

Mr FOSTER. It cannot be stated what this is to be used for, but the expenditure last year was divided over the provinces generally. Up to the 31st December, 1890, it amounted to $13,654.

Mr. WATSON. Why do you ask $16,000 this year?

Mr. FOSTER. The department supposes that amount will be necessary. The year before $24,000 was asked and required.

Mr. CAMPBELL. By the Auditor General's Report I see that G. M. Graham, of Perth, was paid $117 for surveying. Was that on the Tay Canal?

Mr. HAGGART. There were some surveys on the Rideau Canal, I think.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thought, perhaps, it was on the extension of the Tay Canal.

National Art Gallery..... $1,000

Mr. FLINT. What is that for?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a yearly expenditure, and it is a very modest amount.

Mr. CHARLTON. How is it expended?

Mr. FLINT. Where is this Art Gallery?

Mr. FOSTER. It is over the Fisheries Exhibit. This is for care of the building and framing of pictures and repairs.

Mr. MULOCK. It is not for the purchase of pictures?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it is for taking care of them.

Mr. MULOCK. Who is in charge of the gallery?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Watts is the curator.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that his whole duty?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose so.

Mr. MULOCK. When it comes to the purchasing of pictures, on whose advice are they selected?

Mr. FOSTER. The purchase is recommended by Council.

Mr. MULOCK. Is every expenditure on the gallery of that kind by Order in Council?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; it is always considered in Council.

Collection of Slides and Booms dues....$6,500

Mr. FOSTER. This is to cover the expense of the staff: Ottawa district, salaries, $2,500; St. Maurice district, salaries, $200; boatmen, travelling expenses and contingencies—in all $6,500.

Mr. MULOCK. Are these people employed by the year?

Mr. FOSTER. Some are employed the whole year. Formerly we had quite a large staff, but it has been reduced. There is a collector at Ottawa, Mr. Smith, and an assistant collector, and a deputy collector at St. Maurice at a salary of $200. The boatmen are only employed during the season. The total revenue last year was $96,542.

Mr. MULOCK. Any arrears?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; uncollected on the first of July, 1890, $4,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there is $74,000 uncollected.

Mr. MULOCK. When does the rent of the year expire?

Mr. EDWARDS. The dues are payable on the 30th November. If not paid then, 6 per cent. is charged, but they must be paid by the 30th June on the following year.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give the statement I have here. The revenue for sliding and boomage for the year was $96,500. There was collected $84,889. There was written off by Order in Council $221. Ordinary dues uncollected 1st July, 1890—I take that to be for the fiscal year—$4,529. Then the Chaudière boomage in suspense, $6,903, making up the total of the dues accrued during that fiscal year. Outside of that there was collected from dues outstanding the previous year $17,526. I suppose it would be almost impossible to have everything collected right up to the end of the year. Heretofore there were very large arrears, running over a long series of years, but an attempt has been made, and made successfully, to collect them. So, altogether, the amount of collections last year was $102,400.

Mr. MULOCK. Are there any arrears beyond that year?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, there are some arrears from bankrupt firms and the like.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any reason why the business could not be placed on a cash basis?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether that is practicable or not.

Mr. FLINT. Am I correct in assuming, from the Auditor General's Report last year, that the increase from slides and booms was $105,000 and the expenditure $114,000. This was startling to me, because I always imagined there was a profit.

Mr. FOSTER. Those were not working expenses.

Mr. FLINT. Staff and repairs.

Mr. FOSTER. It would appear from the statistics last year that we were $5,000 or $6,000 behind.

Mr. EDWARDS. It would be most awkward to collect slidage from time to time as logs pass through. The custom is to make the slidage due on 30th November. If it is not paid on the 30th June there is still perfect security, because the Government will not give passes to allow lumber to pass through the canal unless the dues are paid.

Mr. MULOCK. On 20th January, 1890, I find among the balances due on slides and booms the following:—$6,426, $11,482, $1,151, $16,684, $4,690, $820, $5,850, or a total of $101,057. The Minister says there have been collected since that time, $17,000, thus leaving outstanding $83,000 at the time of making up the returns. If the Government have undoubted security, as it appears, namely, a lien as it were on the timber itself, why should not this amount be collected if it is a good debt? If it is a bad debt, why was it allowed to accrue?

Mr. FOSTER. These have been standing for a long while, many of them twenty-five years.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Minister lay on the Table a schedule showing the dates of the arrears, less what amount has been collected, with the amounts, and names, and years when due?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I will see that is done.

Mr. MULOCK. When that is submitted, will it be in order that any discussion arising on the statement will be as much in order as discussion is now?

Mr. FOSTER. It can be discussed.

Mr. MULOCK. We will be able to discuss it on Concurrence as freely as in Committee of Supply?

Mr. FOSTER. All right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suggest the expediency of considering whether it is not wise to strike off debts that are absolutely uncollectable.

It is bad book-keeping to keep known worthless assets on our public accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. That is quite true, and there are a number of that class.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before doing so, the statements promised by the hon. gentleman will be submitted, and it will need to be looked over and carefully criticised.

Repairs, &c., harbours, docks and slides..... $115,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What have we particularly to do with the River Yamaska?

Mr. FOSTER. We had a lock built there?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In case of Esquimalt graving dock, there is a charge of $5,600 for repairs executed in 1891. Was not that dock constructed a very short time ago?

Mr. FOSTER. The repairs include the coal required for the working of the dock—350 tons, at $5.50 per ton.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And that is within touch of some of the richest coal fields in America.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it one of the results of handing over our coal fields to some of our confounded speculators? It appears most unreasonable that within a few miles of a coal field we should have to pay $5.50 per ton.

Mr. FOSTER. That is always the place we pay most.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have resided near coal fields, where I paid 4 shillings a ton.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the cheapest rate for which it can be obtained. It was obtained by contract after tenders were invited. There is for water, 350 days, waste, oil and tallow, and repairs and renewals amounting to $5,600.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We spend $13,000 a year on maintenance, besides the building of this dock, and what do we get in return?

Mr. FOSTER. From the 22nd July, 1889, to 25th June, 1890, the dockage received was $13,563. That was the first working year, and it is a very respectable revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Considering that it has cost us $750,000, I fail to see that it is a respectable investment if it pays its working expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. I was speaking about the revenue, not about the investment. The investment is forthe good of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am bound to say that, compared with some of your other investments, it is not a bad investment.

Mr. FOSTER. That is some praise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the best I can say for it. We have an outlay of $30,000 a year for interest and apparently we make both ends meet on working expenses. How many ships were docked?

Mr. FOSTER. There were twelve. The dockage on Her Majesty's ship *Amphion* was $7,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do we get from the Lévis dock?

Mr. FOSTER. The revenue from the 28th September, 1888, to the 25th November, 1889, was $19,848. There were five vessels docked, so that the dockage was fairly good.

Mr. MULOCK. I observe at page 85 that you are already commencing expenditure on repairs for the Kingston graving dock. How does that come?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I doubt very much if it is finished yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it is nearly finished; it is not in working order yet.

Mr. MULOCK. Has it been taken off the contractors' hands yet?

Mr. CHARLTON. Has Bancroft surrendered the dock?

Mr. FOSTER. It is in the hands of the contractors yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we ought to have a receipt produced from Mr. Bancrott freeing us from all claims.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There will be no difficulty about getting that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How will you do it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We got a cheque from him.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to understand how an account for repairs can be put in before the work is finished.

Mr. FOSTER. That is an estimate for slight repairs which may be necessary after the dock is opened.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there a staff already appointed for the graving dock at Kingston?

Mr. FOSTER. The staff is not appointed, but whenever the dock is opened and is ready for business we must have some money to work it, and the engineer has given his estimate of what the staff will consist of, and what it will cost. We will require a dock man, foreman, engineer, assistant engineer, two firemen, and a night watchman.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the estimated salary per annum of the staff?

Mr. FOSTER. A dock man, $1,500; the foreman, $60 a month; the engineer, $100 a month; the assistant engineer, $50; two firemen, $45; and the night watchman, $1 per day.

Mr. MULOCK. What does that amount to per annum?

Mr. FOSTER. $6,000 per annum, according to this estimate.

Mr. MULOCK. This dock is not yet taken off the contractors' hands. These appointments are not going to be made for some time.

Mr. FOSTER. The appointments will not be made until the dock is taken off the contractors' hands and is ready for use. Then, of course, we shall need the officers.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the condition of the work? When are you likely to take it off the contractors' hands?

Mr. FOSTER. At the end of November.

Mr. MULOCK. Then there will be no staff appointed until the opening of navigation or thereabouts?

Mr. FOSTER. We shall need to have engineers and dock masters.

Mr. CHARLTON. You do not want them during the winter.

Mr. FOSTER. They are necessary in the winter.

Mr. MULOCK. If they are, it is not necessary to take a year's vote, which you do not require, to provide for not more than half a year at the outside.

Mr. FOSTER. If it will not be opened till November, of course we shall not use it all.

Mr. CHARLTON. You do not require an engineer for pumping the dock out or for watching it. It is not necessary to put the staff on until you want to use the dock, which will be in the following spring.

Mr. FOSTER. It is possible to have a vessel in during the winter.

Mr. CHARLTON. Oh, no. The navigation is suspended during the winter.

Mr. FOSTER. It might be possible to put a vessel in the dock after November.

Mr. MULOCK. These Estimates were prepared many months ago, and perhaps at that time the Government thought that the work might be sufficiently done to enable them to make use of it. But now we know that you will not have to pay for this staff for more than half a year; therefore, they take a year's pay. If you take this $6,000, and if there be $3,000 over, you will probably smuggle that some way into fixing the Cobourg harbour, but I want that done openly, by a separate vote. I think this item should be reduced by $3,000. Are any appointments made at present?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Then there are no salaries running at present?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, on what principle can you ask to have the whole year's salary voted?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows as well as I do that if it is not needed, it will not be used.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have understood that last February three distinct fellows were promised the appointment of engineer.

Mr. CHARLTON. When the Committee are informed that the vote will not be required, I do not see the propriety of voting $6,000 when only $3,000 will be needed, and possibly not more than $1,500.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not voting the details; we are voting the general sum. For the convenience of members, the details are set out; but this is the general vote.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Minister takes that view of it, that under cover of $3,000 for a half year's salary that can never be called for, he is getting a vote of $3,000 that he may apply to other purposes, that is a more vicious system than I thought.

Mr. FOSTER. It cannot be applied for any but legitimate purposes.

Mr. MULOCK. No; but he tells us that this is a bulk sum, and that if it is not available for this purpose it will be applied to something else. I think this vote should be reduced by $3,000.

Telegraph line between Prince Edward Island and the mainland..... $2,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What is this?

Mr. FOSTER. This is for the maintenance and working of the cable line between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. This line was constructed as one of the conditions of union at the time Prince Edward Island came into Confederation, and it has been kept since that time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I never could understand why telegraphing to Prince Edward Island was so high as it is. Do the Government own this cable?

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) When the Island came into Confederation, the Anglo-American Company had a monopoly of telegraphic communication with the Island, and the Local Government gave then a subsidy. When we joined Confederation the Dominion Government assumed the line and this is the annual vote.

Land and Cable Telegraph Lines of the Sea Coasts and Islands of the Lower Rivers and Gulf of St. Lawence and Maritime Provinces, including cost of working steamer *Newfield*, or other vessel when required for cable service..... $30,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is the usual vote. The *Newfield* is a Government steamer in the Marine and Fisheries service, but she is specially arranged for the taking up and laying of these cables, and whenever wanted for these purposes, the cost is paid out of this vote.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose these cables are not maintained by virtue of any agreement with the Island?

Mr. FOSTER. These are telegraph lines which have been laid along the sea coast for marine purposes, and they play a very important part in the gulf and outer islands. They have been extended by gradual yearly extensions at small amounts each year down to the Labrador coast, where they enable people who live almost outside of civilization to have some communication with the world.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are the receipts equal to the expenditure?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think they are. The revenue from all our telegraph service is $11,829.

Telegraph lines, North-West Territories..... $25,000

Mr. FOSTER. These are our own property. They were rendered necessary, when the country was opened up, to give us communication with the different posts throughout that country; but as railways are being built and the railway telegraph lines come into operation, we are dispensing with them.

Mr. MULOCK. Do not your lines go to centres of population in the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They branch off at Qu'Appelle Station, thence to Touchwood and cross Clark's Crossing to Battleford, from Battleford to Fort Pitt and thence to Edmonton. From Clark's Crossing to Prince Albert, about seventy miles, the wires

were taken down, as the railway has built its own line, and the wires are on hand to be used elsewhere when required.

Telegraph lines, British Columbia.....$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is for the same purpose as the lines on the gulf coast. A line runs from Victoria out past Bonilla Point and up to Cape Beale on the western coast of the Island, and is used entirely for marine purposes. That is the only line the Government maintain there.

Telegraph and signal service generally..... $10,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is for the stations from which we get our reports. The Government pays the entire cost.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are they all in connection with the meteorological service?

Mr. FOSTER. This is for the Government signal service, and has nothing to do with the meteorological service?

Public Works Agency, British Columbia. $6,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the agent there now?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Gamble is the resident engineer and agent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was not that position held by Sir Joseph Trutch formerly?

Mr. FOSTER. No; not that agency.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the increase of $1,200 for?

Mr. FOSTER. That is to avoid the necessity of charging the travelling expenses of Mr. Gamble and other incidental expenses against special works in British Columbia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the details of this expenditure?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Gamble receives $2,200 salary; Mr. McDonald, $1,400; clerk and draughtsman, $1,000; messenger, $400; stationery and printing, $200; fuel, $100; travelling and contingencies, $1,200. That last item is the increase, and that is simply a transfer. It is charged to that service instead of being charged to the different works which Mr. Gamble would be sent to report upon.

Mr. MULOCK. Is any other account reduced by that amount?

Mr. FOSTER. If a public work is to be built in British Columbia, instead of Mr. Gamble's expenses being charged to it, they will be paid under this item.

Mr. MULOCK. Cannot you show what other estimates have been reduced to make up for this?

Mr. FOSTER. No; but there will be a reduction on each expenditure on public works in that province.

Mr. MULOCK. The only thing we can understand is that this is an increase of $1,200, because the Minister cannot show where the reduction takes place. I should like to know what public works are under this agency?

Mr. FOSTER. The agent is the representative of the Department of Public Works in British Columbia in regard to dredging, the different harbour improvements, the penitentiary and all the public works.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 31st August, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE MEMBER FOR EAST NORTHUMBERLAND.

Mr. TISDALE moved:

That the Select Committee appointed to enquire fully into the charges preferred against the member for the East Riding of Northumberland be granted leave to sit during the time the House is in session.

Motion agreed to.

COMMERCIAL TREATY—ENGLAND AND FRANCE.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. RIDER) asked, 1. Is there a commercial treaty in force between England and France? 2. When was such treaty made, and how long will it remain in force? 3. Are butter, cheese and other farm produce, in virtue of this treaty, admitted into France at lower rate of duties than similar articles coming from countries with which France has no such treaty? 4. Are butter, pork, lard, when imported direct from Canada, admitted into France at the same rate of duty as similar articles of English production?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. There is a commercial treaty in force between England and France. 2. It was entered into 28th February, 1882, and came into operation 16th May, 1882, and will continue in force until 1st February, 1892, to be then or thereafter terminated by either party on 12 months notice to the other. It does not appear to be applicable to English colonies. 3 and 4. By this treaty the Customs tariff for goods, the produce or manufacture of either country, is to be regulated by the internal legislation of each, they guaranteeing to each other in all other matters in the United Kingdom, France and Algeria the treatment of the most favoured nation. By a French law promulgated on 27th February, 1882, it was declared that from that date goods of English origin or manufacture should be liable on their entry into France to the same treatment as those of the most favoured nations, with the exception of colonial produce, which it was declared would remain subject to the general Customs tariff. France has two Customs tariffs, one, the general tariff, which can be modified at the will of the Legislature, and which is applied to the goods imported from such countries as do not enjoy most favoured nation treaties; the other, the conventional tariff, which is a combination of the various special tariffs granted by France

to other countries. Corn, live stock and many raw products have not been included in the special tariff, and have therefore to pay the rates of the general tariff, even when imported from countries enjoying most favoured nations treatment. The conventional tariff rates are usually about 24 per cent. less than those of the general tariff, and Great Britain enjoys the benefit of the lower tariff by law and not by the treaty of 28th February, 1882. It would seem that the higher tariff applies to imports into France by Canada, and in addition there is, I understand, a *surtaxe d'entrepôt* on any merchandise imported into France *viâ* British ports.

PURCHASE OF LAND FROM HON. SENATOR GUÉVREMONT.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BRODEUR) asked, 1. During the course of the elections now last past, did the Government authorize any person to negotiate with the Hon. J. B. Guévremont, Senator, for the purchase of a lot of land of which the latter was the owner? 2. If so, on what conditions was the sale completed? 3. What was the price paid by the Government for this land? 4. Did the said vendor, the Hon. Mr. Guévremont, reserve any rights over this land? If so, what were these rights? 5. Before buying this land did the Government search in the Registry Office for the County of Richelieu, where the said land is situate, for the charges paid upon it? 6. Before buying this land did the Government obtain knowledge, either by its own act or by that of its attorney, of the deed of sale which had been accepted by Mr. Guévremont in respect to this land? 7. If so, did it ascertain that this land had been bought by the said Mr. Guévremont for about $500 without any reservation on the part of the person who sold to him?

Mr. TUPPER. 1. During the course of the elections last past, the Government did not authorize any person to negotiate with the Hon. Mr. Guévremont for the purchase of a lot of land of which he was the owner, but the Minister of Marine and the officers of his department had been carrying on negotiations for a considerable time. These negotiations began upon Mr. J. B. Labelle, M.P., in April, 1887, writing to the Minister of Marine on behalf of the pilots, asking for the purchase of the property by the Government in order that the trees thereon might be preserved. 2. The land was heavily timbered. The trees were important to shipping both as affording a shelter and as an aid to navigation. The Minister of Marine, under authority of an Order in Council, offered $66 per acre for 64 acres, this value being first fixed by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. 3. $66 per acre was the price paid. 4. There was a complete purchase without any reservation of rights. 5. Before buying the land the Department of Justice examined into the title and caused a lease to be made in the Registry Office. 6. The Marine Department did not know what the land cost Mr. Guévremont, when a price was agreed upon between Mr. Guévremont and the department. 7. The department was not aware of the circumstances or conditions upon which Senator Guévremont bought the land.

APPOINTMENT OF MAIL CLERK.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BARRON) asked, 1. When was William McArthur first appointed mail clerk between Lindsay and Haliburton? 2. Did he resign? If so, when, and who succeeded him? 3. What was his salary, and what was the salary of his successor? 4. Was said McArthur reappointed; if so, when, and who was mail clerk immediately prior to McArthur's reappointment? 5. Before McArthur's reappointment, did he hold any office under the Government? If so, what office, and what was his salary pertaining to such office? 6. Who is now lock master at Fenelon Falls, and what is the latter's salary? 7. Has said McArthur passed the civil service examination?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. William McArthur was appointed a railway mail clerk of the third class on 29th April, 1879. 2. He resigned 1st April, 1887. William Joseph Meagher was appointed on 1st April, 1887. 3. McArthur's salary was, at the date of his resignation, $720; he being at that time a second class clerk. Meagher was appointed a third class clerk, at a salary of $480. 4. McArthur was appointed as a temporary clerk, at $480, on 7th July, 1891, to replace Meagher who died on 19th May, 1891. 5. Not in Post Office Department. 6. The department is not in possession of that information. 7. He has not passed the civil service examination.

Mr. FOSTER. John Jordan is lock-master at Fenelon Falls. His salary is $250.

TAY CANAL—BASIN AT PERTH.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. CAMPBELL) asked, 1. What was the amount of the contract entered into with Messrs. Davis & Son for the construction of the basin at Perth, on the Tay Canal? 2. Were any changes or alterations made in their contract? If so, what were they? 3. What was the total cost of the work, including extras and all changes and alterations?

Mr. FOSTER. The amount of the contract entered into with Messrs. Davis & Son for the construction of the basin at Perth on the Tay Canal, was $44,437. No changes or alterations were made in their contract. Authority, however, was given by Order in Council, 12th November, 1888, to wharf in and deepen the east side of the basin at a cost not to exceed $7,500. The actual cost was $6,985.05. The total cost of the work, including extras and all changes and alterations, amounted to $53,614.62.

PREVENTIVE OFFICER AT POWNAL BAY.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, Has Mr. James McRae, the preventive officer at Pownal Bay, P.E.I., been dismissed from or relieved of his office? If so, for what reason? Has anyone been appointed in his place?

Mr. FOSTER. The services of Mr. McRae were dispensed with, as per Order in Council, on the 21st July, 1891, for the reason that the Inspector of Ports reported that no revenue was collected at Pownal Bay, that a few small vessels loaded there with produce late in the season which could readily enter and clear at Charlottetown, 7 miles distant; that the office was of no service whatever and was simply a useless expenditure. No one has been appointed in his place. The salary was $50.

PAYMENT TO C. N. ROBITAILLE, OF QUEBEC.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. CHOQUETTE) asked, On what grounds and for what services did C. N. Robitaille, of Quebec, lately receive a sum of $135 from the Customs Department?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. C. N. Robitaille, of Quebec, was appointed for one month at $3 per day and expenses, and paid out of the Contingent Fund on the order of the Minister.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the service?

Mr. FOSTER. The service is not stated in the reply I have here.

HARBOUR MASTER AT TIGNISH, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries received the report of George Conroy, Esq., sub-collector at Tignish, P. E. I., appointed to enquire and report why Benjamin Gaudet, harbour master and wharfinger at Tignish, made no report of what money he collected at Tignish Harbour for the year 1890? Is the said Benjamin Gaudet still acting in the capacity of harbour master and wharfinger at Tignish, P.E.I.?

Mr. TUPPER. I have not received the report of the sub-collector who was appointed to enquire into the case of Benjamin Gaudet, who is still harbour master and wharfinger at Tignish. On 23rd July, 1891, Mr. George Conroy acknowledges receipt of departmental letter appointing him a Commissioner under Order in Council, to investigate into conduct of Benjamin Gaudet as harbour master and wharfinger, and states it may be a fortnight before he is able to transmit report as the captains of the vessels who paid wharfage are coming in and out of the port. He states he will forward report as soon as possible.

LOCKS AT FENELON FALLS.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BARRON) asked, Is the Government erecting a house or office for the lock-master at Fenelon Falls? If so, what are the dimensions? Who is the contractor? Was the contract let by tender? What is the cost? What were the canal tolls last year, and this year, up to date? What has been the cost of the construction of the lock, &c., at Fenelon Falls to date?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government is not erecting a house or office for the lock-master at Fenelon Falls. The canal tolls collected this year up to date during season of navigation were $35.60; to 1st May, 1891, $3.25; during fiscal year 1890-91, $34.56; current fiscal year, 50 cents. The cost of construction of the locks was, by contract, A. F. McNally, $114,355; Charles Young, lock gates contract, $11,174.81.

CHARGES AGAINST INDIAN AGENT JONES.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. LANDERKIN) asked, Does the Government still adhere to their decision in relation to the following matter:—

"In view of the fact that the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs has refused to allow our Council to appropriate money for the purpose of retaining a lawyer to manage the prosecution of the charges made against Peter E. Jones, as agent of the Mississauga Indians of the Credit, and also for the purpose of subpœnaing witnesses necessary to prove the charges; and further, in view of the fact that an investigation without legal assistance on our part and without the means of compelling the attendance of witnesses would only serve to whitewash the accused, if guilty of the charges preferred, and thereby to defeat the ends of justice: Therefore, be it resolved by the Council of the Mississauga Indians of the Credit, that the further prosecution of said charges be abandoned.

(Sgd.) "GEORGE HENRY,

"Chief Councillor of the Mississaugas of the Credit.

"The above resolution passed in a Council held on the New Credit Reserve, 30th June, 1891."

Mr. DEWDNEY. The question of the employment, at the expense of the band, of a lawyer to act for the complainant in the investigation into the charges made against Mr. Indian Agent Jones, is, by decision of the council, to be submitted to the voting members of the band on the 15th proximo, at a meeting of the band to be summoned for the purpose of considering the same.

PUBLIC WORKS IN JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BRODEUR) asked, Whether the Government, or the Minister of Public Works have received a petition from the Corporation of the parish of Isle Bizard, asking for authority to erect an iron bridge on the river separating the parish of Isle Bizard from the parish of Ste. Geneviève, in the County of Jacques Cartier? If so, have the Government granted the authority asked for? If the Government have not yet granted the said authorization, why have they not done so?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The petition has been received, and I shall be able to inform the hon. member in a few days of the action taken upon it.

BRITISH COPYRIGHT LEGISLATION.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. EDGAR) asked, Has the Government been informed of any legislation of the Imperial Parliament during the late session affecting the subject of copyright in Canada? If so, what is the general effect? Will it enable the Canadian Government to issue a proclamation bringing into force the Canadian Copyright Act of 1889?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I believe that no legislation of the Imperial Parliament during the late session has taken place affecting the subject of copyright in Canada.

LABOUR LEGISLATION.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. McMULLEN) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce during the present session any legislation based upon the Report of the Labour Commission? If so, what is the nature of it to be?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On this subject legislation based on that report was introduced and adopted last session. The Government intend immediately to carry out that legislation and complete its design, and they will give further consideration to matters arising out of the report at a future session.

PURCHASE OF CEMENT.

Mr. FORBES asked, Whether the Government have purchased any cement from the Rathbun

Company, during the fiscal year of 1890 and 1891, or between the 1st of January and the 15th of August, 1891? If so, what quantity has been purchased and what price has been paid for the same?

Mr. FOSTER. There has not been any cement purchased by the Department of Railways and Canals from the Rathbun Company during the period mentioned in the above enquiry.

QUEBEC CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. GODBOUT) asked, What portion of the $288,000 voted by this House, by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, section 1, has been paid over to the Quebec Central Railway Company? If no portion of this subsidy has been paid over, what is the reason? Is this amount of $288,000 still at the disposal of the said company? If not, what is the amount still at the call of the said company?

Mr. FOSTER. No portion has been paid over. The reason it has not been paid over is that it has not been earned. The full sum of $288,000, therefore, is still available to the company.

MONTREAL CUSTOMS SERVICE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (for Mr. MCMULLEN) asked, The name or names of the defaulting clerks in the Montreal Customs service? The amount of default of each? Have they or any of them been prosecuted for their offence? If not, why not? Did any of the defaulting clerks abscond? If so, is their whereabouts known? Have any of them returned on condition of not being prosecuted?

Mr. FOSTER. John F. Campbell and Richard Thomas are the names of the defaulting clerks. The amount of Campbell's shortage is $3,500. That of Thomas is not yet reported to the department. They have not been prosecuted for their offence. Campbell having secured the amount, his books having been found correct, having made no attempt at concealment, and having secured the payment of the shortage, dismissal was considered sufficient punishment. Thomas died before the deficit was discovered. Campbell was absent when the deficit was discovered, whereupon he was placed under suspension. He subsequently returned. Campbell's whereabouts is known. To the last part of the question the answer is, no.

OFFICIALS ON THE MURRAY CANAL.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. HARGRAFT) asked, 1. Have any engineers been employed by the Government on the Murray Canal, during the year ending 30th June, 1891, or any part of it? 2. If so, who are they? What are the names of all, including the chief engineer? 3. How much was paid each? The name and amount? 4. What is the nature of the work done by each? 5. Are any of these engineers still under pay? If so, which of them, and how much are they now receiving? 6. Is a man by the name of James Forge under pay on or connected with said canal? If so, what are his duties? How much has he received last year? If under pay now, at what wages?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. Yes; two persons, 12 months each. 2. G. E. Rosamond and W. M. West. 3. $2,000 to Rosamond, $960 to West. 4. Rosamond is in general charge of all duties connected with construction and surveys; West gives lines and levels and makes measurements. 5. Yes; both Rosamond and West are under pay; Rosamond receives $166.66, and West $80 per month. 6. Yes; James Forge is under pay. He is employed as axeman and office-keeper. He received last year $438.20, and is still under pay at $1.40 per diem for working days.

RIDEAU CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. LANDERKIN) asked, What was the total amount of canal tolls collected on the Rideau Canal in the fiscal years ending 30th June, 1890 and 1891?

Mr. FOSTER. The amount of tolls collected on the Rideau Canal in the fiscal years ending 30th June, 1890 and 1891, is as follows:—In 1890, $6,631.34; in 1891, $5,954.99.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. LANDERKIN) asked, Does Mr. John Heney, wood contractor, pay any canal tolls or dues on wood he brings through the Rideau Canal? If so, how much has he paid yearly since the contract began? If he does not now pay any tolls or dues, how much has been refunded or commuted him in that time?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. John Heney, wood contractor, paid tolls and dues on firewood from 1st September, 1873, to 21st August, 1884, as follows:—

		Tolls and Wharfage.
1st Sept. to Dec.,	1873	$471.81
Year.	1874	619.13
do	1875	298.93
do	1876	691.57
do	1877	172.66
do	1878	288.63
do	1879	286.67
do	1880	201.12
do	1881	169.11
do	1882	256.66
do	1883	214.01
To 21st August,	1884	321.19
	Total	$3,850.49

The answer to the succeeding portions of the question is found in two Orders in Council, from which the following appears:—Since 21st August, 1884, Mr. John Heney has not paid any tolls and dues on firewood he brings through the Rideau Canal. The amounts of tolls refunded and commuted is as follows:—Amount refunded 28th June, 1886, $3,850.49; amount of tolls and dues commuted, not collected, from 4th August, 1885, to 30th June, 1891, $2,704.84. Total, $6,555.33.

RIDEAU CANAL TOLLS REFUNDED.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. LANDERKIN) asked, What was the total amount of canal tolls refunded on the Rideau Canal in the fiscal years ending 30th June, 1890 and 1891?

Mr. FOSTER. The total amount of canal tolls refunded on the Rideau Canal during the fiscal years ending 30th June, 1890 and 1891, was as follows:—1890, J. P. Tett & Brother, tolls refunded on let-passes (not used) to the amount of $3.40. No refunds were made for fiscal year 1891.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. LANDERKIN) asked, Was it by Order in Council that canal tolls were refunded

on the Rideau Canal? If so, when was the Order passed?

Mr. FOSTER. The above refund was made under authority of Order in Council, dated 10th July, 1889, as follows:—Railways and Canals, that authority be given for the refund of $3.40 to J. P. Tett &. Brother, being the amount of tolls paid on certain unused let-passes, Rideau Canal.

STATION MASTERS, CAPE BRETON RAILWAY.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton) asked, Has the Department of Railways an agreement with the Western Union Telegraph Company to the effect that station masters at Grand Narrows, North Sydney Junction, and other stations on the Cape Breton Railway, will do telegraphing for the public without any compensation being paid to such station masters, by the Western Union Telegraph Company, except their salary as station masters? Are such station masters expected to attend to public messages during regular telegraph office hours of the day, and attend to such other railway station work as is required, such as receiving and delivering freight and baggage, and attend arrival and departure of trains during night and day, and do such work without assistance? What salaries are paid such station masters, and are such salaries the same as are paid to station masters on the Intercolonial Railway, through the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? If so, what are the names of such similarly regulated stations?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government have an agreement with the Western Union Telegraph Company for the telegraph service on the Cape Breton Railway, by which the sending and receiving of messages for the public, &c., form a part of the duties of the station masters, and which service is covered by their official salary. Such station masters are required to attend to all the business of the stations where no other person is employed. The salaries of the station masters on the Cape Breton Railway are $40 per month, with house, fuel, and light free: at Point Tupper and North Sydney, also Sydney, $30 per month, with house, fuel, and light free; at McIntyre's Lake, West Bay, River Denny, Orangedale, Iona, Grand Narrows, North Sydney Junction, and Leitche's Creek, for similar stations, with new men entering the service, they are the same as on other portions of the Intercolonial Railway. The names of the stations in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, at which like salaries are paid, are Pleasant Beach, Millstream, Moffat's, Eel River, Charlo, Belledune, Gloucester Junction, Red Pine, Bartibogue, Beaver Brook, Millarton, Barnaby River, Kent Junction, Cold Brook, Quispamsis, Passekeag, Calhoun's, Wentworth, East Mines, Valley Milford, Elmsdale, Enfield, Wellington, Rockingham, Denmark, Merrigonish, Avondale, James River, South River. All the foregoing receive salaries not exceeding $30 per month.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood the first order was to be the Quebec resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said we would take up the North Shore Railway resolutions, but the acting Minister of Railways, as the hon. gentleman knows, is ill, and although I might go on with the resolutions, I do not think I have the information the House would expect me to lay on the Table. For that reason I will postpone these resolutions until to-morrow.

Motion agreed, and House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Steam communication with the Magdalen Islands..... $8,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is the same as last year. We have a contract for four years, three of which have still to run. The contract was let at a lower rate than the preceding arrangement, about $3,000 lower. It was put up to tender two years ago and given to the same contractor. The vessel is the *St. Olaf*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Was there a resolution of the House authorizing the Government to enter into a contract? Or was it entered into simply as a departmental arrangement?

Mr. FOSTER. A sum was voted by the House and the whole matter was canvassed. The contract had actually been let at the time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the appropriation?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Steam communication between Grand Manan, N.B., and mainland..... $4,000

Mr. FOSTER. The steamer that is performing this service is the *Flushing*. She has performed it for many years, the service being from Grand Manan *viâ* Campobello and Eastport to St. John and return, one trip each week; from Grand Manan *viâ* Campobello, Eastport and St. Andrews to St. Stephen and return, one trip each week, and during summer one trip per week from Grand Manan to Eastport and return.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does one vessel perform all the service?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is this let by tender each year?

Mr. FOSTER. Tenders were invited last year, but this is not a very paying service and there is not much competition, and, this steamer having been got for that service, there is not enough in the contract to induce others to go into the service.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is not this steamer suited for any other trade?

Mr. FOSTER. She would not be able to do much outside service.

Mr. CHARLTON. How large a vessel is she?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the figures here. It is the same vessel that has been performing the work for five or six years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not hear the Minister state with whom the contract had been entered into for steam communication with the Magdalen Islands.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Halliday.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the name of the vessel?

Mr. FOSTER. The *St. Olaf.*

Subsidy to a line of steamers to run between Liverpool or London, or both, and St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S., a port in the Dominion to be the terminal port	$25,000

Mr. BORDEN. Is this a mail subsidy?

Mr. FOSTER. These steamers are under contract to carry mails if they are offered to them, but they are not offered to any great extent, as they can be carried better by the Dominion line or the Allan line. This subsidy has been paid for a number of years to vessels running from these ports to London, and the trips have been made monthly. Last year I mentioned that we had completed a contract with the same line to put on one new vessel, one being a very fine vessel, to run the service in such a way as to make the trip within 17 or 18 days for the same amount of money we had been paying for monthly trips, the compensation given being in part that the contract should be given for four years instead of from year to year. That contract has three years yet to run. I immediately closed with that offer. In fact that offer was in part due to some pressure which the department put upon the company for more frequent service, to which Mr. Furness responded very fairly.

Mr. BORDEN. Tenders were not invited?

Mr. FOSTER. No. They were invited at first and the service was going on from year to year, and last year they made a contract for four years, and we get nearly double the benefit we had under the old service, for the same amount.

Mr. LAURIER. Is Mr. Furness the contractor?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the name of the vessels that are on this route?

Mr. FOSTER. The *Damara* is one, and, I think, the *Ottawa* is the name of a new one.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It seems to me that it is out of the ordinary course to subsidize a line of steamers from London and Liverpool to Halifax and St. John. I can understand subsidizing steamers to Grand Manan or to the Magdalen Islands, or any out-of-the-way ports, but this seems to me not to be the business of the Government at all. I think this is a matter which should be left to private enterprise. There are numbers of private men running lines of steamers and lines of sailing vessels to those ports, and I do not see why the Government should subsidize a line of steamers there.

Mr. BORDEN. It is the general opinion in Nova Scotia that this subsidy, instead of being of any benefit to the trade between Nova Scotia and Liverpool, has a decidedly opposite tendency; that, as has just been remarked, private enterprise would do all that is necessary for this trade and would do it much better for this reason: The gentlemen who are managing these boats, Messrs. Pickford & Black, and I think you have heard of them before, seem to have used this subsidy in order to lower their rates at a critical moment, when they have been threatened with opposition. When a new line comes in to compete for the trade, down go the rates. When the competition is killed off, the rates go up. This subsidy is used to cut legitimate rates and it is not in the interest of the people that this kind of subsidy should be continued. I have had representations from various parts of the province this year, and also in former years in reference to this matter, and I assure hon. gentlemen opposite that it is not believed that this policy is in the interest of the people. I hope it will be discontinued at an early date, and I should be glad if it were discontinued now.

Mr. KENNY. This subsidy has been so frequently under discussion in this House, that I feel like apologizing in the first place for making any further reference to it. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) when he says there is a general consensus of opinion that this subsidy is not in the public interest. My hon. friend mentions the fact that at certain periods of the year it becomes necessary, or advisable, or expedient, that special steamers should be put on between Nova Scotia or New Brunswick and Europe, to carry certain perishable articles. My hon. friend, I think, will admit that he has a much better chance of securing low freight from these special steamers when they know that there is a regular line on the route; and I must say that although I do not pretend to be familiar with the business of this company, or with the details of its management, it has not come to my knowledge, at least, residing, as I do, in Halifax, that the agents or owners of these steamers have at any time taken unfair advantage of the position they occupy. I am strongly of the opinion that this line of steamers has been exceedingly useful in developing our export trade from the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are they the only line?

Mr. KENNY. I think they are the only line of subsidized steamers. The Allan boats call at Halifax fortnightly, but I am not sure whether they receive a subsidy or not.

Mr. FOSTER. They do not.

Mr. BORDEN. I would say, in reply to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), that the Fruit Growers' Association of Nova Scotia has had this question up for consideration on several occasions, and I think they passed resolutions; at any rate a very large majority of the members of that association have expressed opinions adverse to the continuation of this subsidy. I had that association in mind more particularly when referring to representations that have been made, and other representations have been made as well. Now, the hon. gentleman has said that he has heard of no instance in which this subsidy has operated in the direction which he mentioned. I will tell him one that happened under my own observation last year. A number of gentlemen put on a steamer to ply between the Basin of Minas, in western Nova Scotia, and Liverpool. She made one trip, carrying apples, and the rate of freight was reduced to 75 cents, whereas the rate *vid* Halifax is $1. This vessel having reduced the rate to 75 cents, immediately afterwards agents of these steamers came up into the country and made arrangements with all the large shippers of apples offering them a rate of 70 cents. The result was that the line which had been put on from the Basin of Minas had to be discontinued, because they could not carry freight at that rate and make it pay. So there is an instance in which a legitimate undertaking was killed by the

aid of this subsidy, and if they had not had this subsidy I do not believe it could have been done. I give that instance to my hon. friend, and I can vouch for its truth.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the observations made by my friend from King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden), show the impropriety of this subsidy now under consideration. The hon. gentleman does not pretend that there would be no steamers running between Liverpool and Halifax if this subsidy was not granted. Then I would like to know how the hon. gentleman's conduct, or the conduct of Parliament, squares with what is right and fair to those who are unsubsidized. Here are steamers running between Halifax and Liverpool and Halifax and London, that receive no subsidies or aid from the Government. Do they stand upon a footing of equality with the others? Where is the justice in an arrangement of this sort? It is made possible by this appropriation, as my hon. friend from King's says, to cut down rates whenever there is active competition, and so to deal unfairly with those lines of steamers that are not subsidized. It seems to me this appropriation ought to be struck out altogether. Why should the people of this country be taxed to promote the interest of the proprietors of those vessels that receive this subsidy? Why should they not depend upon the ordinary principles of commercial enterprise just as well as those with whom they are competing? It seems to me a monstrous proposition that this House should single out the proprietors of certain vessels and say to them: We will deal with you in a way which we will not undertake to deal with any other class of persons similarly situated; we will make an appropriation of $20,000 a year which we will pay you out of the public treasury in order that you may kill off the competition of those who are putting on lines of steamers between Halifax and Liverpool. I say that is a most unjust act; it is unjust to those who are competing with the steamers owned by Pickford & Black, and it is unjust to the public at large. Why should the House undertake to take from the pockets of the people of this country nearly $30,000 a year and hand the money over to Pickford & Black? What right has Pickford & Black to that appropriation any more than a man who is hoeing potatoes in his field? Why should these men who have their capital invested in this enterprise be dealt with differently from the men who have their capital invested in land or in any other property? The whole thing is monstrous If this was for the purpose of furnishing accommodation to people in certain localities, to people in inaccessible districts without mail accommodation, or without other necessary accommodation there might be some justification for it. There might be some justification for it on the same principle that we grant contracts for carrying mails by railway, or by stage, or in any other way; we may grant it to vessels carrying the mail just as we grant it to railway companies. But that is not what the hon. gentleman does by this appropriation, he gives the appropriation for other purposes, and he undertakes to subsidize a line, not simply to trade between Halifax and Liverpool or Halifax and London, but to enable the parties to whom the appropriation is given, to kill off their rivals who are just as well entitled to live as they are.

Mr. WELSH. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills); I think this grant is wrong altogether. The marine interests of the Dominion used to be very important, but during the last few years you have done your best to kill them off by subsidizing steamers for mercantile trade, thereby handicapping private interest and private speculation. You are taking this $25,000 out of the pockets of the tax-payers of this Dominion, out of the pockets of the ship-owners, and owners of sailing ships and private steamboats, and giving it to the subsidized line. I say the principle is wrong. Ever since I have been in this House I have opposed the granting of subsidies to all mercantile steamers, to all steamers and vessels engaged in mercantile trade; I have always opposed this principle except for the purpose of carrying mails and passengers. I think when you go beyond that point, you take a step in the wrong direction. While I have a seat in this House I shall oppose every grant of this kind, because it is doing an injury to the marine interests of this Dominion that have been at a low ebb for some years. We know that if at any port of the Dominion there is a cargo to ship, there are twenty vessels to take a charter. What necessity is there for this subsidy of $25,000? Who asked for it? No one but the steamboat owners, some of whom wanted to get an advantage over their neighbours. I am opposed to this grant and to all subsidies of this description; but where there is an opening as regards the carrying of mails and passengers, I do not object to a grant. I object to this grant, for it is a very wrong one.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad to hear the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Welsh) give utterance to the sentiment he has expressed. I think we will bear it in mind when the contract for the line of steamers for which the hon. gentleman, I think, has pleaded in this House, falls in, a line of steamers running on an old route between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. It is true they carry mails and passengers, but it is also true they carry cattle and all kinds of produce.

Mr. WELSH. I advise you to strike it out now.

Mr. FOSTER. I dare say when you come down to fine reasoning you could not make very much difference between the argument in regard to a subsidy to that line and the argument of the hon. gentleman in regard to this line. Almost everyone seems cut off from competition on account of the subsidy being given to that line of steamers; and the only logical conclusion is that the service should be thrown open and an amount paid to any vessel which may carry the mails at any time. There is an advantage, however, in obtaining the service of a company, a monopoly if you wish to call it so, to carry the mails, because you can then obtain regularity, and you can have the mails carried with greater satisfaction to the public service than otherwise would be the case. With respect to the other subsidy, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) waxed righteously indignant; but he is just one year too late in his indignation. The question was thoroughly canvassed last year, when the contract was about to be made and a vote was asked.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I opposed it.

Mr. FOSTER. And a contract was entered into to run till 1894.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman must permit me to know how long the contract was made for, and I say it was to run till 1894. I do not think the hon. gentleman will contend that this item should be struck out of the Estimates after Parliament has approved of the subsidy, and after a contract has been made with responsible parties on this vote of Parliament.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It has been done in England.

Mr. FOSTER. It may have been done in England, but I do not think the Canadian Parliament is prepared to do it. We should keep faith in any public contract made by the Dominion Government with the approval of Parliament. My hon. friend asks why should nearly $30,000 be taken out of the public funds for this purpose? It is not nearly $30,000, but it is exactly $25,000. The hon. gentleman then asks, why should this sum be put in the pockets of Pickford & Black? I beg to inform him that it is not put into their pockets. They simply are agents of Mr. Furness for the line of steamers. They will receive the agents' commission, but that is all; the subsidy goes to Mr. Furness. The subsidy dates back for a period of years when it was thought that the trade between the two maritime ports, Halifax and St. John, should be stimulated by the granting of a subsidy and the putting on of a regular line of vessels which would run at stated periods. That ran on from year to year at the rate of $25,000 per year. The year before last a proposition was made, after negotiation, that the trips should be made every seventeen days, or twenty or twenty-one trips in the year, the same amount to be paid for this vastly improved service. Just about that time the Short Line was opened out, and it was thought to be a very good opportunity to obtain an increased and better service from three years from that date at the same figure, in order that at the opening of the line and the beginning of traffic in that direction, the vessels might be running steadily between those ports, and so traffic might be encouraged and built up between this and the old country. Parliament discussed the subject last year, made an appropriation with full knowledge of all the circumstances, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will advocate the destruction of that contract and the blotting out of this sum from the Estimates.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman quite forgets that contracts of this sort made by the Government for a long period of time do not bind Parliament. The House of Commons is bound simply by its appropriations. This House makes appropriations from year to year. It is true you might have a parliamentary contract. The Government might have come down stating that they had entered into the contract for a certain sum, and have undertaken to carry through the House a Bill providing that a certain payment should be made every year for a certain number of years, as was done by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company when a contract was entered into with that company. But that is not what the Government did. They made a contract and came down and asked for a year's appropriation. Now the Government ask for another year's appropriation. It is open to this House to consider whether it is proper to grant the appropriation or not. This whole question was discussed in England on the report by the Select Committee on Packet and Telegraph Contracts. I will read some extracts from the discussion in order that hon. members of the House may see where they stand on this matter, and that the House is as free to consider this appropriation as it was the appropriation of last year. Sir Francis Baring, afterwards Lord Northbrook, in speaking of this matter, when the same argument was used as was used by the Minister of Finance a few minutes ago, said:

"Suppose the Admiralty had entered upon a contract for 100 years at £1,000 per year—suppose, again, the Government has promised a public servant a high retiring allowance in order that they might appoint to his place—were they to be told, on the vote for such a contract or such a superannuation allowance, to enquire into the arrangements? If they carried the doctrine of the conclusion of contracts to such an extent it might be put almost beyond the power of Parliament to exercise its power in such matters."

Then Sir Francis Baring goes on to point out that the same rule was recognized in the treaty of Utrecht. He said that in the case of the peace of Utrecht there were two treaties, one a political and the other a commercial one. In regard to the commercial treaty, the Crown pledged itself to France to make certain reductions in duties; but when the reductions were proposed, the House of Commons rejected them, because it held that the Crown could not enter into any contract that would in the remotest degree curtail or interfere with its rights. Let me read another extract. Mr. Laing, speaking on this subject, said:

"The course proposed to be taken by the Government in reference to this contract, was a very clear one. [That was a contract with Mr. Churchward to carry the mails from Dover to Calais, and from Calais to Ostend.] The House refused last session to vote the money under the contract now in question, and he supposed that the Government could not properly have taken on itself to reverse the decision of the House of Commons.

"Sir FITZROY KELLY. Then the whole contract was at an end.

"Mr. LAING. The Government could not, after the refusal of the House of Commons, pay the money in the face of such decisions, for if they had done so, they would have rendered themselves personally liable."

That is clear. We are considering this appropriation, and we can affirm it or object to it. It would be the height of nonsense to submit an appropriation to this Committee of the House, if the House were not free to accept it or reject it. So the Minister of Finance will see that while he has bound himself to a contract with a company, that contract is to be read and understood with respect to the powers of this House. It is a conditional contract in law, whether conditionally expressed or not. The hon. gentleman will find the whole subject discussed in the case of Churchward *vs.* The Queen, where the doctrine laid down by the court was precisely the same as was laid down by Parliament, as these extracts show. Mr. Gladstone, in speaking on this same subject on that occasion, said:

"Are we to be told that the House of Commons under circumstances such as these, is bound to vote money without taking notice of these proceedings? On what principle is such a doctrine to be sustained? I maintain, on the contrary, that the Executive has no constitutional authority to make a contract binding on the House of Commons."

That is clear and explicit enough—

"It is a pure question of policy for the House of Commons to say how far it will allow the practice to extend. I ask, can the proceeding be justified where parties attempt to enter into a contract by the use of means which may be held to be construed a breach of the privileges of the House, tending to degrade it and the representatives of the people."

Here certain charges had been made against a contractor and had been enquired into, and there were suspicious circumstances connected with it, and the House had the previous year refused to make the necessary appropriation, and it was held the contract was at an end. That was the view taken by the House. Mr. Churchward was not satisfied with that, and he took the matter before the court on petition of right, and the court upheld precisely the same view. So that we have here a perfect right, where there is an annual appropriation, to consider the propriety of the object for which the appropriation is sought. We have already voted a portion of this appropriation, and the hon. gentleman to-day asks us to vote $20,000, not on the merits of the case at all, but on the ground that we are precluded from withholding our support to this proposition. I deny that altogether. We are as free to consider this appopriation to-day as we were when the hon. gentleman submitted it last year, and if this House should think it is not in the interest of the public that this appropriation should be continued, it is as free to discontinue it now as it will be at the end of four years. The hon. gentleman has not embraced the appropriation for the four years in any parliamentary contract. He has simply made a contract on his own behalf, or on behalf of the Executive, with Messrs. Pickford & Black, and we are free to say whether we shall continue that contract or not.

Mr. FOSTER. It is all very well for my hon. friend to make this argument if it pleases him, but I think there is an equitable side to this. I think there is some moral obligation resting on us. I am not going to dispute the right of Parliament to revise its own action, if it wants to, but I am quite sure that Parliament would not, under the circumstances, attempt to do that in this case, because the obligation has been created by the action of Parliament itself. If the Government without the consent of Parliament, or an appropriation therefor, had made a contract, the case would be on quite a different basis from what it is on to-day; but last year the whole arrangement was explained to the House, as well as the basis upon which Mr. Furness was willing to put on a new vessel and carry on the improved service; the basis being that he should receive a contract for four years from that date rather than be subject to the uncertainty of running from year to year as had been done for quite a long series of years preceding. That was explained to Parliament last session and the merits of the question were debated then. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) says that I wish to have this put through, not on its merits but on the ground of contract. That is not it at all. The merits of the case were submitted to Parliament and were discussed by Parliament last year when the appropriation was made for the first one of the series of four years, and it was on the faith of that approval of Parliament that the service has been going on, and that Mr. Furness has put on his new vessel and made his improved service. Now, I put this case to my hon. friend. He may have a right to say to a man: You come to work on my farm and I agree to give you four hundred dollars a year, and he may keep him on that year and pay him that money. At the end of the year he may say: I will take you on the same conditions, or I will not take you at all. But if he says to the man: You move your family here and build a house, and I will keep you on my farm for four years; he may if he has no written contract say to the man at one year's end: I do not want you any longer: but provided that man has done his work to his satisfaction, I think there is an obligation, written or moral, for him to fulfil to the letter his agreement with the man. It is the same way between this Government, this Parliament if you like, and Mr. Furness. He said: I will put on a new vessel and give you improved service, if instead of receiving a yearly subsidy I will get a subsidy for a stated period of four years ending in 1894. Parliament saw that, and passed upon it after consideration, and gave the vote of the first year's money in accordance with that plan. Mr. Furness put on a new vessel and gives a service almost twice as frequent as it was before, and now that service has been running a year and a-half. Yet we are told in Parliament that no stigma would attach to us if we broke up this arrangement and refused to grant the money. I do not think that my hon. friend, apart from his theoretical right to make an argument, can justify such a proposition by any sound reasons whatever. I take it that, under the circumstances, we should not do what the hon. gentleman asks.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman has not at all answered the argument of my hon. friend in any way. Of course the Minister of Finance, speaking and acting on behalf of the Government, has a perfect right to enter into a contract for the carrying of mails or anything else, and to say that it will endure for any length of time he chooses. But when he comes to Parliament to ask its sanction for this act of his, he must ask of Parliament their sanction for the whole contract. If he has entered into a contract for five years, he must ask Parliament to ratify the whole contract such as he had made it. If he were to take that ground this Parliament might decide whether or not it chose to be bound for a term of five years, or ten years, or twenty years; but if, on the other hand, instead of that, he asked from Parliament a yearly appropriation, Parliament only ratifies the act of the Government each year, by the appropriation for one year.

Mr. FOSTER. But under the circumstances as detailed.

Mr. LAURIER. Under the circumstances, the party with whom the hon. gentleman has contracted must undertand, as a matter of course, that it is within the power of Parliament, at any time, to cancel the contract. And why not? If the hon. gentleman made a contract for five years, why not ask the appropriation at once for five years, and not a yearly appropriation. What can he say to the argument of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills)? Why do you ask an appropriation from Parliament every year, if Parliament has no moral power to refuse it or to grant it? You ask this appropriation every year because we have the right to grant it or to refuse it. Under such circumstances, Messrs. Pickford & Black, with whom my hon. friend contracted, understood, last year

before they undertook the service, that they had an appropriation only for one year and not for the five years for which they had contracted. Therefore, they must have understood that Parliament had ratified that contract, not for five years, but only for one year, and the hon. gentleman must himself see that under such circumstances there is not even a moral obligation on the part of Parliament to ratify that contract. I cannot understand such a thing as moral obligation arising, when it was within the option of the Government to ask an appropriation for the whole term covering the contract, and when they have failed to do so. Under the circumstances the argument of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is not only legal but equitable as well. The party himself with whom the hon. Minister has contracted cannot at all complain if to-day Parliament says: We thought it well, in our wisdom last year, to grant you this appropriation, but we have changed our minds and we do not choose to ratify that contract any longer. As my hon. friend said, this has been done in England, and in the case which he quoted the conclusion arrived at was that if it were possible for Government to enter into a contract for a hundred years, it would be monstrous to contend that under such circumstances Parliament, because it had voted the money one year, would have been bound to vote the money for ninety-nine years afterwards. There is only one way of dealing with these matters. If the Government make a contract, they can ask the whole appropriation from Parliament on the terms of the contract, and if they fail to do so, each time they come to Parliament, Parliament has the right to exercise authority upon it.

Mr. WELSH. I know that when the Government put an item in the Estimates they do not usually like to strike it out, but that is not always the case. Last year there was in the Estimates a vote of $1,000 for the New London breakwater, and I wanted it increased to $3,500; but in a moment of weakness the Government moved that it be struck out, and it was struck out, although their own engineer had reported that $3,500 was required to repair this breakwater. They could strike out that vote, and we shall see whether they can strike out this vote, which is not required at all. My hon. friend must remember what I said, because I spoke plainly enough. I said that I was opposed to subsidizing steamers for any purpose except for conveying the mails and passengers. The hon. gentleman is quick enough to remember that I am a shareholder in a company which has a contract with the Government for carrying the mails and for which there is a vote here of $5,500. Let me say to the hon. gentleman, that if he moves to strike out that item, I will vote for the motion. The company have spent $160,000 this year for one steamer for that service, and we have to keep four steamers for the purpose, and what do we get? Thirteen dollars a trip for carrying the mails across the gulf. I tell the hon. gentleman that this service will not be continued unless the Government are prepared to give $20,000 instead of $5,500. I challenge the hon. gentleman to strike that out, and, although I am a shareholder, I will vote with him. I know something of these subsidies. They are based on a false principle. I remember that in 1871 I was a shareholder in the first Atlantic steamer ever registered in this country; that was the *Prince Edward*. She paid a fair dividend until the National Policy was introduced into this country, and three months after it was introduced we found that we were losing money. The Dominion Government asked us not to take off the vessel and promised to give a subsidy of $1,500 a trip to the company. We held a meeting to consider it, and I advised the company not to take it; but they decided to take it, and the result was that they lost money. Any trade that is an honest trade will support itself, and we do not want any of your boodling money to keep it up. It takes all the enterprise out of business. You handicap the vessel owners by giving subsidies to certain lines, and the ordinary commercial marine of the country suffers. I am opposed to the whole system. Now, I hope the hon. gentleman will not forget the challenge I throw in his teeth, and we will see who is game, he or I. I move that this $25,000 be struck out.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). It is highly amusing to hear hon. gentlemen suggest that the National Policy and these subsidies to steamship lines have reduced the merchant marine so much in the Maritime Provinces. These hon. gentlemen expect us to take their bald *ipse dixit;* but what are the facts? In 1887, Nova Scotia built 87 vessels, comprising 12,300 tons; in 1888, 116 vessels, comprising 12,900 tons; in 1889, 106 vessels, comprising 46,645 tons; and in 1890, 148 vessels, comprising 83,746 tons. This does not look as if by reason of the National Policy and steamship subsidies the merchant marine of Nova Scotia is suffering very much. If these merchant shippers did not make money out of their vessels, would they go on and increase their tonnage year after year? It is mere talk for hon. gentlemen to stand up in this House and tell us that the merchant shipping of the province is going behind. In my county, I have heard some argument with reference to the Furness line not being conducive to the interests of the apple shippers in King's and Annapolis counties; but when the matter is thoroughly looked into, by unbiassed and unprejudiced minds, it is found that there is no ground for the idea advanced by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) in favour of large vessels, which will carry some 15,000 barrels of apples to the London market at one time. It is more to the advantage of shippers that smaller quantities should be sent, and you can only have that done by means of subsidized lines which are certain to go at stated periods, such as the Furness line. What are called ocean tramps occasionally come to Annapolis and load largely with apples, sometimes taking four or five loads in a year, but, although the London market is sometimes called an unlimited market, it is found that even that market can be glutted by a vessel load of 8,000, or 9,000, or 15,000 barrels of apples, and the result is that prices are not so good as they are when apples are sent in smaller lots by these subsidized lines.

Mr. FORBES. I would like to correct the last speaker in regard to the extent of our shipping. If he looks at page 803 of the Trade and Navigation Returns, he will find the total tonnage built in Canada from 1868 to 1890.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I was speaking entirely of Nova Scotia.

Mr. FORBES. We want to stand by Canada as a whole and not pick out any one section of this young

nation. From 1868 to 1874 we built 811,775 tons, or an average of 115,969 tons; from 1875 to 1879 inclusive, those years to which the Conservatives like so much to point as the blank years of the country's properity, we built 690,963 tons, or an average of 138,933 tons yearly. Now, from 1880 to 1890, which are supposed by hon. gentlemen opposite to be the most prosperous years of Canada's history, when the National Policy is supposed to have done its best work and to have made its most fruitful returns, what do we find? We only built 568,000 tons, or an average of 51,636 tons. Still the hon. gentleman tells us that the merchant marine of Canada is increasing.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I said no such thing.

Mr. FORBES. I do not impute to the hon. gentleman any desire to deceive the people, but why should he take as a criterion of the whole Dominion an isolated province which he knows is more particularly a great ship-building centre, and endeavour to create the impression that the ship-building industry is progressive, and I doubt if his figures for Nova Scotia are correct. I have shown him that during the ten years, from 1880 to 1890, we have only built 51,000 tons per year, against 138,000 tons per year during the low tariff regime of Mr. Mackenzie. The hon. gentleman can refer to the Trade and Navigation Returns for the facts I have given.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The right of this Committee to discuss this item, and, if need be, decline to vote the money, is beyond question. If the hon. gentleman desired to bind this House to a contract exceeding one year, he should have asked us to agree to a statute authorizing him to conclude such an agreement; but, in the absence of any such authority, it is plain that Parliament is not bound by the action of the hon. gentleman and need not vote the money he asks. Constitutional law and doctrine, as laid down in the English House of Commons by the authorities there, confirm this opinion, and in the judicial decision given in the Churchward case, this principle is equally affirmed. If the Government should desire to bind the country and Parliament to a contract, they must introduce and carry through a Bill giving them authority to enter into that contract. Otherwise the House does not part with its right to refuse to vote the money in Supply. The hon. gentleman might come down and state that he proposed to enter into a ten-years' contract with Mr. Furness during the recess, he might enter into it, and then I ask him would it not be in the power of the House each year to repudiate that contract by refusing to vote the money, when that contract had not been entered into by virtue of statutory authority? No doubt can exist on that point. If any did, we need only refer to the reasons given for the decision in the Churchward case. Chief Justice Cockburn said:

"I take it, if the other contracting parties then endeavoured to enforce the contract, equity would relieve the contractor from the obligation to obey it: and if an action were brought at law, I doubt very much, indeed, whether a court of law would not say that the providing of the fund by Parliament was a condition precedent to the fulfilment or necessity of fulfilling the contract."

And Mr. Justice Shee said:

"In the case of a contract with commissioners on behalf of the Crown to make large payments of money during a series of years, I should have thought that the condition which clogs this covenant, though not expressed, must, on account of the notorious inability of the Crown to contract unconditionally for such money payments in consideration of such services, have been applied in favour of the Crown."

Ex necessitate the power must rest in this House from year to year of either maintaining or rejecting the votes proposed to us. The power to do that is in this House beyond doubt, and the question of policy is one we may fairly discuss now. The hon. gentleman said that last year he informed the House that he intended to go into this contract with the Messrs. Furness. I am not going to challenge a statement made in such positive terms, but I do not recollect any such statement, nor do any of the hon. gentlemen around me recollect it. I turned up the Debates, and, so far as I can see, the hon. gentleman led the House in the directly opposite direction. This vote was challenged by Mr. Jones, then member for Halifax, on the ground that it was impolitic, and unjust, and unfair, from a commercial standpoint, to pay a subsidy of $25,000 a year to a line of steamboats running as the rival of commercial lines, the Dominion and the Allan. My colleague from Queen's (Mr. Welsh) showed to-day the injustice and unfairness, from a commercial standpoint, of subsidizing steamers. He made a qualification, the justice of which the House will recognize. If the Government seek to have their mails carried by any particular line of boats, they should pay for the carriage, but such a case is not analogous to the one before the House. The question before us is simply whether a line of steamers running for commercial purposes should be subsidized or not. It has been laid down by many members that when you seek to open up a new trade between Canada and some other country, you may be justified for a time in giving a subsidy to steamers to open up the trade, but that argument would not apply to an existing line which runs in competition with the greyhounds crossing the Atlantic every day in the year from English to American ports. This line was subsidized many years ago; and when the necessity of the subsidy was challenged last year, so far from the hon. gentleman leading the House to believe he was going to enter into a new contract for three years longer, he led the House to understand that he had been convinced by the arguments on this side and would not repeat the subsidy. He said that he looked forward to an early time when it would be discontinued. These are his words:

"Mr. FOSTER. It is a condition incident to the payment of the subsidy, that we get the manifest of these steamers on their inward and outward voyages. I must say that the Furness Line has been, in the main, about as satisfactory a line as we have subsidized, both in the way in which it has conducted its business and in the development of trade. At the same time, it is only fair to say that the line has not yet developed business sufficient to pay for carrying on its monthly trips, unless aided by a subsidy. I looked very carefully into that last year, and I became convinced that, if the $25,000 were taken off, the vessels themselves would be retired from that route. I do not, however, hold out the idea that these $25,000 are to be paid always; and, in fact, I have informed the managers of the line that we look for it to be self-supporting. My great hope is that, when the Canadian Pacific Railway gets into thorough working order, and has its connections made, that there will be a large attraction of freight for that line of steamers, to St. John and Halifax, and by which their present cargoes can be largely supplemented. The company itself is looking towards that. We believe that in the course of time, trade will so develop that a monthly line, and I hope a fornightly, or weekly line,

self-supporting, will be found running between these ports and Great Britain."

So far from the hon. gentleman stating to the House that his intention was to enter into a new contract for three years, he desired the House to come to the conclusion that at an early day, when the Canadian Pacific Railway line was in working order, the subsidy would be discontinued. I say, therefore, as a matter of constitutional right we are well within our bounds in discussing it. It is a matter of policy, and judging from the statements of hon. gentlemen last year, so far from the House being asked to vote $25,000 for three years more, we had a right to expect that this would be discontinued altogether.

Mr. McLEOD. The object of this subsidy, as I understand it, is to build up a Canadian trade, to have a regular line of steamers running to St. John and Halifax. There is no regular line of steamers going to St. John except this one. It is true that this line happens to compete with the steamers from New York and Boston, but that is all the more reason for granting it a subsidy. It is neither desirable nor necessary that this subsidy should continue for all time, but it is desirable and necessary that it should continue until we have a trade built up between St. John and Halifax on this side and Liverpool and London on the other. I have always believed that the policy of this Parliement should be to grant such subsidies as would lead to the development of an entirely Canadian trade. In St. John and Halifax we have felt in the past that we have paid pretty heavily for railways which were built out west, but we did not grumble, because we knew it was for the benefit of Canada at large, and we believe that the whole system will not be completed until all our trade is sent by our own Canadian ports, either Halifax or St. John, and, therefore, we think this subsidy should be granted. I think my hon. friends opposite will agree that this is not an unreasonable or unusual thing to ask, so that the trade by those ports may be developed.

Mr. WELSH. My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) spoke almost altogether in regard to the shipment of apples. No doubt that is very important to the people of Annapolis, but, even if there is a subsidy granted to a line running to St. John and Halifax, the people of Annapolis will have to send their apples there in order to meet the boats. The hon. gentleman knows that every week there is a steamer leaving Halifax for Great Britain without this Furness line being required at all. The hon. gentleman replied to my remark as if I did not know what I was talking about when I said that the marine interests of the Dominion were at a very low ebb and had been going down for ten years. I must be a blind man if I do not know that to be the truth. Five years before the National Policy came into force we built more shipping than we have in ten years since the National Policy has been introduced. It is just as the census returns show how the population has been increased in the last ten years. They show that the population is at a standstill. It is just the same with the population as it is with the shipping. You are ruining the best interests of the Dominion by your policy, and I say that the granting of this subsidy is handicapping private enterprise and speculation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. HAZEN. I notice from *Hansard* that, when this item was before the Committee last year, very little hostility was shown to it from the other side. Neither the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), nor the leader of the Opposition, nor the senior member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), had much to say in regard to it. Of course, it is true that the hon. gentleman from Queen's who has just spoken (Mr. Welsh) was against it, but he was more opposed to subsidies altogether than to this particular subsidy. I fail to understand why so much hostility should be shown to this vote this year, when last year scarcely any was shown.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Oh, yes; Mr. Jones opposed it.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman himself did not oppose it, nor the hon. member for Bothwell, nor the leader of the Opposition. I thought there must be some reason for the change. What is the reason? Why last year were they sitting silent and offering no opposition to this vote, while this year they are up in arms against it, and are trying to bring it into ridicule and say it is not a proper item for the House to vote? It may be that last year hon. gentlemen were influenced by the fact that, sitting beside them on the other side of the House, were two gentlemen from the City of St. John, who were prominent in the counsels of their party, and, therefore, they did not like to take the grounds they are taking now. To show that this is not a party vote at all, and to show that the people of St. John, whether Grits or Tories, Liberals or Conservatives, are in favour of this vote, I need only refer hon. gentlemen opposite to the speeches which were made last year. I find Mr. Weldon is reported in the *Hansard* as saying:

"If the system of subsidies is to be maintained, I think that this subsidy is one which well deserves the attention of Parliament."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," because he thinks there is this saving clause, "If the system of subsidies is to be maintained." I have not heard that the policy of those hon. gentlemen is to abolish subsidies, and, if they have not adopted that policy, they cannot conscientiously oppose this item until they decide that these steamship subsidies are to be done away with altogether. Mr. Weldon goes on:

"The Allan and Dominion lines go to Quebec and Montreal in the summer, and, with the exception of a few freight steamers, the Furness line, which runs direct from London to Halifax and St. John, is really the only passenger and freight line carrying on trade regularly with these two ports, and it has been a great accommodation not only for freight traffic, but for passengers as well. It seems to me that so long as subsidies are granted, this line is entitled to a subsidy, and that the granting of it is not unfair to other steamers. The Furness line has carried out the terms of its contract remarkably well, and persons who have travelled by these steamers speak of them as being very good vessels. So far as the Province of New Brunswick is concerned, the Furness line has been a great advantage and convenience to us."

I find, also, that the hon. gentleman who represented the City of St. John (Mr. Ellis), after the Finance Minister had spoken, very shortly afterwards, said:

"It is quite apparent that any line of steamers to the St. Lawrence, subsidized for the transport of mails and passengers, and carrying freight, must have the effect of discriminating against the port of St. John, N. B. I think this is the strong ground upon which the mercantile community of the Maritime Provinces place their claim for a

subsidy. The effect of paying subsidies to steamers on the St. Lawrence route was to cheapen freight to the St. Lawrence, and, therefore, to make it more difficult for the merchants of St. John to carry on an independent business."

What Mr. Ellis meant to say, and what he did say in effect, was this: That the subsidizing of the Allan line of steamers which run to Montreal during the whole period of navigation, made it almost impossible for the merchants of St. John to carry on business on an equal footing with the merchants of Montreal, unless a like advantage was given to them in the way of a subsidy to a line of steamers from St. John and Halifax to Liverpool. Now that, I think, is the real point, all sides agree this is an advantage. Certainly it is to the advantage of the trade at St. John; and when the vote passed last year without any opposition at all, and I think the previous year also, without opposition, I can hardly understand why hon. gentlemen opposite should now feel it their duty to oppose this subsidy, which is one of the few subsidies, which is the only subsidy, which is given for such a purpose in the Maritime Provinces. I trust that spirit will not actuate hon. gentlemen opposite. We were perfectly willing to pay our share of the subsidy to the Allan line of steamers to Montreal, and we think that gentlemen from the other provinces will be perfectly willing to pay their quota of a subsidy to steamers running from the Maritime Provinces to Liverpool. If hon. gentlemen opposite take the ground that this is not a proper subsidy, then I think they must, in order to be consistent, also take the ground that the subsidy to the Allan line was not a proper subsidy. I trust this item will pass the House. I feel satisfied that the merchants in the Maritime Provinces fully approve of it, and in asking for a subsidy they do not feel they are asking anything which is not fair and right, or that should not be granted as a matter of right by this Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman is placing his plea for this grant upon a most unstable and unjust ground. He does not defend the granting of the subsidy on its merits; he is not prepared to ask that this line should be subsidized as a commercial undertaking. If he is prepared to take that line, I can quite understand it, but he gets up and says that because it comes from the Maritime Provinces it has got to be subsidized. That is no reason in the world. The hon. gentleman is labouring under an entire misapprehension when he states that the Allan line is a subsidized line. The Allan line is paid at times for carrying the mails, when it does carry them, and it is a legitimate function of the Government to pay for the carriage of its mails—nobody denies that. You cannot expect steamboat companies, or railway companies, or any other corporation, to carry the mails or to do other service for the Government, unless they are paid for doing it. It would be absurd for Parliament to expect private enterprises to do Government work for nothing. So far as this line or any other line—I care not if it is the Allan line or any others—are engaged in the public service in carrying the mails, they ought to be paid what is just and reasonable. I do not think that hon. gentlemen will offer, from this side of the House or anywhere else, any complaint against that principle. But that is not the point here. The hon. gentleman complains that we did not oppose it last year more bitterly than we did. The Opposition last year was led by Mr. Jones, of Halifax, one of the leading members of the Liberal party, and he opposed it on this ground—and I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to it—he opposed it on the ground, and it was acquiesced in by the Finance Minister, that it was a commercial undertaking, on the ground that this line of steamers was running in competition with other commercial lines, and, therefore, it was an injustice to give public aid to the one which was not given to the other. What was the conclusion of the Finance Minister in answering that argument? After using the words which I have read previously, he said:

"I do not believe that subsidies ought to be granted to steamship lines for commercial purposes to any greater extent than will enable them to develop a self-supporting trade."

And he told the House that as soon as the Canadian Pacific line was completed this would be self-supporting; therefore, there was no object in offering any violent opposition to a line which seemed to be, from the statement of the Minister, about expiring. But now the hon. gentleman tells us that not only is it not expiring, but he is entering into a new contract for the next three years. The hon. gentleman will see, therefore, that so far as the members of this House are concerned, they do not believe in the policy of subsidizing steamboats as commercial enterprises; consequently they are not only justified, but compelled on an occasion like this, at least to put their protest on record. I would like to ask what are the new cargoes to be carried by that line of steamers from St. John? I would like to know what we ship, what we export from the Province of New Brunswick? Is it to a large extent lumber, deals? If it is, it seems to me a monstrous proposition that you should subsidize a steamboat company to come into competition with sailing vessels to carry deals. The House is not informed on that point, but we ought to have the information, and we ought to be told upon what ground the hon. gentleman attempts to defend what is certainly most untenable.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend the junior member for the City of St. John (Mr. Hazen) almost insinuated that the opposition to this grant from this side of the House arose from the fact that the City of St. John had changed its political complexion. I must assure my hon. friend that such is not the case. It is already a misfortune for St. John to have changed its political complexion, without putting upon it another misfortune by refusing to subsidize a line of steamers in its interest. The hon. member for St. John stated that this subsidy would build up Canadian trade. Very well, that is a laudable object, and is to be supported so far as the object is attained; but in this case, in order to build up Canadian trade, you do it by subsidizing an English line, because this is not a Canadian line but an English line. You have it in evidence now, that this line is coming into competition with Canadian lines, because it was stated a moment ago by the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden) that this line had already had the effect of killing off a Canadian line.

Mr. HAZEN. There is no Canadian line, and there never was.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend stated a moment ago that a Canadian line had been established between the Basin of Minas and Liverpool, that had carried one cargo of apples for 75 cents, and immediately this subsidized line brought down its tariff from $1 to 70 cents, the effect of which was to kill the Canadian line. This fact is an exemplification of the arguments which were used last year against this subsidy, and which are confirmed this year by the instance mentioned by the hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia. Therefore, this is a good reason, it seems to me, in the eyes of my hon. friends opposite, for agreeing to cut off this subsidy, namely, that instead of encouraging Canadian enterprise, it really has the effect of stifling Canadian enterprise.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This subsidy of $25,000 a year to this line of steamers represents a sum of $625,000 which the people in all parts of the Dominion will be pledged to sustain. The subsidy represents about 4 per cent., according to the average income from real estate in this country, on $625,000. You are taking from the pockets of the people of Canada $625,000 and are setting it apart to furnish the means to subsidize this line of steamers.

Mr. HAZEN. Will you apply the same argument to the canals of Ontario?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly not. The canals of Ontario are governed properly. These steamers do not belong to the Crown, and are not even owned in Canada. Does not the hon. gentleman see any difference between public property that belongs to the Government of the Dominion, and private property? What does the hon. gentleman propose to do with the canals? Does he propose to close them up?

Mr. HAZEN. I am not making any proposition. I am perfectly satisfied.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. member were to compare the canals with the Intercolonial Railway there might be some analogy, but the Minister of Finance is asking us to pledge $625,000 worth of property to subsidize a line of steamers to run in competition with other steamers equally meritorious and equally advantageous to this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What other line?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for King's has mentioned other steamers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. There is no other line.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the Minister of Finance has misled the Committee, for he said there were other lines, and he mentioned the Allan line and the Dominion line.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say they ran to St. John.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman said they ran to Halifax.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that is not St. John.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The hon. gentleman says there is a Canadian line of steamers running to the Bay of Fundy. I know of none. There are a few steamers chartered to come there and get freight at certain seasons of the year, but there is no regular line.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose the only reason there is not a regular line is because there is not sufficient business to maintain one. Demand and supply will regulate matters of trade if the Government will keep its hands off, and allow trade to regulate itself. There is no reason why there should be the slightest interference in this case any more than in a hundred others, and I venture to say there are a quarter of a million dollars of Estimates here that have no more merit in them than the item we are now considering and that should be struck off, and the people relieved from the burdens which are being imposed on them by the imposition of these charges.

Mr. HAZEN. I do not wish to weary the Committee, but I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the canals in Ontario and Quebec are not paying, and cause a great deficit, but when those items are before the House I do not think members from the Maritime Provinces are ever found objecting to them. On the other hand, when the Intercolonial Railway is before the House we find the members from Ontario stating that the road must be made to pay or be closed up, and when these subsidies are before the House, in which the Maritime Provinces are interested, we find hon. gentlemen taking the very same ground. What I want to say is this, if it is proper that all enterprises connected with the Maritime Provinces be viewed purely on a business and commercial basis, as is put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite, if in regard to subsidies granted the excess of expenditure over income should not be paid out of the Dominion exchequer, it is equally proper that the expenditure over income should not be paid out of the public exchequer in the case of the canal system. If it is a good argument in one case it is equally good in the other. So far as regards the Maritime Provinces, we are perfectly willing, looking at the general interest of the country, believing that our canals are important and necessary for the business of the country, although we practically do not derive one atom of benefit from them, to pay our share with the people of the rest of the Dominion, in order to maintain that canal system. But, on the other hand, we claim equal justice and fair-play, and when items concerning the Intercolonial Railway, which is of advantage to the whole Dominion and not alone to the Maritime Provinces, and when the subsidies come under consideration, which are not only of advantage to the Maritime Provinces but of advantage also to the people of the Upper Provinces, because they can ship goods from St. John and Halifax as well as other ports, we ask to be accorded equal fair-play. It is not fair, that on questions of this kind it should be said that these sums are unjustifiable and should not be voted. I fail to see a difference, although the hon. member from Bothwell sees a difference, between a deficit on a railway owned by the country or on an undertaking carried out by private parties. The tax-payers have to pay the deficit in each case, It requires an hon. member who is very philosophical to see the actual difference to the rate-payers and tax-payers of the Dominion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is exceedingly unfortunate in bringing this argument

down to the level on which he has placed it. He has attempted to divide this House into sections.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman was arguing the question solely on that ground. He does not defend that item on its merits; but simply because it will benefit the Maritime Provinces, we must speak of it with bated breath. I hope that we in the Maritime Provinces do not want anything except what is fair, and that we are prepared to defend any grant and appropriation made on its merits and not because it will benefit us locally. The hon. gentleman did not even scruple to introduce incidentally the Intercolonial Railway and say that members from Ontario were constantly carping at that road because it runs to the Maritime Provinces. Let us be just in this matter.

Mr. HAZEN. I did not say that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The deficit on that railway has alarmed thinking men on both sides of the House. The extravagance which reigns throughout the department and on the road has made the hon. gentleman who sits alongside the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) pause and think, and it was only the other evening a proposition was made to this House by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) that the Intercolonial Railway should be taken out of the hands of the Government entirely and vested in a commission, so that political influences and jobbery might be eliminated, and the awful deficit, which has year by year prevailed, might be wiped out if possible. We will discuss the Intercolonial Railway, and a very serious problem it is, on its own merits, and I do not think the hon. gentleman, and I say it with all fairness, forwarded the interests of his native city and province by defending a grant to a steamboat company because the line runs to his particular locality. Let us vote money on the merits of the service and on no other ground, and the sectional cry, that this amount must be granted, or that amount refused because it goes respectively to a certain part of the Dominion, is not such as will receive the sanction and approval of members of this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to say a word in regard to canal tolls. I deny altogether that the representatives of the Province of Ontario ever asked that the canal tolls be put down to non-paying rates. That demand has been made by people living east of Ontario, and it has been made for the purpose of securing, not merely the traffic of Western Ontario, but of the Western States for cities lying along the St. Lawrence. That reduction was made on grounds of public policy, and it interests those who live outside rather than those who live inside of Ontario. This demand, I repeat, has been made by people living in other provinces. Likewise the demand to reduce the rates on the Intercolonial Railway has been made by people living further east for similar considerations. I say with respect to both these matters that the object should be to impose as large rates as possible, consistent with the general public interests, and there is no analogy whatever between either an increase or reduction of tolls on the canals and the subsidy proposed to a private line of steamers enter into competition with other lines of the Dominion.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) made an argument which is quite common on the stump in the Maritime Provinces, but which we do not very often hear in this House. He took the ground that because this particular item happens to be a subsidy given to the Maritime Provinces and not to Ontario, that therefore it was being opposed by the members of the Opposition in this House. He was unfortunate in making this argument here, particularly so as this item is being opposed by the hon. member for Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) and by myself and other Maritime Provinces members, who, I think, may fairly claim to be as loyal to the interests of the Maritime Provinces as the hon. gentleman; certainly as far as our capacity will permit us to be. This is a question that has to be considered on its merits and not with reference to the canal system or the Intercolonial Railway. I believe that I originated, by accident perhaps, the opposition to this subsidy. I happened accidentally to come first on the list of those who objected to it, and I stated specifically my reason for objecting, and that reason was that I believed the subsidy for these steamers was opposed to the development of legitimate trade. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance stated last session, as was quoted by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies):

"I do not believe that subsidies ought to be granted to steamship lines for commercial purposes to any greater extent than will enable them to develop a self-supporting trade."

Will the hon. gentleman say that if the subsidy were withdrawn these steamers would be taken from that route? Will the Minister of Finance or any other gentleman undertake to say that? I do not believe they will. Last year the Minister of Finance did say that he had looked into the matter and that he was doubtful whether the monthly trips could be sustained without a subsidy, but now it turns out that we are to get a fortnightly service.

Mr. FOSTER. With a subsidy.

Mr. BORDEN. So it would seem to me that he has contradicted the statement made last session, and that had he retained the service as a monthly service, that service at least would have been enabled to be performed without any subsidy. Some question has been raised as to this line of Canadian steamers to which I referred, and I desire to say one word of explanation as to that. What I stated was that steamships had been brought to the points on the Bay of Fundy for the purpose of carrying apples from the western parts of Nova Scotia to London and Liverpool, and at a cheaper rate than the rates maintained at Halifax; but that, whenever a line was established from these western points to England, Pickford & Black, taking advantage of the subsidy which they receive from this Government, reduced the rates at Halifax and killed off opposition. That is what I stated. I might state further, that a few years ago this House voted a considerable sum of money for the construction of a frost-proof warehouse at the town of Annapolis. I see my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) is not in his place now, but if he were he would bear out what I say. A large amount of money was expended in constructing this frost-proof warehouse, and if I remember aright, stock was subscribed and

a line of steamers was put on between Annapolis and Liverpool or London, but owing to the opposition of the subsidized steamers that line of steamers was withdrawn and the money which had been expended on that frost-proof warehouse at Annapolis has been unprofitably invested for this country. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) advanced some arguments here in favour of this steamship subsidy which occurred to me as being somewhat extraordinary. He said that the bringing of these steamers around to the town of Annapolis and to the towns on the Bay of Fundy had a tendency to cause shipments to England which would flood the London market. Well, I am not aware that the steamers which are brought to these points carry any more apples than the steamers which go from Halifax, and I am at a loss to know why a cargo of apples carried by a non-subsidized steamer would have the effect of flooding a market which would not be flooded by a line of steamers which is subsidized. I think the steamers from Halifax carry quite as large cargoes as the steamers which ply between Annapolis and Liverpool or London. The fact is, as I have stated, that this subsidy practically operates to kill off legitimate trade and to prevent opposition in the freight-carrying business. I have no doubt whatever that if the subsidy were withdrawn, that there would not only be as good a service as there is now between Halifax and Great Britain, but that there would be a better service, and that the people would have the advantage of having opposing lines coming to these points. The Minister of Finance has not replied to my friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). I understood the Minister to state here that last session he called the attention of the House to the fact that a contract had been entered into between the Government and the Furness line, and he said that Parliament had voted a subsidy last year which was the first instalment of the contract, and that, therefore, we were morally bound to vote the subsidy this year and the following three years. I have looked carefully in *Hansard* and I fail to find a single word to that effect. In fact, as pointed out by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), the whole trend of the discussion at that time would be in precisely the opposite direction, and would indicate quite the opposite of the statement which the Minister of Finance has made here this afternoon. In view of the statement of the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), I think it is only fair that the Minister of Finance should give an explanation, and if he is labouring under a misapprehension then the only argument he advanced, namely, that because Parliament, in the face of the fact that a contract had been made, voted a subsidy last year, binds Parliament to do so for the future, falls to the ground, and it would be in order therefore to strike out this subsidy.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I would like to make a short explanation with reference to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden). He has forced me to make this explanation because I do not wish to be misunderstood. As I understand it, the granting of these subsidies creates a regular line of steamers from St. John and Halifax to London and Liverpool. Now, with reference to the steamers which have been denominated here to-day by the leader of the Opposition as a line of steamers from the Basin of Minas to London and Liverpool, I may say that we have no such regular line of steamers as that at all. There are, what are commonly called ocean tramps that are chartered at certain seasons of the year for the purpose of taking certain cargoes from the ports of the Bay of Fundy to London or Liverpool and other ports in Great Britain. I state as I said before, that some of the apple growers in King's and Annapolis counties at one time thought that the subsidizing of lines of steamers made it unfavourable for them to get their apples to the market, but when they came to thoroughly investigate it they saw that by a regular line of steamers they were in a position to ship smaller lots with more frequency to the British market, than they could by shipping a large cargo by these chartered boats, from Annapolis and from the ports of the Minas Basin. I say now, as I said before—and the speculators in apples and the farmers have found it to be the case—that it is possible to glut even the London market by a large cargo of apples being put at once on that market. Whereas if they are sent in small lots at regular intervals by these subsidized lines of steamers, there is not that possibility of glutting the London market with this particular cargo. Therefore, there is not as much opposition in Annapolis and King's counties now to these subsidized lines of steamers as there was formerly. The people there realize that by means of the competition afforded by them freight rates are reduced rather than increased.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to ask some of the hon. gentlemen representing St. John, N.B., whether my information is correct, that the cargoes which this line of steamers carry from that port are largely or chiefly composed of deals?

Mr. McLEOD. I believe they do carry some deals; but they carry a large quantity of other goods, including Ontario goods. I may say that the Canadian Pacific Railway line has been completed to St. John only this year, and it is expected that the quantity of freight will largely increase.

Subsidy to steamer between Campbellton and Gaspé and intermediate ports..... $12,500

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is this the *Admiral*?

Mr. FOSTER. This is the *Admiral*.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman think it desirable to carry through this item, before the Committee which is investigating the case of the *Admiral* has reported?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that affects the fact of the service being necessary. It may affect the question as to who should receive the contract; but the service is considered necessary, and the vessel is considered suitable for the service.

Mr. LAURIER. But if the hon. gentleman were to wait until the evidence taken before the Committee were presented to the House, he might come to the conclusion that the subsidy is extravagant. If it is true, as I understand, that the value of the steamer is only $16,000, to give it a yearly subsidy of $12,000 is an outrage. Perhaps under the circumstances the hon. gentleman would consider it possible to diminish the subsidy, and therefore I think it would be wise on his part to let the item stand until we have the report.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, let it stand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was going to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that, if my recollection serves me rightly, there was a profit of $8,000 or $10,000, almost equal to the amount of the subsidy.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a mistake.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not make the assertion one way or the other, but I think my recollection is correct.

Steam communication between Port Mulgrave or Pictou Railway terminus and Cheticamp..... $2,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What boat is on that route?

Mr. FOSTER. The same as that on the Magdalen Island service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the name of the gentleman who entered into the contract?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Halliday.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A Pictou man?

Mr. FOSTER. No; a Quebec man.

Steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland... $5,500

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. Minister of Finance has referred to the fact of this subsidy being granted to a company in which my hon. colleague and myself have shares. Now, I wish him distinctly to understand that, although I am unfortunate enough to have a share in that company, I do not consider myself or the company under any obligation to the Government for paying them $5,000 for carrying the mails. The incidents connected with the ownership of that share, so far, have largely consisted of payments out, and not receipts in. As my hon. friend has stated, this company spent over £35,000 sterling last year in building one of the finest steel steamships, I think, to be found in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. TUPPER. You will have good returns now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We may, but we shall not if the directors are foolish enough to carry the mails day by day for the paltry sum of $5,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman knows very well how that was accomplished, and it is just as well to have it discussed. The hon. gentleman had a steamship built for the winter route, and it was thought she could carry on the summer service between Shediac and Charlottetown; but as a matter of fact she is not fitted for that route, owing to there not being a sufficient depth of water in the Shediac port; and in a moment of weakness the directors of the company consented to reduce the subsidy from $10,000 to $5,000. I think they made a mistake, and they would have been better off if they had refused to carry the mails at all. The hon. gentleman intimated the other day that because I was a member of the House and owned a share in that company, I could not vote the money. I do not know what he meant by that statement. If I stood here and voted a subsidy for a company about to be formed, and behind the name of that company sheltered myself, I would be doing something unconstitutional. I was not an original member of this company, but I became possessed of a share in it some years ago in a moment of weakness, but I think the Government will have to deal with the company in a more liberal way than they are doing now.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentlemen complains about what the company are getting for carrying the mails. They are getting about twice as much for carrying the mails between Prince Edward Island and the mainland as would be paid for carrying them from Montreal to Liverpool.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) How much does the hon. gentleman pay for carrying the mails from Montreal to Liverpool?

Mr. HAGGART. At the rate per pound my duputy tells me that this company is getting double what is paid for carrying the mails from Montreal to Liverpool.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Would the hon. Postmaster General apply that rule all around?

Mr. HAGGART. Not at all.

Steam communication between Canso, Arichat, Guysborough, Port Hood and Mabou, and such other places between above limits as may be agreed upon, touching daily at Port Mulgrave, and also to provide for continuance of service during winter on the Port Mulgrave and Canso Section $4,000

Mr. FRASER. Would it not be possible that this communication should be confined to Canso, Arichat and Guysborough? I should think that the former item for steam communication between Port Mulgrave or Pictou Railway terminus and Cheticamp would serve the County of Inverness.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). No.

Mr. FRASER. The service touches the two points, Port Hood and Mabou, to which the service we are now subsidizing is also to go. Canso is the most important section in eastern Nova Scotia. A very large trade is done there, as also in Guysborough in winter in fresh fish, and there ought to be a daily trip made between Canso and the railway station at Port Mulgrave. It is the most important point in Nova Scotia, so far as telegraphic communication is concerned. The large offices built there by the commercial and other companies have made it the most important telegraphic town in Nova Scotia. The *Rimouski* only goes there two days in the week and two days to Guysborough, and on the other days it goes in other directions, that is two days to Port Hood, two days to Canso and two days to Guysborough. It might be possible, particularly in summer, that the *Rimouski* would go to Canso and Guysborough every day. That county except at the point Port Mulgrave, has no railway communication whatever. The amount voted for communication between Port Mulgrave and Cheticamp ought to serve the County of Inverness and let the *Rimouski* go to the County of Guysborough and Richmond. She has to serve both counties in going the other direction, and while she gives twice as much service to Guysborough and Richmond as to Inverness, she serves the two counties. Inverness has, therefore, two services, although Guysborough and Richmond have twice as much trade, but the amount of trade done between Canso and Mulgrave is larger than the amount done with all the other places, including Cheticamp, Port Hood and Arichat. The Government ought to take that into consideration, and Inverness will be served sufficiently

by the other line, because the steamer could make two trips a week, which ought to be enough.

Steam communication between San Francisco and Victoria, B.C..... $17,640

Mr. FOSTER. This is voted each year, and is one of the conditions of the union. We have tried to get it transferred from this road where it is not so necessary and have it apply to more necessary service, but so long as that transfer is not agreed to we must provide this amount.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We are the only Government in christendom which has a steamboat in its constitution.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to call the attention of the Postmaster General and the Minister of Finance to the great importance of providing for a mail subsidy between Victoria and Comox. There is a large number of intervening islands at present which have nothing but a weekly mail communication, for which is paid 10 cents a mile. Between Nanaimo and Comox the country is almost a wilderness, there is no public highway by which a land mail may be transported, so that the people have to depend entirely on this weekly mail. The trade of the district of Comox and adjacent intermediate islands is of great importance. Comox alone, during the month of July, exported $55,000 worth of coal to the markets of California. There is also a large agricultural district in the immediate vicinity which has considerable export and is developing rapidly. It is utterly impossible for a steamboat company to perform the mail service more than once a week at 10 cents a mile. While that rate might be satisfactory between cities, it is utterly inadequate for the conveyance of mails between agricultural communities, in new and sparsely-settled districts. Ever since 1885 the people have been petitioning for a better service. I am satisfied that the exports of Nanaimo during the past year and those of Comox will be increased next year by half or even double that amount. I hope the Government will consider this matter, and see that we get the accommodation so necessary and so much desired.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see this vote is $17,640. Is that the sum that has been annually paid for this service since the union?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. What service is performed? How many boats along the line? How often do they run?

Mr. FOSTER. This is to keep up the steam communication between Victoria and San Francisco.

Mr. CHARLTON. How often do they run?

Mr. FOSTER. I think three times a month.

Mr. HAGGART. They perform this service once a week. They perform it oftener than they are required by the contract.

Mr. CHARLTON. Who is the contractor?

Mr. FRASER. Do they receive a subsidy from the American Government?

Mr. HAGGART. No. It was one of the terms of Confederation with British Columbia that a certain sum should be paid for steam communication with San Francisco, and we pay this under the Act of Confederation. We endeavoured to arrange with the Government of British Columbia to have the amount transferred to some other service which would be of more benefit, but they have the right to get this under the Act of Union.

Mr. FRASER. Is not the railway built through Northern California now?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. The reason for this original agreement was that we had no railway across the continent and the passengers and mails from British Columbia had to go to San Francisco in order to reach Ottawa. Has not that necessity been removed?

Mr. HAGGART. Unfortunately, the object is not stated in the Act.

Mr. FRASER. I am aware of that; but surely a statute is to be construed with a view to the reason for which it was passed. The statute is not to stand when the conditions under which it was passed have been removed. If the reason I have given is the correct reason for this provision, and if that reason has been removed, surely it cannot be contended that the provision is to remain. Suppose this boat ran on this subsidy alone and made nothing, is the Government to keep up that vote because it is in the statute? The railway is built now. Suppose this route would not pay and the company would stop running their boats, would this vote have to be paid when there was no boat to receive the money? Is not, as a matter of fact, the greater part of the trade now to San Francisco through California by the railway?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Section 4 of the terms of union provides for a service between Victoria and San Francisco and Olympia for freight and passengers, but ours is a very extraordinary constitution, and I suppose this provision is looking rather to a union with the state of California than one with British Columbia and the other provinces. It is a prophetic constitution, seeing that it originated with hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. There is a good deal to be said in regard to the construction my hon. friend from Guysborough has put upon this part of the constitution. When this provision was made there were no other means of communicating with the other portions of the Dominion except by way of San Francisco, and, as San Francisco was the western terminus, postal facilities were provided to convey the mails by that route to Canada. That being the case, the ordinary legal principle would apply. Where the reason for this rule ceases, the rule ceases also. But I do not know that British Columbia would be willing to accept that construction. Still, it is extraordinary if, for all time, we are to keep up a fortnightly service between British Columbia and a city of the American union. Suppose war were to break out between Great Britain and the United States, then all communication would cease and yet this term of union with British Columbia would be as operative as ever. The Government would be under as great an obligation as ever to provide for a postal service with the City of San Francisco as if peace existed between the two countries. That shows how ill-considered were the terms and conditions of union, when they were agreed upon, because this assumes a perpetual condition of perfect peace, which cannot be assumed.

Committee rose.

CENSUS RETURNS.

Mr. HAGGART. I beg to present a correction of the census returns in regard to the district of Alberta, showing that instead of the population being 20,056, it should be 26,123.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of supply.

Post Office—Mail Service..... $2,010,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Postmaster General will no doubt give us some explanation of this vote, of the amount of the vote, and of the number of sub-contracts for subsidies that have been entered into since the last session of Parliament. I see that the hon. gentleman is granting the Canadian Pacific Railway a large subvention, and one proportionally larger than has been given for the carriage of mails by railway in the case of other railways. The hon. gentleman must be able to give us full information in regard to that matter.

Mr. HAGGART. There is considerable increase in the payment for the mail service. The amount paid to the Grand Trunk Railway for 1888-89-90, by the Auditor General's Report, was $328,552.11; for 1891-92, $338,000. The increase is caused by the estimated increase of the service on the Wellington, Grey and Bruce, and the Georgian Bay and Lake Erie, of $8,265.54. The amount paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1890 was $372,825.07. The New Brunswick Railway, $25,670.88; Great North-Western, $160. These were both included in the vote for railways last year. The rate paid last year from Montreal to Vancouver was 12 cents a mile. The increased rate would be about 12 cents per train per mile, which would be about $75 per mile. It is increased this year to $105 per mile, or an increase of $75,936. There is also an increase on the Montreal and St. John service. Prince Albert branch, $2,000. This road is from Regina to Prince Albert. The Mission branch, that is a little road from Vancouver down to the boundary. Winnipeg to Glenborough, $1,081. That means a total of $505,992.31, less arrears paid in 1890, $39,261.20, which leaves $485,731.11.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What was the amount paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. HAGGART. The amount paid to the Grand Trunk Railway is $160 per mile for 884 miles over the main line, and $124 per mile per annum for 369½ miles. Then there are $25,000 for increased accommodation, that is, large-sized cars from Montreal to Toronto. There is also $5,725 for carrying the American mail. These items make up the estimates for 1891-92 of $483,500 for the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How many trains per day carry mails on the Grand Trunk?

Mr. HAGGART. Two each way.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How many trains carry mails on the Canadian Pacific Railway each day?

Mr. HAGGART. One each way. The other railways are as follows:—

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Amount paid in 1889-90	$109,590 00	
Prince Edward Island	17,577 00	Both included in other railways last year.
Eastern Extension	5,896 40	
Cape Breton	5,000 00	Estimated increase.
Oxford and New Glasgow	3,455 52	do
Total	$141,428 92	

Estimates for the year 1891-92..... $149,000 00
Special service included; ferry included.
Rate of remuneration, $139 per mile per annum over 764 miles.

CANADA SOUTHERN RAILWAY.

Amount paid for 1889-90 $34,162 80
Estimates for years 1891-92 .....$35,000 00

NORTHERN PACIFIC.

Estimates for years 1891-92..... $2,500 00

OTHER RAILWAYS.

—	Estimated, 1891-92.	Paid, 1891-92.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
Alberta	2,050 00	2,047 02
Bay of Quinté	730 00	730 00
Boston and Maine	2,000 00	1,971 90
Canada Atlantic	8,500 00	8,442 72
Canada Eastern	2,500 00	2,500 00
Caraquet	1,800 00	1,795 70
Central Ontario	5,500 00	5,490 02
Central Vermont	4,700 00	4,668 44
Chatham	896 00	896 00
Cumberland	900 00	895 18
Elgin, Petitcodiac and Havelock	700 00	626 08
Erie and Huron	4,500 00	4,256 80
Esquimalt and Nanaimo	4,000 00	3,906 24
Great Eastern	800 00	In operation.
Joggins'	200 00	do
Kent Northern	700 00	626 08
Kingston, Napanee and Western	14,900 00	8,841 26
Kingston and Pembroke	7,200 00	7,210 11
Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River	2,000 00	In operation.
L'Assomption	250 00	250 00
Manitoba and North-Western	5,000 00	4,084 34
Pontiac and Pacific Junction	2,500 00	2,428 44
Quebec and Lake St. John	7,500 00	7,098 84
Quebec Central	7,250 00	7,161 44
Salisbury and Harvey	2,400 00	2,403 84
Shore Line	2,100 00	2,060 19
1000 Islands Park	730 00	730 00
Maine Central	1,200 00	$5.89 increase
Western Counties	3,500 00	3,355 36
Windsor and Annapolis	8,500 00	8,288 24
St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company	500 00	500 00
New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island	1,250 00	1,240 08
New Westminster Junction	1,201 92	In operation.
Lethbridge and Fort Benson	1,800 00	do
Montreal and Rigaud	400 00	do
Drummond County	1,700 00	do
Lake Temiscouata	2,600 00	do
Annapolis and Digby	1,100 00	do
Nova Scotia Central	2,300 00	do
Total	117,857 92	

Mr. BORDEN. Does that list include all railways intended to be used next year? The hon. gentleman will remember I brought to his attention another railway.

Mr. HAGGART. There are some others we may possibly use, but this list is as nearly correct as possible. I know the hon. gentleman brought to my attention a small line on which we may possibly put the mails. It takes, however, some time to

arrange the matter and get rid of the contract already in existence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We desire an explanation particularly with regard to the increased amount paid for mail service to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Last year the amount was $340,000; this year the proposed amount is $483,000, or an increase of $143,000, equal to 42½ per cent.

Mr. HAGGART. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been urging for a long time on the Government the small amount paid them for mail service. For the last two years they have been in correspondence with us upon the subject. They stated that they were the lowest paid of any railway in the country, and perhaps I had better read some of their communications to me on the subject, as well as my report to Council upon which the Order in Council was founded. I should mention that there is no increase in prices between Ottawa and Toronto on the 12 cents per mile, and the small allowance we give them between Smith's Falls and Montreal, which I think is 4 cents per mile. This is a communication from Mr. Van Horne, dated 27th January, 1891 :

"CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY,
"MONTREAL, 27th January, 1891.

"SIR,—I regret that up to the present time this company has received no favourable reply to its several applications for an increase in the amount allowed the company for carrying mails.

"You have had in your possession for eighteen months a memorandum showing the very great difference existing between the rates paid to this company and those paid to the Grand Trunk and other Canadian railways and to the transcontinental railways in the United States, while the highest rate received by the Canadian Pacific Railway is $75 per mile per annum, the undermentioned rates are paid to the railways named, for the postal service on their main lines:

"Grand Trunk Railway, $160 per mile per annum, with $25,000 per annum additional for special train service between Montreal and Toronto.

"Great Western Railway, $124 per mile per annum, with $5,725 per annum for carrying the American mails.

"Intercolonial Railway, $130 per mile per annum.

"The payments by the United States Government for mail service during the year ending 30th June, 1890, were as follows:—

"Northern Pacific Railway about $200 per mile; Union Pacific Railway, with an additional allowance for use of postal cars, $689 per mile; Southern Pacific Railway, with the same allowance, $467 per mile.

"With the exception of one or two divisions of the Grand Trunk where more than the ordinary number of cars are run, the mail service on the lines of this company is just as frequent, and certainly as good, as upon any other railway in the country, and our directors, therefore, find it difficult to understand why this company should be allowed only about 50 per cent. of the amount paid to other companies for doing the same work.

"We have had reason to expect, for eighteen months back, that the company's applications and representations in this regard would be favourably acted upon, and we have been accepting payments during this time on the original rates, in the belief that no advantage would be taken of the delay and that justice would be done.

"I beg, therefore, that this matter may receive the earliest possible consideration of the Government, and that the rate for postal service on the company's main line, from Quebec to Vancouver, be fixed at one hundred and fifty dollars ($150) per mile of railway per annum, so as to make it conform in a degree to the rates in force on other Canadian lines, and that the rates so fixed be made to apply at least to the past year.

"As something has been said in the discussion of this matter about the revenue of the Government from the service in question, I beg leave to say that, in the case of lines through new districts and on the frontier, the proportion of revenue to expense has never governed the compensation to the mail-carriers, either in Canada or the United States, mail service having, from the nature of the country, to be frequently maintained at a cost of more than one hundred times the revenue. The expense of our service north of Lake Superior and through the mountains, and on our main line generally, is much greater than on the lines in the best developed sections of Ontario and Quebec. Such conditions have always been recognized by the United States Government in fixing the mail compensation for their transcontinental railways. The revenue to the Government from mails is a matter beyond the control of the carrier, and the compensation for the carriage of the mails should not, therefore, be based on such revenue, but on the fair value of the services performed.

"For the mail service on the Short Line between Montreal and St. John, the Post Office Department only allows the ordinary compensation for baggage-car service, although the business is quite large enough to warrant a 24-foot mail compartment. The mail matter cannot be handled in the baggage cars without absorbing space required for passengers' baggage, and, on more than one occasion, I believe, mail bags have been left over because there was not room for them in the car. We have been expecting, from month to month, since the attention of the department was called to this fact, that instructions would be given to put on a suitable car for the mail and the messenger in charge, but, up to this date, no such arrangement has been made."

That was the last application I got, and upon that I founded the report to Council on the 3rd February, which was as follows :—

"POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, CANADA,
"OTTAWA, 3rd February, 1891.

"The undersigned has the honour to represent to Your Excellency in Council that for some time past an application from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been before this department for increase in the rate paid to them for mail service over the line between Montreal and Vancouver, the ground of which is the higher rate at which certain other railways are paid for similar service. In connection with this, it is observed that at present the rate of payment for the service over the line in question is twelve cents (12 cents) per mile, for a space equal to one-half (½) a baggage car, no regard being had to the special character of this railway as an interprovincial link. This feature, in a railway's importance, has not, however, been overlooked in determining the rate of compensation for mail service in the case of other railways furnishing similar connections, a special rate of one hundred and sixty dollars ($160) per mile having been given to the Grand Trunk Railway Company in 1865 on account of its bringing Upper and Lower Canada into closer communication, and afterwards the Intercolonial Railway was paid one hundred and thirty dollars ($130) per mile for a service of a similar nature between the older provinces and the Maritime Provinces. It is conceived, therefore, that the Canadian Pacific Railway may fairly maintain a claim as respects the portion of the railway in question, based upon the same ground. As, however, the frequency of service over this line is not now, nor is likely to be for a long time to come, as great as it is over the other railways mentioned, it is not thought necessary to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway as high prices as are paid to other railways, but one hundred and five dollars ($105) per annum would seem to be an equitable recognition of the special character of the service rendered by this railway company. At this rate the amount payable for the service between Montreal and Vancouver would be three hundred and six thousand and seventy-five dollars ($306,075) per annum, an excess of seventy-four thousand nine hundred and thirty-six dollars ($74,936) over the amount now paid.

"It is, therefore, recommended that the Canadian Pacific Railway be paid at the rate of one hundred and five dollars ($105) per mile per annum over the line between Montreal and Vancouver, and that in consideration of this payment this department shall be entitled to call upon the railway company to carry mails by any train now running, or that may hereafter be run between the points mentioned."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The increase is $143,000, but that only accounts for $74,000 of the increase.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand from the figures given us that the Grand Trunk Railway receives $160 per train per mile for two services each way per day, and the Canadian Pacific Railway receives $105 per train per mile for one service each way.

Mr. HAGGART. Some portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway run two trains each way per day.

Mr. CHARLTON. How is the balance of the increase accounted for? There is $69,500 increase to the Canadian Pacific Railway not accounted for yet.

Mr. HAGGART. There are some of the branches being added, and the line between Montreal and St. John is put on the same footing as the other lines, 12 cents per train per mile. Instead of the baggage car we put on a postal car and run it through.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That surely cannot account for the other $70,000.

Mr. HAGGART. There is an increase between Montreal and St. John from $7,023.72 to $35,982, making an increase of $28,958. Then, there is the increase on the main line and a small allowance for the Mission Branch and the line to Prince Albert.

Mr. CHARLTON. That $28,000 fails to account for the $69,500 by $41,500.

Mr. HAGGART. The $25,670 paid to the New Brunswick Railway was charged last year to other railways; this is now paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway; to the Great North-Western Railway, $160; increase for the service from Montreal to Vancouver, $75,936; increase for the service from Montreal to St. John, $28,958; service from Regina to Prince Albert, $2,000; the Mission Branch, $300; and the Winnipeg and Glenborough service, $1,081. These are the increases.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is more than $10,000 short yet.

Mr. HAGGART. The total of the amounts which I have given is $505,992.31, less arrears paid in 1889-90, $20,261, which leaves $485,731. There is an increase of about $105,000 paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway this year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That may be so, but it does not appear from the Estimates. We have in the Estimates an appropriation for the year 1890-91 to the Canadian Pacific Railway of $340,000, and for the present fiscal year $483,500, or an increase of $143,000. The hon. gentleman when invited to account for the increase, accounts for $132,000. There appears to be a hiatus somewhere.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is taking the amount that was voted last year, $340,000. The amount actually paid was $372,825.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does the increase for this year cover that deficiency of last year, besides the increased expenditures?

Mr. HAGGART. No; the vote taken this year is for the purpose of covering the amount to be actually paid.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon gentleman has not accounted for the increase in the appropriation by about $10,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think we can congratulate ourselves upon the condition in which our Post Office Department is at the present time. It is the department which above all others ought, I suppose, to be free from political influence or taint. The hon. gentleman may have satisfied himself and his friends that the deal which he made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company just before the last election was a square and honest one, but I think a great many in the country will doubt that. It is within the recollection of everyone that just previous to the last election the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company published a most extraordinary political manifesto, and it was generally believed, and is believed to this day, that that manifesto was published after the hon. Postmaster General had made this political deal with Mr. Van Horne. Now, we have the proof, to some extent at least, in the fact that the letter conveying the application for this enormous increase was dated on the 27th day of January. The hon. Postmaster General paid a visit to Mr. Van Horne on or about that time, and on the 3rd of February he made his report—not, it is true, conceding what Mr. Van Horne wanted, but conceding a large portion of his demands. Mr. Van Horne was modest; he only wanted $150,000, and the hon. Postmaster General compromised with him for $105,000. The long and short of the story is this, that just before the last election the hon. gentleman promised to pay increased subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway by about $143,500 a year. My hon. friend beside me says $150,000, but I take the figures from the Estimates. There may be something else beyond that. At any rate, I am well within the lines in saying that.

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has just been giving the details. He has paid $76,000 increase for carrying the mails between Montreal and Vancouver; $28,000 for the St. John line; $25,600——

Mr. HAGGART. That was paid last year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Just so; the two items are increased.

Mr. HAGGART. It is just simply a transfer of account.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has stated that there is an increase of $76,000 between Montreal and Vancouver over last year, and $28,000 from Montreal to St. John. That only makes $104,000, and leaves the other $40,000 to be accounted for; and he accounts for part of that by saying that $25,000 paid under another name last year are now paid the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that there is over $100,000 increase paid in consequence of the application of Mr. Van Horne addressed to the hon. gentleman and to which he acceded in his report to Council. As a matter of fact, how does the Post Office Department stand? I would have imagined that the hon. gentleman would have embraced this opportunity of making a few general statements upon the condition of his department, which is not one on which we can congratulate ourselves. I find that the total expenture last year was $3,074,469 and the net revenue $2,357,388, leaving a loss of $717,000. One would have thought that the hon. gentleman would have taken pains to explain how this arose, and whether he has any policy which, in his opinion, would result in diminishing it. Instead of that, his policy has simply been one of increasing the payment to the Canadian Pacific Railway to an amount which

I do not think can be justified. We never heard in this House before, certainly not last session, from the hon. gentleman, that there had been any claim from the Canadian Pacific Railway that the mileage they received for carrying the mails to British Columbia was unjust or unfair, and now he increases that by $30 per mile. That may be justified, but it is a very suspicious circumstance that the negotiations took place just previous to the general elections and the issue of the celebrated manifesto against reciprocity. A great many people believe that this demand which the Government complied with was simply complied with as an inducement to the company to lend their political influence to the support of the Government. Certainly the hon. gentleman has not made any pretense whatever of defending it. He simply reiterated to us in a laconic manner what he reported to the Council. He has not attempted to justify his action by showing what the United States pay for carrying mails across the Union Pacific or Northern Pacific, or any of their great lines; and I suppose he relies on the House carrying the vote without explanation. In my judgment, the hon. gentleman has shown no grounds to justify the heavy loss in the yearly administration of the department. Both the circumstances of the increase and the time it was made are peculiarly unfortunate, inasmuch as immediately after this enormous sum was granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway they issued their political manifesto, so that it would seem the payment made them was in the nature of a payment for value received.

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the statement of the hon. gentleman that the financial position of the Post Office Department is worse than it has been in past years, let me inform him that the deficit has been growing gradually less those few years back, and last year it was $50,000 less than the year before. The hon. gentleman has said that I did not make any comparisons, but I made a number of comparisons with other railways in the United States in precisely similar circumstances, and showed that they are paid more than double what we pay. I could show the hon. gentleman, but it would only excite, perhaps, the cupidity of railway companies, that we are paying far less rates than are paid by the United States. Some of the railway companies in the United States are paid as high as from $1,200 to $1,500 per mile per year; and with reference to the statement of the hon. gentleman that a manifesto was issued immediately after the interview I had with Mr. Van Horne, I had no such interview with Mr. Van Horne and there was no such arrangement made with him. I recommended this increase to the Council solely on the ground——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman deny that he had an interview with Mr. Van Horne?

Mr. HAGGART. I had no interview with him. I may have met him, but not on any subject with reference to this. I had no communication with him on any political subject. I do not remember having had any interview with him, even on postal matters. In fact, I am certain I never had. The only communications I had were those I had in my office with Mr. Drinkwater, who frequently represented to me the small amount the Canadian Pacific Railway were receiving for their services, and with Mr. Shaughnessy. I made comparisons, which may have been laconic as the hon. gentleman states, but were as complete as I could possibly give them, with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, and also with the Northern Pacific and the two other Pacific lines running to California.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the hon. gentleman mentioned the Union Pacific.

Mr. HAGGART. I mentioned the three of them. It was mentioned in Mr. Van Horne's letter which draws a comparison between the amount paid by us and those paid by the United States; and I think the service we are receiving from the Canadian Pacific Railway at $105 per mile per year is a service which has a very small compensation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be a matter of opinion. Over a very large portion indeed of their route traversed between Montreal and Vancouver there is, as the hon. gentleman knows, absolutely no inhabitants whatever. After you leave Nipissing until you get to Port Arthur there are very few people indeed. From Port Arthur to Winnipeg there are very few people indeed. For a few hundred miles past Winnipeg there is some considerable settlement, and from that time on, until you get very near the coast in British Columbia, settlement is of the sparsest possible description. It is a very extraordinary circumstance that whereas the Grand Trunk Railway presumably serves a very much larger number—I suppose seven or eight times as many as the Canadian Pacific Railway can serve—you find that $338,000 compensates the former, while it takes $483,000 to compensate the latter. But I rose more particularly to call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that the figures he gave, large as they were, and they are very large indeed, do not show the true deficit on the post office service. We have the large amount of $3,360,000 here, but we have besides that the large sum of $201,360 for the office at Ottawa, and the large sum of $35,000 for contingencies of the office at Ottawa, and, of course, there is the Minister's own salary to be added. So that in all we spend $3,604,310 on our post office service, and the net receipts last year appear to have been $2,357,388; so that at present the net loss on the post office service amounts to close on $1,250,000 per year. And this is the time when the Postmaster General thinks it expedient to add this large amount to the expenditure of the mail service. It appears to me that this is a very unfortunate time to choose for that purpose, when we have a deficit of a million and a quarter. The Canadian Pacific Railway, which has received enormous benefits from this country, which has received enormous subsidies, in cash and in land, put in a claim in the very heat of an election for a large additional subsidy. If there were any railway which the Government would have been justified in requiring to be satisfied with a moderate subsidy it is that railway, especially in view of the fact that they traverse what is almost an uninhabited territory from about the end of Lake Huron until they get to the Pacific coast. I would ask the Postmaster General to tell me what is the sum total paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway for their postal service, from such a point as Pembroke to Vancouver. The population served is very small and very sparse. I presume that, all

told, it can be very little more than 300,000 and yet for that service it appears that we are expending $300,000 or $400,000 a year.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would call the attention of the Committee to the unintentionally misleading character of the Minister's comparison between the amounts paid on the Canadian and the American roads, between the cost of the mail service on the Union Pacific and the Canadian Pacific Railway. These American roads, which are receiving from $1,200 to $1,500 a mile, run two or three mail trains each way, sometimes from New York to the west with four or five mail cars, and they are simply mail trains. They run at 50 miles an hour, and this rate is maintained from New York to San Francisco. While we are serving 90,000 people west of the Rocky Mountains, the American mail trains are serving a population of 2,000,000 west of the Rocky Mountains. The service is vastly better than ours, the time is more speedy and the accommodation is vastly greater. These mail trains are models. They are entirely mail trains, with nothing but mail cars on them, and the comparison between the American roads which serve 63,000,000 people and the Canadian roads which serve only 5,000,000 people is very difficult to make correctly. We have to take all the circumstances into account before we institute a comparison between their roads and our own.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, yes; no doubt the hon. gentleman is correct. For instance, the rate between New York and Buffalo, 439 miles, is $2,080 per mile per annum. From New York to Philadelphia, 90 miles, the amount is $2,824 per mile per annum. But I was trying to draw a comparison with roads which are very similar to the Canadian Pacific Railway, such as the Northern Pacific from St. Paul to the sea coast, which receives more than double what we pay to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was asking what the amount was which we paid from Pembroke to Vancouver. I have not that calculation. The distance I have is from Montreal to Vancouver, the increase being $75,936. That would be the difference between $75 and $105 per mile for 2,915 miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the distance from Montreal to Pembroke would be about 250 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes. The hon. gentleman draws a comparison between what we pay to the Canadian Pacific Railway and what we pay to the Grand Trunk Railway, and he says that the Grand Trunk Railway serves a population seven or eight times greater than that served by the Canadian Pacific Railway. He must remember that the Canadian Pacific Railway have their lines in every portion of Canada. They have lines from Montreal *vid* Smith's Falls to Toronto. They have another branch along the Ottawa River.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not quite follow what I was pointing out, which was, that on the road from a point like Pemkroke to Vancouver the amount paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway was very much larger than the whole amount paid to the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. But I show that, in Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, the Canadian Pacific Railway have nearly as large a railway mileage as the Grand Trunk Railway. They have their line from Montreal to Toronto. They have their line along the Quebec side of the Ottawa River to the City of Ottawa. They have their line to Carleton Place, to Pembroke, to Owen Sound, to Woodstock, and from Woodstock to Detroit. They serve nearly as large a population as the Grand Trunk, and, taking in their line in New Brunswick, they probably serve quite as large a population, and they receive not a tithe of the amount which the Grand Trunk Railway receives in the older part of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That does not alter the fact that, from Pembroke to Vancouver, they receive very nearly as much as the Grand Trunk is paid for the whole of the service it performs. At $105 a mile, the Canadian Pacific Railway receives close upon $300,000 from Pembroke to Vancouver, and that is exclusive of a large amount paid for what may be called the side lines in the North-West, the amount of which I have not got.

Mr. HAGGART. I gave that before you came in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Taking Pembroke as your starting point, you are paying to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purpose of serving a population scarcely 300,000 strong, scattered over the North-West and over part of the unsettled portions of Ontario, and over British Columbia, as much and probably more than you are paying to the Grand Trunk for all the work they do from one end of Canada to the other. In what we may call the unsettled part of our territory, there are great regions extending to 400, perhaps to 600, perhaps even to 800 miles, together where there is no settlement, whatever there may be in the future. And to all this service on the main line which we pay for there is to be added what is paid for the branches in British Columbia and Manitoba and elsewhere.

Mr. HAGGART. The amount paid for the Prince Albert Branch is $2,060; for the Mission Branch, $300, and for the Winnipeg and Glenborough Branch, $1,081.60.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You pay on the Manitoba and South-Western?

Mr. HAGGART. That is what is known as the Glenborough Branch.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would make in any case close on $300,000 paid for the service of 300,000 people. Now, it does appear to me, all things considered, that it is a very monstrous charge to make for the service. As I said, I do not regard the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has received donations to the tune of close upon $100,000,000 in cash and property, as being entitled to exact the last farthing from the post office or any other department of this Government. On the contrary, I think there is very good ground for keeping it close. Now, the hon. gentleman has not gainsaid the accuracy of my statement, that instead of a deficit of seven or eight hundred thousand dollars, under present estimates the deficit in the post office will be, all told, $1,250,000, unless there be a large increase in receipts, which, to the best of my knowledge, he did not count upon, did not expect, and probably will not

realize. In charging and accounting the cost of the Post Office Department you must add not merely this $274,000, but you must likewise add the cost at headquarters, which comes close to a quarter of a million dollars that it is necessary to charge against the post office expenditure.

Mr. HAGGART. That always was a charge, and very nearly of the same extent. The increase in the post office management since I have been in charge has been very little at headquarters, and the deficit this year $50,000 less than last year, and last year it was less than the year before. The hon. gentleman must remember the amount paid from Montreal to Vancouver, and the service of the line from Montreal to Toronto, one portion of it from Montreal to Smith's Falls at $25 per train mile per year. We are paying over some of the distance on the Grand Trunk Railway $160. We are paying from Smith's Falls to Toronto, and from Ottawa to Toronto, only $75 per train mile per year, while on the Grand Trunk Railway we are paying $160 per mile, besides $25,000 added to it for special mail accommodation on the road. The Grand Trunk Railway is receiving for the service in Ontario over double what the Canadian Pacific Railway are receiving.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This road from Montreal to Toronto passes, as the hon. gentleman knows, over a comparatively thinly-settled portion of the country for a great part of it. There is a long distance from Perth till you get near Peterborough, in which settlement is very sparse, in some parts of which there is no settlement at all. But the Grand Trunk Railway goes along the St. Lawrence, through the oldest and most populous portion, almost, in the country; necessarily, it does a great deal more work, and serves a great many more people, and should receive the larger subsidy.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the hon. gentleman will break his record for reducing expenses in the Post Office Department with this increase of $274,000. I had been looking with some hope to the time when we would reduce our postage to two cents per letter, but with this large increase in the expenditure I suppose we must consider the realization of that hope deferred for some time.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is fond of making comparisons with the United States. I can tell him that we have mail contracts and post offices to a far greater extent, and more of them, than they have in the United States, according to the population. In Canada the distance travelled comparatively is far greater than in the United States, and the number is nearly double for the same population.

Mr. FRASER. I submit that the post offices are not as well organized, nor are the postmasters as well paid, as in the United States. The allusion of the Postmaster General reminds me of a case that I am acquainted with. Previous to Confederation, the postmaster of a small settlement in my county received some $30 a year. After some time there was a representative sent to this House opposed to the present Government, and his salary was at once reduced from $30 to $14. He did not want to keep the office at all at that amount, and notified the department. They tried to get somebody else to take his place, but they could find no one for that amount. Mr. Maguire, of Steep Creek—that is the name of the gentleman—is a very decent citizen in my county, and he asked the department to take the office away. However, the department sent him the salary from year to year, and Mr. Maguire credited them with the amount. Finally, they wanted him to pay back the sum of $90, and for the last three years they have neither taken his post office from him, nor have they sent him any stamps, and so the man has actually to buy the stamps that are used, and pay for them himself out of his own pocket, and the Government will allow him neither salary, stamps, nor anything else. It is very easy to run a Post Office Department in that way. At the same time, they are voting $75,000 to carry the mails on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, I admit if you carry on the post office service like that you may pay the railways liberally. With the means at our disposal, we have in Canada, I admit, a fairly good service, so far as serving the people is concerned. In Nova Scotia generally we are well served, so far as offices in the districts are concerned. But no thanks to the Government for that, because the people will have post office matter, we are a reading people, and we must have post offices. I do not know whether there are many cases like the one I have mentioned. I hope the Postmaster General will attend to this matter, and that he will get some other postmaster, and pay this man the amount that is due him, and not allow him, at his own expense, to carry on a post office in that district.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know the post office nor the requirements. But every postmaster in the country is paid upon a principle that he knows perfectly well, entitling every postmaster to a fixed salary, as well as the Postmaster General, or any other officer. As to stamps, very likely it is a small office, a non-accounting one, and we do not give stamps to any of the small offices unless the postmaster sends money in for them.

Mr. FRASER. You might at least give him a salary in order that he may buy the stamps.

Mr. HAGGART. The salary will be sent him regularly. I will make enquiry about it.

Mr. HYMAN. It will be remembered that some time ago the rate of postage in cities where there is free delivery was raised from one cent to two cents. There is a class of matter which it seems to me might be excepted by the Postmaster General from the class of written matter and might be carried at the rate of one cent, the same as circulars. I refer more particularly to statements which are sent out by friendly societies. I think these should be sent out at the one cent rate. The rate has been raised to two cents for drop letters, which includes ordinary writing matter. I think that the Government might consider this matter and take some discretionary power, by which the Postmaster General by an Order in Council might designate what particular circulars could be put under a one cent rate. I may say that the matter has already been referred to in England, and the post office authorities have taken action in the matter. At a meeting of one of these societies the following letter was read :—

"GENERAL POST OFFICE, Aug. 4.

"DEAR SIR ALBERT ROLLIT,—The Post Office Act Amendment Bill empowers the Postmaster General, with the consent of the Treasury, to determine what circulars shall

be charged with rates of postage as letters, and it is proposed under this authority to allow circulars to be sent by book post, whether attached or not to other documents, such as a statement of accounts. This proposal will admit to the privilege of the book post arrears notices sent out by friendly societies, which are at present inadmissible."

I should be very glad if the Postmaster General would take the matter into consideration, and see if some arrangement of this kind can be made in Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is no doubt aware that it is out of my power to make this change. That can only be done by a change in the Act. Consideration will be given to this subject. I am glad to obtain all suggestions for improving the service.

Mr. FLINT. What rule of the department exists in regard to decisions being arrived at by the Government as to whether they will allow a daily mail in different sections as an improvement on a weekly or semi-weekly mail? Has the department fixed any particular limit of population or of postal revenue on which this basis is made? While on this subject, I may say that, in the constituency I have the honour to represent, there are one or two, and perhaps three cases, in which strong representations have been made to the department asking that a semi-weekly and in some instances a tri-weekly mail may be displaced in favour of the daily mail. I will not dwell on the reasons given, because I believe they are fully contained in the correspondence under the hand of the Postmaster General, but I would strongly urge that these cases be favourably considered by the department, because I believe the case made up by the petitioners is practically unanswerable. These communities that ask for the daily mail are growing communities, and great financial loss is sustained by business men sometimes for want of more frequent communication. There is, an addition to these cases I have in my mind, and which are probably well understood by the department, a claim made by a community on the border line between Digby and Yarmouth counties. The mail now, I believe, is semi-weekly and ends at the post office at Carlton, in the County of Yarmouth, the post office being about the same distance on the other side in Digby County, leaving Forest Glen, between the counties, without other mail accommodation but that furnished by the two post offices 7 miles apart. If the department could manage to make a contract by which the mail would be carried from Carlton through Forest Glen to the other post office in Digby County it would be of great advantage to the people of the community. It is a growing community, and the people, numbering 40 families, are put to great inconvenience and loss, in consequence of the fact that they have to send or go 6 or 7 miles in either direction in order to secure their correspondence and papers. So great has been the inconvenience that many of the inhabitants have given up their weekly papers, because it is dead loss to have them lie in the post office for some time before they obtain them. I hope the Postmaster General will give his patient consideration to the claims made by these people and, if possible, give them an answer in accordance with their wishes.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no principle on which increased mail accommodation is given; it is simply a question as to whether the revenue will justify it or not. When there is an application made to the department the first action taken is to obtain the revenue derived from the offices, and next the cost of the proposed service. Then the report is sent down to the inspector, and he reports as to the necessity of it. No doubt this application was sent to the inspector to report, and if no action has been taken it is because the revenue did not justify an additional service. However, the hon. gentleman can see the report and the grounds given by the inspector by calling at the department, or I will bring up the papers.

Mr. FLINT. I will accept the invitation of the Postmaster General, because there may be certain statements in the report that may be of interest to the petitioners in order that they may reply to them.

Mr. BORDEN. A short time ago I asked if the railway of which I have spoken and written to the Posmaster General, the Cornwallis Valley Railway, was to be employed to carry the mails. It was not included in the list of new railways to be employed. The Postmaster General said it might possibly be employed next year. I find that railway is the only railway in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick that is not employed, and it is a very remarkable circumstance, because the hon. gentleman has had the matter pressed on his attention ever since January last. The road was opened in December, and the president of the company promptly informed the department that the company were prepared to carry the mails, as the road passes near many post offices. The Postmaster General said he would refer the request to the inspector for his report; and I believe he reported favourably. I assure the hon. gentleman that it will involve very little increase in the expenditure, and it will give enormously better service to that section of the country. The people are almost entirely in favour of this change. I think when the hon. gentleman has time to give the matter attention he will not refuse the people of that section and the railway company that which is granted to every other railway, and all the people living in the neighbourhood of railways in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. HAGGART. I have had representations from the hon. gentleman with respect to putting the mails on that road. I caused enquiries to be made, and if the mails are not on that road I believe it is because the report was unfavourable. But there are several roads in precisely the same position, that the mails have not been put on them for some time—the Glasgow and New Oxford, and some other railways. My intention is, whenever I have means at my disposal, to use the Cornwallis Valley Railroad for the purpose of carrying the mails.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). There is the Nova Scotia Central.

Mr. BORDEN. They are on the new list.

Mr. HAGGART. It will involve the expenditure of a very small amount, and we will be able to take it out of another vote.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Postmaster General stated there was a fixed rule by which compensation to postmasters was arranged. Will the hon. gentleman please state what the rule is?

Mr. HAGGART. I brought down a return to the House a few days ago in answer to a similar question, and it will be found in possession of the clerk. The whole matter is carried out on a principle, and the amounts of salaries are fixed and revised every year.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are the enumeration weeks for the different officers uniform throughout the Dominion ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; they are all taken at the same time.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see the allowance for the Northern Pacific Railway is $2,500. How many miles of this railway are covered by this allowance ?

Mr. HAGGART. I have not got the number of miles here, but the line runs parallel with portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it was by special arrangement with the agent of the Northern Pacific that the mails were carried at a very low rate.

Mr. CHARLTON. Do they run a mail car, or are the mails carried in the baggage car ?

Mr. HAGGART. I should think they cannot run a mail car for the small amount of money allowed them.

Mr. TROW. I wish to ask the Postmaster General upon what plea the increase of $30 per mile was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway ? Was it on account of the increased population along the line ? I notice by the census that in Muskoka, Nipissing, Parry Sound, and a few other places, there is some increase of population, and was it upon that plea, and upon that only, that the increased mail subsidy was given ?

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the hon. gentleman was not in the House when I went over the whole of that subject. The increased allowance was made at the request of the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, who set forth a number of reasons why he was entitled to it.

Mr. TROW. Was the increased population one reason ?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Post Office—Salaries and allowances...$1,144,950

Mr. HYMAN. There is one class of servants who are paid out of this item that I desire to bring to the kindly attention of the Postmaster General, and that is the letter carriers. I see that the letter carriers when they first enter the service are paid the munificent sum of $360 per year. I think that this is rather a small remuneration, and it is certainly not in proportion to the work they are called upon to do. There are peculiar requirements necessary for the men in that service. They have of course to be faithful, they have of course to have a fair education, and have at all times to travel in inclement weather of all kinds and be on duty for very long hours. I think that to such a man as could fairly be said to fill that position the sum of $360 a year is rather a small amount on which to begin. I may be misinformed, but I understand that in the time of the Mackenzie Government the letter carriers started at a salary of $400 a year, and if that be the case, it does seem that it is a small enough amount to ask such men to work for. There is one circumstance which happened in the city which I have the honour to represent, and which I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister. That is, in regard to the delivery of mails upon holidays. I understand that it is the custom of the department that on ordinary holidays the letter carriers are only called upon to deliver one mail in the morning. However that may be, I know that in the City of London, on the civic holiday, which is observed probably more than any other holiday in the year, the letter carriers were called upon, owing to some order having been sent from the Department of the Postmaster General, to deliver two mails that day, one in the morning and one in the afternoon, the same as they do on ordinary days. It seems to me there must have been some red-tapeism that such was the case, because when all the business houses in the city were closed up these men were certainly just as much entitled to a holiday as any one else.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is perfectly correct as to the salary at which the letter carriers commence. It compares favourably with the salaries paid to carriers in any other portion of the world. In the United States the salary of the letter carriers is nominally a little higher, but you must remember that in Canada they are sometimes entitled to a superannuation allowance; they get their uniform free, and there is no reduction for any time they are absent on holidays. It is a strict rule in the United States that any day they are absent there is a reduction in their pay. In this country they have the right of rising in the service up to $600 per year, and we have not any difficulty in filling the situations when any of them are vacant. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that the commencing salary was $400 some time ago, but that was only in force for a short time. As to the other matter, persons want their letters on holidays, and it has always been the custom of the department that letter carriers should make one delivery at least on a holiday.

Mr. HYMAN. That just bears out the complaint I was making in regard to the letter carriers in the City of London. I am informed that the last civic holiday they were called upon to make two deliveries, and I always understood it to be the rule, as the Postmaster General stated, that there was only one delivery made on a holiday. I would like the Postmaster General to look into the matter and see how it is that they were called upon to make two deliveries on a holiday generally observed in the city.

Mr. HAGGART. I think the department only recognizes statutory holidays, and not civic holidays.

Mr. TROW. I think it is perfectly right that the general public should be accommodated in receiving their letters, and that they should not be deprived of this convenience for the sake of one or two individuals in the post office. People require their mail matter on these days just as well as any other day, and I think it is perfectly right that these parties should be employed a part of the day at all events. In my opinion the system of economy on the part of the Postmaster General is rather rigidly enforced with regard to country postmasters. I know of many instances in my riding where the postmaster, in receipt of $10 or $12 per annum, has got to be in his post office

daily, and for a good part of the day in many instances. Is it the invariable rule of the Postmaster General that the postmasters receive forty per cent. on the income, and is that rule universally in force?

Mr. HAGGART. It is universally enforced, except in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, where the postmasters who have been in the service before Confederation receive the same salaries as they did then. The new incumbent of an office, however, has to come under the general regulations. In no case that I know of throughout the Dominion is any other system adopted.

Mr. BORDEN. I wish to ask some information from the Postmaster General in reference to the post office of Kentville. I put a question on the Order Paper early in the session with regard to that office, asking if the Postmaster had been suspended there, and I was informed that he had been suspended in January last for being short in his accounts. There has been no postmaster in that office since January, and the inspector at Halifax has been sending a man from the Halifax office to discharge the duties. There have been several changes made there within the past few months; the people are complaining very much of the unsatisfactory condition of things, and representations have been made to me that it is desirable that a permanent postmaster should be appointed. Even on the score of expense, that is quite a heavy loss to the department, because the officer who has been doing the work there was receiving $1,000 at Halifax, and I presume that he is getting the same salary at Kentville, and a clerk is receiving $260 a year, which makes $1,260, while the postmaster's salary is $840, showing a loss of some $400 a year to the country. I do not know why the hon. gentleman does not make an appointment. If he cannot find anybody there in the Conservative ranks, and if he will consult me, I think I can find a man in King's County who will be competent to fill the position, and I should be delighted to give him the benefit of my assistance.

Mr. HAGGART. I answered the hon. gentleman's question the other day. I stated that on account of some deficiency in the accounts of the postmaster at Kentville, an officer from the inspector's office at Halifax had taken charge of the post office at Kentville. I do not think the hon. gentleman can complain that the service is not as efficient as formerly, because I think an officer of that kind would see about it being conducted in the best manner. The fact is that I have not yet received a nomination for the position of posmaster at Kentville, but I hope to make the appointment shortly, and I hope to obtain a postmaster who will satisfy the hon. gentleman and all the people of the locality.

Mr. BORDEN. I thought the trouble generally was that there were too many applicants. One other thing I wish to say. It is currently reported that the post office inspector has said that the shortage in the suspended postmaster's accounts is being made up out of his salary—that the salary is really being paid, and that the money is going to his sureties.

Mr. HAGGART. Since the suspension?

Mr. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr HAGGART. Oh, no.

Mr. BORDEN. I asked the Deputy Postmaster General, and he stated that this was not true, and I mention it in this public way so that it may be contradicted.

Mr. HAGGART. If the inspector or any other officer allows anything of this kind, I will take it out of his salary.

Mr. FLINT. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General what the rule is with regard to free delivery—what size a city or town must be to entitle it to have a free delivery. I should think that towns like Yarmouth and Truro ought to be entitled to a free mail delivery as well as some larger towns.

Mr. HAGGART. There must be a post office, the postmaster must be on the Civil Service List, and there must be as nearly as possible a population of 10,000.

Mr. PERRY. The Postmaster General is not so active in appointing a postmaster at Kentville as he has been at Summerside, P.E.I. The postmaster at Kentville was suspended in January, and his successor has not been appointed yet; but the postmaster at Summerside, Mr. Green, was dismissed on the 5th of this month, and his successor was appointed on the same day. In answer to a certain question I asked, the hon. Postmaster General undertook to give reasons why Mr. Green was dismissed, but the reasons were frivolous; there was no reason at all. Mr. Green, it appears, wrote to the hon. Postmaster General, making a statement, and writes to me to say that the Postmaster General has not even answered his letter. I do not know what sort of a court his subordinates on the island have held over the conduct of Mr. Green; but Mr. Green has not been tried. He got no notice that he would be dismissed; but Mr. Campbell walked into the post office at about ten o'clock on the morning of the 5th of this month, and he said to Mr. Green: "You have no more right here; your services are no longer required in this office; I have authority to take charge of the office;" and on that very same day his successor was appointed by the Postmaster General. If that be British fair-play, I do not understand it. Why was not Mr. Green given a chance of having a trial? Is it because Mr. Hunt, or Mr. Somebody else, stated to the Posmaster General that Mr. Green should be dismissed without any reason? I would like to ask the Postmaster General how he would like to have an accusation made against him, and be turned out of his department to-morrow without a trial? Would he say it was fair-play? No; he would resent it, he would kick at that, and he would be right. The same justice which the Postmaster General would expect to be meted out to him he ought to mete out to his subordinates in Prince Edward Island. If Mr. Green was guilty of any misconduct, and if after a fair trial he was proved guilty, then it would be right to dismiss him; but he is justified in claiming a proper investigation. It looks very suspicious that the man who is now the incumbent of that office was here in Ottawa shortly before Mr. Green was dismissed. Mr. Green has served the country in Summerside for 23 years, and no fault could be found with him during all that time. The only reason that could be found was that a letter had fallen out of one drawer into another drawer underneath. It was not a letter of any particular importance; it was not registered; there was no

money in it; and in a few days it was found and handed over to the proper party. I am here to say that greater irregularities than that may exist in higher places, and no notice is taken of them; but it seems that Mr. Green should be satisfied with being remunerated for his past services. Mr. Hunt is a pet of the present Administration. He had done some service, he had worked hard, he had been in harness until he had almost broke the harness, he had canvassed the whole county and told a good many things that were not altogether the whole truth, any more than what was told by the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General had said that Mr. Hunt had never applied for the post office. Will he say that when he went to Ottawa Mr. Hunt did not go to the department and whisper into somebody's ear that he wanted the office? They gave him the office because he asked for it, and the Postmaster General must now explain why this request was granted. The department has not been fair to Mr. Green or to the Summmerside people. Mr. Green has served his country for almost a quarter of a century; no fault can be found against his administration. All of a sudden, just because a small irregularity occurred through a letter having been dropped by mistake into one drawer instead of another, he was dismissed. There have been greater irregularities in the Charlottetown post office, and in many of the departments here at Ottawa, but these gentlemen still hold their portfolios. I do not mean to say that they should be dismissed without an investigation, as Mr. Green was. In his letter, Mr. Green says that before the new post office was built at Summerside he spent $500 from the time he commenced until the new post office was built in making the office fit to receive Her Majesty's mails. What remuneration has he got? What remuneration is he going to get for that? How much superannuation is he going to get? My hon. friend told me that he was not entitled to superannuation. No: he kicked him out on the road because he was so unfortunate as to have voted for one of the Liberal candidates at the last election. Is that British fair-play and justice? Just because he would not gratify Mr. Hunt by giving him a vote he was taken by the back of the neck and thrown out, without even a month's notice. The Postmaster General says he was dismissed on the 5th and that his successor was appointed on the morning of the 5th, and the first notice Mr. Green had of his dismissal was the announcement by Mr. Campbell that he was no longer postmaster at Summerside and that Mr. Hunt was to take charge of the office, which Mr. Green had managed for twenty-three years. Would the Postmaster General himself like to be served in that way? I am sure I would not, and I would not like to see him or anybody else handled in that way. Mr. Green had a right to a proper investigation, and the Postmaster General should have ordered a court to be held at Summerside, by the inspector, and witnesses heard, so that Mr. Green might have been given a chance to clear himself, but he did not do that. Mr. Green writes a very doleful letter, which I am sorry to say the Postmaster General did not think it worth while to answer. I know that Mr. Green wrote nothing but what was true and correct, and I am sure he did not insult the Postmaster General, because insult is not in him, and he was only waiting to be asked by the Postmaster General to come to Ottawa and be given a chance in the department to vindicate his character. There is not an honest man in Summerside whom you could call upon to give a certificate of character who would not give one attesting to the integrity and honesty and every other good quality of Mr. Green required in a postmaster. I hope the present incumbent will be able to get such a recommendation. Who recommended Mr. Hunt to be postmaster at Summerside? Did he constitute himself the disposer of all the patronage of the county—he, a defeated candidate—not only the Post Office Department, but of the Public Works and the Marine and Fishery Departments and every other department. Would my hon. friend the Posmaster General stand up here and tell me at whose recommendation he appointed Mr. Hunt? Where is the petition? What names are signed to it? Who wrote to the Postmaster General recommending Mr. Hunt? I would like to know how many names there are on the petition, if there is any. Is Mr. Holman's name on the petition? Is Mr. David Rogers' name on it? I will be told, as I was the other night respecting the dismissal of the two men on the railway, that someone whispered to the late Minister of Railways that the two men had to be dismissed, and he gave instructions to dismiss them. Who is the little bird who whispers in the ear of the Postmaster General, and asked him to perpetrate what I consider an injustice of the worst kind. If Mr. Green be not reinstated in the department he is entitled to consideration. He is now thrown on the world penniless, after having served his country for a quarter of a century. He is a man now about seventy-five or eighty years of age, and I ask how is he going to earn his living? Does the Postmaster General expect that he could take an axe and go to the woods and cut down the forest and plough the land and plant potatoes? When the Postmaster General is twenty-five years in the department he will not be fit to go to the woods and till the land; and I for one, if he serves his country for that length of time, would have no objection to his getting fair remuneration. Let the grand old motto apply to every one alike, and as the Postmaster General would wish to be served himself let him serve others.

Mr. McGREGOR. I would ask the Postmaster General if there is not some way of giving us letter carriers in the town of Windsor, which is a fine growing town, with a population of 11,000? The facilities there for the delivery of the mail are very poor indeed.

Mr. HAGGART. Windsor has hardly a population that would entitle it to letter carriers. There are far larger places that have no letter carriers, and there has not been any application made from Windsor, as far as I am aware. Mr. Green was dismissed from the post office on a complaint made by the Merchants' Bank of Halifax, not only for one irregularity, but for several of the grossest irregularities. The enquiry was made by the inspector, Mr. Brecken, and on his report it was shown that Mr. Green had been guilty of the grossest irregularities, and he was therefore dismissed. As to the statement that Mr. Hunt was an applicant for the office and was in Ottawa at the time and no doubt visited me, I can only say that he never visited me, and that I never knew that he was an

applicant for the office, As to the statement that I did not answer Green's letter, I can state that I took it to the deputy at the time I received it, and asked him to pay particular attention to it and to see that a letter was sent to him.

Mr. McMILLAN. Has the Postmaster General made any change in regard to the mail route, in regard to Bayfield, from Clinton to Seaforth and Priceville?

Mr. HAGGART. I think so. I think it was ordered to be the same as before the last change.

Post Office—Miscellaneous..... $206,000

Mr. HAGGART. There is an item in reference to St. John there, the payment of an officer in the New Brunswick division—a first-class clerk—for whom I am asking $1,400, which is as much as the assistant inspector receives, and I propose to reduce that by $50.

Geological Survey..... $60,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You might explain what you propose to do this year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This year the geological surveyors are mostly in the same districts as they were last year. The director has lately made a visit to the Crow's Nest Pass, in order to examine the petroleum and coal districts there, and, I believe, to-morrow he leaves for the Sudbury district.

Mr. CHARLTON. What report does he make about the petroleum deposits at Crow's Nest?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He makes the most favourable report. He brought some specimens of the petroleum. One was a dark crude oil, and one was a lighter oil, which looked as if it had been distilled.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are these oils obtained by exudation or by digging?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are all on the surface. They seem to come into the lake from the hill side. There have been no borings yet. The director was greatly impressed, not only with the oil indications, but with the deposits of coal, which were most extensive.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it anthracite coal?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; but is very good bituminous coal. Professor Macoun is at Banff; Dr. Bell is in the Algoma and Sudbury region; Professor Laflamme, who, I believe, gives his services gratuitously, is in Quebec; Professor Adams is in the counties of Montcalm and Berthier; Mr. Tyrrell has gone to Lake Winnipeg, where he previously discovered those extensive amber deposits, and also large deposits of phosphates; Professor Bailey is occupied in Yarmouth, Shelburne and Queen's counties, Nova Scotia; Mr. Fletcher is in Hants and Colchester; Dr. Ells is in Terrebonne, Two Mountains and Beauharnois; Mr. McInnes and Mr. Smith are in the Rainy Lake district; Mr. Low is in the counties of Champlain, Portneuf and Montmorency.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is where he was last year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes. Mr. Chalmers is engaged in the counties of Kent, Albert and Westmoreland, N.B., where he was last year. Mr. Ingall is in the Kingston and Pembroke Railway phosphate district, and is engaged in a general investigation in regard to that. He has charge of that portion of the work. Mr. Giroux has gone to the counties of L'Assomption, Joliette, Berthier and Montcalm; Mr. Faribault is engaged in the county of Halifax; Mr. J. McEvoy, who is Dr. Dawson's assistant, is in British Columbia, and is completing a portion of the work which Dr. Dawson had to leave unfinished when he left as commissioner on seal fishing. Mr. Ami is in the Rocky Mountains. That is the whole of the staff.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has any examination been made of the petroleum district in the Athabaska valley?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. McConnell was there last year and the year before. His reports as to the indications are most encouraging, and show the existence of petroleum in a very large district, 200 or 300 miles in extent. He speaks of large deposits of oil-tar sand banks, of from 20 to 200 feet in thickness. We pressed a portion of it into a box this last winter and exposed it to the coldest weather we had, 50 degrees below zero, and it stood perfectly hard and solid. But there has been no boring there yet. Consequently we cannot tell what is the extent of the basin.

Mr. CHARLTON. No doubt there is a very rich petroleum region in that valley. What length of railway would be required to reach it from any present line?

Mr. DEWDNEY. From the present terminus it is estimated that a railway of 80 miles would reach the basin. It is estimated that the oil could be found at from 1,200 to 1,500 feet. By going further they may possibly reach oil at a depth of 600 or 700 feet, but it is utterly impossible to tell much about it without boring.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What are the receipts from the Geological Survey? I suppose they must have disposed of the large stock of reports they had on hand.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The number of reports we have of different years varies a great deal. Of some years we have really none for distribution and in others we have a large number. I have not a memorandum by me showing the receipts for this last year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. A gentleman wrote to me asking me to procure a report for him, and on applying at the department I received the answer that it could be had for a small sum at the book store. I went to the book store and was unable to obtain it. I thought if there was such a large stock on hand, as was represented, that probably it might be distributed to parties who actually wanted it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Do you mean at the different points where they are sold?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I mean here in Ottawa.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It can be obtained of course at the museum here. If application had been sent to me by any member I think I could have procured a copy for him. Where we have a surplus printed on hand there is no difficulty. But the issue of this report is regulated by Order in Council, and the director is bound by that. If the hon. gentleman could tell me any numbers that he wants I can get them.

Mr. CHARLTON. Where is the report printed now?

Mr. DEWDNEY. At the Printing Bureau. This is the first year.

Mr. CHARLTON. Can the Minister give us any detailed information with regard to the discoveries made by the director at Crow's Nest Pass with regard to the thickness of the coal seam?

Mr. DEWDNEY. One seam is 30 feet thick; the coal is exposed at a number of points. The main exposure is on Elk River, on the western slope of the mountains. There is a valley some miles on this side higher up on the mountains, where some coal is exposed, no doubt the same line of coal, showing that the whole of that country is of the same description of coal—some ten miles apart. It has been tested, and Dr. Selwyn himself brought down a very large specimen, which is at the museum. It is bituminous coal of good quality.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About what does it grade?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The assay has not been made since the doctor came back.

Department of Indian Affairs, Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, relief of distress $4,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In what way do you spend this money? Does any portion of of this go into salaries?

Mr. DEWDNEY. $4,200 were voted and $5,701 has been spent, and there was a sum of $1,501 voted in the Supplementary Estimates this year. Relief was furnished to the Lower St. Lawrence Indians to the amount of $1,150; Cacouna, $100; Rimouski, $100; Abenakis and St. Francis, $150, and so it goes on, taking in all the reserves of those Indians who have no money of their own.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe, last year, that the whole grant went to the relief of Indians in the Province of Quebec. I am aware they are more destitute than in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are very few in the Province of Quebec who have money of their own. The provisions are purchased and distributed as they are applied for, and so much is given to each of the agencies for that purpose. It is impossible to call for tenders for these supplies, because, until they are wanted, it is never known what is wanted, or what class of goods are wanted. The supply consists of flour, tea, tobacco, sometimes a little clothing, and a few boots.

For Indian schools in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. $25.032.50

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is distributed principally amongst the school teachers in Ontario and Quebec for those bands who have no money of their own. But many of the Indians are paying for their own teachers. This year there is a decrease in this way of $3,000. We have effected a saving by causing some of the Indians, who are able to do so, to bear the cost of the education of their children.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In most cases these schools appear to be conducted by clerical bodies.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; most of them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that done discretionary fashion, at the pleasure of the department, or are the Indians consulted in any way?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are consulted in accordance with the Indian Act. The majority of a body belonging to a certain denomination have the school of that body.

For payment of annuities under Robinson Treaties $16,806

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How did the department come to pay $18,000 in 1890, when the vote was only $16,800?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The amount paid under the Robinson Treaty varies considerably.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the number of Indians known?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Sometimes they do not come in from their hunting grounds.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the terms of the Robinson Treaty? Does it bind you to pay so much to each Indian?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; $4 a head. They were not paid so much for a long time, but when their lands were sold it was increased to $4.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are there as many as 4,000 Indians in that range?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; the number varies from time to time. In 1889 there were 5,200, owing to natural increase and the stragglers who were out hunting.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is the natural increase considerable?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; the natural increase is fairly large. A good many of the Indians lived in the interior and did not come to the front, but they are coming out by degrees.

Removal of the residue of the Lake of Two Mountains Indians from Oka to Township of Gibson (revote).. $4,865.83

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like that the hon. gentleman would give the House some statement of the position in which these matters respecting the Oka Indians now are. Apparently, the purpose for which the vote was given last year has not been carried out, for I see that almost the whole of this sum is a revote. I should like to know from him how the Indians on the reserve are satisfied with their condition, and also, what is the exact condition of the remnant of the band who remain at Oka and have not yet removed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I fancy the position is similar to what it has been for the last two or three years, and this vote has varied very little ever since I have been here. Last year I stated that negotiations were in progress, and I thought that a considerable number of those who might wish to go to Muskoka would leave. Negotiations were entered into and extended for some little time; but when we thought we had got them in the humour to move something interfered. It takes very little to upset the mind of an Indian, and at any rate our expectations were not realized. I think, with the exception of one or two, none have left to go on the new reserve at Algoma. They ar

exactly in the same position as they were when Chief Angus Cook and his party left. The remainder insisted on stopping, and until they make up their minds that they can better themselves or will accept of the offer which was made by the Government I think they will remain there. The Seminary is, of course, very anxious to get rid of them, but you cannot force them to leave; you cannot take them bodily and transfer them to the reserve, and we do not wish to do it. We wish them to be able to realize that their friends who have gone to Algoma are doing well, as they certainly are doing well, and we are then in hopes they will change their minds and move to the reserve.

Mr. CHARLTON. Why are the Government desirous of having the Indians removed, if they are adverse to doing it themselves?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We think they would be better off and more independent, and they would be relieved of this continual trouble and difficulty that they are in while residing at Oka. The hon. gentleman is familiar, probably more so than I am, with the difficulties——

Mr. CHARLTON. I confess I am not.

Mr. DEWDNEY,—with the difficulties they have had with the Seminary, and which has extended over a period of ten or twelve years. The arrangements which we are completing were first made during the time of the Mackenzie Government, and the offer was made to these men, and some of them took advantage of it and left for the reserve. I am not aware whether any lawsuit took place, but I think there has been a ruling of the courts that the property belongs to the Seminary, although the Indians and their friends contend that such is not the case. I think, in the interest of everybody, it would be very much better that the Indians should remove and go to the new reserve.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will they receive any compensation?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They have been offered to have houses built, and any improvement which they abandoned paid for at so much per acre. I forget what other concessions are given them, but at any rate they would be placed in a very comfortable position on the new reserve. The Ontario Government granted us a township or two for that purpose, and those that have gone there are doing very well.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How many of this tribe are yet to be removed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think there are 100 or 120 remaining.

Indians, Nova Scotia..... $5,520

Mr. FRASER. Some time ago I asked for a return, to which I now wish to call the attention of the Minister, in regard to the method pursued by certain Indian agents in the Province of Nova Scotia. Whether the practice is general or not I know not, but I have heard the statement made that much more money remains in the hands of the agents than ought to remain, and that the Indians, though they are the wards of the Government, do not receive anything like the amount they ought to receive. A glaring case is one which I am going to bring to the notice of the Minister. I find that there were purchases of provisions, clothing, lumber, cattle, &c., for the supply of the Indians of Antigonish and Guysborough, in 1887 and 1888. Among these was one yoke of oxen charged at $73 and one yoke charged at $70. On making enquiry I find that the oxen did not cost that much. I have a certificate signed by Donald Chisholm, who sold the oxen, stating that he had sold a yoke of oxen to the Indian Agent, W. C. Chisholm, for $60, and that he found that the agent had charged the Government $70 and $73. Of course, this is a small sum, and the man who sold the oxen does not know whether his oxen have been charged to the Government at $70 or at $73; but this is a matter which the Government should enquire into. I give the name of the agent, and the name of the man who sold the oxen. I take for granted that this is a general principle acted upon by the agents in dealing with the Indians, though not, of course, with the authority of the Minister. I suppose these men feel that the Indians are never going to enquire or say a word about the matter. I notice that the agent sold one yoke of oxen again for $66. I do not blame him for that, if he could not get any more. There were got also a plough, and ox-cart, harrows and picks. I understand that the plough is lying by the fence side summer and winter, and is never used. I would like to know what system is pursued—whether there is any check upon the agents, or whether the Government simply accept any bill they put in.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am very glad the hon. member has brought the matter to my notice. It is the first intimation he has given me that the price for which the oxen were sold was not the price received, and I fancy there must be some misunderstanding with regard to that.

Mr. FRASER. I can scarcely understand why the yoke sold for $66 did not bring more, because they were sent to Newfoundland, and cattle sent to Newfoundland from Antigonish bring a very good price.

Mr. DEWDNEY. With regard to the purchase, I shall make enquiry. That is a serious accusation, and if it could be proved the agent would not remain in the service an hour. A letter was written by Mr. Chisholm to the department to this effect on 28th October:

"About four months ago Charles Pullet, an Indian of this reserve, who had charge of a pair of oxen given him by the Department of Indian Affairs, wished me to sell them for him and get him a younger and more active pair of cattle. Considering his request a reasonable one, I disposed of the cattle to very good advantage. I then told him to be on the look-out for a younger and more suitable pair. Shortly afterwards he informed me that he did not intend keeping any cattle during the coming winter, and despite all my advice and persuasions to the contrary he remains obstinate in this determination. The proceeds of the cattle, $66, I have placed in the Halifax Banking Company, Antigonish. Now, Sir, I would like to know what I shall do with this money?"

He received a letter from the department to this effect:

"I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th ultimo, reporting that by the request of Charles Pullet, an Indian of your agency, you sold the pair of oxen entrusted to his care by the department, and requesting to be advised as to what you should do with the proceeds of the sale, $66, which you state you deposited with the Halifax Banking Company. In reply I have to inform you that your action in selling the cattle without express permission from the department was most improper and irregular; and you should at once place the amount to the credit of the Receiver General on account

of Indian funds, and forward bank certificates of deposit of draft for the same to the department."

Then, the agent writes:

"I beg leave to acknowledge yours of the 8th instant, No. 30682, and as requested, I enclose a cheque in favour of the Receiver General for amount of $66. I regret very much I acted irregularly in the sale of the oxen. I was urgently requested by the Indian Pullet to sell the cattle and get a younger pair which would suit him better, and I considered that the time I sold them was the most favourable time. No doubt the Indian will require another pair of cattle next spring, but he wants exclusive rights to them, and besides, he is, as well as most of the Indians are, so fickle it is almost impossible to satisfy him."

The pair he sold, I do not know whether it is the pair of oxen for which he paid $73 or $70, but I do not think there is anything wrong in regard to the sale. Probably $66 was all he was able to get. At any rate, the money is deposited with the Receiver General, and he was told that the transaction was irregular. I would ask the hon. gentleman to send me the delaration he has in regard to the matter and I will enquire into it.

Mr. FRASER. I will give a copy; of course I wish to keep the original.

Nova Scotia, Indian Fund..... $5,520

Mr. CAMPBELL. In looking over the Auditor General's Report, I find that in Digby County we have $50 for the agent's salary; relief grants, $100; seed grain, $107; and then for medical attendance, $625; and burial expenses, $27; so that while we are granting to the Indians $107 we are paying the doctors $625.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I noticed that myself when I came to look at the Auditor General's Report some years ago, especially with reference to the Maritime Provinces. But there is very little else done for the Indians in the Maritime Provinces. Instructions are given that no doctor can be paid for his services to an Indian unless he receives an order from the agent. The doctors are paid 50 cents a mile one way for road travel, and actual railway fares, and cost of medicines and extra charges in the case of operations. We are continually receiving, besides these accounts authorized by the agents, other accounts from doctors who have attended the Indians. As soon as an Indian gets ill he will go to the nearest doctor and the doctors cannot send them away, so that there are many accounts which are not paid because they are not certified by the agents. These accounts which we pay every year in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are not excessive, and they are only paid on the certificates of agents who have a knowledge of the circumstances.

Mr. FRASER. While that may be the case in the district to which I refer, the charge for medical attendance last year was more than twice as much as the previous year. Of course, there was a change of doctor.

Mr. WATSON. How many Indians are there under treatment for this amount?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot tell without going through the accounts.

Mr. WATSON. Are the Indians diminishing very rapidly?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I fancy they are.

Mr. WATSON. They must be, if they get so much doctoring.

Mr. DEWDNEY.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It would be better if there was a physician appointed to attend each band. In this district there are no less than six doctors paid for treating the Indians.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Indians there are very scattered.

Mr. BORDEN. Was the attendance in Digby County, N.S., for one year? Here are two accounts from the Doctors Ellison, father and son, amounting to nearly $500, or $1.50 per day for the year. That seems most outrageous, and I speak with some knowledge.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Digby County is the largest reserve we have in Nova Scotia.

Mr. BORDEN. How many Indians are there?

Mr. DEWDNEY. About 200 or 300, and I think they had the epidemic *la grippe* among them.

New Brunswick, salaries—Indians..... $2,005

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe a curious item here under the head of New Brunswick, salaries of agents, $950; constable, $20; medical officer, $320; missionaries, $1,015. I have no objection to good people doing their best for the spiritual welfare of the Indians, but if we are going to undertake to look after their spiritual welfare as well as their bodies, I should like to know some of the details. I am not aware that in any other case we have undertaken to provide missionaries, and it squints towards the establishment of a state church. It seems to me the missionaries are much more needed nearer home.

Mr. DEWDNEY. One year there were special appropriations made to several of the priests who had been giving a great deal of their time for years to Indian work, and that was given to them as a bonus. I have not the names here, unless it has been mixed with Nova Scotia, and in that case the names are the Rev. Mr. Cameron, the Rev. Mr. Richard, the Rev. Mr. Smith and the Rev. Mr. Morrow. They received bonuses varying from $100 to $200 apiece for services of that nature, and they were given once and for all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that should have been made a special vote; the special attention of Parliament should have been called to it, and the reasons should have been stated before you undertook to pay it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think the reasons were stated last year, before the vote was asked for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think so. We can easily see by a reference to the *Hansard*. I have never, to my knowledge, seen such an item before.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I find the details are in the Indian report, page 26, part 2. This appears to have been a regular payment for some years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was not a grant once and for all?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Not in regard to all of them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are these gentlemen? There appear to be eight or nine of them. What denomination do they belong to?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are all clergymen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of what denomination?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are all Roman Catholics, I think. The Indians there are all Roman Catholics.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that this is a new departure that the House is not acquainted with, and this should have been taken as a special vote and discussed. Here you find that, out of a total vote of about $6,000, $1,000 have been appropriated to the payment of salaries of a number of clergymen. That certainly, as far as I know, was not contemplated by the House at any time, and I think the House should have had its attention specially called to it, and ought to have discussed the matter. The hon. gentleman is aware that clergymen in various parts of the Dominion have devoted a great deal of time and attention to the spiritual welfare of the Indians, but it was not contemplated by us to salary all these gentlemen, and if it is to be done in New Brunswick I do not see where you are to stop and draw the line. The amount is not large, and it is most probable that these reverend gentlemen have taken a great deal of care and pains in regard to these Indians, but the question is of considerable importance, and I should like to know how long this has been done and what relation these gentleman bear to the Indians in New Brunswick. Out of this whole item for salaries, as far as I can see, considerably more than half is likely to go for clerical services.

Mr. FLINT. I think it would be an improvement to give this money to the Indians in the shape of physical food for their bodies, and, on behalf of the Indians of Nova Scotia, I must complain that their spiritual welfare is not paid for by this Administration. I think they are as worthy of having their souls looked after as the Indians of New Brunswick. This brings us to the point mentioned by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), as to whether the principle is a sound one, and I think the department should consider it carefully, because the different provinces and the different denominations will be inclined to come to Parliament to ask for assistance for their missionaries of all classes who have been labouring and are labouring among this class of people. I think that, in addition to the amount expended for agents and for food for the Indians, the amount for medical attendance is very large. I have no doubt that the attention of the disbursing officer will be called to that, and that he will see that the medical men are not making too much out of their position in regard to the Indians. If the bulk of the Indians in any district are mainly of one religious persuasion, it might be desirable that the agent should be a clergyman, and that he should look after their spiritual and their temporal welfare at the same time.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In Nova Scotia most of the Indian agents are Roman Catholic priests. They attend to the Indian work as well as to the spiritual wants of the Indians. New Brunswick appears to be divided into only two agencies, and the rest of the work has been come by these reverend fathers who have been receiving salaries for years back.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For how long?

Mr. DEWDNEY. For some years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Although the amount involved is not large, the question is one of importance, and, when this is known and attention is called to it, you will have a number of applications made from various denominations who have been concerning themselves in looking after the Indians, and we require to know what the Government propose to do about it. Here you have seven or eight or nine gentlemen, who, you tell me, have been for years in receipt of a regular salary as missionaries, as the spiritual pastors and masters of these Indians. What are you going to do if the other clergy, scattered over the whole of the North-West apply for similar salaries? It seems to me that it is a precedent which may give considerable trouble.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will look into the matter. It appears to me they must have been doing a good deal of Indian work as well, but this did not strike me before. In Nova Scotia we have a number of recognized agents. In New Brunswick we have only two.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How many Indians are there in New Brunswick?

Mr. DEWDNEY. About two thousand.

Mr. BORDEN. All the agents in Nova Scotia are not clergymen?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Not all of them.

Mr. BORDEN. I want to know to whom the hon. gentleman entrusts the souls of the Indians in my part of the country. Perhaps it is to the Indians' doctors?

Mr. TROW. Has there been an epidemic among the Indians of New Brunswick? I see between the preachers and the doctors they have taken one-half of the whole amount in the province. There must be something radically wrong. I see $1,800 goes to ten doctors.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We are very fortunate that the money goes in that direction; we pay very little for anything else. Hon. gentlemen know that wherever there are Indians there are diseases. They worry the life out of the doctors. They go to the agents and beg for orders to visit the doctors, and they go to the doctors without orders. I have in my department several applications from doctors asking to be paid heavy bills because the Indians came to them to be treated, and they could not send them away.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have had no answer as to the question of policy.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I shall enquire into it and see if any change can be made and to what extent these gentlemen have given their services to purely Indian work outside of religious work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me, as I said before, that if you are going to undertake to pay clergymen as clergymen, the House must be distinctly consulted about it. I do not at all like this mode of smuggling in votes to missionaries, no matter how zealous, and faithful, and useful men they may be. I do not want to have the votes for missionaries smuggled into our estimates, without a distinct understanding of the why and the wherefore, and all about it. If I had noticed before how this money had been used I would certainly have called attention to it, and I call the at-

tention of the House and of the Government to it now, because I know right well that the moment it appears, as it will from to-night's discussion, what has been going on, there will be a very considerable amount of comment and a very considerable number of demands, in all human probability, made upon the Government. The moment you recognize spiritual services in one province and refuse to recognize them in another, you must see that from the explanations given to-night, and from the mode of entry here, the hon. gentleman is preparing, for himself and for us, a pretty difficult question to solve, if this item remains in the Estimates. Now, of this $2,000, what are you going to apply to the payment of clergymen in the present year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The amount would be similar to that of last year, I think, with the exception of one, the Rev. Mr. Bannon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is this $2,000 going to be distributed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will get the details of that to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, I would suggest that the item be allowed to stand.

Mr. DEWDNEY. All right.

New Brunswick—Medical attendance to Indians..... $1,195

Mr. CAMPBELL. Of that amount, $6,518 that has been asked for. I find that $3,712 goes for medicines and salaries to agents, and only $2,806 really goes to the Indians.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We have physicians who receive salaries, three at $100, one at $50, and one at $20 per annum. The balance of the medical attendance is paid for in the same way as in Nova Scotia.

Prince Edward Island Indians—Salaries..$500

Mr. CAMPBELL. How many Indians are there in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Between 200 and 300.

Mr. FLINT. In connection with this item for seed grain, I would like to ask if the Minister has any report as to the progress the Indians are making in adopting civilized habits in the matter of becoming farmers, making suitable houses, &c.?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I fancy in the Maritime Provinces they are not making very much progress. In New Brunswick a majority of the men work a great deal amongst the lumbermen. I fancy the farming is done mostly by the old men and the women.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I see an item of 2 barrels of flour for Indians, at $6.50.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That question came up, and I found the same price in the Auditor General's Report last year. It appeared a large price, but on enquiry it turned out to be the ordinary price of flour in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do you furnish the very best patent flour to the Indians?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know much about our eastern Indians, but our western Indians are very particular. We supply strong bakers' flour.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This flour was about $3 per barrel above the market price.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. McDOUGALL. No; that is very nearly the price at which it was quoted at that time. It was, no doubt, bought in the spring of the year.

Manitoba and North-West Territories, Annuities and commutations.....$130,080

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister explain exactly what is meant by commutations, and on what principle they are made?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Under the Indian Act, if an Indian woman marries a white man she can commute her annuity for 10 years, for which she gets $50 and a certain quantity of clothes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Married in what way?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Legally married. This commutation is only made in the case of Indian women.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see the advisability of offering a premium of $50 to an Indian woman to get married to a white man. I have strong suspicions that such marriages are often made one day and dissolved the next. We who have visited Manitoba know something of the notions that prevail in regard to marriage by Indian women.

Mr. DEWDNEY. When I said white men I include half-breeds; 90 per cent. of those women are married to half-breeds.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About what is the total number of Indians this vote covers?

Mr. DEWDNEY. 23,710 Indians, including 19 chiefs.

Mr. WATSON. Are the Indians increasing or diminishing?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In some parts they are decreasing, in others they are increasing. They are decreasing as a whole.

Mr. WATSON. Independent of those who are being paid under the treaties?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. These 23,000 odd Indians represent 6 or 7 treaties.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, in Manitoba and the North-West. There are a few non-treaty Indians still hunting and making their own living, but they are far north. I heard of a band recently that had gone out very well equipped and outfitted, and they were very independent; they were even better off than our own Indians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the number of Indians a year or two ago?

Mr. DEWDNEY. For the last half-dozen years there has been a continual decrease. Only within the last two years have we been able to know almost every man, woman and child. For several years we were grossly imposed on by the Indians; it was utterly impossible to keep a check on them. I took charge of a band myself four or five years ago, one of the smaller bands, and I tried to check them. After I had paid off the number I felt convinced was the number of the band, 150 of them turned up at Fort Macleod and insisted on being paid. I refused to pay them. Some few were left over unpaid, and I had every man, woman and child brought out in front. Every man was then called upon to pick out his wife and children. Before that, a man simply stated the number of his wife

and children, and he always counted over the fingers of his hand and generally went over them again. When I had the Indians point out their wives and children, I found that the average was four or five. There was the case of a woman who applied twice for payment. After being paid she went away and painted her face yellow instead of red, and put on a different blanket, and sat down to be paid again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I always believed we had been imposed on a good deal. Are 20,000 odd Indians located on different reserves?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, on separate reserves, and we know every man, woman and child among them.

Mr. WATSON. With respect to those who receive payment in scrip in Lake Manitoba district, are they satisfied to be severed from the treaty, or are they anxious to get back?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not had any request from them. We have had a request from others in the Cumberland country, especially, and also from some near Edmonton belonging to the Bobtail band. They really were Indians, although they contended they had white blood in their veins, and inadvertently we gave them scrip. I then issued instructions that none should receive scrip unless he had a certificate from the agent that he was entitled to it. This Bobtail band slipped out, but they begged to come back and they were allowed under special conditions.

Mr. WATSON. It is rather a serious thing that we should pay $160 worth of scrip to these people, and then take them back. I believe, in the first place, they should never have been given scrip, nor left the reserves at all. I may say that a few years ago when the Indians under Mr. Martineau's superintendence took scrip, I called the attention of the then Minister in charge of the department to the fact that I was informed that Mr. Martineau received a consideration for advising the Indians to take scrip, he giving them to understand that within a short time their treaty money would be stopped, and a great number of them took scrip at that time. I made that statement in the House, and stated that I was informed that people interested in speculating in scrip used Mr. Martineau for that purpose. The late Sir John A. Macdonald promised to make enquiries into the matter, and if he did so there must be a report in the department. These Indians are not in a position to support themselves, are not sufficiently well educated in agriculture to make their own living, and it was a great mistake to advise them to take scrip. It would be much cheaper to provide for them on the reserve than to give them scrip and then receive them back again after speculators got the benefit of the scrip.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Indians that were taken back get their rations, but they do not receive any annuities. With regard to the statement made about Mr. Martineau it is the first I have heard of it.

Mr. WATSON. I made the statement in the House.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Our agents were all instructed to be very careful with regard to what certificates they gave. I would like very much to get to the bottom of it, and find if that was the case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I find that it costs about $200 per family. What do you average a family at?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Five. Our vote last year was considerably less than the year before. We have also made a very considerable decrease this year, and I expect to be able to keep the expenditure well within the vote.

Mr. WATSON. Is it not a fact that the percentage of children in the Indian families is decreasing?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They have not been increasing since I have been in the North-West. There have been one or two epidemics which carried off a great number. The Bloods had the grippe amongst them and it carried off a great number. The number of Indians in the Pelly Agency, in 1891, was 651, and there were 30 births and 25 deaths; in Birtle, there were 20 births and 43 deaths; in Moose Mountain, 5 births and 14 deaths. On the Onion River, where there is no doctor, there were 35 births and 18 deaths.

Mr. WATSON. You had better have no doctor at all at that rate.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Amongst the Bloods where there are 2,041 Indians there were 59 births and 180 deaths; Blackfeet, 73 births and 56 deaths; Piegans, 36 births and 30 deaths.

Live stock for Indians..... $6,905

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What plan are you adopting for distributing this live stock?

Mr. DEWDNEY. For the last two or three years we have been starting small herds of cattle at different points in the territories. We do not distribute the cattle amongst the Indians, but they cut the hay and take charge of the cattle and raise them for beef. The cattle are mostly amongst the Crees and we expect that next year one band at Battleford will raise all the beef necessary for their own use.

Mr. WATSON. It appears to me that it is a very good idea, and if the Indians take an interest in it, there is no reason why they should not be self-sustaining in a very short time.

Supplies for destitute Indians..... $230,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this large reduction of $100,000 a mere speculative reduction, or is it based on actual facts?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is based on our experience of last year. The buildings and farms of the Indians are now in a first-rate condition; they are working better, putting in their crops better, and improving just as the white settlers do when their lands are in better cultivation. The Assiniboine and Crooked Lake Reserve used their own flour for six months last year. This year I expect even greater results. Besides allowing them to feed themselves with their own flour, we allow them to sell a certain amount to encourage them, if they take it to the mill themselves, and we allow them to spend their money in the purchase of some useful articles. We keep an account of what goods they purchase with money obtained from the produce of their farms. I have a statement here of the money earned by the Indians. This year the Indians on the Crooked Lake Reserve received $1,279 from the sale of hay, wheat and rye, and those on the Piegan Reserve

earned in money $1,151.41. I have a statement showing that from 1886 to the present year the Indians have increased their earnings of money from $12,000 to $32,000 from their own work, and from the produce they have raised on their farms.

Triennial clothing.....$4,490

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that you have a pretty large increase on last year's vote.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is for treaty clothing. It varies each year. For Treaty No. 3 we require $2,970, and for Treaty No. 6, $1,520.

Mr. WATSON. Where is this clothing procured?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is to provide clothing to 30 chiefs and 139 headmen. The clothing is made at the penitentiary, I believe.

Mr. WATSON. Have you any idea of the cost of the suits, and what it might be furnished for by outside competition? Are tenders asked for?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; the penitentiary supplies it. This is the way we have obtained the clothing for some years. It costs something under $20 a suit.

Mr. WATSON. It must be a pretty good suit for an Indian.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are very good suits. Those for the headmen are made of blue cloth, and those for the chiefs of red cloth. They are made in accordance with the treaty, and the Indians will not accept anything else. This is for the dress suits, which they get every three years.

Day, boarding and industrial schools. $200,000

Mr. FLINT. As this is a rather important item, perhaps the Minister would give us some information as to the number of the schools, the attendance and the work that is being done?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We have in the North-West and Manitoba 88 day schools, 20 boarding and seven industrial schools. The Roman Catholic schools are 19 day, 10 boarding and three industrial schools; the number of pupils on the roll is 923, the average attendance 607, and we pay $55,426.83. The Church of England has 46 day, two boarding and three industrial schools; the number of pupils is 1,414, the average attendance, 681, and the amount we pay $67,832. The Methodist Church has 12 day and one boarding school; the number of pupils is 401; the average attendance, 180, and the amount paid by the Government, $6,010.82. The Presbyterian Church has three day, seven boarding and one industrial; the number of pupils is 275; the average attendance, 180, and the amount paid by the Government, $46,583. There are eight non-denominational day schools, the number of pupils on the roll is 201 and the average attendance 103, and they cost the Government $1,576. Since this return was made up another Methodist industrial school is being built on range 4, Red Deer River, and one in Manitoba.

Mr. WATSON. Where is the industrial school in Manitoba to be located?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We are endeavouring to secure a location near Brandon. There are two locations, one at Carberry and one at Brandon, and the Methodists generally prefer the latter, but it appears we would be unable to get the land there unless at a higher price than we can afford to pay.

Mr. WATSON. I understand there is a very fine location, which could be secured very reasonably, very near Carberry, and I believe there is a half section of land in Southern Manitoba reserved for that purpose. That could be taken in exchange for part of the school section near Carberry. I was under the impression the Methodist Church was favourable to the site near Carberry.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Dr. Sutherland indicated some time ago he was very anxious it should be near Brandon. With regard to the section in Southern Manitoba, I do not know how that compares in value with the section near Carberry. We want, of course, to get acre per acre as nearly as possible.

Mr. WATSON. The objection to Southern Manitoba is that it is too far from the reserve, most of the Indians being north, and Carberry is on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway easily accessible to everybody.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We are paying a very large amount for these industrial schools, nearly $200,000. According to the hon. gentleman's figure the number on the roll is only about 5,000, and of these probably not more than 2,000 or 2,500 attend. It appears that the average charge for the pupils in attendance is $70 to $80 per head, which is a very tall figure indeed to pay for Indian children. I suppose, out of the 23,000 Indians for which the hon. gentleman says we are more or less responsible, there are available for the schools not more than the 5,000 or 6,000, and they are not likely to be all on the rolls of attendance.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is no doubt we are paying a great deal for our schools, but it appears inevitable. The larger the number in attendance, of course the more reasonable will be the figure per head. There were 2,181 children at the schools, including the day pupils.

Mr. WATSON. That charge includes clothing?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. There is quite an amount of clothing supplied by charitable contributions.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If it were not for that we would have to find a great deal more. The denominations send large quantities, and they are sent free from the shipping points to the agencies. There are different schools. There are the large industrial schools on which we pay the whole cost of maintenance. There is one at Fort Qu'Appelle, another at Battleford, another at High River, of which we pay the entire cost. The Battleford is a Protestant school and the Qu'Appelle and High River Roman Catholic. At Qu'Appelle they are all boarders, 178 boys and girls. In 1885 the average was $280 per pupil; this year it is $162. Their ages vary from four to five up to sixteen and seventeen. We have sent out from seventeen to twenty-five boys and girls, and they are doing very well. At the Battleford industrial school, we had 120 last year, and they cost on an average $269 per pupil, but Battleford is a good deal up in the north which makes increased cost of transport and prices. At St. Joseph's, where there are 60 pupils, the average is $209, but that is nearer the railway.

Mr. BAIN. I see the salaries are $5,000 at Battleford. That is pretty high for 120 pupils.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a principal in charge, a head teacher, a matron, a cook, a farm instructor and a trade instructor and two or three other helps about the kitchen. The principal gets $1,200 a year. Battleford school has been established since 1883.

Mr. WATSON. There should be sufficient pupils educated to become teachers.

Mr. DEWDNEY. A great deal of the work done around the schools is done by the girls, They have their regular work cut out every day, for which of course they are not paid.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Can the hon. gentleman give a general idea as to how far the experiment made some years ago has been a success? We have spent an enormous sum in the last ten years trying to educate the Indian and make him self-sustaining, but I have not been able to see, by the late records of the department, that we have had very much success in that direction. We pay nearly as much now to sustain the Indians as we did four years ago. We entered upon an experiment in 1882 to train the Indian and make him self-sustaining. It appears to me that the experiment has not been much of a success. As to this item, I would like to have some general idea as to how far the experiment of educating, christianizing and civilizing the Indians has been a success. I should like to know where the young girls go who come out from the schools? Are situations secured for them? Are they trained sufficiently to teach their own people, either in their own language or in the English language? We ought to have some information as to the practical results of this very large expenditure. I have not been able to judge much in regard to it from the report of the department, and I regret that the information given in that report is so meagre.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon gentleman will recollect that we are not very old in this matter. We only started our industrial schools a few years ago, and a large number of those who went into the industrial schools as children are still there. They are taught housework, needlework, knitting and the sewing machine, as well as other things. The Indian girls at Qu'Appelle, for instance, make all the clothing required for the children. We supply them with the material, and they cut out the boys' pants and coats and make them there.. We have not yet been able to place many outside, but there are a certain number leaving every year and being placed out in service, and they are doing very well. Some of the young boys are also doing very well. I specially recollect one of them now. He is the son of one of the chiefs, and he is at home now taking entire charge of his father's farm. This year he has 50 acres of wheat and a considerable amount of stock. My experience is that we have done fairly well in this regard. I think there is every chance of our industrial schools being a success, and educating properly the young Indian boys and girls. I cannot say so much of the success of our day schools. I have never had much opinion of these day schools, but we have had to establish them on the different reserves because we are bound to do so by treaty. The Indians say they have a sufficient number of children on the reserve to attend a day school, and we have to establish one; but where these children go to school for a few hours and then return to their wigwams or houses, there is not much chance to improve them. I am anxious to curtail the day schools and increase the number of boarding schools. We have different kinds of boarding schools. We have the industrial schools, where the pupils are taught trades. They are taught shoe-making and harness-making and carpentering. They make whiffletrees and yokes and other things of that kind for our institutions, and work on the buildings, and the boys become very handy and progress very well. Then we have boarding schools which are carried on by the different denominations, who take pupils at a fixed rate of $6 per annum, and they find what is necessary for them, such as clothing. But they are not taught any trades there, only reading, writing and so on. In the day schools the pupils are taught their A B C, and only the younger children go there. The sooner we can close the day schools and send the children to the boarding schools, the sooner we will be able to do something with them.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I had more reference to the day schools than to the industrial schools, because the latter have not been established so long. In six years I find that we have expended about $300,000 on the schools. There ought to be some effective results from that large expenditure. I do not find in the report any results commensurate with the expenditure that has been made. While dealing with this subject, I have some observations to make on the general policy of our management of Indian affairs in the North-West Territories. I believe it is an extravagant policy. I believe that far more money is voted by Parliament for the support and training of Indians than we ought to vote for that purpose. I believe that a large amount of that money does not find its proper destination. I believe there is extravagance —I do not go further than that now—and that the Minister would do well to investigate and consider that extravagance. I find that in the Carlton agency there are only 680 Indians, men and women, little and big, old and young, and upon that agency we spent last year $25,211. Of that sum, no less than $4,786 was expenditure in salaries and travelling expenses. Now, it is impossible, or it is improper if it be possible, that any such sum as that could be expended for salaries, &c., of people to look after 680 Indians, Indians and squaws and papooses. I find that, in Crooked Lake Agency, there are 654 Indians in the tribe, but there are only 135 grown up males. Yet last year you expended on that agency $21,160, and you actually extracted from that amount $6,245 for travelling expenses and salaries. I submit that is a matter which requires investigation, more than investigation, it requires the application of the pruning knife so that such extravagant expenditure may be cut down. Is it conceivable that 135 adult male Indians should require such an expenditure for travelling expenses and salaries? How do they spend it? Who gets it? That is not the only one. The same plan runs through almost every agency in the North-West Territories. Take the Edmonton Agency, which expended $33,424 on 129 male adults; and out of that sum $6,574 was for salaries and travelling expenses. Has the Minister had his attention

directed to that? Has he ever examined the Public Accounts with a view of seeing exactly whether that money is properly expended or not? Take the Muscowpetung, near Regina, about 23 miles distant. In that agency there are 122 male adults, and altogether 537 individuals. You spent $24,000 upon that band last year, and out of that you have taken $7,576 for salaries alone. The agency is right in the heart of the territory, near the capital. The item is so charged in the Auditor General's Report in connection with that band. Now, there is a third of the sum appropriated by Parliament for the agency used up in salaries. I say that circumstance requires investigation by the head of the department, and the head of the department is not doing his duty to the Indians or to the tax-payers of this country without making a thorough investigation, and, if the facts that appear in the reports are true, without cutting down this enormous expenditure. I make these observations to draw the Minister's attention to it, in the hope that before next session of Parliament some change will be made in this respect. Now, I think it is an unreasonable expenditure for the services that are performed. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that a good deal more of the money voted by Parliament for the support of the Indians in the North-West never reaches the Indians themselves. In the Auditor General's Report for the last year, at page C—171, I find, under the heading of "supplies and presents, Governor General's visit," a most extraordinary class of items. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that when dignitaries visit the North-West Territories and see fit to make presents to the Indians, that the Indian fund is to be charged with them? Does he mean to tell us that when some of the officials in the North-West Territories see fit, for their own benefit, to get up a jamboree in the agency, that all this is to be charged to the Indian account? I have no objection to the officials in the North-West getting up a fandango to the dignitaries who may visit them, but I object to that money being charged to the Indian fund. Let those who enjoy themselves pay the piper. I find here some extraordinary things—candies, nuts, raisins, fruits, groceries, beer and cigars. How much of that did poor Lo the Indian get? Not very much, I think; yet every farthing of that is charged to the Indian fund. There are some charges elsewhere, under the heading of presents made to the Indians. Well, it is a nice way to make presents to the Indians and charge the Indians with them. I find Old Sun and Crowfoot, and some of these dignitaries in the North-West, get fancy blankets, fancy bridles, fancy shirts and things of that kind, as presents, and they are all charged to the Indian account, all taken out of their own money. I do not think the hon. gentleman would care much about that sort of thing applied to himself, but that is the way they treat poor old Lo.

Mr. BAIN. They make him pay for his coffin.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not object to buying him a coffin; he has trouble enough in this world, I hope he will not have so much in the next. It is wholly inexcusable that such items should be allowed to pass. That is in the Blackfoot Agency. In the Blood Agency you will find the same charges under the same heading. Now, I trust, for the sake of the tax-payers of the country, as well as for the sake of the Indian himself, that these things will not occur any more. They have been occurring from year to year for the last eight or ten years, against my solemn protest, at all events, when I was in Parliament before. Things are better, I must admit, than they were under a former Superintendent General, but there is room for a good deal of improvement still. I intended to draw the Minister's attention to it at some length, knowing that there were reasonable grounds for complaint. I have gone over the Indian reports since I came to Parliament this time, and I venture to think that if the Minister of the Interior will take the trouble of going over the reports upon two or three items for the last eight or ten years, he will be startled. Has the hon. gentleman any suspicion at all of how much the public expend on certain bands of Indians in the North-West Territory for agricultural implements alone? Has he any suspicion how much has been expended for cattle alone? I am quite sure he has not. He has not figured it up for a series of years, because I am sure that if he had done so, he must have been startled at the results. But at this late hour of the night, and at this late hour of the session, I do not feel inclined to discuss the matter at any length. I only wanted to draw the Minister's attention to that aspect of the case. Now, I will just give him one illustration. Under treaties Nos. 1 to 7 from the year 1883 to 1889 inclusive, we expended on implements alone $218,615.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think there is some mistake about that.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If it is a mistake, it is one in your book. I have taken it from the book, and I am not responsible for its accuracy.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Is it not for the whole of Manitoba?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is given in the book as under treaties Nos. 1 to 7. Under treaties Nos. 4, 6 and 7, with a population of 12,000, big and little, young and old, male and female, we spent from 1883 to 1889, $201,000 of agricultural implements. We have spent during six years on agricultural implements, cattle, wages, schools and what are called general expenses, which amount to $967,000, to treaty Indians alone, the enormous sum of $2,060,475. If an opportunity presents itself, which I hope may be the case on a future occasion, I propose in a friendly spirit, and with a view to rectifying the wrongs I believe to exist in the North-West Territories, to draw the Minister's attention especially to a great many more of the extravagant charges that appear to be made against the Indian account in the North-West Territories. It is worthy of the attention of the Committee, and it ought to be worthy of the attention of the Minister.

Surveys..... $5,000

Mr. WATSON. For what purpose is this money to be used?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are sub-divisions to be made on a great many reserves. What we propose to do this year is to sub-divide the reserves in Duck Lake Agency. We also propose to put in iron angle posts at all the reserves. There has been great difficulty with respect to the boundaries, and heavy iron posts 2½ inches square will be let down into the ground some distance, and 6 inches left

above ground. The Indians take a great interest in this proceeding and assist in putting down the posts. The Duckwood Hills Agency will also be sub-divided. A new reserve will be surveyed at a cost of $300.

Mr. WATSON. What is intended to be done with the proceeds of the Paspaschese reserve?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They will be placed to the credit of the Indian fund.

Mr. WATSON. How are the Indians on the reserve being disposed of?

Mr. DEWDNEY. With the exception of half a dozen, they all took scrip. The total number was 30 or 40 families.

Mr. WATSON. You pay an Indian off with scrip out of the general funds of the country, and when you sell the reserve you credit the Indian Department with the proceeds. The proceeds of the sale of the land should not go to the Indian Department.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Those were really half-breeds, and should never have been on the reserve.

Mr. WATSON. It was made exclusively for those particular people.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand it, you first issue the Indian scrip, which is equivalent to the value of their reserve. Then you sell the reserve, and credit the Indian fund with the proceeds of the sale. Thus you are paying the Indians twice.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is the system that has been adopted throughout the country. A portion of those on this reserve are true Indians and did not get scrip. They went to another reserve.

Mr. WATSON. I call the attention of the Minister to the Silver Creek reserve. There are very few Indians remaining there, probably eight families, and thirty square miles of land are reserved in the centre of a very good settlement. There is difficulty in regard to establishing public schools for the benefit of the settlers on account of the Indian reserve lying almost in the centre of the municipality. The people there are very anxious that the Indian reserve should be done away with. I am credibly informed that the Indians remaining there will be well pleased to take a patent for an ordinary homestead of 160 acres, and go out of treaty altogether. They are doing as well as most of the white settlers in that country; they have a large number of horses, cattle, sheep and pigs, and quite a large amount of grain. If the Indians took homesteads and broke up the reserve it would be an advantage to themselves and a great convenience to the settlers, because their stock is running at large, and it is very inconvenient for school purposes to have that reserve there. It comes within a short distance of the village of Binscarth.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We are very careful in interfering with Indian reserves when first established. There are very few Indians now left at Silver Creek, and our surveyor has got instructions to go there this year and cut off half of that reserve at Silver Creek, and add on a small piece again to the other reserve. Then we shall be able to open half of that reserve. That is the present intention, so that I think we will be able to meet the hon. gentleman half way immediately, and at a later date, perhaps, be able to take it all over.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman might ask his agent to enquire from the Tanners if they would not be satisfied to take 160 acres of homestead.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Nelson, the surveyor, is a first-class Indian man, and I have carried on many negotiations of that character through him. I will give him instructions with regard to that before he goes.

Supplies for farmers.....$14,925

Mr. WATSON. What is this for?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is for the different supplies required. I may say, to show the progress that has been made, that in 1885 we had 159 white men as farm instructors, and now we have only 58. We have been able to substitute a large number of Indians for white employés, who received high wages. The agencies are made smaller, and the agent himself gives a great deal of attention to the farming business.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). How is it there is no depreciable reduction in the expense? If you dispense with the services of these employés there ought be a corresponding reduction in the expenses. The general expenses for the Indians is reduced during the last two years, but in these particular items I do not see any reduction. Can the hon. gentleman tell me how it is that on the Muscowpetung reserve, where there are only a small number of Indians, $7,000 were required for salaries?

Mr. DEWDNEY. These salaries included school teachers, farm instructors, labourers, agents, doctors, &c.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The expenses of the doctor is under a separate item, and this seems altogether out of proportion. You have spent only $24,000 on this band, and out of that you deduct $7,576 for salaries, which is about one-third of the whole sum voted by Parliament for these. I want to get some explanation of that. It looks to me to be out of all reason. There are only, according to the report, 573 Indians, of whom only 122 are men. This band must be pretty well civilized and christianized.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They must be almost self-sustaining. They have found their own flour five months of this year.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then, why do you require $7,500 for salaries?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are 577 Indians, of whom about 150 are men. There are three bands—the Muscowpetung's, Piapot's, and another band.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this band is nearly self-sustaining?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; it is one of the first we expect to be self-sustaining.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The report shows that the band has been making great progress in the last two years, and yet I find a large expenditure for supplies and maintenance.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman will find a great decrease up to the 30th of June last.

Sioux Indians..... $5,669

Mr. WATSON. Why this increase?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a grant of $1,300 to Portage la Prairie school, which is charged to the Sioux for the first time this year.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 1st September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SEAT FOR QUEBEC WEST.

Mr. GIROUARD presented report of Sub-Committee of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which was referred the matters contained in the Order of Reference from the House of the 19th August, with instructions to search for precedents, and to report the result of their deliberations, as follows :—

That the election of the Hon. Thomas McGreevy was lawfully contested on the 15th day of April last past, and that the said contestation was pending at the time that he tendered his resignation to Mr. Speaker.

That under the circumstances, your Sub-Committee recommends that the said resignation be not acted upon by Mr. Speaker, and that his Warrant for the issue of a new Writ be recalled.

Your Sub-Committee is also of the opinion that, under the present state of the law, the Speaker, when not aware of the contestation of the election of a member, may properly act upon the resignation of such member, and issue his Warrant accordingly; and, should clause 7 of Chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes be continued, they beg to recommend that this want in the Statute be remedied by providing that, in the future, the prothonotary or clerk of the court where an election petition is fyled and pending, shall forthwith notify the Speaker of such election petition.

Your Sub-Committee finally, without expressing any opinion thereon, recommends the advisability of the House considering whether the said clause 7 of Chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, should not be repealed.

ANDRÉ SENÉCAL.

Order for André Senécal, the witness named in the report of the Public Accounts Committee submitted to the House on Thursday, 27th August, to attend at the Bar of the House at three o'clock in the afternoon, read.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is André Senécal in attendance?

The DEPUTY SERJEANT-AT-ARMS. Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to report that the witness Senécal left Ottawa on or about the 24th ultimo, and, although I have made careful enquiry, I have been unable to ascertain his present whereabouts. In consequence of his absence, the Order for him to attend at the Bar of the House this afternoon, was left with a member of his family at his Ottawa residence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, when was the service made at the residence of Mr. Senécal?

Mr. DEWDNEY.

Mr. SPEAKER. When was the service made?

The DEPUTY SERJEANT-AT-ARMS. On Friday last, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LISTER moved :

That André Senécal not having attended this day at the Bar of this House, pursuant to the Order of this House of the 22nd August last, he be taken into custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms attending this House, and that Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant accordingly.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH SHORE RAILWAY BONDS.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (7th August) providing for the cancellation and discharge of certain mortgage bonds of the North Shore Railway Company held by the Government.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The resolutions themselves state in very considerable detail the case which is presented to the House on behalf of their passage, and, therefore, it will not be necessary that I should trouble the House with a long explanation. In 1884, the policy of Parliament with regard to the North Shore Railway was embodied in a statute. That policy was to provide for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the harbour of Quebec; and inasmuch as the Provincial Government of Quebec had incurred large expenditures in completing the railway along the north shore to connect Quebec with Montreal, the aid that was given in 1884 to provide for a complete extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway facilities to the harbour of Quebec, necessarily included the absorption of the North Shore Railway and the relief of the Provincial Government in regard to the expenditure which the province had incurred in that undertaking. The form which that relief took, not only in the statute of 1884 which gave the aid, but in the agreements which were subsequently made, has given rise to the occurrences which seemed to the Government to make these resolutions necessary. The statute of 1884 contained an appropriation not exceeding $6,000 a mile, to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to extend their line from St. Martin's Junction to the harbour of Quebec, in such manner as might be approved by the Governor in Council, not to exceed $960,000. At that time the North Shore Railway, although it had been built by the Province of Quebec, was in the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and a reasonable time was allowed to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to acquire it from the Grand Trunk Railway Company; and failing the acquisition by the Canadian Pacific Company of the North Shore road within that time, the Canadian Pacific Company were allowed to extend their own line to the City of Quebec, and to make this subsidy available. The interval of the time was given in order to avoid duplication of the lines, and to make the one which had already been built at the expense of the province available, as I have said, for forming the connection with the City of Quebec. In the course of the negotiations which ensued it was found impracticable for the two companies to come to an

agreement between themselves, and the Government interfered in the negotiations, with the result that Parliament was asked in 1885 to vote an additional sum of $340,000, which, added to the $960,000 appropriated in the previous year, and $200,000 voted to acquire the Jacques Cartier branch, made a total of $1,500,000 available for the purposes of that policy. The Government then proceeded to acquire the rights of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the North Shore Railway. They purchased the rights for $530,000, and then there remained the $970,000 which was appropriated by the Government to the purchase of the North Shore Railway Company's bonds which were secured by a second mortgage on that line of railway. The outstanding bonds amounted to $1,108,626; so that the Government itself became the owner of the North Shore Railway, subject only to the first mortgage, which was in favour of the Provincial Government, to the extent of $3,500,000. That mortgage was, as I have said, a first lien upon the road, and was connected likewise with the lien of the unpaid vendor, as we style it in English law, or *privilège de bailleur de fonds* according to the law of the Province of Quebec. The road was then transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company upon certain conditions which are to be found in the agreement which was made between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the year 1885. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company having, in pursuance of the policy adopted by the Government and Parliament, become the owners of the road subject to the two mortgages, were, of course, subject to the second mortgage to secure the bonds to the extent of $1,108,626; and it was deemed by the Government in 1885 the best policy, instead of paying the company the $970,000 which remained in their hands, and instead of extinguishing the mortgage, to spend the $970,000 in purchasing these outstanding bonds which were secured by the second mortgage on the road. The Government then, in 1885, entered into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, by which it was stipulated that this sum of money at the disposal of the Government, in accordance with the two statutes of 1884 and 1885, should be invested in the purchase of these bonds, and it was stipulated that this purchase should be made on a condition which I shall now read to the House:

"That in the event of the net receipts of the operation of the said railway, after paying the operation expenses thereof, proving insufficient to meet the interest on the first mortgage bonds of the said North Shore Railway Company, including those held by the Government of Quebec as collateral security for the balance of the price of the said railway, the Government will apply the interest on the said sum of $970,000 at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum in whole or in part, as may be required, towards the payment of the deficiency. But if or when after payment of all such deficiencies, the net receipts of the said railway, as aforesaid, shall be sufficient to pay the interest on the said bonds, the said company shall cease to have any further claim or demand upon the Government in respect of the said sum of money; provided, as regards operating expenses, the cost of no new works or renewals of a more expensive character than existing works were when new, shall be accounted as forming part of such operating expenses, unless the previous consent of the Minister of Railways and Canals has been obtained to their construction."

Going back now for a moment to the point of my remarks, when I stated that a sum of $970,000 remained available for the policy which Parliament adopted in 1885, and referring to my observation that it was considered best to apply that to the purchase of the outstanding bonds secured as a second lien upon the road, I would observe that instead of putting upon the face of the agreement the fact that the $970,000 was to be so expended, it was made to appear as one of the stipulations of the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—and that may have been because it was in advance of what was afterwards done—that that sum of money should be held available for the purpose of carrying out this policy, and that the Government would appropriate the interest of that sum towards making good any deficiency in the earnings of the road towards the payment of the sum secured by the first mortgage. But, as a matter of fact, the way in which that $970,000 was applied was in the purchase of the North Shore bonds, which amounted to $1,108,626. The Government then stood practically in this position, as the result of this agreement: that the sum which had been voted by Parliament was applied to the acquisition of this road; but instead of giving the subsidy out and out to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Government continued to hold a lien upon the road for the subsidy which had been voted by Parliament. It has been contended from time to time, not only by those connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but more strongly by those who are interested in the welfare of the City of Quebec, as affected by this policy, that the Government hardly carried out to the full the intent and meaning of the statutes of 1884 and 1885, that the meaning of these statutes was that the aid should be given out and out, and not that the Government should hold any lien for it after it had thus been voted by Parliament. But the effect of the agreement was that the Government did hold a lien upon the road, subject only to the one condition, namely, that the earning powers of the road should be equal to the payment of our interest, and that otherwise we had no claim for the interest on our security. As a matter of fact, it resulted, as I suppose it was anticipated at that time it would, that the earnings of the road have not been sufficient to allow the Government any interest upon the money so invested; and from that time to this, that $970,000, although forming a lien upon the railway, has been an unproductive investment, as indeed it was expected by Parliament when it was first voted. The accounts of the railway company have been kept with regard to the earnings of the North Shore Railway and its ability to pay the interest on the security, and these accounts show that the net receipts of the company have never been sufficient to entitle us to claim any interest upon our investment. It has been pressed upon the Government from time to time, that the disadvantage of a policy of this kind, giving a lien upon the railway instead of paying the money as an out and out grant, has been that the company has been hampered in the operation of its enterprise, and that the Province of Quebec had not derived the advantage which Parliament intended it should have when it made the appropriation, especially in view of the latter clause of the agreement which I have read and which states that:

"Provided, as regards the operating expenses, the cost of no new works or renewals of a more expensive character than existing works were when new, shall be accounted as forming part of such operating expenses, unless the

previous consent of the Minister of Railways and Canals has been obtained to their construction."

Application has been occasionally made to the Minister of Railways, according as structures went into decay, for permission to renew them by more permanent structures, and that permission has been granted in every respect, except that the right has not been conceded to charge as working expenses a sum any greater than was necessary to provide works similar to those which required to be replaced. We have declined to allow the company to charge as against working expenses the additional cost of iron over wood, and we have done that simply because we felt that until we asked Parliament to recast the terms of this agreement, we were not entitled to waive the provisions of any security we had taken in favour of the Crown, notwithstanding the fact that the security itself contained in that agreement was an unproductive one. The negotiations have resulted in the policy these resolutions now embody, and by which it is proposed that, in consideration of large expenditures in the way of improvements on the line of railway and improvements at the terminal port at Quebec, the security so taken by the Government shall be relinquished. The terms and conditions upon which it is proposed to relinquish the security are expressed in the resolutions. They include the provision that the company binds itself to complete and provide, with all due diligence, the following works and improvements:

"Rolling stock, including sleeping cars, day coaches, baggage, mail and express cars, locomotives and freight cars, of a standard equal to that used on other portions of the company's railway system, involving an outlay of about $350,000.

"Improvements over the whole line between St. Martin's Junction and the City of Quebec, of such a character as to bring that section up to the highest standard of the other Canadian Pacific sections, including additional accommodation for passengers at nearly every station, and increased space for the handling of freight, the lengthening of platforms and sidings, the furnishing of new sidings for the development of stone, lumber and other traffic, the substitution of iron for wooden bridges on the line of the North Shore Railway, and the construction of the following specific works, that is to say:—

"(1.) In the City of Quebec:
(a) One grain elevator.
(b) One flour shed.
(c) Such local improvements and facilities as are necessary for the handling of the traffic of that city.

"(2.) In Three Rivers:
(a) One grain elevator.
(b) Improvements over the loop line.
(c) Improvements on the Piles Branch.

"The said improvements over the whole line involving an outlay of about $300,000 in addition to the said outlay on rolling stock.

"The whole to be completed to the satisfaction of the Minister of Railways."

And we recommend, in view of that undertaking being given on the part of the company, that the bonds which we hold to the amount I have stated, namely, $1,108,626 of nominal value, but in which we have invested $970,000 of subsidies voted in 1884 and 1885, shall be relinquished and cancelled by the Government. We are led to believe that this will, as provided by the terms of this agreement, lead to the complete and efficient equipment of the line of railway, both as regards permanent way and rolling stock, and likewise as regards terminal facilities which will be provided at Quebec and some other points along the line for the accommodation of business. As to the question whether it is contemplated that the bonds shall be cancelled on this agreement being entered into, it is so contemplated. The reason for that is obvious. The expenditure which is to be made by the terms of this agreement involves nearly $700,000. It is only reasonable to give the company the means of raising the moneys necessary for that purpose on the road itself if they should desire to do so. It would be hardly reasonable, with these bonds outstanding, to expect the company, charged as it is with very onerous undertakings, to raise a sum equivalent to about three-quarters of a million of dollars, to be expended in the improvement of this road, unless it has the means of pledging the road as security for that advance. The documents on the subject which contain the history which I have thus briefly referred to are, I think, all to be found in the Sessional Papers of 1885, volume 12. The agreements which were made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and with the Quebec Government, all appear there. It may be possible that some other documents may be desired by the Committee, and if so, I shall be glad to lay them on the Table before the resolutions reach a further stage.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not apprehend that upon the principle involved in these resolutions any objection whatever can be taken. This is only carrying out a policy which was inaugurated in 1884 and 1885, and which, in my opinion, should have been carried out long ago. As has been stated by the Minister of Justice, that policy was to continue the Canadian Pacific Railway line to the harbour of Quebec, so as to make the harbour of Quebec the summer terminus of the railway. This was the language made use of by Sir Charles Tupper when he introduced the resolution in 1884, and made it apparent that the object for which Parliament was asked to vote the money to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway line to Quebec so as to make Quebec the summer terminus. His words were:

"To make the harbour of Quebec that which it is believed, in the interest of the whole of this country, it is desirable it should be made, namely, the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

And towards that object the sum was voted "to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway from its terminus at St. Martin's Junction near Montreal to the harbour of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $6,000 per mile, nor exceeding $960,000 in the whole." In the following year, 1885, that sum was increased to $1,500,000. At that time it was contemplated by the authorities of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company whether they should acquire the existing line which at that time belonged to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which had been built by the Province of Quebec, and had been sold by the Quebec Government to the North Shore Railway Company, and by the North Shore Railway Company to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or whether they should build another line to Quebec. They already owned the line from Ottawa to St. Martin's Junction, and the question was whether they should acquire the line from St. Martin's Junction to Quebec or should build a line of their own. Provision was made in the statute for either of these alternatives, that the company should have the power either to purchase the existing line from the Grand Trunk Railway, or to build another line. Suppose that, instead of purchasing the existing line, they had built another and an

independent line from St. Martin's Junction to the harbour of Quebec. Then the whole of that subsidy of $6,000 a mile or $960,000 in the whole, would have been expended from the Dominion Treasury towards the construction of that railway. It was thus contemplated that the whole of that money should be expended towards the realization of that object, whether it was attained by the purchase of the existing line or by the building of another line, but, whether it was done one way or the other, the intention of Parliament was quite obvious that in either case the Dominion treasury was to contribute $960,000 towards that object, and more than that, because the amount was increased in the following session to $1,500,000. But the two companies came to an agreement whereby the Canadian Pacific Railway Company became the owners of the North Shore line from St. Martin's Junction to the harbour of Quebec. How was this done? It was done first by paying the Grand Trunk Railway Company a little more than half a million dollars, if I correctly understand the Minister of Justice, and then purchasing bonds to the amount of about $1,000,000. I have always held that that purchase of bonds was not carrying out the letter or the spirit of the statute. It was not expending money, because the money has not been expended, but it was simply taking $1,000,000 in round numbers from the treasury and putting back $1,000,000 in bonds. That was not carrying out the letter or spirit of the statute, because that was not the object for which it was adopted, so the policy which was followed in 1886 of purchasing these bonds and keeping them hanging over the road was not in any way carrying out the law, and the present resolution is simply giving effect to the vote of Parliament in 1884 and 1885. It seems to me that this transaction is so clear, that it is so evident that this is the object of the law which was put on the Statute-book in 1884 and 1885, that there cannot be any question about it. You will see in the Public Accounts as one of the assets of Canada, the bonds of the North Shore Railway line. That was not what was contemplated, and when Parliament voted that money, it was voted for the benefit of the line which was to make Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was to be made as effectively in every manner as if an independent line had been built, and the harbour of Quebec would not have been in as favourable a position as it would have been if an independent line had been built, because an independent line would have been unblemished, whereas the Canadian Pacific Railway Company received this line blemished by these bonds of about $1,000,000. Now, it is proposed to relieve the Canadian Pacific Railway of the $1,000,000, and to that extent to carry out the statute which was passed in 1884 and 1885. So far, I am totally in accord with the spirit of the resolution. As to the details of the manner in which this is to be done, I will not at present refer to the explanations which have been given by the Minister of Justice, but, as the resolutions come up, we will refer to them.

On resolution 1,

Mr. AMYOT. I am glad the Government have at last decided to redeem some of their promises, and to give effect to the statutes passed in 1884-85. But I want to draw their attention to the exact situation in which the harbour of Quebec will stand after this legislation has been passed, and to certain other of their promises which have not yet been fulfilled. You remember that during the last election we were not only promised the settlement of what was called the million dollar debentures, but we were also promised a bridge, and that promise, which seems to have been effectual in securing a small majority for one of their supporters, does not yet seem to have received the consideration of the Government. I am glad, at all events, at seeing this first instalment of justice. The result of this legislation will be that the Canadian Pacific Railway will bring a considerable quantity of their grain to our harbour as soon as they are free from the obligations imposed upon them. If I am correctly informed, the Pacific Railway, at the present time, carry to the harbour of Montreal, daily, over 300 cars loaded with grain and other produce, to be shipped on ocean steamers. They have accommodation in the City of Montreal to receive and unload only about 150 cars daily, so that the company themselves are now embarrassed by the present state of things. Therefore, as soon as they can take their cars to the City of Quebec without increasing their obligations towards the Government, their commerce will impose upon them the necessity of sending some of their cars, at least, to the City of Quebec, and that city may have reason to expect that ocean steamers will have to be loaded in its port. But, Mr. Chairman, there will still be a great obstacle to the prosperity of the City of Quebec, and to the general prosperity of the Dominion, and I beg to draw the special attention of the Minister of Justice to that point. There exists at Quebec a society called the Ship Labourers Society. I am not opposed to these organizations of labour, but that one in particular has proved most detrimental to commerce in general. Its members have imposed exorbitant charges upon ships, exacting fees altogether out of proportion to the resources and the profits of navigation. In 1887, seeing that our commerce was diminishing at the port of Quebec, I proposed certain legislation to prevent the ship labourers from having a monopoly in loading and unloading ships. I proposed to prevent them from driving away those who did not belong to their organization, and from excluding them from the work of loading and unloading ships. On that occasion our request was refused by the Government, but the Government, impelled by public opinion, proposed a law which was nothing else than a sham. I said then to the Government, before this honourable House, that it was strange that whenever the City of Quebec was concerned, everything seemed to turn against it. At that time I did not know the exact cause of the Government's indifference, I could not see why the Government refused legislation which was asked for by our shipping interests, by our commercial interests, by our own Board of Trade; I could not see why the wishes of the city and of the district at large were ignored by the Government. The Government substituted to my proposed Bill, another very mild Bill, and in Committee of the Whole they amended and changed their Bill so as to make it more ineffectual still. Finally, when the Bill was passed, it amounted to nothing. The words

which might have helped us in the first proposed Bill, were taken away by the Government. That first clause read:

"Every person who, by violence, threats or any other means whatsoever, hinders or attempts to hinder any person engaged in loading or unloading any ship."

The words "any other means" were struck out in Committee at the request of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). My Bill was framed in such a way that if it had passed any man could have been employed, at any wages he chose to accept, in loading and unloading vessels. The Bill of the Government left the monopoly in the hands of the ship labourers, and since then the members of that society, with the help of the Government, have been laughing at the city, laughing at our commercial and shipping interests, and going on with their tyrannical by-laws and exactions, ruining themselves and ruining our harbour. Hon. gentlemen can easily judge of the evil effects produced upon the commerce of Quebec by the legislation of this Government, and by the refusal of the Government to accept my Bill, against which they could not find any reason, when every influence seemed to tend to the passage of their Bill. In the Montreal *Gazette* of 30th June, 1891, a Conservative paper, I read the following:—

"The ship labourers are showing bad faith in their present attitude towards the merchants. When it was proposed during the last session of the Legislature, to abolish their society, the presidents of all the sections agreed that all their rules should be annulled, and that no rule should be enforced before it received the sanction of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Instead of standing by this agreement the men are acting in a more arbitrary and tyrannical manner this season than ever before. The old rules are being enforced as rigorously as ever, and some new ones have been adopted, while there has not even been a pretence of submitting them to the Government for approval.

"For instance, this year St. Jean Baptiste day was added to the feasts of obligation on which the men are strictly forbidden to work, and although an application was made in writing for leave to work on the steamship *Valetta*, which had already lost a day by arriving a few minutes too late to get into the basin, and on the steamship *Enchantress*, which was being unloaded for examination, the society refused to grant the permission asked for. This is the first time that work was ever stopped on St. Jean Baptiste day. Again, application was made to the society to allow the deals from the steamship *Enchantress*, to be unloaded by steam, but this also was refused, and the deals had to be taken out by hand and one at a time. It is said that the application, which was couched in respectful terms, was thrown into the waste paper basket with the remark that the ship was loaded in Montreal and would not have had any work done here if she could have helped it. It is somewhat significant that there is a decrease of seventy in the arrivals of sailing vessels from sea at this port for this season. This can only be partly due to the depressed state of the timber trade."

This is for the present year. We see, moreover, in a telegraphic communication sent to the *Mail*, of 24th July, the following statement:—

"The trans-Atlantic arrivals to date are 129 sailing vessels and 138 steamships. This, as compared with the same time last year, shows a falling off of 94 sailing vessels and 79,000 tons, and 31 steamships and 34,077 tons. This showing is bad enough, but the indications are that it will be worse before the season is over. To the large number of people who gain their livelihood from the shipping business the outlook is bad, a regular poor-house one in fact."

In the report of the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec I find the following most significant facts:—The value of the exports in 1889 was $7,276,805; in 1890 it was only $6,187,585, or a difference of $1,089,220. If we take the value of the imports, we find that in 1889 it was $3,593,193, as compared with $3,210,928 in 1891, or a decline for the latter year of $1,383,065. If we take the number of ships and the tonnage, we find the following: In 1889 the number of vessels was 387, in 1890 it was only 385. The tonnage in 1889 was 433,894 tons, against 419,690 tons in 1890. If we compare last year with 1885 there is a difference of 134 vessels. In 1885, 519 vessels left our port, while only 385 left in 1890. The tonnage also shows a striking difference. In 1885 the tonnage of vessels outward was 557,395 tons, while in 1890 it was only 419,690, or a difference of 137,705 tons. A similar difference exists in regard to vessels entered inwards. In 1889 there were 509 vessels, and only 480 in 1890. The tonnage in 1889 was 630,332, as against 589,204 in 1891, a difference of 46,281 tons. If we take the difference between these two periods in regard to vessels entered outwards, we find also an immense difference. I need not go into all these details, which are given in the official report of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners. These facts illustrate that our port is deserted by shipping, and the primary cause assigned is not the industry of Montreal, not the digging out of the St. Lawrence, which may be very proper even to Toronto, if possible. We do not object to that; but in Quebec there is a society, ill-advised, which works against the interests of the city, and we complain that the Government, also ill-advised, act against the interest of Quebec, or at all events refuse to comply with our wishes. I say that plainly, I affirm it, and I will prove it. It is one of these instances where private documents go very far to illustrate what is going on behind the Throne. I am sorry I have to lay before Parliament a private document; but the principle has been laid down by one of the Ministers in this House that where a telegram or letter is marked private or confidential or is in cypher, it means publish it at once, even if you incorrectly publish it. But this letter I will publish in full, I will not take the opportunity now or at any other time to cast any blame, based on this document, against any of the members of the Executive; but I communicate to them the document, so that they will understand in whose hands they have been and how they have been treated. The letter is of 11th June. By its terms the Committee will see that it was written in 1887, the year I presented the Bill referred to. It says:

"My Dear,—"

The first name is there in the original, but in the photograph it has been taken away. I am ready, however, to communicate the original to the Government.—

"You will see by the parliamentary proceedings that Amyot has introduced a Bill for the punishment of labourers or ship labourers who interfere with outsiders who do not belong to the society and load ships against the rules of their society. You may tell Dinan privately that the Bill will not be allowed to pass and the Government will state to Amyot and the House that the Local Government have sufficient power to deal with them. So his Bill will fall through. I write this so as they may keep quiet and not say anything about it. Tell the president to say nothing about it.

"Yours,
"THOMAS."

This shows at least, Mr. Chairman, why my Bill was not accepted; this shows what was the power behind the Throne which induced the Government to maintain firm, solid and powerful, that organization which was the ruin of themselves and of the City of Quebec, and an injury to the whole

Dominion. The Government was in the hands of a man in whom they had confidence and who dictated to them the law as far as the City of Quebec was concerned. The same thing occurred when the question——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection at all to the hon. gentleman reading private letters as much as he likes, but he seems to have mistaken the Bill before the House. This is not the Ship Labourers Bill, and I shall not have any opportunity of answering on that subject, because I will be out of order in so doing. Under these circumstances, I will have to ask you, Mr. Chairman, to keep the hon. gentleman in order.

Mr. AMYOT. I think I am establishing that the resolution we have before us is intended for the good of Quebec, and I am trying to show that it is incomplete. I am trying to show that it is the duty of the Government to come seriously to the rescue of Quebec.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the Chairman can see that, I cannot.

Mr. AMYOT. We will be glad to hear the hon. Minister of Justice, whom we always hear with the greatest pleasure, not only during this debate, but at any time he will be pleased to honour the House with his address upon that or any other topic. I do not tell him anything which is very new, I suppose. He must be aware that when the Short Line was contemplated to Sherbrooke, the member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) was most ardent with the Ministers to induce them not to mind Quebec but to build that road. He must be aware that if we have no bridge—and this will be established by another private letter when one of the members of this House will be here who is not here at present—it is due to the member for Quebec West. When the question of the bridge came up the hon. member for Quebec West in that case said: "Never mind when the Order in Council will have to be passed, I will have my word to say." Now, what do we find in the enquete printed and distributed about the Baie des Chaleurs Railway.

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. AMYOT:

"MY DEAR ROBERT,—Pope sent for me to ask what answer he would give——"

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would ask the hon. gentleman to confine his remarks as much as possible to the resolution which is before the House. I, myself, was struck with the idea that he was going too far, but I thought he was coming back to the question, but instead of that he is going further away from it.

Mr. AMYOT. I will do my best to speak within the scope of the resolution before the House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The only connection I see with the hon. gentleman is, that Quebec wanted to have a deep water terminus and my hon. friend is in deep water.

Mr. AMYOT. At all events I have no connection with the member in question, whether he be in deep water, or in boiling water, I do not know. I have no connection with him and do not intend to. Mr. Chairman, when you interrupted me——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; chair.

Mr. AMYOT—I was trying to establish that if my Bill, presented in the interest of Quebec, was refused, it was due to bad advice.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman is again speaking about his Bill, whereas the House is considering a resolution in reference to the North Shore and Canadian Pacific Railways, which has nothing to do with the question which he is discussing.

Mr. AMYOT. I want to prove that this Bill is incomplete, and I think I will prove it. I say it is the duty of the Government to complete the measure by bringing in a Bill which will bring the Ship Labourers' Society within the limits of a proper law which would protect us. I am glad that the Government has brought forward this resolution to-day; but they will remember that from the year 1885 up to the present time they have kept the City of Quebec suffering, and that even to-day they only give partial justice to that city. But I will go a step further than that. It is true that the Government gives back to the Canadian Pacific Railway the sum of $1,000,000 odd, but that was not the agreement in 1884 when we consented to grant $30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The formal understanding then was, and I have referred to it frequently before in this House, that the Province of Quebec, not the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, would receive $12,000 a mile from Ottawa to Quebec. That was the understanding, but the Government do not carry it out now. You give to the Canadian Pacific Railway $960,000 which in 1884 you promised to the Province of Quebec. It is true, and I admit it, that you satisfy your obligations under the statute of 1885, but you have left the City of Quebec suffering from 1885 to 1891. You cannot deny that you do not comply with your obligation undertaken in 1884 to grant to the Government of the Province of Quebec $12,000 per mile from Ottawa to Quebec. It is the people of the Province of Quebec, and not the Canadian Pacific Railway, who have built the railway from Quebec to Ottawa. You have admitted the principle that the province should be recouped for the expense which it incurred in the construction of that road, and according to the promise you made you are bound to give to the Province of Quebec, the $12,000 promised. If the Government fulfilled one part of their obligation, the essential one for the province is not fulfilled and we will insist until it is fulfilled. The Government has admitted the principle of building the bridge at Quebec, and the declaration has been frequently made in this House that a bridge should be built. I have here a declaration made by the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald in the month of April, 1884, and I will translate it as follows, from the French version:—

"The Government recognizes the existing importance of connecting the Intercolonial Railway with the Canadian Pacific Railway by an iron bridge at the City of Quebec, and believes that it should be built in the near future. But so long as the Canadian Pacific Railway shall not have reached Quebec, and a good plan is not submitted to the Government, the Government cannot answer specifically to the question as to when it will be built."

At the last election the Government thought proper to send down their official representative to the City of Quebec, and they took care to select a man in

whom we might place implicit confidence, whose word carried weight, from his past services of many years to the country, and from the high position he occupies in the world as the representative of the Government near the Throne of our beloved Queen. They selected him, and he stated in the name of the Government that the bridge would be built at once. They then sent Mr. Schreiber, their celebrated chief engineer, and he was there with his instruments examining, taking levels, sounding the river, ascertaining the distances, and so on: so that the bridge was a decided fact apart from the assurance contained in the telegram of Sir John Macdonald that the bridge was to be built at once. This is a pledge, and it must be fulfilled. So the Government are now under three obligations: first, to pay to the Province of Quebec the $96,000 promised; secondly, to undo the mischief which bad advice caused them to keep in force in 1887; thirdly, to construct this bridge, which is necessary to the trade and commerce of the country. I understand that the finances of the country will not at present very well permit a bridge to be built; but could not the Government decide on a line of ferries, which would cost from $200,000 to $250,000, for maintaining communication between the two sides of the river at all seasons of the year? The Government should at once see that the communication between those two shores is established; and why? Not only for the sake of the City of Quebec and its harbour, but for the sake of the whole Dominion. What is the case to-day? When travellers come by the Intercolonial Railway to Lévis, they are detained there very frequently for a night, and often for a day or two; but, if we had those steamers, there would be more traffic by the Intercolonial Railway, and that railway, instead of involving a deficit of $500,000 or $600,000 a year, might become a paying line and compensate us to a large extent for our large expenditures. I beg to draw the attention of the Government to these points. As to the measure before us, I, of course, accept it as a step in the right direction; but we must not stop there. We must see that the older portions of the Dominion are not entirely or constantly disregarded, and that our exclusive attention is not given to the development of the newer parts of the country. We must see that all parts of the Dominion are benefited equally by the large enterprises which we undertake for the future of the country.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is not my intention to answer the remarks of my hon. friend. He has been going a little outside of the record; but that is of course his own affair, and the House has allowed him to make those remarks, and he was welcome to make them so long as he was allowed to do so. But as he claims, as a representative of the old capital of the Province of Quebec, that Quebec has been abandoned and neglected by the Government, and that justice has not been shown to Quebec, I must tell him that surely his assertion is not warranted by the facts and by the action of the Government. In these circumstances especially my hon. friend should remember the old French proverb, *chaque jour amène son pain*. He should not find fault with the Government, when they are meeting the legitimate demands of Quebec in the measure brought before the House. My object, however, was to allude to the remarks made by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman stated that the Government in these resolutions were only carrying out the real wish and intentions of Parliament when in 1884 and 1885 Parliament voted the sum of $1,500,000 to assist in securing an extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to deep water at Quebec. That was the demand at that time, and I shall explain at once under what circumstances it arose. My hon. friend has said that the Government are now only carrying out the wish of Parliament, and I think he is perfectly correct. I think that the arrangement which was then thought the best possible to be made between the Government and the Canandian Pacific Railway Company has not proved to be the one most likely to carry out the real, honest intentions of Parliament. We know what the intention of Parliament was by preceding legislation. In 1884 Parliament voted a subsidy of $12,000 a mile for the building of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, as it was then called, between Ottawa and Montreal. That demand was made upon the Government, and Parliament in consequence of an alleged promise—I was not a party to it, but I heard of it—that if the Province of Quebec would build a railway which would form a continuation of the great trans-continental line by means of which the Government had undertaken to connect the Maritime Provinces and the Pacific Provinces, a certain subsidy would be granted to it. A subsidy had been granted to the Canada Central extending from Ottawa to a certain point westward. In the charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and in its subsequent contracts with the Government, was included provision for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway through a large and important region of the Province of Ontario. Nobody grudged that at the time, and large grants were made for that work. But pursuant to the recognized promise made by the leader of the Government of 1874-78, the Province of Quebec expected that if the road was built as a continuation of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Ottawa to deep water at Quebec, our great ocean port, it would be granted a subsidy by this Parliament; and after it was agreed to grant a subsidy of $12,000 a mile for the line between Ottawa and Montreal, it was felt—it was then my view—that there was no reason whatever why the same subsidy should not have been granted—for the railway which had been built by the Province of Quebec at a very heavy cost between Montreal and Quebec. But at that time an agitation was raised, a movement was got up—I do not say wrongly, it is not my place here to find fault with it—but at Quebec it was thought that the Canadian Pacific Railway line was not extended to where it should have been extended; because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, not having purchased that part of the line between Montreal and Quebec—for reasons of their own, which we are not here to-day to discuss—the city and district of Quebec had the right to ask to be benefited by a continuation of the Canadian Pacific Railway to deep water at Quebec. The North Shore Railway, which was at that time really the property of the Grand Trunk, was the one line between Montreal and Quebec. The Quebec people said: No; the Government will not grant the same measure of assistance to the Province of Quebec for having

built the line between Montreal and Quebec, because we have not really the continuation of the Canadian Pacific Railway to deep water at Quebec. And that agitation went on, and the subsidy was reduced from $12,000 to $6,000, and the other $6,000 were voted in 1884 to assist the Canadian Pacific Railway in extending their line from St. Martin's Junction to Quebec. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) alluded to that at the time. But by whose efforts was it that the Government of Quebec did not receive compensation for the expenditure they had incurred in building the whole line from Quebec to Ottawa? I do not ask whose fault it was; but at whose request was it that the Quebec Government were not allowed what is granted by the statute of 1884 as a subsidy for a line between Montreal and Quebec? It was, as I have stated before, at the request of the people of Quebec, who wanted to have the Canadian Pacific Railway at Quebec. The two companies were brought together, preliminary negotiations were entered into, and I remember having seen the vice-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Van Horne, and the president of the Grand Trunk Railway, Mr. Hickson, meeting in the Railway Department and trying to come to an agreement to have the North Shore line between Montreal and Quebec their joint property, so as to make it a kind of neutral road by which those two companies could reach the deep water terminus in the harbour of Quebec. The Quebec people objected to that arrangement. They said they did not want anything but a continuation of the Canadian Pacific Railway works to Quebec. I do not know whether it was at their request or by their agitation, but all I know is that the preliminary agreement between the two companies was broken, the negotiations were set aside, and things remained in the same position as before. Then it was said that the Grand Trunk Railway, which was really the owner of the North Shore line, should immediately transfer it to the Canadian Pacific Railway on their own terms. Difficulties arose, objections were made, propositions were refused, and then we find in this statute of 1884:

"That for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from its terminus at St. Martin's Junction, near Montreal, or some other point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the harbour at Quebec, in such a manner as may be approved by the Governor in Council, a subsidy not exceeding $6,000 per mile, and not exceeding on the whole $960,000.

Thus exactly the amount that should have been paid the Quebec Government for that line was granted by Parliament as a compensation to the Canadian Pacific Railway to build a line. My hon. friend fell inadvertently into error when he said that at the following session the Government gave power to any new company, if the Canadian Pacific Railway could not get possession of the North Shore road—any such new company to be incorporated, not by charter of Parliament, but by letters patent—to build a railway from St. Martin's Junction to Quebec, for which they would have a right to receive from the Federal Government a subsidy of $960,000. That was not exactly the case. Here are the words of the statute of 1885. But I forgot to say that in that same session of 1884, the sum of $200,000 had also been given for a line of railway and bridge between the Jacques Cartier railway station and the Canadian Pacific Railway at St. Martin's Junction, connecting the Jacques Cartier Union Railway with the North Shore road. Let me call the attention of my hon. friend to this: Is it not strange that $200,000 were voted to the Grand Trunk Railway—for the Jacques Cartier was owned by the Grand Trunk Railway—to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway? The conclusion arrived at by those who know how things were carried on is this: The agreement between the two companies was nearly ended, and the Grand Trunk Railway, which had built the Jacques Cartier Union, wanted a subsidy to connect their main line by the shortest link—the North Shore Railway. They wanted a subsidy of $200,000 to meet the eventuality of their joining partnership with the Canadian Pacific Railway. In 1885 we find it was proposed that:

"The Governor General in Council may grant a subsidy to aid in procuring free access for the trains and traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway from St. Martin's Junction, near Montreal, or from some other point on the said railway to be selected by the company, to the harbour of Quebec, in such manner as shall be approved by the Governor in Council, to wit: An additional subsidy not exceeding $340,000, constituting, together with the subsidy authorized by the said last mentioned Act—the Act I have just quoted—to aid in procuring the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec, and the subsidy thereby authorized to aid in constructing a line connecting the Canadian Pacific Railway at Jacques Cartier Junction with the North Shore Railway, which subsidy shall be applicable to the said first mentioned purpose—a sum not exceeding $960,000.

If you add together these $340,000, $200,000 voted in 1884, and $960,000, you have $1,500,000, which was exactly the subsidy to be given to any company that would build that railway between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec. If that threatened project had been realized, we would have seen two lines of railway, one of which had already difficulties to struggle against in obtaining a revenue fair enough to justify the building of that railway, and another company building within probably a distance of from two to ten miles, a railway 170 miles long between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec. Really, the undertaking was absurd. But why was that provision agreed to by Parliament? It was agreed to in order to force the Grand Trunk Railway, if the Grand Trunk Railway had been unreasonable, to come to terms rather than allow a competitive road to be built at public expense by their great rival, the Canadian Pacific Railway. What ensued? The Grand Trunk Railway saw that the Government and Parliament were yielding to the wishes of our friends from Quebec, yielding to the great agitation that had been aroused by the Quebec people, and they said: Yes, we are ready to sell, but not to the Canadian Pacific Railway; we are ready to act in conjunction with them to work together the line between Montreal and Quebec, so as to bring the important traffic of immigrants to that line. Contracts were made between the Grand Trunk Railway and eight or nine steamship companies to land immigrants at Point Lévis or wherever the Grand Trunk Railway would decide, and the Grand Trunk Railway had been thinking of landing them on the Louise embankment at Quebec, which would then profit by the whole traffic of the immigrants; and more than that, the immigrants, instead of going by the Grand Trunk Railway to the south shore and being enticed by American agents to Chicago and the Western States, would go by the North Shore and the Canadian Pacific Railway to our North-West. I must say that I was individu-

ally of the opinion that such an amalgamation of the two interests on the North Shore would have been for the good of Quebec and the country at large, and I strongly advocated it. The Quebec people, however, objected, and they conquered. That is why I find it strange my hon. friend from Bellechasse should say they have always been forgotten and neglected. An agreement was made by the Grand Trunk Railway to sell the personal interest they had in the railway for $530,000. There remained the bonds which existed on that road, besides the $3,500,000 representing the privileged claim of the Quebec Government. Those bonds were to the amount of $1,108,626. The Minister of Railways at that time, a pretty careful business man, the Hon. Mr. Pope, purchased those bonds at 85 cents on the dollar, for $970,000, which is the amount which the Government is now asking this Parliament to relinquish. I am desirous that the news should not go abroad to other provinces, which are naturally anxious to know whether the Government is going to give favours to a company, or to a province, to their detriment, when demands are made everywhere for grants to develop the resources of this country, that the Government is giving $970,000 either to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or to the Province of Quebec, or to the City of Quebec. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has put the case correctly in saying that what is now proposed to be abandoned is nothing but a fictitious claim, and that this is not giving a dollar more than was given by the law of 1885, which Parliament voted unanimously. Parliament voted $1,500,000 in order to have the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Quebec, and Parliament said it did not desire to hear any more of this question of terminus thereafter. The Government made an agreement with the company in pursuance of the legislation authorizing that grant. They thought that was the best bargain. Events have proved that it is not the best bargain, because, and in this matter I go further than the Minister of Justice, and I say it is not only going against the intention of Parliament in 1885, but it has resulted in depriving a large section of the country between Montreal and Quebec of the legitimate hopes they had as to the development of trade in that part of the country after the sacrifices which their Provincial Government had made for that enterprise. What was the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in developing trade between Montreal and Quebec? We know what the Canadian Pacific Railway has done for that line. Near St. Vincent de Paul there is an immense ravine which had been covered up by a temporary trestle work. A sum of nearly $100,000 has been expended there—I am not sure as to the figures—but a trestle work of more than 900 feet long has been replaced by fine work and has been made as good railway work as could be desired, at a very large cost. Two heavy bridges, one at St. Anne, the other at Pont Rouge, have been changed from wooden to iron bridges. The agreement made by the Government was so strict that, if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were making improvements of such a nature that the primitive construction was to be changed in such a way that it would be an entirely new construction, the Canadian Pacific Railway could not be repaid by the Government unless the Minister of Railways consented to it, and the Minister decided that no payments should be made unless the work amounted only to repairs on old structures. Was it reasonable to expect the Canadian Pacific Railway to spend $200,000 in substituting iron for wooden bridges? They have spent more than half a million of dollars in the improvement of the line between Montreal and Quebec, and to what effect? If they were going to develop trade in developing the resources of the country they traverse, they might have been called upon to invest another million of dollars. They are bound to spend at least $700,000, to put their line in a first-class and remunerative condition, after having spent half a million. That is to say, they will have spent a million and a quarter, and the only result of this will be that this vast outlay of money will only serve to pay the interest on debentures amounting to $1,108,000, or at least on the amount of $974,000. What has been the consequence? According to the agreement between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, if deficiencies occurred between the revenue and the expenses of the road, such deficiencies would have to be accounted for, and it would only be after such deficiencies had disappeared that the Government could receive any interest on the $1,108,000 of debentures in their hands. During the last five or six years the deficiencies have accrued to over $500,000; that is to say, that to cover up those deficiencies and further deficits that would accrue every year, the Government would look to the Greek calends before they received a cent of revenue as stipulated in the agreement. I conclude my remarks in saying that what is done to-day is only carrying out the legislation of 1884 and 1885. I hope nobody will begrudge the City of Quebec this measure because special works are asked to be done there. They are works which will benefit shippers of grain from Manitoba or Ontario as much as they will benefit the population of Quebec itself, and while we may apparently be doing a favour to the City of Quebec, we are really only carrying out the intention of Parliament as shown in the legislation of 1884 and 1885.

Mr. AMYOT. We do not grudge anything to the City of Quebec. We do not say that this measure is bad. It is a good measure, but we say it comes too late, and I do not see exactly why we have had that very fine speech from the Secretary of State, which would certainly have been pronounced out of order if it had been delivered by me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not say it would have been pronounced out of order by the Chairman, but it would have been by some other members of the House. The hon. gentleman has not explained why this measure only comes now. He says it is the result of the legislation of 1884 and 1885; but what is the cause of the delay? That has not been explained. The hon. gentleman says that, in granting $960,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Government have been yielding to the members from the district of Quebec, and he pointed to me specially, mentioning the member for Bellechasse. Is he sure of what he says? Has he the proofs in hand? We are living in a period when it is good to have our proofs before us; we are not sure of what a man will say. I have seen proceedings in a court of justice where a man has stated the con-

trary of what everybody thought he would. I will give the evidence of what I said myself in 1884, as reported in the *Hansard*. Here is what I said:

"I notice that this amount of $960,000 is only one-half of the first amount that was to be given to the Government of the Province of Quebec according to the principle laid down in the first paragraph; so, in order to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to reach Quebec, we take away from the Provincial Government the sum of $6,000 per mile to which that province is entitled, by what I may call the preamble of the resolution, as I take it for granted the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is not willing to go to Quebec. I observe that the paragraphs that we have already adopted, instead of forcing the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec, sends it elsewhere through the United States."

I predicted that in 1884, and unfortunately I was too near the truth. I suppose the hon. Minister does not want to refer to 1885. I may tell him in advance that in that year I was in the North-West.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. You were better engaged.

Mr. AMYOT. In 1884, I was opposed to the then Government on some questions, especially concerning the autonomy of the provinces, and also concerning legislation regarding certain private Bills. With the exceptions I have named, I supported the Administration, though I objected to that legislation.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. You objected, but you voted for it.

Mr. AMYOT. There was no vote taken, so far as I remember.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, of course; but you voted for it.

Mr. AMYOT. I said then that I would propose an amendment so as not to take away from the Province of Quebec any part of the $12,000 that the province was entitled to. But of course, trying to overthrow the Government on that point in 1884, would not have been a reasonable task. I will go on reading what I said on that occasion so as to take away from the hon. gentleman's mind the idea he expressed:

"The Province of Quebec has built the railway which forms part of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It has been always understood that the Canadian Pacific Railway was to reach from ocean to ocean on Canadian soil, and it has been stated and reiterated from year to year that Montreal and Quebec would be benefited by the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have been told of steamboats that were to cross between Quebec and Lévis; we have changed the course of the Intercolonial Railway by the St. Charles branch; we have brought the Grand Trunk Railway from Lévis to Rivière du Loup—all that to complete this great national route. But now, Mr. Chairman, instead of doing that, we put aside three-fourths of the Province of Quebec, and say, 'you shall benefit no more from the Canadian Pacific Railway; we are going to send it elsewhere.' To-day, under pretext to sending it to St. John or to other cities in the Maritime Provinces, we send it in the direction of Portland or Boston, or some other port in the United States, and there our commerce will consequently go. I think that before doing that we should, as far as possible, compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to remain in our own country, to benefit our own country, and to develop our cities at home instead of those of the United States. However, without going further into details, I repeat that I see no reasons for giving that sum of money to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and taking it away from the Province of Quebec. The principle laid down is just, and we are entitled to it. The Province of Quebec built the whole road from Quebec to Ottawa, and is just as much entitled to $12,000 a mile between Montreal and Quebec as it is between Montreal and Ottawa."

Then, on page 1495, I went on to speak still more explicitly, and I opposed any legislation which would take away from the Province of Quebec that large amount, either to build a second line, or to compel the company to buy the existing line. What do we care for the name of the company that has a railway going to Quebec?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Hear, hear.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman goes on saying I did.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; I said the Quebec deputation wanted to have "Canadian Pacific Railway" written on the cars and nothing else.

Mr. AMYOT. I never was a party to that, I never knew anything about it, and the Government should at once have informed the public at large that those who came to them in that deputation had such extraordinary plans; they were to be watched very closely. Now, Sir, against the assertion of the hon. Minister—which, of course, was made in good faith—I put my positive denial, and it is proved by what I said then, and since that time I have frequently had occasion in this House to reiterate my assertion and to affirm that that grant was taken away from the province contrary to a formal agreement that was entered into. We had consented to give $30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway on condition that our province got compensation, because we had built a great part of the line. The Government promised us such compensation, but they failed to fulfil their promises. They have done worse than that; they have built what they call a short line, which is no short line at all. They have driven away commerce from our district, and to-day, if we have no bridge at Quebec, it is because the Government have arranged things so that it would be too great a sacrifice. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have no interest now in building a bridge across the St. Lawrence at Lévis, because, when they arrive at Quebec they reach the end of their railroad. They would be interested in a bridge if they had built a new line from Lévis to join their short line. Now, if, instead of that, the Government had pursued the policy of building a bridge and of disposing of the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway, we would have a good railway, all on Canadian soil, running from ocean to ocean; we would not have diverted our railway from its natural course on British soil, and we would not have driven away our commerce to the United States. To-day we do not want to oppose this legislation, but we only desire to assert that some of the rights of the province are not granted, that other promises made by the Government have not been fulfilled. We say to the Government: If you are in power to-day, it is due to the policy you announced by your authorized agents, the policy of building a bridge. But, since you declare that you are unable to build the bridge, we ask you to do the next best thing, and put on ferry steamers to transport cars from one shore to the other.

On resolution 4,

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objection to the wording of these resolutions, because I agree in the main with the conclusion of the Government; but the manner in which this resolution is worded is calculated to convey the impression that that road is to some extent an inferior one, that there is no traffic to maintain it, or at all events not sufficient to make it a paying road. This is not the case,

however. There is reason to believe, and I think I will be supported by every one in this contention, that if that portion of the road had been placed on the same footing as the portion lying between Ottawa and Montreal, the result would have been the same on this section as on the section between Montreal and Ottawa. But the agreement which we made had as its natural conclusion the impairment of the value of this road, because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were not willing to put it in the same condition as other portions of the road, so that it might have been in a position to have gained all the advantages it might have received otherwise. My objection to the wording of the resolution is taken, because I want to make it plain, as was stated by the Secretary of State, that this is not at all a favour done to the City of Quebec or the Province of Quebec, but is simply carrying out an agreement made in 1884, and as that agreement was not made in a satisfactory manner the present legislation is a necessity.

Mr. LANGELIER. There is another reason in favour of what has been stated by the leader of the Opposition. It is stated in the agreement of 1885 that if the receipts of the railway were sufficient to pay working expenses and interests on the debt due to the Local Government, and interest on the debentures, the whole should be paid ; if not, the whole should not be paid. There was no provision made in regard to determining the division of the receipts of the road. I have been told by those who are pretty well informed, among others by the president of the Board of Trade of Quebec, that the receipts of the railway between Quebec and Montreal were apportioned in such a way that the eight miles from Montreal to St. Martins Junction obtained as much of the receipts as the 164 miles between St. Martin's Junction and the city of Quebec. It is quite easy to understand that, although the railway may have had a large traffic, it could never pay under those circumstances. It may be that there was some exaggeration in what was reported; but there was no provision, I repeat, for a division of the gross receipts of the railway ; and if that portion of the road between St. Martin's Junction and Montreal, which is only eight miles in length, obtained almost the same proportion as that portion of the line between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec, 164 miles in length, there need be no surprise that the latter portion of the road has not paid. The truth is it has paid very well. Let us take a case mentioned to me. Freight is carried between Quebec and Montreal, and as much is charged for the distance between Montreal and St. Martin's Junction as is charged between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec. If $1 is charged for freight, 50 cents is for the distance from Montreal to St. Martin's Junction and 50 cents for the whole distance between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec. It is easy to see that the road could not pay when the charge for eight miles and for 164 miles was equal. That, I am told, has been the system followed. There was no control over the division of the receipts, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, whose interest it was to make as bad a showing as possible between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec, arranged their figures and accounts in such a way as to show that that portion of the line between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec did not pay. All those who travel between Quebec and Montreal, and Montreal and Ottawa will bear me out when I say there is more passenger traffic on the portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Quebec and Montreal than on any other portion. I have travelled between Montreal and Ottawa almost as frequently as between Montreal and Quebec, and I have travelled sometimes, not frequently, between Montreal and Toronto, and there are quite as many passengers on every train I have seen between Quebec and Montreal as between Montreal and Toronto, and as many, if not more, passengers travelling on the line between Quebec and Montreal than on the line between Ottawa and Montreal. If those other portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway pay, I do not see why the other portion between Montreal and Quebec should not pay. I do not blame the Canadian Pacific Railway for the action they have taken, as it was in their interest. It was their interest to make a poor showing for the line between St. Martin's and Quebec, in order to prevent the value of the debentures going up. It is quite evident that if the traffic between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec, as reported by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and as shown by their own account, was sufficient to pay the interest on their debentures, they would acquire a value and the company would have had less chance of getting rid of them. They wanted to get rid of them, and they took the necessary steps to prevent them from ever having any value. The company held that it was better to get rid of them, and the purchase of the bonds was a misappropriation of the money voted by Parliament in 1885, as it was using that money for an investment. It was never contemplated by Parliament, when $1,500,000 was voted in 1885, that nearly $1,000,000 of that amount should be used for making an investment. What is the difference between an investment in the bonds of the Northern Pacific and of the North Shore? No one would deny that it was a misappropriation if the Government had used $978,000 to purchase bonds of the Northern Pacific, or the Union Pacific, or the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other railway. What has been done is exactly the same in effect. Instead of buying bonds of American roads or of a Canadian road, the Government bought the bonds of the North Shore Railway, and they bought them as an investment, and we see the result in the Public Accounts. Ever since 1885 those bonds have appeared in the Public Accounts as an asset of the Dominion of Canada. If they appear as an asset there must have been an investment which the Government had no right to make; and I am very glad they are going to dispose of this asset and to do justice to Quebec, which has not been dealt justly by since 1885. At the election in 1887 we had the release of that $1,000,000 of bonds, as it was called, promised to the electors of Quebec if they returned supporters of the Government. I presume that now the Government see that if they made the same sort of promises at an election the promise would be taken as an insult by the electors. It did not have much effect at the last election, and I presume, that is the only reason why the city of Quebec is now going to obtain a tardy justice from the Government.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would not like to leave my hon. friend under a wrong impression. If

the information that he has received from Quebec is what he has stated to the House, his information is not correct. My hon. friend said that that part of the Canadian Pacific Railway which lies between St. Martin's Junction and Montreal was paying the Canadian Pacific Railway as much as the whole balance of the line between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec. I am no more the auditor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company than my hon. friend is; but I believe that if my hon. friend says that the Canadian Pacific Railway were charging for freights or passengers as much between St. Martin's Junction and Montreal as between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec, my hon. friend is wrong. If the Canadian Pacific Railway is an honest company, and they are known to be so, their accounts can only be kept according to the agreement which was entered into when the Canadian Pacific acquired the railway between Ottawa and Montreal. They were the proprietors of the road between St. Martin's Junction and Montreal, and the Quebec Government was the owner of the line between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec, and when they acquired that part of the railway between Montreal and Ottawa, we made an arrangement by which special rates were agreed and accepted on both sides between Montreal and St. Martin's Junction. My hon. friend may take it for granted that the rates which were then agreed upon, when the railway was sold by the Government at Quebec and when I was Minister of Railways, are the rates which are carried out now. I say that in keeping their books and in making out their accounts the Canadian Pacific Railway could not have charged more than the exact rates that were agreed upon when the railway between Montreal and Ottawa was sold to them, and when all the arrangements were fixed between the Government of Quebec and the Canadian Pacific Railway for freight and passengers between Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. LANGELIER. I gave these figures simply as an instance of the idea I wanted to convey; but I will mention a fact that was stated to me. It is understood by everyone who has any knowledge of the management of railways, that they charge proportionately less for a long haul than for a short haul, and on the portion between St. Martin's Junction and Montreal they charge for a short haul.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Of course.

Mr. LANGELIER. Instead of charging for the long haul between Quebec and Montreal, and giving the same proportion to the eight miles between Montreal and St. Martin's Junction as to any other eight miles of the road, the whole charge for the short haul was made for the eight miles from Montreal to St. Martin's Junction, and then the rest of the distance only received the balance of the money. That is what I was told.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend is right there. The short haul rates were applied for traffic between St. Martin's Junction and Montreal, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway did not do that they would rob themselves, which I do not think they are in the habit of doing.

Mr. LAURIER. This is somewhat outside of the question. The only thing I object to in the wording of the resolution is that persons throughout the country will have the impression that the Government is getting rid of an asset which is of no use whatever. In my estimation the resolution would have been preferable if it had been stated that this is carrying out the legislation of 1884 and nothing else; but instead of that the impression seems to be conveyed to the public at large: Don't you fear, the country loses nothing, the assets are worthless, the line is not a paying one and, therefore, it is just as well to get rid of it.

On resolution 5,

Mr. LANGELIER. I would like to know what is the intended capacity of the grain elevator to be erected at Quebec? It is of great importance to know what the capacity of that elevator will be.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot state what the capacity will be, as there is no agreement on that point. The basis of the whole arrangement is that the accommodation provided for there shall be such as is sufficient for the future trade of the city in view of the improvements to be made on this line. The negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway are all on the supposition that the improvement of the line will greatly develop the trade of the City of Quebec, and also that the facilities to be afforded there are facilities in the interest of the railway company as well as the city, and that it will be necessary that the railway company should provide ample facilities there, when the traffic is improved by the improvement of the line itself. We, therefore, leave to the company the capacity of the elevator and matters of that kind, believing that their own interest will be the best guide as to that.

Mr. LANGELIER. I see at the end of this resolution that all these improvements are to be completed to the satisfaction of the Minister of Railways. I would like to know what kind of grain elevator will satisfy the Minister of Railways? Some capacity must have been contemplated when this resolution was prepared. It is quite evident that if this will be only an elevator of 20,000 bushels capacity, it will be useless. If it were stated in the resolution that the elevator shall be the same as that erected near the Canadian Pacific Railway depôt in Montreal, it could be easily understood. I think that should be mentioned, because otherwise the company will be at liberty to erect an elevator of 20,000 or 25,000 bushels capacity, which would be useless for commercial purposes. The commercial men of Quebec, who are deeply interested in this resolution, ought to know the capacity of that flour shed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company believe that it will be necessary to have more than one, and they hold themselves ready to erect four or five if necessary. But my hon. friend will see that Quebec has been very well treated, because the works to be done in Quebec are specifically mentioned, as well as those at Three Rivers. It is not to be supposed that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would erect an immense elevator at Three Rivers and a small one at Quebec. My hon. friend should know that the port of Quebec will and must necessarily have the best accommodation for the future traffic that the company will be able to procure. If anybody has to complain, it is not Quebec, but the other localities on the line; the other places will have to look only to the good-will of the company under their agreement with the Government.

Mr. LANGELIER. It is just as well that the resolutions should not enter into these details, because after they are adopted, and a Bill based upon them is passed, the Government will have to enter into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to carry out these resolutions; and if we were to bind the Government in advance by some cast-iron resolution, it might embarrass them in their negotiations. But I would like the Government in the agreement to mention the capacity of the elevator; that is, the Government should make such an arrangement that if it is not carried out, they could proceed by law to compel the company to carry it out. The resolution provides for a grain elevator at Three Rivers; but Three Rivers has no right to any of this money. When it was voted in 1885, it was not contemplated that any portion of it should go to make improvements at Three Rivers. It was not intended that Three Rivers should be the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but Quebec; and I do not see how you are going to secure the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Quebec by building an elevator at Three Rivers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman forgets the speech of his leader, Mr. Joly, about the great progress and prospects of Three Rivers.

Mr. LAURIER. Give us your answer.

Mr. LANGELIER. So much the better for Three Rivers; but what I say is that in 1885, when that money was voted, it was never intended to be expended at Three Rivers, but at Quebec.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand, from the explanations of the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Secretary of State, that the Government had no specifications from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the nature of the works which they intend to construct, but that they have simply a general knowledge?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is true, there is no detail with regard to these expenditures, and that is perhaps accounted for by the fact that we have not made any agreement on this subject with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. As the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) mentioned a few moments ago, until we come to settle the terms of the agreement, it is very difficult to fix details. We do propose, before entering into the agreement, to have some enquiry made as to the probable requirements of trade there; and, on consultation with the proper authorities, I think we can arrive at pretty correct conclusions as to the necessary dimensions of any works of this kind. It is probable that a grain elevator of at least a quarter of a million bushels capacity will be required at Quebec. It is likely that will be needed by the requirements of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself. The communication from the company in regard to that states:

"Additional siding accommodation and business tracks must be provided at Quebec, as well as an elevator and flour shed of such capacity as may be necessary to provide accommodation for the business of the railway at that port."

Later, the president of the company, writing as to the accommodation to be furnished by the flour shed, says:

"The additional building for the storage of flour is already specifically mentioned in the resolutions. The company is most anxious to increase the business of the line, so that more than one shed may be required. In fact, the company would be glad to find that the business required half a dozen such buildings, and it is needless to add that they would be provided with the greatest possible expedition."

Mr. LAURIER. This, I submit, is hardly satisfactory. It seems to me that Parliament has a right to know what is the nature of the improvements to be made—not in the bulk, or in full detail, but something like an accurate statement. Of course, I would not ask anything absolutely precise; but the resolution states that the whole is to be completed to the satisfaction of the Minister of Railways. Well, what standard has the Minister of Railways to guide him as to the nature of the work to be done? How is he to decide whether they are sufficient or not sufficient? It seems to me that before we come to the next stage or the final stage of this measure, Parliament ought to be placed in possession of more information on this point. Apart from that, what my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) has stated is correct, that this money was not intended at first for the City of Three Rivers, but for the City of Quebec.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It was not intended for the City of Quebec, but for the whole line.

Mr. LAURIER. It was intended to make Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that spending a portion of this money at Three Rivers will at all serve that object? It seems to me there is no connection between the two at all. What has the Piles Branch to do with this matter? How much will be expended in improving that branch?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The line is in running order, but, no doubt, has to be improved. There is no special figure mentioned. It would be rather dangerous to measure exactly the amount to be given each locality.

Mr. LAURIER. And this is the reason why Parliament is to be bound in advance. I see that the company is to expend upon the rolling stock $350,000, and upon all the other improvements $300,000. We release the company from a debt of $1,000,000, and they undertake only to spend $600,000. Moreover, if you bind the company to expend over all the lines, about one-third will have to be spent on the Piles Branch.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. What for? For cordwood?

Mr. LAURIER. I do not know what for. This is what seems so mysterious. I do not understand why this Piles Branch should be so favoured. Why is there nothing upon the L'Assomption Branch?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The L'Assomption Branch does not belong to the Canadian Pacific Railway, whereas the Piles Branch does.

Mr. LAURIER. I mention this just as an argument to show that we should have more details as to the manner in which this money is to be applied.

Resolution reported.

SHIPPING OF LIVE STOCK.

Mr. TUPPER moved concurrence in amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 154) respecting the shipping of live stock. He said: The only amendment is in the direction of improving one of the sections which made a certain offence a misdemeanour, and it also makes another section more definite, which provides that the ships shall be lia-

ble to a penalty of $100 and seizure. It is to prevent misunderstanding.

Mr. LAURIER. This may be a good opportunity to ask from the Government some explanation with reference to the introduction of American cattle for slaughter into this country.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was an announcement made here on that subject, but the hon. gentleman was not in his place.

Mr. HAGGART. I made the announcement the other day that there was an application from a company for the purpose of having cattle slaughtered at Three Rivers to be exported, the cattle to be admitted only under stringent regulations. The Government have not come to any decision, and will not without giving the subject the fullest consideration.

Mr. LAURIER. Is that a revival of the old meat company?

Mr. HAGGART. It is a new company.

Amendment concurred in.

DECK AND LOAD LINES.

Mr. TUPPER moved concurrence in amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 106) to provide for the marking of deck and load lines. He said: The amendment is with the object of making clearer the seventh sub-section of the seventh section, and does not change the effect of the Bill.

Amendment concurred in.

SUPPLY—TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. FOSTER moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BARRON. It will be remembered that, a few days ago, when I rose to discuss the subject of the Trent Canal, the Minister of Justice asked me to allow it to stand until the acting Minister of Railways would be in his seat. I was glad to accede to the request of the hon. gentleman, because I was anxious that the fuliest discussion should take place upon the merits of the scheme, and was specially anxious that we should have some information from the Government as to their future course in connection with this great work. I am glad now to see that the hon. Minister of Customs, under whose special charge are these particular works, has recovered from his illness and is now in his seat. When I say he is now in his seat, I see that he is not actually in his seat, but I mean that he has sufficiently recovered to be in the House, and before the discussion ceases I hope we shall have some remarks from him or from some members of the Government in regard to this great work. I may say that I have asked some gentlemen on the other side of the House, and some gentlemen on this side of the House, to take part in this discussion, knowing that they were interested in this great work, and I hope that before the House adjourns to-night there will be a sufficiently full discussion to enable the people in the Midland district of Ontario to come to a definite conclusion as to what the views of many hon. gentlemen are on this great subject. In approaching the discussion of this subject, I am quite willing to admit that there may be some force in the statement that the Government of to-day is not the Government of a short time ago. I am quite willing to admit that the Premier of to-day is not the Premier of a short time ago, that the hon. gentleman who presides over the destinies of Canada, as far as the premiership goes, is not the gentleman who was in that position a short time ago, and who was answerable to the representative of the Crown and responsible to the people as far as this great subject is concerned. Therefore, perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite might anticipate my remarks by saying that, as far as the Government of the day is concerned, they have a right to say that they have not yet announced their policy upon this great subject, and thus anticipate criticism. But I take it that, to a certain extent, any argument or any answer of that nature from hon. gentlemen opposite is somewhat taken away from them by reason of the announcement made by them soon after the late Premier's death, the announcement made by the then Minister of Public Works, who, I believe, has recently resigned his portfolio, to the effect that the policy to be pursued by the gentlemen now in office was to be the same in all particulars as that which was pursued in times past by the Conservative party. That being so, I do not think that it will lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to say they have a right, before any adverse criticism—and I do not propose to deal in much adverse criticism—to announce their policy upon this great subject, great indeed to a large number of people in the Province of Ontario, and more particularly to the people of the Midland district of Ontario. In view, then, of the announcement made by the then Minister of Public Works that the policy of the present Government is the policy which has characterized and actuated the members of the Government in the past during the lifetime of the late Premier, I have a right to see what that policy has been, and to let those who are interested know, so far as the past is concerned, what the policy is likely to be in the future. There can be no doubt that in the past their policy has been one of professed intention to at once proceed and construct this great work. I may read as I did the other night, and I shall do now without showing that alleged undue feeling and alleged improper warmth with which I was then charged, the telegram sent by the late Premier to a gentleman at Trenton in regard to the policy of the Government, at all events up to the death of the late Premier, in regard to the construction of this work known as the Trent Valley Canal. On the 3rd March, he telegraphed from Kingston to Mr. Murphy in these words:

"KINGSTON, March 3, 1891.

"D. R. MURPHY,
"Trenton.

"Trent Valley Canal commission have reported favourably on the completion of the scheme. Parliament will be asked next session for a grant for the purpose.

(Sgd.) "JOHN A. MACDONALD."

The people have reason to complain of the manner in which the Government have played at battledore and shuttlecock with this great work, and of the non-fulfilment of the promises which have been made just anterior to every general election. There could not be a more distinct and determined promise than this which is contained in the telegram sent by the late Premier to Mr. Murphy, and, in ac-

cordance with the statement made by the Minister of Public Works before he resigned his portfolio, that the policy now actuating hon. gentlemen opposite would be the same as that which actuated them in the past, I think they are in honour bound to carry out this promise made by the late Premier, Sir John Macdonald, in his lifetime to the people on behalf of whom Mr. Murphy telegraphed to him. There can be no doubt about the authenticity of that telegram. As I said a few nights ago, the original was seen by me, and was read by Mr. Murphy at a large public meeting in the town of Peterborough, at which there were present the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson), the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), the hon. member from North Ontario (Mr. Madill), and I think, though I am not sure, the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn).

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. I think we should wait until the members for West Peterborough and East Peterborough are present before we discuss this question. They are as much interested as anyone in this Trent Valley route.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. At all events, I may say that I was not present at that meeting.

Mr. BARRON. I said I was not sure whether the hon. gentleman was there or not. When the hon. gentleman becomes more familiar with the practices of this House, he will know that hon. members should be in their seats, and I may state that so anxious was I to have them present that I have repeatedly told them that this discussion was coming on, and I actually took the trouble this afternoon to try and find these hon. gentlemen and have them here. As a further proof of the past policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, I want to read what the chief engineer wrote on the 21st May, 1881, in regard to this great work :

"SIR,—By direction of the Minister, I have to request that you will be pleased to take the necessary steps to obtain, during the ensuing summer, surveys for the system of canals, &c., whereby communication may be made between the Bay of Quinté and the Georgian Bay, already in part effected through the Trent River works, for which survey the sum of $6,000 was voted by Parliament at its last session."

I wish to emphasize the words "between the Bay of Quinté and the Georgian Bay," because by these words it will be seen that the intention of the Government was to afford communication between those points by using the internal waters, and of course to afford communication between those points means the final construction of the Trent Valley Canal. Then we go on a little further, and we find that Sir Charles Tupper, on the 6th April, 1882, reported to Council as follows :—

"The undersigned has the honour to report that from time to time, for many years past, as is shown in many successive annual and other reports, the establishment of a line of water communication between Lake Ontario and the mouth of the River Trent and Lake Huron, through the utilizing of existing river and lake waters, has been under consideration."

I might cite numerous statements from speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite, in authority, to show that the intention has always been, and has always been expressed to be, at important periods of time by hon. gentlemen opposite, to go on with the construction of this work, and to complete the whole as a waterway from the two points I have mentioned.

If being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. BARRON. Before proceeding with the discussion of the subject with which I was dealing before recess, I wish to notice a remark made by my hon. friend from South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn). No doubt, that hon. gentleman thought I was proceeding somewhat harshly in discussing this question in the absence of some hon. members interested in the subject of discussion, but he must know that it is the duty of hon. gentlemen to be in the House, and instead of desiring to proceed in their absence, I appealed to the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson), to the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), and to other hon. gentlemen in this House, all of whom know that I was anxious that the fullest possible discussion should take place, and I desired that these hon. gentlemen should be present. I appealed also to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), whom I also asked to take part in this discussion, and who knows, as well as these hon. gentlemen I have mentioned, that I was anxious they should be present and speak on this subject, in order that the country might be made aware of the great merits of this work. Therefore, I think the hon. member for South Victoria was unfair and unjust in his interruptions, besides being out of order according to parliamentary rules. I was proceeding to point out that the pronounced policy of the Government has always been in favour of the construction of this canal, not merely for the purpose of opening up the internal waters in the interior of the province, but in order to proceed with the work as a great highway from the waters of the Georgian Bay to the mouth of the River Trent. I had given before recess several quotations in support of my contention as to what has been the policy of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. I find further that the late Premier, speaking in Peterborough, in the month of June, 1882, just before a general election, spoke as follows :—

"Every town of a sufficient size wanted a post office and a Custom house, and every part of the country wanted some improvement in order to develop its resources, just as those he was addressing demanded carrying out of the Trent navigation system, and they were going to get it. It was by a mere chance that the Government had the opportunity of carrying out that great project of inland navigation."

Then, speaking of the Trent waters, the late Premier said :

"The Government kept them until the revenue had expanded sufficiently to justify them in coming to Parliament, as they did last session, and getting a subsidy voted, which will be sufficient to add 150 miles of internal communication to their part of the country. That vote taken last session would, however, amply guarantee that the whole work would be carried out as fast as the revenue allowed so that it might be constructed."

Thus, Mr. Speaker, you will see that when the late Premier spoke of the whole work, he did not mean to confine it to the internal waters, but he meant it as a work connecting the waters of the Georgian Bay and the waters of Lake Ontario. Then we find that the hon. member for West Peterborough, speaking on the night of the election, in 1887, in the town of Peterborough, said :

"The Minister of Public Works had given him every assurance that the Trent Valley Canal contract between Peterborough and Lakefield, would be let during the coming summer. This was no electioneering dodge, because the elections were now all over."

Now, when the hon. member spoke these words on the night of the election, he must have had an intimation from the hon. Minister of Public Works, whom I now see in his seat, before the election came off, and of course he was expected to use the information in order to carry his seat by the large majority which he actually received. So you see that on every occasion hon. gentlemen opposite have been authorized by the late Premier and by the Government to promise to the electors that the work was going to be completed as a great through work; and it is that promise, recently made in a telegram by the First Minister, which I have read to the House, and was even made to the electors prior to the general elections, it is that promise which I now ask the Government to fulfil, a promise in accord with the policy which the Minister of Public Works stated only a short time ago the Government intended to carry out as part and parcel of the policy of the Conservative party. Now, I will read a statement made by the late First Minister to this House on the 11th July, 1885, and surely it cannot be said that such a statement made upon the floor of the House before the representatives of the people, is not an authoritative statement. Speaking of the Trent Valley Canal, he said:

"The subject is a very old one, and it has been reported on by many able engineers, and at last the Government adopted the idea of making a permanent work by connecting the two great waterways."

The two great waterways being, of course, the Georgian Bay and the waters of Lake Ontario. The late Premier went on to say:

"It may be it cannot compete in all respects with other and deeper waterways, and with a railway system, but it will be substantially a Dominion work connecting the two waters, and at the same time a great advantage to any district of country through which it passes."

I might go on quoting remarks and speeches made and promises given by hon. gentlemen opposite sitting, not on the back benches, not behind the Government, but sitting on the Treasury benches themselves, promises made time and again, to go on with this undertaking, not merely as a system connecting the internal waters of the province, but as a system connecting the great waterways which I have just mentioned. Now, when the Government, and especially the late Premier, promised so often that this work would be carried on, it is reasonable to suppose that they had sufficient information before them to enable them to make those promises, and no doubt they had. Nevertheless, they thought fit to appoint a commission. When they appointed a commission to ascertain whether this work should go on or not, whether it was feasible or not, I did quarrel with hon. gentlemen opposite for appointing the commission, because I thought, and I still think, that the commission was appointed for no other object than merely to gain time and to encourage the people still to believe that the Government would fulfil the promises they had made to them. I do not quarrel now with hon. gentlemen opposite for having appointed that commission, but I say that having done so, and the commission now having reported in favour of the construction of the work, I appeal to hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to say to-night what they intend to do in regard to this matter. In face of the telegram sent by the late Premier to Mr. Murphy, that the Trent Valley Canal commission having reported in favour of the construction of the work, we were justified in expecting that the Government, at this session of Parliament, would place a sum in the Estimates for the purpose of completing this great work. At the time the commission was appointed I found fault. Why? Because the gentlemen appointed, at least so far as two of them were concerned, were gentlemen whose interests were entirely adverse to the construction of this work. One was Mr. Frank Turner, of Toronto, whose interests, if he had any, lay in the direction of another canal; and the other gentleman was Mr. John Kennedy, of Montreal, whose interests likewise, if he had any, were against the construction of the Trent Valley Canal. But, notwithstanding that the interests of those gentlemen were against the construction of the canal, they found, on examination of the facts and on taking the evidence, which occupies 1,700 pages, that they were compelled, notwithstanding that one lived in Toronto and the other in Montreal, to report in favour of the construction and early completion of this great work. I hold the report in my hand. I will not ask the House to listen to it, because it is of considerable length; but I will content myself by simply stating that the report is in favour of the construction of the work, and if any hon. gentleman doubts my statement, I refer him to the telegram I have read, sent by the late Premier to Mr. Murphy, wherein he says the Trent Valley commissioners have reported in favour of the construction of the work. I find that both inside this House and outside this House, except among gentlemen who have taken trouble to study this great question, there is considerable opposition and antipathy to going on with the work. I find even on my side of the House, and also on the other side of the House, hon. gentlemen seem not to realize the importance of this work. They do not seem to appreciate it, and I can account for that fact in no other way than that they have never yet taken the trouble to consider this great project in all its phases. The Minister of Customs the other night, acting in the capacity of Minister of Canals, stated, in support of the construction of a canal on the north side of the St. Lawrence in the place of the Beauharnois Canal, that it was a very old subject and had been thought of for a great many years. In like manner, if that is any argument, I may say to the hon. gentleman, that this likewise is a very old project and has been thought of for a great many years. I find that in 1827 it was first thought of, and a special committee of the Lower House of the Parliament of Upper Canada was appointed to consider the matter. The committee's report was as follows:—

"Exceedingly desirable and important that those waters which constitute the chain of lakes and rivers which run in a south-easterly direction from the vicinity of Lake Simcoe, and which empty into the Bay of Quinté by the River Trent, should be examined and surveyed by competent persons, with a view to ascertain how far they might be rendered navigable, and the probable expense attending the same."

In accordance with the report of that committee, surveyers were sent out. But it might be assumed from that recommendation that it was only intended to connect the interior waters, and not to

make a great through canal. Further on, it is stated:

"It seems to have been well understood at the time, that the small wooden lock thus executed was only a temporary expedient, and that works on a much larger scale with stone locks and on a comprehensive plan, extending from Lake Ontario to Lake Huron, would be ultimately undertaken."

So, as far back as 1827, it was anticipated that a great through canal would be built from the waters of Lake Huron to the waters of Lake Ontario. In pursuance of that recommendation in 1827, I find that Mr. L. H. Baird went on and made a survey in 1833 and 1835, and in pursuance of his survey and recommendation there were locks built at Bobcaygeon, Little Lake, Hastings, and Chisholm Rapids. We can now take advantage of the locks built at that time. Later on, in 1841, surveys were made by Mr. Lyon and Mr. Keefer; and a few years since, under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, locks were built at Burleigh, Lovesick, Buckhorn, and Fenelon Falls. Here, I may be permitted to say, that the works done in these respective places which I have named, are magnificent works. They are, it is said, far too good for the occasion and the locality. That, at all events, is the report of the Trent Valley Commissioners, and, in consequence, the commissioners state in their report that a great saving could be effected to the country by building in the future less expensive locks. With regard to the locks already built—and I draw attention to this fact without any desire to make adverse criticism—the Trent Valley Commissioners have reported that the locks at these places, which are 134 feet by 33, are too wide and they need only be 134 feet by 23, and thereby another saving would be effected on further construction. The locks are 5 feet in depth, and are constructed for side-wheel steamers instead of for tugs and barges. So, on the work done, this large and expensive work, an excessive amount of $20,000 has been expended on the construction of each lock, and $80,000 is estimated by me as having been unnecessarily spent in connection with the work. In passing, I may say that we can save $20,000 on each lock, and as there will be 71 locks a total sum of $1,500,000 may be saved in the future by building less expensive locks. If this work is completed, and it must be completed, if hon. gentlemen desire to carry out their promises and fulfil their pledges made to the people, and desire to be honest, fair and just, and not get the reputation of being deceitful, if they carry out this work we will obtain an uninterrupted waterway from Matchedash Bay to Trenton. That is the course recommended by the Trent Valley Commissioners, the distance being 197 miles. Let me refer to the report of the commissioners to show for a moment what has been done. The report says:

"The commissioners appointed 'to consider the question of further extending the line of water communication between Lake Huron and Lake Ontario, and to determine whether any other local works are necessary and whether it is advisable that an extension of the main work should be undertaken, and, if so, to what extent,' beg leave to report:

"The main work referred to is what is commonly known as the Trent Valley Canal, being a projected waterway from Matchedash Bay, Georgian Bay, Lake Huron, to Trenton on the Bay of Quinté, Lake Ontario.

"The works already completed, as set forth in the report of the Chief Engineer of Canals, have rendered navigable the following portions of the main route, viz.:—Balsam Lake to the village of Lakefield; the town of Peterborough to Heeley's Falls on the Trent River, leaving necessary to be done, according to the same report, to render the whole route navigable, the following sections, viz.:—A canal from Matchedash Bay to Lake Couchiching, a distance of 13 21-100 miles, requiring 14 locks; a canal from Lake Simcoe to Balsam Lake, 17 74-100 miles, requiring 11 locks; a canal from the village of Lakefield to the town of Peterborough, 9 61-100 miles, requiring 13 locks; a canal and improvement in the present navigation between Heeley's Falls and Hoard's Creek, 10 85-100 miles, requiring 23 locks; improvement in the present navigation between Hoard's Creek and Frankford, and a canal between Frankford and Trenton, 7 29-100 miles, requiring 10 locks."

Accordingly, 71 locks are still required to make an entire through waterway from Matchedash Bay to the Bay of Quinté on Lake Ontario. I find, in conversation with hon. gentlemen whom I have endeavoured to convert to my views on this great work, that there is a feeling that it is going to launch us into tremendous expenditure. They seem frightened to undertake it because they do not know where the money is to come from, or where we are going to end if the expenditure is once begun. It is true that the original estimate by Mr. Rubidge was, I believe, about $10,000,000, but with the increased engineering knowledge and facilities of to-day, that estimate is found to be altogether too high, and the general consensus of opinion is that the expense of the work can be very greatly reduced from that. Let me ask the attention of the House while I show from figures I have taken from the reports of engineers, how the cost can be brought very much below the original estimate of Mr. Rubidge. That original estimate for 197 miles was $8,685,000, and there has been expended since then $1,100,000. The other night the Minister questioned the accuracy of my figures, but I have since ascertained whether they were correct or not, and I find that the figures I gave then are practically correct, and that there has been $1,100,000 expended since the beginning of the work, leaving a balance to be expended of $7,558,000 according to the original estimate of Mr. Rubidge. The commissioners who have reported upon this canal point out that a great saving can be effected. It is said that 35 per cent. can be saved by a difference in the class of work on the lockage, and 10 per cent. on the reaches between the locks, which will altogether amount to $2,000,000, reducing the original estimate to $5,585,000. I have already pointed out that the commissioners have reported that the locks are too expensively built, that they are too wide and can be reduced from 33 feet to 23 feet and that the cost of each lock could be lessened by $20,000, which for the 71 locks would be a reduction of $1,420,000; thus reducing Mr. Rubidge's estimate of $8,685,000 to the sum of $4,165,000 still to be expended, that is, including the $1,100,000 already expended. If we carry out the recommendations of the commissioners the cost of this great work, instead of being $10,000,000, will be reduced to the sum of $4,165,000 yet to be expended, and I would ask the attention of the House to the peculiar coincidence that this reduced cost practically corresponds with the estimate of Mr. Starke, an engineer who also made an estimate of the cost. Therefore, the expenditure on this important work ought not to frighten hon. gentlemen or to frighten the country, because, as I have already said, instead of costing $10,000,000 it will only cost $4,500,000 or $5,000,000. I can recollect well that Sir Charles Tupper, whether in this House or when travelling through the country I forget which, said that if the cost would not be more

than $3,000,000, then, so far as he was concerned, he was quite willing to let the contract to any person who would undertake to complete the work for that amount of money. I want now to draw the attention of the House to what I consider to be a little unfair treatment of the Province of Ontario, and especially of the Midland district of Ontario, through which this canal runs. Let me point out what are the subsidies to railways received by the different provinces, excepting the Canadian Pacific Railway main line and the Sault Branch. Since Confederation Quebec has received $7,948,667 in railway subsidies paid out of the Dominion treasury: New Brunswick has received $4,261,972; Nova Scotia has received $8,936,882, while in the Province of Ontario the Dominion Government has only spent on railways the sum of $1,970,000, and besides that declared our own roads to be within their jurisdiction: and so, when we come to ask this House and this Government for a little fair-play from a subsidy standpoint, in constructing this great work, we tell them that if they spend $5,000,000 upon it, they would not then have given to the Province of Ontario as much money, so far as public works are concerned, as they have given to the Province of Quebec, or to the Province of New Brunswick, or to the Province of Nova Scotia. I say that gentlemen interested in property in the Midland districts of Ontario, and living there, have a right to come here and ask the Government to fulfil their promises, especially in view of the fact that so far as our interests are concerned we have not received fair-play at the hands of the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it is extremely discreditable that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House should keep up noises as they are now doing. My hon. friend is speaking on a question of immense interest, not only to his own constituency, but to a large portion of the province from which he comes. This is the first time he has discussed the question this session, and the least hon. gentlemen opposite can do is that they will not disturb him while speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask hon. gentlemen to keep order.

Mr. BARRON. It does not disturb me at all, so long as hon. gentlemen can hear what I say. I know that hon. gentlemen who are making the noise do not desire to hear, but it will not be very creditable to the Government side of the House to let the people who are interested in this great work know that noise and clamour have been going on from the Conservative side of the House when this work is being discussed, in which so many people are deeply concerned and interested. I must ask for a moment or two the attention of the House while I point out what is known to all of us, that there are on this continent the northern, the western, the southern, and the eastern water slopes by which our trade and commerce is conducted in and from this continent. So far as the northern and western outlets are concerned, we may dismiss them at once, because they do not come into competition with the southern outlet or the eastern outlet; but I must ask the attention of the House for a few moments while I discuss the southern and eastern outlets. The great competing water route with the St. Lawrence is the Mississippi. That river affords 20,000 miles of inland navigation. It drains by its main and tributary streams nearly half the territory of the United States, or an area of 1,226,000 square miles. Its length from its source to the Gulf of Mexico is 3,160 miles, or if the Missouri be included it would extend to 4,491 miles. In its southerly course to the Gulf of Mexico it passes through ten states and is, for 1,000 miles from its mouth, from 2,200 to 5,000 feet in width. Its average inclination is about 3¼ inches per mile, but in summer it falls to 2⅓ inches. The level is raised in rainy seasons from 15 to 20 feet at New Orleans, and from 35 to 40 feet at the mouth of the Ohio. Now, I want to emphasize the magnitude of the great southern route, in contrasting it with the route *viâ* the St. Lawrence, for reasons which will appear hereafter. It will carry light draught vessels which can ascend 600 miles above the Ohio, and as far as 2,200 miles from the Gulf shoal water vessels can be used. The Ohio River which empties into it, can be navigated for 975 miles above its junction with the Mississippi, or at times even further. The States of Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia have both canals that are ultimately to be connected with the Ohio, if they are not so already, and the States of Ohio and Indiana have already built canals uniting the Ohio with Lake Erie, while Illinois and Wisconsin have also water communication between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi. Yet the engineers say that this great southern waterway cannot compare favourably or compete successfully with the great eastern route by way of the St. Lawrence. Although the Mississippi and the Ohio flow through a country possessed of every possible fertility, and prolific of every species of industry, the engineers, Messrs. McAlpine & Kirkwood, speak as follows:—

"The determination of the question of the best route for the water-borne trade to or from the west, is reduced to a comparison between the routes through the State of New York and that along the St. Lawrence."

So that, notwithstanding the enormous magnitude of the waters of the Mississippi and its tributary waters, affording inland navigation to such an enormous extent of territory, we find that nature has assisted us and made the great eastern route by way of the St. Lawrence the great carrying route for the trade of the far west. The St. Lawrence is the natural outlet of a great basin of inland waters. It drains an area of 400,000 square miles. The lakes and rivers alone represent 93,000 square miles. The area of territory, where commerce is tributary to the St. Lawrence outlet is 600,000 square miles. Its lakes contain fully one-half of the whole fresh-water of the globe. The stretch of navigable waters covered by the St. Lawrence and lakes and tributaries reaches not less than 4,000 miles. Then let us consider for a moment the distances. For instance, from Chicago to Liverpool the distance, *viâ* the Mississippi and New Orleans, is 6,006 miles; *viâ* the Erie Canal and New York, 4,600 miles; *viâ* the Welland Canal and the River St. Lawrence, 4,180 miles; but *viâ* the Trent Valley Canal and the St. Lawrence the distance is 4,025 miles, the shortest of all. Now, let me ask the House to listen for a moment to a comparison of the distances, *viâ* the Trent Valley Canal and the Welland Canal respectively, as shown by the evidence adduced before the commissioners. Of course, it may be said that so long as we have the Welland Canal there is no necessity for constructing the Trent

Valley Canal, and it may be said by those who are not familiar with the fact, that the distance by way of the Welland Canal would be just as short as that by way of the Trent Valley Canal; but such is not the fact. The statement given in evidence before the Trent Valley Canal Commission shows that from the Georgian Bay to Kingston by way of the Welland Canal the distance is 750 miles, while the distance by way of the Trent Valley Canal is only 370 miles, a little less than half. The time taken in going from the Georgian Bay to Kingston by way of the Welland Canal would be 139 hours, and by way of the Trent Valley Canal 98 hours, allowing the same length of time to go through the locks of the Welland Canal as through those of the Trent Valley Canal. It may be said, and very properly said, that the distance from the Georgian Bay to Kingston does not give altogether a fair comparison. Then take the distance from Sault Ste. Marie to Kingston: by way of the Welland Canal it is 795 miles, and by way of the Trent Valley Canal it is 540 miles. The time taken to go from Sault Ste. Marie to Kingston by the Welland Canal would be 145 hours, and the time taken to go by the Trent Valley Canal would be 124 hours. The question, too, is sometimes raised as to what trade there would be for the Trent Valley Canal. Let me ask the House to note this fact, that from the year 1884 to the year 1887 we sent from Collingwood 6,827,000 bushels of grain, and from Midland 7,841,894 bushels; besides the grain which was carried by way of the Welland Canal and by railways; so that it cannot be denied that there would be plenty of trade for the Trent Valley Canal after its construction. Then, let us consider the quantity of timber that would be carried. We know perfectly well that this canal would open up an immense forest territory and give a value to our forests in Ontario which they have not now. The estimated quantity of timber annually cut on the Georgian Bay and the northern districts tributary to the Trent Canal, for shipment eastward, including shingles, lath and lumber, is altogether 732,000,000 feet, all of which would be tributary to the Trent Valley Canal route, which would certainly have its proportion of the trade. I would like the House to notice this fact that, according to the report of Mr. Rogers, the engineer of the Government, and according to his evidence given before the Trent Valley Canal Commissioners, there is a shore line accessible to the Trent Valley Canal, when it will be constructed, of 1,345 miles, along which shore line there is unlimited wealth. There is along that line a country, perhaps in some respects not as fertile as the line along Lake Ontario, but, at all events, a very good farming country, and possessing unlimited forests and unlimited wealth so far as minerals and iron are concerned. In my own riding we have iron which is unsurpassed by any iron in any part in United States. Mr. Rattel, of Chicago, an eminent iron man, is reported to have said that it quite equals, if it does not surpass, in intrinsic worth, the iron of any mine in the United States, yet that iron mine is practically idle, whereas, if we had this canal, we would have, at all events, another way by which the iron of that and other mines throughout this district would find an outlet. Let me give, especially to the farmers in this House, some idea of the grain and the root products of that country which would be tributary to the canal. I take my figures from the evidence given before the commissioners and contained in their report, and will just give the total, so as not to take up any more time than is necessary, because I understand some hon. gentlemen opposite are desirous of speaking on this subject. I find that in the Counties of Northumberland, Hastings, Peterborough, Victoria, Haliburton, Ontario, Muskoka, Simcoe, and the north part of York, the fall wheat grown in these counties, according to the census returns of 1881, amounted to 2,045,208 bushels in one year; the spring wheat amounted to 2,410,891 bushels; barley, 5,959,829 bushels; oats, 9,869,955 bushels; rye, 329,949 bushels; pease, 2,245,820 bushels; corn, 168,282; buckwheat, 228,871; beans, 30,552 bushels; hay and clover, 272,045 tons; potatoes, 4,583,943 bushels; carrots, 973,096 bushels; and turnips, 12,284,476 bushels—the value of all which, according to the statement given to the commissioners, is estimated at $21,757,667 for the period of one year. I draw the attention of the House to these facts in order that they may see the importance of this district through which this canal will run, if it is ever built. Of course, my remarks must be, to a certain extent, uninteresting, by reason of the fact that I must refer very largely to statistics; but I am most anxious that the House should have this information, because I find, in discussing this question in private conversation, there is an utter want of knowledge of the fertility of the soil and the wealth beneath the soil of the country which this canal is to serve. I do not desire to minimize in any way the importance of any portion of the Dominion or to reflect upon any portion of the Dominion, but I may be permitted, without laying myself open to the charge of being invidious, to make comparisons between the district through which this canal will run and the other provinces, notably the Maritime Provinces. According to the census of 1881, the population in the Trent Valley district was 301,185, while the population of Prince Edward Island was only 108,891. The population of Nova Scotia was 440,572 and that of New Brunswick 321,233. This shows that the district I have mentioned contains as large a population almost as any one of the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and very much larger than the Province of Prince Edward Island. Then take the owners of land. In the Trent Valley district there were, according to the census of 1881, 42,288 owners of land, while in Prince Edward Island there were only 16,663, in Nova Scotia 67,129 and in New Brunswick 46,162. In the Trent Valley district the occupiers of land, according to the census of 1881, numbered 35,565, while in Prince Edward Island they numbered 13,629, in Nova Scotia 55,873, and in New Brunswick 36,837. You will see, therefore, how favourably this district compares with these provinces in that respect. Passing on to the growth of wheat, I find that we grew in the Trent Valley district 3,817,412 bushels of wheat per year, according to the census of 1881, while in Prince Edward Island they grew only 546,986 bushels, in Nova Scotia only 529,251 and in New Brunswick only 521,956. Take barley, In the Trent Valley district we grew 3,231,860 bushels, in Prince Edward Island they grew 119,368 bushels, in Nova Scotia, 228,748, and in New Brunswick, 84,183 bushels. So I might go on all the way down. I might quote oats,

rye, pease, buckwheat, corn, potatoes, turnips and other roots, hay, tamarack, birch, maple, elm, pine logs and other logs, and so on all the way down through an immense number of other articles, showing the growth and product to be much larger in the counties through which the Trent Valley Canal would run than in those provinces I have mentioned so heavily subsidized by the Dominion Government. I would ask permission of the House that I might be dispensed from reading this long statement and hand it to the reporters for publication.

Mr. FOSTER. That is against the rule.

Mr. BARRON. It has also been said in regard to this work that it would never pay. I have taken this statement, which I shall give to the House, from a report of an engineer whose name I am not at liberty to give at present.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. BARRON. The carrying capacity——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. BARRON. I must ask hon. gentlemen to keep order. I notice that the opposition to this discussion comes from the Conservative side of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BARRON. It is said that the canal would be open at least seven months in the year, and each vessel or barge will carry at least 15,000 bushels, and there would be 100 barges per day, which would give a carrying capacity of 1,500,000 bushels a day or 225,000,000 bushels a year. At 2 cents a bushel, that would be $4,500,000 of a revenue to be got from the carrying capacity as far as grain alone is concerned, and if our North-West ever comes to be that which hon. gentlemen say it will be, that which Sir Charles Tupper said it would be, if it ever produces that immense quantity of grain which I hope sincerely and believe it will produce, we must have some outlet such as this, and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot be surprised at the figures which I give them, showing that we would have 225,000,000 bushels going through that canal, which would afford a revenue, at 2 cents a bushel, of $4,500,000. These figures are fair and reasonable, speaking for the future, and I give them in order to show that this work will pay if our North-West Territories and Manitoba ever amount to that which we have been promised by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is also said that the water supply would not be sufficient. That is an argument I have heard used. It is said that there would not be sufficient water to work this canal when it was built, inasmuch as the height of water at what is known as Balsam Lake, would not be enough to supply the whole route. So far as that is concerned, I may refer to the report of the commissioners themselves on this subject, and they say:

"In regard to the practicability of the proposed route in regard to its water supply, the commissioners are of opinion that this has been established beyond question, both by the report of the engineer and by the evidence received."

I might refer to the evidence at length on this point; but I think the report of the engineer, based on the evidence is sufficient to satisfy any hon. gentleman that the water supply will be sufficient for this canal when it is constructed. Before closing, I want to draw the attention of the House to the canals on the other side of the line in order to show the enormous trade they do to-day. It has been said that the time for canals had passed by, that railroads do all the traffic. In answer to that argument, and it has been made time and time again, especially in regard to the construction of this work, I will refer to the canal statistics for 1890, and we find that the New York canals had a traffic from 1880 to 1890 in vegetable food alone amounting to 14,960,128 tons, and in heavy goods of 17,239,351 tons. To show that that has not been decreasing, I draw attention to the fact that in 1881 the total tonnage of vegetable food on the canals in the state of New York was 1,116,561 and in 1890, it was 1,167,901, giving an unanswerable argument in reply to the statement that the traffic on the canal, as an opposing route to the railway, is decreasing. In 1881, the traffic on the New York canals in heavy goods amounted to 1,827,287 tons, and in 1890 to 1,157,291, showing that the traffic in these goods is not decreasing. Turning to the Erie Canal, which is often spoken of in comparison with the Trent Valley Canal, and no doubt they bear some comparison, we find that from 1880 to 1890 there was cleared at Buffalo and Tonawanda by the Erie Canal 12,963,068 tons of vegetable food alone, or an average of 1,296,306 a year, and at Oswego by the Erie Canal 813,792. Take the amount of vegetable food carried on the New York Central and Erie Railways, and you find the average during those ten years was 426,083 tons. This shows that the traffic on these canals is not decreasing, but that, if it is not increasing, it is remaining just about where it was ten years ago. This speaks favourably for the future of the Trent Valley Canal, especially if we have the North-West and the North-Western States at the back of us, sending immense quantities of grain and produce which must find its way to the seaboard by the shortest route, and I have proved by unquestioned figures that the shortest route is that by the Trent Valley Canal. Now, when I tell the House that I have but touched upon the outward circle of the arguments in favour of this Trent Valley Canal, they will see what strong arguments can be adduced in favour of this great work. Certainly, I have not exhausted any of the arguments which can be adduced in its favour, and I have omitted numberless ones. If I have succeeded in interesting any hon. gentleman in the slightest degree in favour of this work, if I have induced him to enquire into it and study up the question to see whether we cannot support a grant in favour of its construction, then I shall have received my reward. I have felt it my bounden duty to speak upon this subject, because it is one of such vast importance to the people living in the Midland district of Ontario. In conclusion, I ask hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to take the matter in hand and to do one thing or the other. Let them tell the people whether they are going to construct the work or not, and if they are not going to do it then let them give way to some other hon. gentlemen who will be able to make up their minds whether they will do it or not. On this side of the House, at all events, there will be no uncertain sound. There will be no promises made just before election time, to be broken afterwards, as history shows has been the practice of the present Government. On this side you will

have good faith kept with the people: you will not see the people humbugged as they have been heretofore just before every election, but the people will be told honestly whether the work will be carried out or not. I now ask the Government to say yea or nay upon this subject once for all, in order to let the people know what they may expect.

Mr. STEVENSON. The people whom I have the honour to represent expect me to lay before the House the claims of the work which has been referred to by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron). Upon this subject I claim to know as much of the intentions of the present Government as that hon. gentleman does, and, perhaps, a little more. I claim to know that the gentlemen who compose the present Government have no intention or shifting or throwing over this great work. I claim to know that the promises which have been made were not merely electioneering dodges. Hon. gentlemen opposite and their newspapers have constantly declared that the promises of the Government to go on with this work were mere electioneering dodges; but I am able to tell the hon. gentleman that those promises were the honest and fair intentions of the Government, and it was really the intention of the late Minister of Railways to construct this work and carry it on to completion. The hon. gentleman has referred to a speech of mine made in Peterborough, wherein I said that the Minister of Public Works had given me an assurance that the contract between Peterborough and Lakefield would be let during the ensuing summer. I may have made a mistake on that occasion, because it was not the Minister of Public Works, but it was the late Minister of Railways and Canals who gave me that information. It will be remembered that during the second session of the late Parliament, deputation after deputation came here from the Trent Valley district, all the way from the Georgian Bay, being the largest deputation that ever appeared before this House, to urge upon the Government the necessity of the construction of this work. I myself have been upon five or six deputations that have waited upon the Government to urge upon them the necessity of going on with this work. I can assure any hon. gentleman that if he will take the trouble to go over the route and examine the chain of lakes, with only short stretches of land or small waterways between them, he will see at once the enormous advantages that would be derived by that section of the country from the construction of this canal, with a comparatively small expenditure. Now, it may be said that this is a very expensive undertaking. In some respects it may be expensive, but we are certain that in the long run the advantages will more than compensate for the expenditure. It must be remembered that this canal will pass through a mining region containing the Galway iron and lead mines and the Marmora iron mines—in fact, nearly all the mining districts in Western Ontario lie contiguous to the Trent Valley. This is not a work that will require the cutting of a canal through a long stretch of land, but involves merely the opening up of short stretches between lakes. I hold in my hand the commissioners' report, referred to by my hon. friend opposite. By that report I find, that of the proposed route, there are 126 miles already of navigable waterways, and the portion to be dug out will be only 57 miles. Of course, there are a number of locks on that line, and it is in consequence of the expensive class of locks found necessary in some portions of that line that an outcry has been raised that the canal will be too costly for this country to undertake. Some of those locks have cost in the neighbourhood of $60,000 each; for instance, the one at Burleigh, and the one at Fenelon Falls, whereas locks built twenty-five or thirty years ago, only cost about $25,000. The lock at Young's Point cost $30,000; at Peterborough, $26,000; at Lindsay, $28,000; at Bobcaygeon, $25,000. Now, we calculate this latter class of locks will be ample for all the purposes of that canal. I know it has been said by a great many people: Why do you need a canal? You have a railway from the Georgian Bay right through to Peterborough, is not that sufficient for you? Well, one reason why we want a canal is that we cannot bring heavy freight by that railway. Freight like coal, for instance, required for our manufactories, passes along the valley. Now, we know that coal is carried from Buffalo to Duluth for 25 cents a ton, and also from Buffalo to Midland for 25 cents a ton, as they get return cargoes, whereas freight from Midland to Peterborough would be $2 a ton. Coal brought from Ohio or Pennsylvania by way of Georgian Bay would cost $2.35 per ton to Peterborough, whereas if brought from Buffalo the cost would be $1.35, or nearly one-half. During the past year 50,000 tons of coal have been brought to Peterborough for our manufactures, and that fact gives some idea of what they will be in the future. We possess all along the line of the Trent Valley as fine water power as any in Ontario outside of Ottawa. The manufactures along there have been increasing, and are rapidly increasing to-day. Where are you going to grind the wheat coming from the North-West? At Peterborough we ground 400,000 bushels last year; and we have a head of water power there sufficient for almost any number of mills. I have already said that our manufactures are rapidly increasing. Only a short time ago only 200 tons of coal were brought into Peterborough, whereas 50,000 tons are now required. We, therefore, hold that we must have the Trent Valley Canal to enable us to bring our coal at cheaper rates and thus enable our manufacturers to produce goods at less cost. The whole country will be benefited by this canal. Not only will the counties on the direct line of the canal be benefited, but other sections of the country will be benefited likewise. I hold in my hand the report of the Trent Valley Commission. The commissioners were gentlemen from Toronto and Montreal, and not from Peterborough. They were engineers and went over the whole route, and then made a report to the Government. The commissioners not only declare that this canal will furnish sufficient water supply for all purposes, but they point out that it will be of vast advantage to the country in all respects, to the whole country on the route, while the north shore of Lake Huron, and even the north shore of Lake Superior will be benefited, as the people will be able to send their products east much cheaper by the Trent Valley Canal than by Lake Erie, and at the same time the dangers of the lakes will be avoided. The route will be an inland one for the whole distance. These are the grounds on which the people of my county demand that the Trent Valley Canal question shall receive the attention of this House and of the Government,

and why they hold that their claims on this subject should be paramount. While we do not for a moment say that the Welland Canal is not necessary and should not be maintained, still we think we have some rights in regard to our section of the country as well as other sections, and we feel confident that time will force any Government in power to build this great waterway and great outlet for the commerce of the North-West. It may be said, what are you doing in manufactures? The town of Peterborough a few years ago had a population of 4,000 or 5,000; now it has a population of 12,000. What has built it up? Manufacturing industries. These industries are constantly increasing, not only in that town but along the whole line of the canal. At Campbellford there is a very large factory, where a large quantity of coal is consumed. All the factories there use steam, and consequently consume a large quantity of coal. The Edison Manufacturing Company in Peterborough consumes no less than 7 tons daily. If we can show that a saving of 68 or 70 cents per ton would be saved by the construction of the Trent Valley Canal, that is surely a strong argument. It would also be the means of bringing other industries, and thus give employment to our young men, so that instead of driving them to seek employment in a foreign country we would have them at home manufacturing for ourselves. In Peterborough we have more than fifty American families from Massachusetts, Cleveland, and other places engaged in manufacturing. I can take you through the factories where they are employed, and some hon. gentlemen opposite know this to be the fact for they have been in the factories with me. On this question of the Trent Valley Canal we claim a hearing in this House, and we desire the fair and candid judgment of hon. members to be given as to the necessity of having this water-way. No less than sixteen or seventeen members are elected by constituencies on the line of this canal, and every one, without exception, has been instructed by his constituents to press the construction of this work on the Government. I am well aware the Government are doing all they can to make ends meet, and they have made some reductions on sugar duties; but I wish this House to understand that we must have this canal, and I wish the Government, whether the present Government is in power or a Government of hon. gentlemen opposite, to understand that they cannot expect we will rest satisfied unless they assist in its construction. It may be said a great many towns along the frontier are not manufacturing towns. I grant the truth of that statement, and in a great many cases it is their own fault. I know many towns where the people, instead of investing their money at 5, 6 or 7 per cent. elsewhere, might have put it into manufactures and thus built up the town. I recollect a good many years ago when a member in the upper House made a speech in our town, and said that manufacturing and farming must go hand in hand. "Look at the river running past," he said, "with all its dams and water-power, and yet no manufacturing is done in your town; how can you expect to prosper without manufactures?" I recollect that hon. gentleman, who was politically opposed to myself, urged that manufactures should be established in the town. I hold that our hope in Ontario is to manufacture for the North-West. The people there have to depend on us for their manufactured goods, and so long as we have water power and steam power, and plenty of men and boys, who are willing to come into town from the neighbouring farms, hundreds of whom are constantly asking for employment in the factories and are obtaining it, we can manufacture successfully. The sooner we know this and act on it, the better for the country. Our manufacturing establishments are now producing articles consumed by our farmers at less price than they can be bought across the line. I remember a few years ago that I went across the line and had to pay 15 or 20 per cent. duty on the goods I brought into this country. Now, under our system of protection we are enabled to manufacture the articles which we require, and to compete successfully with our neighbours across the line. I hope that we shall continue to do so, for I believe that the true policy for this country is protection and the National Policy. I regret very much that some gentlemen on the opposite side of the House have thought proper to run down our manufacturers and to call them bloated monopolists. The manufacturers in Canada are not bloated at all; they are trying to make a living for themselves and to give work to the artizans and labourers, and to help the farmers; and they do help the farmers and give them a home market for their produce. Before I left home, this morning, I met a farmer who is a good Reformer, and he said to me: We farmers want protection too; give us protection. I said to him what do you want, and he replied: Make the distillers pay 30 cents a bushel for their corn, and they will have to buy our barley, and we will get lots of protection then. I say to the Government: Put on 30 cents a bushel on the corn and the farmers will be protected. But, perhaps, this is outside the question of the Trent Canal, and I will return to that subject. I see in the report of the commissioners that they state that the locks are too large and too expensive, and I may say that the people of Peterborough were so dissatisfied with the cost of them, and the mode of construction, that they asked to have the engineer removed. We came down to Ottawa and saw the late Minister of Railways and Canals about the matter. We thought the engineer's plans too expensive, and that we should have three locks built for the cost of one he was building. I think I have shown that the locks could be built, so as to answer all purposes, at far less cost than the one built at Burleigh. Mr. Starke reported that the whole of the work could be constructed for about $4,000,000, and that is very wide of the first estimate, which was about $10,000,000. You can very easily spend a great deal of money on locks, or upon any other work, if you construct them as some of those have been constructed, while locks which would answer the purpose equally as well could have been built for one-half the money. Of course, some of the engineering work may be difficult, but the Peterborough section is simply all gravel, and there are no rocks to be blasted, and there are quarries near by to supply the stone. I think the Government will find on careful enquiry that the cost is greatly magnified above what it should be, and that the work would be equally suitable to all requirements, if they build a cheaper class of locks and cheaper masonry. We are not asking the Government for a very expensive work, but we

are asking them for the cheapest work which can be built to suit the requirements of the case. As I said before, the Government are trying to make both ends meet, and we are only asking them to put a reasonable sum in the Estimates for this work this year. We ask them to put a sum in the Estimates that will show they are determined to go on with this work in accordance with the promises that have been made to us; promises not made at election times but at other times, in view of the great importance of the project. Every Minister of the Crown, and in fact every man who has been over that route, have remarked what a foolish thing it was that we did not have locks to facilitate navigation in that district. We have there a lake 10 miles long and 60 feet deep and no means of getting through westward, in consequence of a railway bridge on which there is no opening, but the Government have promised to remove that evil very shortly and I believe they will do it. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Barron) has quoted figures to the House this afternoon bearing on this canal, but figures are a very dry subject, and I do not think I can add anything more to what he has said, because as a rule he is pretty well posted about this matter. The hon. gentleman has read from the report of the commissioners which is very exhaustive, that they believe this canal would be a paying work when it is built, and I believe they are correct in this prophecy. These commissioners were not influenced by anybody, they passed over the route, taking evidence wherever they went, and I am sure if any hon. member of this House had been there he would have come to the same conclusion that the commissioners did. When they heard the evidence, that we were paying more than double what we should pay for fuel; a thing above all other things which it is absolutely necessary for the people to have, and when they heard that the iron mines which lie right at the very edge of the canal, at Galway and Marmora, were almost idle for want of coal, they saw the importance of the work. They have tried to work these mines with wood, but to develop them to any extent they have got to get coal and coke, and the only possible way of getting it in there at a reasonable price is by water and not by rail. It may be said that we can get the coal by rail, but hon. gentlemen know as well as I do that railways combine. We have two railways there now, but the freight rate is exactly the same on both. If we had five railways they would always combine about prices, and until we get the canal we need not expect to be in a better position than we are in now. We, therefore, urge upon this House, and upon the Government, to proceed with the construction of this canal; and we urge it upon them, because we think it is absolutely necessary to build up the industries of the country, and to give us a good water way from Lake Huron to Trenton on Lake Ontario. This may not be done in a short time, for it will take years to complete, but we are making rapid strides in the development of the country, and I do not despair of seeing this water-way fully opened before many years pass. It has been a long time under consideration, it is true, but the Government and the country have had a great deal to do in the meantime. They have been building railways at race-horse speed; they have been building canals very extensively, and they had calls upon them from more important sections of the country than ours, as in the case of the St. Lawrence and Welland Canals. As these great works are now completed, I think the least the Government can do would be to give us assistance to open up the Trent Valley Canal, and, at all events, to complete one section of it at least during the next three or four years. I trust that the Government and the House will see the necessity of doing something to carry out the completion of this important work. I believe that it has been retarded because hon. gentlemen in this House and the people of the country have not had a better knowledge of its importance, and of the large and valuable section of the country which it will develop. I am sure that if the members of this House travelled along the route of that canal and saw the country in which it will be constructed they would be unanimous in voting that the work; should be proceeded with. Hon. gentlemen no doubt have heard this project talked about for the last twenty-five years, but I am afraid they have not studied closely the importance of the work, because nothing has been done all that time therefore it is not necessary. Now, Sir, it is absolutely necessary to have this work done, and I believe that the Government intend to open up this highway as soon as possible.

Mr. BURNHAM. I do not know whether I have prevented an advocate of this canal from addressing the House in the person of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Welsh), who got up at the same time as I did. If so, I would very much regret it, because so far as I know the only member of the Opposition in this House who has spoken in favour of the project is the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), who has spoken to-night. He referred to the fact that I was not in my place when he commenced his remarks, saying that he had extended a cordial invitation to me to take part in this discussion. Well, Sir, I do not require any invitation from the hon. member for North Victoria, or from any other member of this House to speak in the House, and I do not need to be told that my duty as a member of Parliament is to be in my place in the House at all times.

Mr. BARRON. May I interrupt the hon. gentleman? I think he quite misunderstands me. There was no invitation from me to him to be present. I simply told him when I was going to speak, with the view of his being here when I should speak.

Mr. BURNHAM. At all events, reference was made to my not being in the House previous to six o'clock. I do not know exactly what I lost by not being here at that time. However, if the hon. gentleman sees fit to lecture me on parliamentary practice, I think it is open to me to do the same. He has made a very lengthy speech here to-night, and he has quoted largely from the report of the commission and the evidence given before it, which I understand was laid on the Table of this House by the acting Minister of Railways. That report, I understand, was laid there for the benefit of the members of this House, but I have not had the opportunity of seeing or reading it, for the reason that, so far as I know, it has been locked up in the desk of the hon. member for North Victoria from the day it was laid on the Table of the House to the present time. So that I am at some disadvantage to-night in speaking of the report. Now,

Sir, as the hon. gentleman has said, this is a very old project. It was projected as far back as 1827, in the days of the old Province of Upper Canada. At that time the Government were looking for the easiest and most secure route through the centre of Upper Canada from the northern lakes to Lake Ontario. They found this natural depression through the centre of Upper Canada occupied by rivers and streams, which is well described in the report of the commissioners, as follows :—

"In considering the bearing of the canal upon the development of the trade and natural resources of the country through which it will pass, it should be noted that the conditions are peculiar, inasmuch as it would act as a connecting link in a chain of lakes and streams which, for the most part, lie transversely to the line of the canal, and that it would therefore afford access to an extent of country and coast much greater than usual in a canal of its length."

Now, it is a peculiarity of this particular route that it is a valley filled with a series of lakes connected by short streams which require deepening to make them navigable, and a number of falls and rapids which require to be overcome by locks. The whole length of the canal from the Georgian Bay to the Bay of Quinté is about 206 miles, of which about 150 miles are naturally navigable. When that work was brought to the attention of the Government of Upper Canada in 1827, they employed engineers to make reports upon it, and funds were voted for the construction of the work. Commissioners were appointed, known as the commissioners for the improvement of the waters of the Newcastle district. That commission built a number of locks which will form part of the proposed system. They have been in operation something over 50 or 60 years. In 1841 that commission was in existence, but it ceased with the union of the provinces. At that time the project of building the Welland Canal was taken up, it being thought more important to have a route through the Niagara Peninsula. Now, I think it would have been better for the Province of Upper Canada, as well as for the country as a whole, if the Trent Valley Canal had been built at that time instead of the Welland Canal. The Welland Canal may have been a benefit to Montreal, bringing freight there, and it may have afforded the Americans an opportunity to take their produce to the seaboard; but the securing of a passage through the narrow strip of the Niagara Peninsula has not been of as great benefit to the Province of Ontario as a canal would have been, opening up the central portion of the province. Therefore, the people residing in that district have never ceased to take an interest in this work or to look forward to its completion. This canal has always had strong advocates in this House. The late Mr. Conger brought it to the attention of the Government previous to 1867, and had a commission appointed to enquire into it; and since that time the public interest in it has not diminished. There are ten or twelve constituencies bordering on this route which would be immediately benefited by it. There is something over 1,300 miles of coast line on its length, and the produce of the district tributary to these works, it has been estimated, includes something like 25,000,000 bushels of grain; and I think the census will show that the population of the district is something over half a million. Now, Sir, it has been urged as one objection to this work, that the days of canals have gone by. We do not find it so, however, in the United States. On the contrary, we find that large appropriations are made there for the construction of new canals. The Erie Canal, which was built for the purpose of bringing the trade of the western states to the City of New York, has not only paid its own cost, but has built up the State of New York and made it the empire state that it is; and notwithstanding all the routes running from Chicago to New York—I do not know how many there are, but an hon. member says 17—we find that 60 per cent. of all the western grain brought to the City of New York at the present time is carried by the Erie Canal. Statistics show that 30 per cent. of all the grain and heavy commodities that reach New York are carried by the Erie Canal. The Erie Canal, compared with the proposed work, is a mere ditch, because it is an artificial work. The locks on the proposed canal are 33 feet in width and 134 feet in length, whereas those on the Erie Canal are only 17 feet in width or about one-half the width of those on the Rideau Canal. Now, another advantage this canal would have over the Erie Canal is this, that the Erie, being an artificial ditch, steamers cannot be used on it, whereas on this canal steamers can be used, because there will be no danger of the banks being washed away. On the Erie Canal, however, nothing of that kind could be attempted, as there would be great danger of washing away the banks. With regard to the district through which the Trent Valley Canal is to run, its capabilities have been well stated by the hon. member for North Victoria, and in the evidence before the commission it is admitted that the canal will give an opening to the agricultural products, mines and timber of one of the wealthiest districts in these respects in Ontario. In addition to the pine timber, the canal will open up a market for the very best hardwood, which is not floatable and will not bear transportation on railways on account of the expense. Iron is there also in great quantities, and could be developed and carried much cheaper by water than by rail. These matters have been largely dealt with by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), who has also spoken of the cheapness and the shortness of the route for vessels leaving Duluth or Chicago carrying grain to Montreal. Of course, it is not pretended that any vessel leaving Chicago or Duluth with grain could reach Lake Ontario by this canal, because the grain will be treated the same as cargoes brought from the western states to Buffalo, where it is trans-shipped into barges. Those barges leaving Lake Huron and coming through the Bay of Quinté would have practically land locked navigation all the way to Kingston, as they would come down the Bay of Quinté behind the islands and reach Kingston without being exposed to danger from lake navigation. A vessel leaving Chicago has to come down through Lake Huron, Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, and the most dangerous part of navigation is through these lakes, whereas the distance from Lake Huron to the Bay of Quinté around by the lakes is something over four hundred miles more than by the canal route. We cannot at present say that there is a grain trade from our North-West to be carried to the seaboard equal to that of the western states, but we hope we will have it, and if the production of our North-West is in the same proportion as that of the north-western states, as we believe it

will be, three or four Canadian Pacific Railways will not be sufficient to carry it. The Canadian Pacific Railway cannot carry the grain to-day out of the North-West, but has to depend upon the water navigation from Port Arthur, without which they could not handle the trade. This will only be an auxiliary route, and I believe we cannot have too many routes if we want to develop the North-West. I believe, further, that vessels bringing grain from the western states or from any particular locality along the canal to Kingston will get return freights. I believe water-borne freight is cheaper than any other. We know that water-borne freight from Chicago to New York, by the Erie Canal, is charged a cheaper rate than the rates upon the railways, and these are to a large extent governed by the water competition. If the railways had not the Erie Canal to compete against, they would make the people of the west pay a good deal more for the carriage of their grain. This is evident from the fact that during the season of navigation, at all events, the rates of freight on grain and other products are reduced on account of the water competition, and it is calculated that if we had this route open to us, it would mean a saving of about 6 cents a bushel on every bushel of grain grown in that particular section, and a saving of about $2.50 on every thousand feet of lumber produced in that district. Those considerations are worthy of attention. One of the objections made is, supposing you carry the grain by the canal, what return freight will you have? But vessels can carry grain from the Bay of Quinté through the Murray Canal across the lake to Oswego and bring return freight home, or go to Kingston and bring back Nova Scotia coal to the interior of Ontario. If we had that canal, we could carry Nova Scotia coal to the centre of Ontario, so that there are advantages all round as far as we can see. Another objection is that the days of canals are passed, and that railroads will be the only means of carrying freight in the future. I have shown that railroads are not sufficient, but that there is also work for canals, and that in other countries there are at present canals still being constructed. With reference to this particular work, we have had engineers' estimates, and these engineers have put their figures very high. They have estimated for a very expensive class of work, works of the class already constructed there, and which need not have been so expensive by any means. The cost of these works could be reduced very materially. The commissioners stated that the locks might be narrowed in width and be made of less expensive materials, so that $20,000 could be taken off the cost of a lock, instead of building locks such as they have now. In the evidence in the report, there is reference made also to improvements in the system of constructing canals and especially to what is known as the lift lock. Instead of building six and seven locks in a nest, they use on the improved canals in England, Belgium and France what is called the lift lock; that is, no matter what may be the height, they make one lock work by hydraulic pressure and the barge is lifted from the lower to the higher level in one operation. Mr. Turner, one of the commissioners, was struck by that fact, when recently in England, and he referred to it in the report. I believe the adoption of the lift locks in the canal would effect a very considerable saving, in addition to the other reduction I have mentioned in the nature of the construction of the work. The hon. gentleman who brought up this subject has stated that the Government have been very profuse in promises, and that they used this project whenever there was an election. I do not deny that political capital may have been made out of it, but if the hon. gentleman occupies the position he does here, he owes his seat to this proposed canal, so that probably in self-defence he has to take the position of an earnest advocate of that work. No doubt he is sincere, but, at all events, it is a necessity for him to appear here in that character, if he wants to retain the confidence of his constituents. I must acknowledge that I am in the same position, and so is my hon. friend from West Peterborough; but, irrespective of politics and party feeling, there is a strong desire on the part of all the people in that section to have that work built. I do not appeal to this House for the construction of this work on the same grounds as those taken by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron). He proposes to consider the amount of money expended on public works and railway subsidies in other provinces, but he says he believes that a great Dominion should be built up here. I do not believe that the way to build up a great Dominion is to appeal to sectional feeling. If a work is a good one, it should be constructed, no matter what any Government may have expended money on in other places. If this work is not for the benefit of Canada, then the Government should not undertake it, and I do not want them to consider what they have spent in this or that province, but to take up this work as one for the benefit of the whole Dominion. It may be of more local benefit to the district through which it goes, but it will be for the benefit of the whole country. As my hon. friend from North Victoria has said, the commissioners have reported in favour of the construction of this work. They went there ignorant of the nature and of the advantages of that work. As to Mr. Turner, we naturally felt that he would be rather inclined to be opposed to it because he would be more interested in the Welland Canal, but it struck him, as it struck Sir Charles Tupper in 1882 when he went over that work, that here was a natural channel almost complete and only wanting a few works to make it perfect, and he acknowledged that he had no idea that such a natural water system existed through the heart of the Province of Ontario. The commissioners, Mr. Kennedy, of Montreal, and Mr. Turner, of Toronto, neither of whom was in favour of the work from anything they had previously known about it, were struck with its advantages and with the provision made by nature towards the completion of such a work. A considerable portion of this work is now utilized, and I suppose there are twenty or thirty steamers on these waters and using these locks. About nine miles above Peterborough there are some sixty or seventy miles of navigation through the chain of lakes and through the locks which have been constructed latterly and fifty years before, and forty miles below Peterborough there is a chain of navigation through locks which were constructed in 1834 or 1835. I advocate this as an entire work to connect the waters of the Georgian Bay with those of Lake Ontario, but continuous navigation on the parts already built is prevented by the non-construction of the work between Peter-

borough and Lakefield which should be proceeded with at all events. The Government have always shown their earnest desire to foster this work, and we have the promises to which the member for North Victoria has referred. We have the telegram from Sir John Macdonald which the hon. member read, and we always felt that he was in favour of that project. In that district we feel—not only those who were his supporters, but his opponents also—that we have lost a good friend in the late Minister of Railways and Canals. He knew the district as a citizen of the Province of Ontario, and we felt that we had his earnest sympathy in the matter. The Government now are not in just the same position. The portfolio of railways is not permanently filled, but we believe the Government have the information upon which they can act, and I hope they will continue the work and bring it to completion. It has been shown that the expense can be reduced very much below what the engineers stated by adopting the recommendation of the commission as to the size of the different locks, so that the question of expense, which has been so often referred to as against the work, will vanish altogether.

Mr. CORBY. I have listened to the remarks of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), and, as this canal passes through a part of my constituency, I suppose I may be allowed to make a few remarks in regard to it. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) is not sincere in coming before this House and advocating this canal. I certainly think, from his speech, from the time it took him to deliver it and the time it must have taken him to prepare it, that he expected to deliver it at the last session of Parliament instead of at the first. He refers to the appointment of the commissioners as having been a political dodge. Now, the hon. member's speech to-night is a political dodge for his own constituency and not in behalf of the Trent Valley Canal. He pitches into the Government because there is no amount put into the Estimates for this canal. Will the hon. gentleman wait till the Supplementary Estimates come down, when I think the Government will put in an amount which will be satisfactory to that part of the country. I stand up here to advocate the building of that canal. As representing West Hastings, where the eastern terminus of that canal will be, I may say that the town of Trenton is a very flourishing town, that it has one of the best water privileges in the country, that it has one of the largest lumber concerns in the Dominion. It is said that Messrs. Gilmour & Co.'s mill is the largest mill in Canada. The town of Trenton has expended about $100,000 in building water-powers and race-ways, which have put in shape a water-power amounting to about 2,000 horse-power. I think this canal would bring a large business to the town of Trenton and to the Bay of Quinté district. I have not gone over the Trent Valley Canal and am not thoroughly posted in the route, but I think it would be a great boon to that part of the country. We have the Murray Canal now open, and vessels going to Oswego and Rochester can go through the canal instead of going by the Bay of Quinté and out through the lower or upper gap. I got up, because I knew that the member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) would not like to see anyone on this side of the House advocating the construction of this canal. I desire to say, that I am in favour of it, and I hope the Government will put enough in the Supplementary Estimates to proceed with the construction of this work.

Mr. HAGGART. I wish to say a few words on the subject which has been occupying the time of the House for the last three or four hours in reference to building a canal from the Bay of Quinté to the Georgian Bay. I myself individually, as a member of the Cabinet, am in favour of the construction of this work, as I believe it would be a great benefit to the country. I believe that in the development of water-powers alone, aside from the advantage which will accrue to trade in the carriage of goods through this canal, the building of dams for the purpose of equalizing the distribution of water throughout the year, and the effect it will have on the diminution of freight rates in the different sections of the country through which this canal will pass—I believe all these advantages will far more than compensate the expenditure that that will be required to construct the canal. I know the section of country through which the canal is being built; I know that it passes through as fine an agricultural country as there is in the Dominion. I know, as some hon. gentlemen have stated here to-night, that it passes through the whole extent of one of the best timbered sections in the Dominion. All along the banks of the canal until you get up into the rough sections at Lake Simcoe and to the north of that, there are acres of fine deposits of mineral, phosphates, iron, and other ores as there are in any other country in the world. I believe the building of that canal would be a great advantage, not only to that section of the country, but to the Dominion at large, and I may here state that the policy of the Government in regard to it is the same as it has always been. A telegram of the late Sir John A. Macdonald in reference to the construction of this canal has been quoted, also a speech of Sir Charles Tupper on the subject. The policy of the Government is confirmed by the report of the engineers who have surveyed the route and have fully considered the proposed construction, and have showed how, possibly, a large reduction may be made in the cost of construction; and this report has confirmed the policy of the Government and rendered its determination stronger than it ever was before. It is true that the amount in the Estimates is small; but, as the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) mentioned, the reason of that is patent to every member of the House; we have made a large reduction in the taxes imposed upon the people, and we are obliged to be economical this year, but I hope that in some subsequent year we may be able to increase the sum and that we may be able to give the amount that we intend to expend upon it. My principal object in getting up to speak now is for the purpose of stating that the policy of the Government is entirely unchanged in reference to the building of that great work. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) has given us a flowery description of that region of country, of the amount of freight that has passed through the canal, and he read an extract from some engineer's report stating that 225,000,000 bushels of grain will pass through that canal; I suppose he vouches for it, although he did not give the name of the engineer whose letter he read

on the subject, and who states that at 2 cents a bushel the receipts from the canal would be $4,500,000. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have no such roseate anticipations of revenue as the hon. gentleman appears to have. We have no expectation that an amount of grain will pass through that canal greater by far than the total exports of the whole continent of North America in the form of cereals, because 225,000,000 bushels of grain is nearly double the amount of all the grain in the form of wheat, oats, pease, barley and all other agricultural products, in the form of breadstuffs, that are exported from this country to all the countries in the world.

Mr. BARRON. What was Sir Charles Tupper's statement.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know; I am speaking about your statement. I believe, as the hon. gentleman from Peterborough stated, that the canal would prove a great advantage in carrying through freight from Chicago to the ocean, that large ships, instead of passing through the Welland Canal and passing down to Kingston and there unloading into barges, may possibly adopt the shorter route and go to the end of the Georgian Bay and be unloaded there and be taken down through our Murray Canal, through the sheltered Bay of Quinté, where they will not be subject to storms on the lake, and thence onward to the ocean. I believe that a work of that kind would be of great benefit to the Dominion, and an immense benefit to the section of country in which it is built, and we all know that the indirect advantages in the shape of developing water powers and manufactories on canals, will sometimes more than compensate for the amount of money expended upon the canal. I conclude by repeating the assurance which I give to the hon. gentlemen who have spoken before me, that the policy of the Government in reference to assisting this project and building this canal remains unchanged.

Mr. WELSH. I am not acquainted with the locality of this proposed canal. During this session we have had several matters before us involving requests for grants to railways, and to-night there is a demand made for aid to a canal, There is no motion before the House, not from the Government, at all events, asking for a grant for the construction of this canal. From what I understand, this canal will cost from five to six millions of money. I merely rise to put in my protest against aiding any of these projected canals or railways until the Prince Edward Island tunnel is taken in hand. The hon. gentleman from Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson), the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Barron) and the Postmaster General have all spoke in favour of this work, so that it is not necessary for me to take up the time of the House in discussing it. But I wish to give notice to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that I for one, and I am sure every hon. gentleman representing Prince Edward Island will agree with me, will not listen to any vote for aiding any work of such a magnitude as this canal, until the Prince Edward Island tunnel is taken into consideration by the Government. In the matter of this tunnel, and also in many other matters, when we ask the Government for a fish they give us a stone. I think it is high time there was a change. The hon. member for Peterborough, while speaking about this canal, rambled away and began to talk about the National Policy, about its giving employment to people and encouraging home manufactures. He says that we make all we want, and buy everything cheaper. Well, Mr. Speaker, I tell him that the less said about the National Policy the better. Nearly twelve months ago the late Parliament was dissolved because it was a moribund Parliament, and therefore it was claimed that not being fresh from the people we were not able to discuss the question of reciprocity. The late Sir John A. Macdonald proposed to send delegates to the United States on the 4th of March to obtain a reciprocity treaty. Well, we have lived since the 4th of March, and this new Parliament is not a moribund Parliament. After the election several members of the Government went to the United States and they came back without making any treaty, and I am sure that this Parliament will be a moribund Parliament before they get reciprocity. I think that the prosperity of this country depends altogether on obtaining unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. FOSTER. A canal.

Mr. WELSH. No, Sir, you may put a tunnel in if you like. We do not hear from hon. gentlemen representing the Government on that side of the House concerning this tunnel, but just before the election they sent down telegrams promising it to us. One hon. gentleman, a senator, who had devoted years of his life to bring that matter before the people, resigned his seat in the Senate and came down to Prince Edward Island, and ran an election on the tunnel question. Every member who is elected from the Island, either Liberal or Conservative, endorsed that ticket, and we are all in favour of the tunnel. But since the election, we hear very little about it. I see the member from Toronto is here. He had better keep quiet, or I will put the Conservative member for King's on his back, and he will then have the old man of the seas on him. I am glad there is no motion to expend some millions on this canal that has been discussed, for I will oppose any large grant to any public work until the Prince Edward tunnel is taken in hand.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. ALLISON. Before the Estimates are proceeded with, I should like to obtain the information promised by the Minister the other night. The information had reference to item 53 of the first Supplementary Estimates, $6,000 for new dredging plant. I should like to get answers to the three questions I asked: Where was this plant built? By whom was it built? Who now has it in possession?

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid we passed these items on the following night. As I was not reminded of these questions, the answers were not given.

Mr. ALLISON. I was not here that night.

Mr. FOSTER. I will get the book and see that the hon. gentleman gets the information.

Indians, British Columbia—Schools... $43,730

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to obtain from the Minister some account of what is going on in the British Columbia schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman will recollect that about two years ago we established three industrial schools in British Columbia, one at Kamloops, one at Kuper Island and one at Kootenay, and it is proposed this year to establish one at Williams Lake, in the northern part of the province. It is estimated to cost $6,480.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the number of pupils?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There were 23 at Kamloops, 17 at Kuper Island, 22 at Metlakahtla. There is no return from the Kootenay school, as it was not completed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The attention of the House should be called in exceedingly strong terms to this item. It appears that 23 pupils at Kamloops cost $12,583, or $500 per head.

Mr. MARA. That included the cost of the building, furnishing and starting the school.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then we will take the Metlakahtla school. They expended $5,200 in educating 22 Indian children; and that is too much to ask from the white people of the Dominion, unless the Government are able to give sufficient explanation.

Mr. DEWDNEY. A great deal of that is for furniture.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see there are certain items, but they are not very large ones.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We expect a large increase in attendance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be; but making all possible allowance, to ask the people of Canada to pay for these twenty-two Indian children at Metlakahtla at the rate of $220 per head per annum seems to me a very extravagant charge, and unless there be some special cause that is not apparent on the face of it, it seems that we are wasting our money at a very heavy rate for the instruction of these Indians for whom we ought not to be specially chargeable. The land is held by the British Columbia Government, and it occurs to me it is their duty to look after their own Indians under such circumstances.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Government, under the terms of the treaty, agreed to look after them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They might do it at a considerably cheaper rate. We are paying for these Indians a sum considerably in excess of what would be paid for white children under similar circumstances. I think the hon. gentleman should revise these Estimates with more care.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think we have been rather niggardly for years as regards Indian education in British Columbia, and it is only within the last two or three years that we have taken a new departure. This may look a little extravagant if you average the amount you see here per head, but you will find that a number of these items, with regard to the furnishing of schools, will not occur again. We expect a much greater number of Indian children, and we will be able to educate them there.

Mr. MARA. I think the expense of the British Columbia Indians to the Government last year was something under $2 a head, and even with the additional items for new schools I imagine it will not exceed $2.50 per head, as against $20 in the North-West Territories. The management of the Indians in British Columbia is so small *per capita* that the hon. gentleman should not object to it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the case of the Indians in the North-West, we have received the whole territory, but in the case of the British Columbia Indians we got nothing at all. There is a very good reason for this expenditure for the North-West Indians, because they were possessors, in a fashion, of the entire territory in the North-West, and when they surrendered their lands to us we undertook specific obligations to them. In their case a large part of the expenditure is the payment of a debt due by the people of Canada to those Indians whom they have dispossessed of their hunting grounds and territories, but that does not apply to the Indians in British Columbia.

Mr. MARA. All the same, the Indians of British Columbia are the wards of the Government, which is supposed to look after them. The Indians in British Columbia are self-sustaining, and cost the Government comparatively little, and when you look at the cost of $2.50 per head for the Indian population of British Columbia, you will see that it is very small.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That does not bear on this particular item. The question is whether or not the rate at which we are expending money for these industrial schools is a reasonable one or an unreasonable one. How many children do you expect to be able to maintain at Metlakahtla, and what do you expect will be the cost per head?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We expect to be able to maintain about 40, and it is estimated that all the industrial schools in British Columbia will cost $130 per head.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are you going to do with these people afterwards?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We will make them good citizens, and teach them to read and write so as to be able to earn their own living. I think by education, it is the only way we can civilize the Indian, and I think as the other expenditures decrease, in justice to the Indian we must pay more for education.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is the duty of the Government to educate them, but it is not part of the duty of the Government to educate them at an extravagant rate. It does seem that the charges for these pupils in that institution are out of all proportion. I thoroughly believe in educating them as far as possible, but the most they have a right to expect is a common school education. Surely the hon. gentleman is doing a great deal more than that when he asks for the enormous expenditure of $43,730. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether or not supplies for the Indians in the North-West and elsewhere are all obtained by contract, and if the lowest tender is accepted; such supplies as tea, sugar, salt, coal oil, &c.?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the North-West Territories?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Yes.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; they are obtained by tender.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). All of them?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Are any of these schools in British Columbia denominational?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are of different denominations. The Metlakahtla school is Protestant Episcopalian; the Kamloops school, Roman Catholic; All Hallows and Yale, Protestant; Chilliwack, Methodist; Kootenay, Roman Catholic, and the one we propose to establish at Williams Lake will be Roman Catholic. The schools are of the denomination of which the Indians are in the districts in which they are situated.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Has there been an application for the establishment of other schools by any other church?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was told last night by a Methodist clergyman, that the Methodists had applied for Government aid to some of their schools there for the Indians, and that they were unable to get a grant.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I know of no application from the Methodists in British Columbia for any school. I know that they have made application for aid to an hospital on the west coast.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The gentleman who told me was the president of the Methodist Conference. He told me that they had three schools, and that they were unable to get the assistance they wanted from the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know where they are, unless they be the four day schools for which we have made provision in our Estimates this year. I have not a memorandum of what denomination they belong to.

Mr. TROW. If the supplies for these Indians are bought by tender, the prices appear to me to be extravagant—beef at 12 cents a pound, and butter at 30 cents a pound.

Mr. DEWDNEY. These are the ordinary prices in British Columbia. The supplies for the schools were not bought by contract, neither are the supplies generally in British Columbia, for the same reason that we are not able to buy our supplies in Ontario by contract. It is impossible to know what is wanted until the application is made. The supplies mentioned in the Auditor General's Report were not bought by tender, because the buildings were completed and the furniture was put in, and we wished to get the schools started, and the officers were instructed to get the supplies. In future the supplies for the industrial schools will be got by contract; but generally the supplies are given to the sick, the aged and the indigent, and it is impossible to estimate what will be required for any one year. When the fishing is good in certain parts there is no necessity of giving any relief whatever, but sometimes the fishing fails, and then we have to support the Indians. I may state, with reference to the estimated cost of the Indians in British Columbia of $130 *per capita*, that that is less than the average cost of Indians in the United States in their industrial schools.

Mr. TROW. I notice that corned beef costs 7 cents a pound, while fresh beef costs 12 cents a pound. It strikes me that the one would be as good for the Indians as the other, if not better.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I fancy that corned beef was got when fresh beef could not be got.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I see that bacon is charged at 25 cents a pound and tea at 57½ cents a pound. Surely these are extravagant prices.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Where is that?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Williams Lake Agency.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is three or four hundred miles in the interior, and these supplies have to be carried that distance by ox teams.

Mr. MARA. Williams Lake is so far in the interior that even if these supplies were purchased by tender, you would have to pay that price, because only one man would tender. At Kamloops the Government agent and the principal of the school went to the different stores and got a list of their prices, and they apportioned the supplies to those stores where they could get them best and cheapest. In reply to the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), I may say that the price of fresh beef in Victoria is from 15 cents to 18 cents a pound, so that if only 12 or 13 cents a pound is paid at Kuper Island, it is a low price. Butter is also very high priced in British Columbia. The farmers demand from 25 to 30 cents a pound for fresh butter in summer, and they get from 40 to 50 cents, and even as high as 60 cents a pound, in winter, so that 30 cents a pound is not a high but a low price. Bacon is not made in British Columbia; it is mostly obtained from Hamilton.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask my hon. friend why beef should be so dear in British Columbia, which I understand is a grazing country?

Mr. MARA. There are several reasons why beef was high in price a year ago when the supplies were purchased. The winter previous was very severe, and the price of cattle in the spring was very high. Then there has been a sudden growth of the towns on the coast. Vancouver has grown from nothing a few years ago to a city of 16,000 to-day; Victoria has doubled in population within a year or two; and Westminster has also doubled in population in a short time. The farmers in the interior were not able to supply those cities with the quantity of cattle they required in the spring of the year, and the prices were correspondingly high. My hon. friend will recollect that the winter previous was a very severe one; a number of shippers and drovers had to ship cattle from Oregon.

Mr. LAURIER. That would be an accidental reason, applying to that year only; but I understand that these high prices are the prices in British Columbia, not only for one season but for all seasons.

Mr. MARA. They are in Victoria and Vancouver, because the cattle are raised several hundred miles in the interior, and, of course, it costs considerable to bring them to the coast. The prices you are now quoting are at Kuper Island, some few miles from Victoria. The price of beef at Kamloops would be perhaps 10 cents or 12 cents a pound, not more than that.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). How many Indians are in charge of the North-West Coast Agency?

Mr. DEWDNEY. 4,039.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I observe that you spent in that agency last year $10,164, of which $4,155 was for salaries, and $1,878 for medicine. How many employés are there, and was there any

epidemic that necessitated this enormous expenditure in medicine?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Indian Report shows exactly how the charge for salaries stands. The agent receives $1,800 a year and keeps himself.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does he get anything for travelling allowance?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; he gets the regular allowance, $2 or $2.50 per day. Some of the agents get $2 and some of the higher officials get $3.50 per day travelling allowance. Then there is $1,679.12 paid Mr. Wooden, stipendiary magistrate, from 1st July, 1889, to 1st of February, 1890. That was paid under arrangement between the Provincial Government and ourselves, when there was some difficulty on the North-West Coast. We had to keep a stipendiary magistrate there three years, but that arrangement has expired, so that this expense will not occur again. Then, there is the wages of the engineer on the steamer *Vigilant*, $375. That is the steamer we have on the coast. There is also the wages of the pilot.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). But the amount paid the stipendiary magistrate and the wages of the engineer and pilot are charged separately and are not included in this $4,155.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Well, there are the salaries of the school teachers.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Why are these items charged to Indian account?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Because they are all in connection with the Indian agency. A boat is kept purposely for the agent to visit the different reserves, extending over 700 miles, and the agent also acts as Custom house officer, and part of his duties is to try and put a stop to whiskey traffic on the coast.

Mr. McMULLEN. There are travelling expenses for the stipendiary magistrate, $897.50. Is that for the year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Those were paid in closing up Mr. Wooden's account, including his travelling expenses down to Victoria.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a charge of $71.79 for legal expenses.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That must have been with reference to some difficulty in the Metlakahtla district which Mr. Wooden was sent to settle. Two or three Indians were arrested and brought down to Victoria.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that the expenses of the stipendiary magistrate's office amount to $493. It appears to me there are a great many items in connection with these schools which are altogether too extravagant, and I think it would be well that some investigation should be made into these expenditures. The Minister must come to the conclusion that there is room for cutting down in many of these cases. The salary of the stipendiary magistrate is $1,600 and he has $900 for travelling expenses.

Mr. MARA. That office is no longer in existence.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is only half the salary. The Provincial Government paid half the salary.

Mr. TROW. What are the regulations as to the election of the headmen of the tribe? I see that some tribes have twenty headmen when the Indians are very few in number. A headman gets $15, while a common Indian gets only $5, and a chief gets $25. Was that arrangement in the treaty?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The numbers were arranged in the treaty for every band.

Mr. TROW. But what would happen when the band decreases in numbers?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We do not appoint a chief if we can possibly avoid it. We find we can get along very much better without a chief.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The Minister was giving me some information as to the salaries of the officials in this agency, but he did not finish.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot offer to make an explanation of the accounts as they appear in the Auditor General's Report. He gets our accounts, puts them together, and it would take a Philadelphia lawyer and a great deal of time to decipher what an account of that kind would mean, unless you could get a clerk from his office to pick out the items. I gave what I thought were the items, but I see that some of them were not charged here. There is an amount of $1,110.95 which is represented in the Indian Report as salaries, and I believe is charged in this $4,000 for the different teachers. There are ten school teachers in that superintendency.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). What do they get?

Mr. DEWDNEY. $32.97 a quarter.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I see that at the Hazleton school there is an amount of $62.70.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is a school grant. The salaries of only three teachers appear here in the Auditor General's Report, and the eight others do not appear.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is a very extraordinary way of keeping accounts. I doubt whether the hon. gentleman's reports show this in full.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, they are here.

Mr. MARA. You will find the particulars on page 33 of part 2 of the Report of the Indian Department.

Mr. LAURIER. I notice that the supplies for the steamer *Vigilant* sum up $2,097.05. This seems to me a very extraordinary sum for such a steamer as that, and it would require some explanation.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This steamer has only just been built. These are the furnishings for the steamer. She is only run by the agent, the engineer and an Indian pilot, and that is the whole expense of the boat when she is running.

Mr. McMULLEN. What do you pay your engineer?

Mr. DEWDNEY. $75 a month.

Mr. McMULLEN. That appears to be quite a salary for an engineer on that boat.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is a small salary for an engineer on that coast.

Mr. MARA. I pay $125 a month.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I see $1,878 for medicine.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not surprising they should want so much whiskey when they get so

much rotten beef. I asked the Minister with regard to the legal expenses.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I told the hon. gentleman that I believed that $77 was in reference to some trouble that arose at Metlakahtla.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). How does it come that we have this large sum of $1,878 charged against this agency for medicine—physic?

Mr. DEWDNEY. These are medicines which are distributed on the different reserves on the North-West Coast. There are a large number of reserves. The medicines are sent to the different missionaries and the school teachers who dispense the medicines. That is the distributing point for the medicine, and that is the head agency on the North-West Coast.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think that is hardly so, because I find medicine is also charged in the other agencies.

Mr. DEWDNEY. But that would not be on the North-West Coast. On this North-West Coast there is the Skeena River, the Naas River, Metlakahtla, Fort Simpson—there are probably thirty or forty reserves on that agency.

Mr. McMULLEN. On the opposite page we find $285.55 charged for medicine at West Coast.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is another agency further south.

Mr. McMULLEN. I thought the Minister said this was the distributing agency, and all the medicines were charged here for the North-West Agency.

Mr. DEWDNEY. For the North-West Coast Agency—that is the name of it. Mr. Todd is the agent for that North-West Coast Agency, which extends two or three hundred miles and along the coast back into the interior. This West Coast Agency is on the west coast of Vancouver Island, this is the north-west coast of the mainland. If I had known the hon. gentleman wanted such definite information, I would have brought in plans showing the different agencies. You must be acquainted with the geography of the country before you can understand where the agencies are. They extend several hundred miles running north and south, and six or seven hundred miles running east and west.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice on the North-West Coast Agency there is a charge of $12 for wood in one item and $7 in another, and I notice a charge of $37.50 for cutting this wood.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It cannot be for cutting this wood alone.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). In looking at part 2, page 33, of the Report of the Department of Indian Affairs, I see that all sorts of items are included. There is included an item for the engineer and the fireman of the steamer *Vigilant*, also the salaries of the two carpenters that the Minister mentioned. There appears, consequently, to be a great difference between the Minister's report and the Auditor General's Report; or, in other words, these two or three items I have mentioned appear to have been charged twice, once in the Indian Report and in the Auditor General's Report. They are first included in the large item of $4,155; then they appear in detail again under another heading, and the same item is in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Then the Auditor General's Report must be a mistake; but I do not think that is the case.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think it more likely to be your mistake.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think I can explain where the mistake is. I think I made a mistake when I was endeavouring to give you an explanation of what that $4,100 odd represented, and I gave the wages of the carpenters as they appear in the Indian Department's Report, thinking these wages were included in that $4,000 until I saw they were charged in the Auditor General's Report as $4,115.40; so that it cannot represent two portions of the same account.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The items mentioned for the carpenters are really in your report, and the wages of the engineer and the wages of the pilot are also in that. They make up the sum of $4,358.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are not included in the $4,155 of the Auditor General's Report, because you will find them lower down.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). How do you make out $4,155?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I commenced to give that information to the hon. momber for South Huron, when another hon. gentleman asked me something else about medicine. There is $1,800 for the agent; carpenters' wages, $117; stipendiary magistrate, $1,679; then salaries to school teachers, which are not in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). All these items you now mention are here; they are in the report of the department separately.

Mr. MARA. It is evident the salaries are included. There may possibly be a little difference between the Auditor General and the accountant in the Indian Department, but the difference will not be more then $2. No doubt if he had the vouchers, the discrepancy would be easily discovered.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is also clear that the Auditor General has included three school grants also included in the school salaries in the Indian Department.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the explanation of repairs to agent's house, $305?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is for repairs to the agent's house. The old house, which had been occupied by Mr. Duncan, had been damaged by the Indians, and it was placed in a proper state of repair for the new agent.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is an item of $115 for vegetable seed.

Mr. DEWDNEY. These seeds were given to Indians on the different reserves in this agency, which included 4,000 Indians.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice there is an entry for food of $2.60 and for medicine $1,868. Do you find it more advantageous to use medicine than food?

Mr. MARA. You are bound to give them medicine, but you are not bound to provide them with food.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is difficult to supply them with medicine. I once went up the Skeena River and had a crew of 6 Indians in my canoe. One was

taken ill, and I had to give him a dose of salts. Each of the 5 insisted on having a dose also.

Mr. McMULLEN. I observe a large sum for miscellaneous expenses. Can the hon. gentleman give the details?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot give the details. It is to provide small amounts to different agencies for stationery and other supplies. The amount of $300 will cover ten agencies. There has been a new agency established since the last report, in the interior west of the coast range and near Skeena River, called Babine.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The difficulty in regard to items of this kind is that you are never able to get any reasonable information as to what becomes of the money. Is there an inspector of agencies for British Columbia?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is no inspector proper, as in the North-West, but the superintendent visits as many agencies as possible during the year. Four or five inspectors would be required to inspect the agencies during the year.

Steam launch $2,860

Mr. McMULLEN. What is this?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is the *Vigilant*, which we were talking about before.

Mr. LAURIER. It is an annual expenditure, because I notice there is an increase of $180.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The increase is for fireman's wages and pilot.

Mr. LAURIER. How is the general expenditure made up?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Wages of engineer, wages of pilot, expense of fuel, occasional service of deck hand and incidental expenses. The fuel is estimated to cost $1,000 per year.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman told me that the item of $2,097 was for the fitting out of the steamer, as she was a new boat. That was a fair explanation as far as it went. It now appears that this expenditure will come up year after year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The expenditure in question was for only five months.

Mr. WATSON. During how many days will this steamer be employed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Probably the year round, except December or January,

Mr. WATSON. What is the capacity and power?

Mr. DEWDNEY. She has a double compound engine, and is 70 feet in length; she is eight or ten tons.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What service does she do?

Mr. DEWDNEY. She brings the agent round to the different reserves. Before we had this steamer the agent was only able to reach them by canoe and half the time he was not able to get to the reserves at all. We had a good deal of trouble with the Indians in that portion of the country, and a good many heart-burnings occurred that would not have happened had the agent been able to visit them as often as he ought to.

Mr. McMULLEN. When was the steamer built?

Mr. DEWDNEY. She was built in Victoria and cost about $6,000. Part of this was to be defrayed by the Customs Department.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does she do duty for the Customs Department now?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The agent has the power of a Customs officer and can exercise it if necessary; but he does not receive any extra payment for that.

Surveys $9,672

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that you employ three axemen at $40 per month, and a Chinaman at $50 per month, how does that come?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Chinaman is the cook for one of the survey parties. There are two survey parties.

General expenses, Manitoba and North-West Territories..... $134,000

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It does appear to me and it impresses me stronger every year that the amount expended in the North-West in connection with the Indian service is out of all reason and out of all proportion to the work that is really done. The amount that is paid for salaries is, in my judgment, excessive, and the amount paid for supplies is in many cases unreasonable. Let us look for a moment at a few of the items. You will find at page 185 of the Indian account a charge for horse hire "89 days, $89." When the 89 days expired the Government have had to pay $89 and to give the horse back to the owner. Would it not have been more economical to have bought the horse in the first place. I venture to say the horse was not worth $89, and yet the Indian account is charged $89 for 89 days' horse hire, and the horse goes back. It does not belong to the Government. Then, an extortionate price is paid for coal oil at all the agencies. At the Blackfoot Agency it costs 63 cents a gallon. Now, I am told that Canadian coal oil could be bought last year at 12 cents a gallon wholesale, and surely it does not cost the difference between 12 cents and 63 cents to take the coal oil from Ontario to the North-West and get a fair profit on it? At the Blood Agency 75 cents a gallon has been paid for coal oil. Has the hon. gentleman any explanation to give of these charges? For the Saddle Lake Agency, $100 is charged for one cow. This may not be an excessive price for a cow of a fancy breed, but it looks to me out of all proportion for the purpose for which this was intended. Then, I would like to know how far the Touchwood Hills Agency is from any line of railway?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Sixty-five miles.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If you look at page 187, you will find that you are paying at that agency $8 a barrel for salt. You can get salt in Ontario for from 70 cents to 80 cents a barrel, and it surely does not cost $7 a barrel to take it from Goderich or Clinton to this agency? At the Battleford Agency you are paying for potatoes $1.95 a bushel; I would like to know whether these were bought under a call for tenders or not? At Battleford you paid $9.80 a barrel for your salt. I notice that at the same agency you purchased 38 oxen last year, and I would like the Minister to tell us what necessity there was for this purchase? I also find that you paid $4 a pair for 19 pairs of laced kip boots. Do you buy these for the Indians of the

North-West? If so, I think it is an outrageous thing that we should pay any such sum as that for boots for the Indians. It was never contemplated that we should buy such high priced articles, either for the headmen or the chiefs. I find that in these accounts we are charged by every agency for tea, sugar and tobacco. I do not know what the custom has been in this respect, but I should like to be informed whether it is part of the system adopted by the department to supply such articles of luxury to the Indians? If not, who gets the benefit of them? When we supply the Indians with the necessaries of life to keep them from starvation, I think that ought to be sufficient. I know that the hon. gentleman's policy, when he occupied the position of Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, was to reduce the Indians to submission by starvation. I hope that policy no longer prevails; it is not necessary that it should prevail, because a great many of the Indians are self-sustaining, if we are to believe the hon. gentleman's report. Now, if that is so, what is the reason we should provide tea, or sugar, or tobacco, if we do provide them, for the Indians, as is charged in the accounts? As charged, one cannot tell whether these supplies go to the Indians or the employés of the Government in the North-West Territories. Now, the fact that the hon. gentleman's own reports for the last two years indicate a marked degree of success in the experiments begun eight or nine years ago in training the Indians to become civilized and making them farmers, is not an unreasonable argument against voting the enormous sum the hon. gentleman is now asking at the hands of Parliament to feed and clothe the Indians. Sir, notwithstanding the encouraging accounts given in the reports of the department for several years, there does not appear to be any indication, in so far as the demands on Parliament are concerned, that the hon. gentleman's predecessor's experiments in the North-West Territories have been at all successful. If they have been successful, and nobody reading the reports can come to any other conclusion, why does the hon. gentleman ask Parliament to vote nearly as much money to feed and clothe the Indians as was required four or five years ago? There is only a difference of $47,000. There are one or two other things it is important for us to know in connection with the administration of Indian affairs in the North-West Territories. Have you as many farm instructors there as you had eight years ago? Have you as many employés? If the Indian has been successful in cultivating his reserve, if he is now able to stand alone, there can be no necessity for keeping, if you do keep, the same number of farm instructors and employés as you did eight or nine years ago. I find in this report other extraordinary items of expenditure. I find that not less than $2,174 is charged for advertising for supplies in the North-West Territories. What justification has the Government for that? I suppose these supplies are advertised in the local papers. Is there the slightest justification for expending upon that item in one year over $2,000? I am satisfied there is not a department in the public service which requires the vigorous application of the pruning knife more than the Indian Department. I believe that with economy we could fulfil all our duties, both moral and legal, towards the Indians with nearly one-half of the sum asked from Parliament to-day. I believe, unless we have retrenched very much in the last four years, there is an army of officials in the North-West wholly unnecessary. I believe that one-half would be sufficient for the efficient performance of the service. If the hon. gentleman wants to immortalize himself, which I am afraid he has not yet done, in the service of his country, he can do it by a vigorous application of the pruning knife in the department over which he now presides. It is a big subject, I admit, which requires great consideration. We are under very heavy obligations to the Indian. We took from him his possessory right to a vast country; we deprived him, by our advanced civilization, of his means of living; we drove away the buffalo; and we are in duty bound to implement every treaty and every condition of every treaty, both in the letter and spirit. We are not only bound to do that, but we are bound, outside of treaty obligations, to deal fairly with the Indians, and that can be done, I am satisfied, at a great deal less expense than the hon. gentleman annually asks Parliament to meet. I give him credit this year for asking $100,000 less than was asked last year, but I know the hon. gentleman can go further. I can see from the reports no marked signs of improvement in some branches of the service in the North-West Territories; I can see no great diminution of employés; and I am sure from the tenor of the reports the same number cannot be required now that was required eight years ago. I trust, before another Parliament, the hon. gentleman will have caused a thorough investigation to be made in this matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. I received a letter to-day from Regina, dated 22nd August, from which I will read an extract. The writer says:

"I will give you one example of many: Upon Muscowpetung's reserve is a herd of Government cattle, all diseased, drowned and starved. These beasts are cut up, carted to the Government warehouse on the agency, issued out to the Indians, and charged up to Government. Who gets the money? In the winter of 1889 and 1890, many cattle died and were fed out in this way. I refer you to the following:—1st. Farming instructor at that time who positively issued that vile stuff to the already fast-dying natives, Donald McIntosh, Devil's Lake; 2nd. I refer you to herdsman, at the time James McGinnis, Reynoldton P. O. All that Cameron of Huron stated about the Indian Department was quite true: but he failed to get hold of the proper witnesses. He can prove all he said and far more, if he refers to said D. McIntosh and one Richard Portis, Balgonie P. O."

Mr. DEWDNEY. Who is that from?

Mr. McMULLEN. It is a private communication to me. I am giving a quotation from it, and I have a perfect right to do that.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is only right that the hon. gentleman should give me the name. It is a serious accusation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will give the hon. Minister the name privately.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have received two letters on the same subject.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have heard that several communications have lately been sent down by disappointed officer-seekers.

Mr. McMULLEN. This man who has written to me was never an official, but he has witnessed the abominations which have taken place under this man Reid in the discharge of his duty. We have had on several occasions to criticise not only

the charges which he made himself but the way in which rotten stuff has been given out to the Indians. I have heard my hon. friend here (Mr. Cameron) boo-hooed and abused in the most uncourteous way for the charges which he made against this man. This letter was sent to me personally, asking me if I would not criticise this individual, particularly in regard to his turning out dying animals, and some that were drowned, and that were carried to the Government storehouse.

Mr. DEWDNEY. On my reputation as a man, and I hope as a gentleman, I say that the statements that appear in that letter are lies.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman say so, and I have no doubt that he thinks so, but there is a possibility that this thing may exist.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Our system will not allow of it. There is no better man in charge of any band of Indians than the gentleman who is in charge of that band, Mr. Lash; and I will stake my reputation that that gentleman has never allowed a rotten piece of beef to be taken into his storehouse.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We heard the same thing about Senécal.

Mr. McMULLEN. The writer of this letter says:

"The farming instructor who issued that vile stuff to the already fast-dying natives is Donald McIntosh."

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is a lie. They are not fast-dying natives.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was Donald McIntosh the farm instructor there?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; and he is there now. Give me the name of your informant, and I will bring them both together?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will give the hon. gentleman the information confidentially. I do not know the person who writes to me.

Mr. FOSTER. I was just going to ask if you knew the man at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, I do not; but he sends me the letter.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There may be no such man in existence.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes; he must be in existence, or he could not write the letter. I think there is a great deal of extravagance in the handling of the Indians in the North-West, as well as cruelty. There is enough money voted by Parliament to deal with these creatures without dealing out to them dead animals in this way, if it is done. I am glad to hear the Minister say that he is confident it is not done, and certainly it should not be permitted.

Mr. McMILLAN. Are the cattle which are kept in the North-West for beef purposes or for milk?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A large number of cows are kept for milk. The Indians own cattle which they have raised from the cattle which have been distributed to them, and they are generally milch cows. There may be one or two Government cows on an agency; but the cows owned by the Indians are generally broken cows. I hope we shall break a great many of the young cows we have in our herd, and distribute them to the Indians to help them to support themselves.

Mr. McMILLAN. I see that at the Saddle Lake Agency there were cattle which cost $45 a head, while at the Battleford Agency there were five that cost $200 a head.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They were brought from Compton, Quebec.

Mr. McMILLAN. How do you account for the difference?

Mr. DEWDNEY. These were thoroughbred bulls.

Mr. McMILLAN. So were the others thoroughbred. They were Polled Angus. Further, I find that the agency has been paying $2.75 a bushel for potatoes.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Those potatoes were brought from the Edmonton Agency when there was a great scarcity of potatoes. They were teamed down early in the spring before the ice was out of the river.

Mr. McMILLAN. I see at Battleford there are 54 oxen.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are six different reserves in that agency.

Mr. TROW. At Duck Lake, which I know very well, I see that 35 bushels of potatoes were bought at $2 a bushel. That is a large price, seeing that there are considerable settlements all around Duck Lake and up to Prince Albert.

Mr. DEWDNEY. These were all seed potatoes. We paid $2.25 a bushel for some of them.

Mr. WATSON. The Minister contradicts the letter which has been read by my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) *in toto*. Is the Minister aware that, during his time in the North-West, pork of an unsound character was dealt out to the Indians, rusty pork that was purchased in Chicago for 1½ cents a pound, and was given to the Indians as rations?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not aware of any such thing at all. I am not aware of any pork being bought at a cent and a-half a pound.

Mr. WATSON. Are you aware that rusty pork was dealt out to the Indians by the Government?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am aware, and the report of the inspector showed, that some of the pork which was bought from Chicago on contract had been kept in our warehouse for a length of time, and a little of it got a little rusty. That was in the Indian Head warehouse, and that is the only case I know of reported on by our inspectors.

Mr. WATSON. How much of that pork was fed out to the Indians?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A very small quantity of it remained over.

Mr. WATSON. I know the charge was made that some twenty tons of this rusty pork was bought for a cent and a-half a pound in Chicago, and was dealt out to the Indians. One chief complained about it, Chief Longlodge. I think the Minister was present when a remonstrance was made. I think I was credibly informed by a gentleman who was present, that the hon. gentleman's reply to him was: "Eat that pork or die," when the

Indian complained that this pork was actually poisoning and killing his family.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I saw that report in the records of the House here, and I take this opportunity of saying that it was a base lie, as plain as I can say it.

Mr. WATSON. Would the hon. gentleman allow a commission to investigate such a matter as that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will allow a commission to investigate any matter connected with the Indian Department.

Mr. WATSON. That no such pork was dealt out to the Indians in the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No such charge was made to me.

Mr. WATSON. You say the charge was made in the House?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I saw it in the papers.

Mr. WATSON. Will the hon. gentleman furnish a commission to investigate that same charge?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; I will furnish a commission to investigate any charges in regard to the Indian Department.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see there is a Government herd at the Muscowpetung Agency. Does the hon. gentleman know whether any of those cattle in 1889-90 were returned as having died or being drowned?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The report we have is that they increased in number that year. Heifers were bought two or three years ago, and this year 95 per cent. of them have had calves.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In looking over these items no person can help coming to the conclusion that there ought to be a great deal of care exercised in making the purchases. You will find that about double prices are paid for everything that is required. Take the Duck Lake Agency, where there are only 1,013 Indians; we find that coal oil is paid 74 cents a gallon; flour is bought for $6.75 a sack; medical attendance, $1,272; salaries at this agency, $5,300. Going on to the Edmonton Agency we find flour is bought there at $4.75 a sack, and so on through the different agencies you will find extraordinary prices are being paid for everything that is bought. At this same agency we find an item that was mentioned by the member for South Huron, advertising for tenders for flour, $217.86; tenders for potatoes, $208.90; tenders for beef, $176.75; for general supplies, $1,569—all this for advertising. The total amount paid for advertising is $2,174.54. Go on a little further and you find: inspecting samples of blankets, $10; samples of food, $100; samples of clothing, $8.21; samples of harness, $10; samples of flour, $508; all that is on C—193. There is a total of $661.21 paid for inspecting samples. Surely there must be some mistake. How could you pay $508 for inspecting samples of flour?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is no mistake at all. Hon. gentlemen in this House are constantly complaining that the Indians are given bad flour, and if we give them good flour, we have to see that our deliveries are made of sound flour. A sample is taken from every purchase, and when the flour is delivered the sample is sent down here to the department, and the department has that flour inspected and tested to see whether it comes up to the sample which is lodged in the department, upon which tenders are made.

Mr. LAURIER. What about the boots?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Those boots were made in the penitentiary, and they are given year after year to the chiefs and headmen, in accordance with the treaty made, every three years.

Mr. LAURIER. It costs $100 for inspection.

Mr. DEWDNEY. A man is sent up to the penitentiary to inspect the boots before they are sent out. The flour is inspected by an inspector from McKay's mills here in Ottawa.

Mr. WATSON. How is the inspector paid?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are paid $2 a test: they were charging $5 a test at one time. That will be one delivery. There is a large number of deliveries all over the territories, and many samples have to be taken out of every delivery in order to ensure that the quality is good.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This plan of sending flour down to McKay's mills to get it tested, is all nonsense. You can get flour inspected in any city in the world for two cents a barrel. Any person at all acquainted with flour can judge as to its quality and value, without making a test of that sort. I think this $508 is thrown away. I find an item for flour for freighters in 1885, $300; also twine for Indians on Mackenzie River, $500. Was the twine to be used for binding the grain they raised?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is used for fishing nets. The $300 was freight on flour shipped in 1885 and seized by the half-breeds before it was delivered. A claim was made by the merchant who had the contract to deliver the flour, and who had paid the freight. The matter was submitted to the Department of Justice, and on the department's report it was paid.

Mr. CAMPBELL. At Duck Lake Agency the Government are building several mills, and are giving a bonus of $1,000. Is that given to a private individual?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes. He constructed the mill and grinds at special rates for our Indians. This system has been followed in several localities in the North-West in order to encourage the erection of mills, as we find that until a mill is erected the Indians are careless about raising their wheat.

Mr. WATSON. What are their special rates?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are less than the ordinary and are fixed by agreement. Mr. Van Allen or some such name is the party.

Mr. WATSON. With respect to the inspection of flour, I see $2 a sample is charged. Is the inspection made on the sample furnished?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A sample is sent to each agency where the flour is delivered, and a sample is kept at headquarters. The parties tender in accordance with the samples left at each agency and here. When delivery is made, a small quantity is taken out of every two or three sacks and these samples are sent to the department and we test them.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is the Indian surveyor at Ottawa?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Nelson, at a salary of $1,800 per year.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is he allowed a living allowance?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Not while here. That is stopped now. That was for the year before last.

Mr. CAMPBELL. With respect to the Qu'Appelle Industrial School, there are 175 pupils in attendance, and the salaries are $7,000. Why are the expenses so large?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a principal, assistant principal, matron, cook and four or five servants. It is a very large establishment.

Mr. McMULLEN. Under the head of miscellaneous, $500 are charged for seed for Indians; and yet under the head of each school separately there is a charge for seed. How does this occur?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will look it up.

North-West Mounted Police—Pay of force.....$320,000

Mr WATSON. Is it the intention of the Government to make any attempt to reduce this force and consequently to lessen the expenditure? I am strongly of opinion that if the Government would spend a portion of this money for the purpose of inducing immigrants to go into this country, the North-West would become so thickly settled that the necessity for many of the police would not exist. There are more policemen in the North-West to-day then there were fifteen years ago, notwithstanding that the country is better settled, and that a great many of the Indians now under treaty were then roaming on the plains. I am of opinion that it would be well to keep an official staff along the frontier to prevent any raiding from the neighbouring territory, but certainly in the interior we ought to commence reducing the Mounted Police.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think I can hold out very little inducement in that respect. Our experience has been that the more a country gets settled up, the more work we find for the men, and the calls on them increase every year. As the country gets settled in the north, and it will continue to settle especially now that railways have gone into that country, you will find that it will be all that the force can do to discharge the duties they will be called upon to discharge for many years to come.

Mr. WATSON. Could not local constables, resident in the country, attend to the mere police duty? The Mounted Police, stationed at two or three different places, are maintained at very great expense, and it would appear that they are simply doing the work that local constables do in organized districts of the North-West. If a man loses a horse he goes and asks the Mounted Police to find it for him, and a lot of that kind of work might be done away with. It appears to me that most of the Mounted Police work might be done by special constables stationed in the different municipalities.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is a very important item, and as it is very late I think the House should now adjourn.

Mr. FOSTER. We will have to get some more business done.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then if you proceed with the item it will have to be criticised. We have in connection with this force no less than fifty-five officers drawing $60,000, or about an average of about $1,200 each. I contend that it is an imposition on the people of this country to keep this enormous force in the North-West. Before we had the outbreak in the North-West Territories, and when there were more Indians and half-breeds than now, 500 mounted policemen served all the purposes. I would like to know from the Minister why it is that the force is now doubled, when the country is more settled and when we have railways running all through the territories?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It was considered, by wiser heads than mine, after the trouble was over, that 500 men were not sufficient to keep the peace of the country, and with the excitement that had taken place all over the country it was thought, in the interest of the Government, that an increase would be necessary. Since that increase has been made the duties of the force have been greater than they have been before. The settlements are more scattered, the calls upon the police are greater, and in fact every little settlement expects to have one or two police settled among them. When districts are organized into municipalities they have their own constables and the police do not interfere more than they can help. Some municipalities were jealous of the police interfering, particularly in regard to the whiskey business, but that has now been changed. The Mounted Police have been the means of keeping order in the districts outside of the municipalities, and are giving confidence to the settlers from one end of the territories to the other. I think it would be fatal to the interests of our western country if it was known that we were going, at the present time, to decrease the number of the force. By looking at the report of the Mounted Police, and observing the duties which they discharge, one can easily see that the country is well repaid for the expense incurred.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What do you pay the men?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The constables get 50 cents a day to start with.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do the Mounted Police vote?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Some of them vote.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Have they any political functions at all?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Those qualified can vote. That is all the political functions they have.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was charged in this House that the Government gave them instructions how to vote. Is that so?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I did not hear any hon. member say that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The statement was the reverse, that he had been ordered not to direct the men how to vote, but undertook to tell them what his own opinion was.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They do not vote by ballot there?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; by open vote.

Mr. WATSON. I may say that I have been informed by a person equally interested in the votes of the North-West, that the officers in command of the different stations were instructed by Herchmer to keep strict account how each man voted, and were told that no man voting against a Govern-

ment candidate would receive promotion. Has the Minister's attention been called to that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know why the Minister considers it necessary to keep 26 mounted police at Regina? That appears to me to be a place where a town constable would be enough to keep the peace.

Mr. DEWDNEY. A thousand men require to have some headquarters, and Regina has been the established headquarters since it was selected as the central point in the territories. All the supplies go there for distribution, the recruits go there to get their drill, and there is no more convenient place in the territories. I was astonished that there were so few there.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that over $40,000 annually is paid for the transport of supplies for these 1,000 men. Most of the supplies are bought in the North-West, and how is it that $40 apiece is spent in transport, when the supplies are virtually bought at the doors of these men?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The supplies are not all bought in the North-West, and everything is bought by contract.

Mr. McMULLEN. They are bought to be delivered at certain points.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That may be so with regard to flour, but the bulk of the supplies are delivered at headquarters and are distributed to the points where they are required.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does Mr. Herchmer, the commissioner, live at Regina?

Mr. DEWDNEY. His headquarters are there.

Mr. McMILLAN. Is the assistant commissioner his brother?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; he lives at Calgary.

Mr. McMULLEN. There are no less than ten inspectors at $1,000 each. What are their duties?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They visit the various stations. Some of them act as Customs officers, but not so much as formerly. They used to collect at Fort Macleod and Fort Walsh, but Fort Walsh has been abandoned, and there is a regular Custom house officer at Fort Macleod. They get a small percentage on the collections of Customs when they act as Customs officers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is ridiculous that we should require to spend $700,000 on police in a territory where there are only 34,000 people. There is no justification for this, as the settlers out there are orderly people, the very best of our people, and do not require all this force to preserve the peace. The force is not required in times of peace and is perfectly useless in times of war.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If the hon. gentleman went out a perfect stranger with his wife and children to settle on a homestead within easy reach of an Indian reserve, he would be very grateful to the Government for having afforded him police protection. It is of great importance to have these men in the country in order that the Indians may know there is a force there able to cope with them. The Indians are well behaved, but are still Indians and require to be looked after.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When the Indians rebelled, the Mounted Police were powerless and volunteers had to be called out. At present they are a standing menace to the peace. I have more faith in the Indians than in the hon. gentleman, and I believe that, if they were not menaced day by day by the force, they would soon become civilized. This expenditure is also a reflection on the whites, who are greatly in the majority and who ought to have no difficulty in managing a few Indians.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The people of Ontario have never lived in an Indian country, and when they went out to the North-West to settle they went out unprotected without any fire-arms to protect themselves, and they are very glad to have the protection of the police.

Mr. McMULLEN. As this is a very important item and embraces an expenditure of $750,000, if the hon. gentleman will allow one item to stand, so that anyone who is absent may have an opportunity of speaking upon it, we do not desire to detain him any further.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we must pass the items.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not right to force the item.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not forcing it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then, I want to know how many stations there are along the border of the United States, and how many men there are at each station?

Mr. DEWDNEY. At Willow Bunch—of course the hon. gentleman knows where that is; it is on the southern boundary—there are two constables and two horses.

Mr. McMULLEN. In what township and range is that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot tell you that. I can give you an idea of the locality. It is almost south of Regina on the boundary line.

Mr. McMULLEN. Give us the stations east of that first.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is Lee's Creek, which is west of that, and that has one sergeant and one constable, total two, and two horses.

Mr. McMULLEN. How far is that from the station the hon. gentleman named just now?

Mr. DEWDNEY. About 400 miles, but there are many stations between.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to shorten the explanation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. Let the hon. gentleman finish.

Mr. McMULLEN. I asked the hon. gentleman to state how many stations there were on the boundary.

Mr. DEWDNEY. At Fort Pitt there are three men and five horses. That is in the neighbourhood of Fort Macleod. At St. Mary's there are three men. That is in the same district, about 40 or 50 miles from it. Stand Off, there is a total of five, four constables and one sergeant. That is going east towards Willow Bunch. There is one at Milk River, further west towards Wood Mountain. There is one south of Cypress, one at Wood End, and a small party were at Alameda, but I am not sure whether they have been removed from there

now or not. Then there is a party in Deloraine, which is in Manitoba. They travel from one point to another, communicating every forty-eight hours.

Mr. McMILLAN. Did I understand that each inspector had 100 men under him?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; each superintendent.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think they might do with less than 32 inspectors at $1,000 a year. That is an enormous amount of money. I would ask if in any of these stations the Mounted Police make their own hay?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No, not now. They used to do that, but it was found inconvenient. They used to have farms which they cultivated, but it took up too much the time of the men and it was given up.

Mr. McMULLEN. Have we not to pay for the removal of the supplies from the station at Regina to the police headquarters?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; they cart a good deal themselves, but a portion is carted by the contractors.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is absurd, with 1,000 men there, with all the horses and the carts that I saw when I was there, and with every facility to remove the goods from the station to the headquarters, the country should have to pay the expense of that, while these fellows are walking round doing nothing.

Mr. WATSON. I was sorry to hear the Minister state to-night that he had no hope of doing away with the Mounted Police.

Mr. TAYLOR. For some time.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; for some time. It seems to me that the more settlers go in there the less need there is for Mounted Police. The remarks of the Minister to-night, that it was necessary to maintain the Mounted Police in order to protect the settlers from the Indians, will have a bad effect on immigration to that country. I have not heard of any depredations committed by the Indians in the North-West, and certainly there have been none in Manitoba, and I should think the number of the Mounted Police might be decreased. The hon. gentleman says that wherever a small settlement exists there is a demand made for some of the Mounted Police. It appears to me that if some small encouragement were given to some men in these settlements, to keep a horse, for example, they would be willing to protect themselves in case of an emergency, and I think it would be a better advertisement for the North-West in regard to intending immigration, to diminish the numbers of the Mounted Police, than to maintain 1,000 men there on the ground that they are required to protect the settlers from the Indians. The Commissioner states in his report that one reason for the employment of the police is the necessity of looking after the liquor traffic. I understand it is the intention of the Government to give the North-West Council some control over that traffic, and in that case the duties of the Mounted Police would be so much less. The Commissioner refers to the difficulty of enforcing the regulations in regard to the liquor traffic, in consequence of the permits given by the Lieutenant Governor, and I think the Government ought to amend the Act in such a way that the liquor traffic might be handled more efficiently by the Mounted Police.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We have a clause in the Act of this session.

Mr. WATSON. The fact that there is a clause in the Act of this year should be a reason why the Minister should offer some hope of a reduction in the number of the Mounted Police, as they will not have so much to do.

Mr. DEWDNEY. You misunderstood me. I say there is a clause in the Act which will correct the difficulty the Commissioner speaks of in reference to the ruling of the court.

Mr. WATSON. Was it in regard to placing the sale of liquor in the hands of the North-West Assembly?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is in the Bill as well.

Mr. WATSON. Then if the North-West Territories have the right to deal with the liquor traffic, they should have the right to appoint officers to protect their own rules and regulations.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a strong temperance element in the North-West, and we are not at all sure that the Legislative Assembly will be able to do away with the liquor law.

Mr. WATSON. I am sorry the Government have destroyed that temperance element in the North-West, to a great extent, by allowing the Lieutenant Governor unlimited scope.

Clothing $50,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Who are the successful tenderers for clothing?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot give you the names; there are 100 names. I will give you the information in the morning.

Mr. McMULLEN. Let it stand, then.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This question involves a list of 100 names. It is impossible that any Minister on the spot can answer that question.

Mr. McMULLEN. I only asked who were the successful tenderers for the clothing supplied last year.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a fair question, and if the Minister is not ready to answer it, then let the item stand.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The item will not stand.

Mr. LAURIER. Then let us have the information. I am surprised that the Minister of Justice should adopt such a tone at this hour.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is just the time to adopt it.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman must understand that the adoption of such a tone will not advance business. This is a fair criticism, and if the hon. gentleman is not ready to give the information the item can stand, and we can pass to something else. But if the hon. gentleman says "it will not stand," in that tone, I would be sorry if he persisted, because I do not want to delay business more than is necessary.

Mr. DALY. There are 50 or 60 tenders.

Mr. McMULLEN. We asked for the successful men.

Mr. DALY. That means that you have got to give the names of 50 or 60 tenderers.

Mr. LAURIER. Are they all successful tenderers?

Mr. DALY. There are 50 or 60 successful tenderers.

Mr. FOSTER. No one knows better than my hon. friend that it is possible to ask even a pertinent question upon every item we pass, and the Minister cannot answer it on the spur of the moment. It is always usual, when a Minister promises to bring down information, to allow the item to pass under that condition. For four or five hours now we have been subjected to a style of criticism without precedent. The leader of the Opposition has not heard it; he kept out of the House, so that he should not hear it.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman had given a moment ago the answer which he now gives——

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend said he would give the information in the morning.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman said that he would give it at a later stage, then I would allow the item to pass.

Repairs, renewals, replacement of horses, arms and ammunition.... $50,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How many horses were kept for the Mounted Police last year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. 50; 75 are wanted this year.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many died last year? How many were lost or killed?

Mr. FOSTER. Ask whether their hoofs were boiled up?

Mr. McMULLEN. No; we might find out they were fed to the Indians.

Mr. DEWDNEY. 26 horses died last year.

Mr. DALY. I want the hon. gentleman from North Wellington to take back the insinuation he made there, that if these horses died they might be fed to the Indians. You have no right to make a statement of that kind to this House, and I want you to understand it. I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not prepared to withdraw any remark I have made. I have a perfect right to make any statement such as I have made. After seeing the reports with regard to the treatment of the Indians, I am perfectly justified in making such an insinuation.

Mr. LAURIER. Let us proceed to business. Do I understand the $5,000 increase is for the purchase of new horses?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Where are these horses purchased?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are all purchased in the North-West, and all raised in the North-West. The average price paid last year was $121. They are picked out by the men in the force, who are the best judges of horses.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do the men who pick them out put the value upon them?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think the man who sells the horses puts the value upon them.

Mr. WATSON. Is there not a regular agent to purchase horses?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; the commissioner, the assistant commissioner and the "vets." usually purchase.

Mr. WATSON. The commissioner and assistant commissioner may not know much about horses, but the veterinary surgeons should be prepared to purchase the horses. What amount is paid for scouts?

Mr. DEWDNEY. $6,000 last year.

Mr. FLINT. Has the department ever considered the question of training up Indian scouts gradually to become so connected with the Mounted Police that they might ultimately take the place, to a large degree, of the Mounted Police of the territories? In the United States the army in the west is being recruited from Indian tribes. The report from the officers in charge of the detachments is that the men are giving satisfaction. In considering this question of the force in the North-West, probably some such suggestion has been considered and discussed, I should like to hear if such is the case, and what opinion has been arrived at?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We have for several years employed Indian scouts, and there are always more or less of them connected with the force. We find it difficult to get them to remain permanently. We obtained uniforms for them, and they generally found their own horses, and then acted as guides and scouts, riding from station to station with messages, and were very useful in many ways. The experiment has been tried to that extent. They have never been drilled together. The Blackfeet and Bloods, who alone have been engaged by the Mounted Police, are very erratic, and it is impossible to keep them at work.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Minister has stated that the services of the police were required owing to the whiskey business in the North-West. Has the North-West Council made representations to the Government asking that more power be given to it, in order to assist in controlling the liquor traffic? If that body has made such representations, do the Government intend to concede to any extent the concession asked?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think any representations have been made in that regard, except asking that the liquor business might be placed in their hands.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did they not petition against the granting of permits?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They never asked for the privilege of granting permits.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did they not protest against the granting of permits by the Lieutenant Governor?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They asked for power to deal with the liquor traffic.

Mr. McMULLEN. I observe that $2,600 was charged for telegrams.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No expenditure was made unless it was absolutely necessary. The sending of a telegram often saves the despatching of a horse and man. The telegraphs in the northern

part of the North-West are owned by the Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do you pay the Government lines for telegraphs?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. This does not seem to be wholly satisfactory, and as it seems a large amount to be charged for telegrams in a single department, I hope the hon. gentleman will bring down some further information at a later stage.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is not a large sum, when it is remembered that the mail communication is defective. It is necessary to telegraph on the ground of urgency, for mails may sometimes be seriously delayed, as in some parts there are mails only once or twice a week. To wait until a letter is delivered might destroy all the benefit that might otherwise accrue.

Mr. LAURIER. That may be the explanation, but I understand the Minister will bring down further information.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.45 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 2nd September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 161) in relation to the unlawful disinterment of dead bodies.—(Sir John Thompson.)

THE MEMBER FOR EAST NORTHUMBERLAND.

Mr. GIROUARD moved:

That the evidence now being taken by the Select Committee appointed to enquire into the charges preferred against the member for the East Riding of Northumberland be printed for the use of members of the Committee, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. GIROUARD moved the adoption of the sixth report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. He said: I wish to offer one or two remarks in relation to one or two paragraphs of this report. The first is as follows:—

"Your Sub-Committee is also of the opinion that, under the present state of the law, the Speaker, when not aware of the contestation of the election of a member, may properly act upon the resignation of such member, and issue his Warrant accordingly; and, should clause 7 of chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes be continued, they beg to recommend that this want in the statute be remedied by providing that, in the future, the prothonotary or clerk of the court where an election petition is fyled and pending shall forthwith notify the Speaker of such election petition."

I would call the attention of the House to clause 7 of chapter 13, which reads as follows:—

"No member shall tender his resignation while his election is lawfully contested, or until the expiration of the time during which it may by law be contested on other grounds than corruption or bribery."

There is no provision in the statute for the sending of any notice to the Speaker of the House by the clerk or prothonotary of the court when an election petition has been fyled and is pending, so that the Speaker will know whether he should issue his Warrant or not. Therefore, the Committee has recommended that should clause 7 of chapter 13 be continued, a provision should be added to the statute that the prothonotary or the clerk of the court should give immediate notice to the Speaker of the fyling of an election petition. The last paragraph of the report of the Committee states:

"Your Sub-Committee finally, without expressing any opinion thereon, recommends the advisability of the House considering whether the said clause 7 of chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada should not be repealed."

I may mention one reason—a good many others, I suppose, may be advanced—in support of the repeal of that clause. There is nothing in the law which prohibits the same person from being a candidate in two or more constituencies. The consequence is that if the same person represents two electoral districts, and his seat as to both is contested, one of those districts is disfranchised. Take the case of Sir Hector Langevin, the ex-Minister of Public Works, who represents the district of Three Rivers and the district of Richelieu. The two seats, I understand, have been contested, and the consequence is that one of those districts is unrepresented. The same thing may be said of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who ran in two districts and was defeated in one. The same thing may have happened in his case; and what happens in the case of two members may happen in the case of half-a-dozen. So that it seems to me that this is a very serious public grievance which is sufficient to induce the House to repeal clause 7. No inconvenience will result, I think, from the repeal of that clause. Suppose that a member whose seat is contested resigns, we have a clause in the statute relating to controverted elections which states that notwithstanding his resignation the proceedings may continue either to disqualify him or to secure costs against him. So that I do not see that any good object can be gained by refusing to allow a member to send in his resignation, while I see a very great grievance in the law as it stands, and it seems to me that the advisability of repealing altogether clause 7 should commend itself to the judgment of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would just say a word or two in regard to the report. Before this matter was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I called the attention of the House to one point upon which we were not called upon to report, that is, to what extent, apart from statutory provisions altogether, a member has the right to resign when serious charges are pending against him which if established would justify his expulsion from Parliament. I notice from the authorities that in England the Chiltern Hundreds would never be given to a person in a state of mental incapacity or where proceedings are pending whereby the applicant might be lawfully deprived of his seat or

expelled from the House. Now, I apprehend that the Chiltern Hundreds being the only method known to the House of Commons in England by which a member can cease to be a member of the House, apart from being appointed to some other office of emolument under the Crown, what would deprive a person from obtaining the Chiltern Hundreds in England would also preclude him from tendering his resignation, or his resignation from being accepted. This is a matter of very serious importance, and it ought to be well considered by the House before we undertake to lay down any general rule. The Committee have expressed their views upon the provisions of the statute and how far the statute is applicable to such a case; but, apart from the statute altogether, there is a law of Parliament which deals with this matter in certain classes of cases, and I suppose it would not be well for the House, without investigating the subject, to come to a conclusion averse to this ancient rule of usage. Sir William Anson mentions in his work on the English constitution that a member against whom charges are pending which would justify his expulsion from Parliament, if established, is not in a position to accept the Chiltern Hundreds, and thus cease to be a member of the House; and I fear he would not be entitled to tender his resignation to you, and you, Mr. Speaker, would not be at liberty to accept it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With respect to the matter which was immediately referred to the sub-Committee, I think there was a unanimous expression of opinion that under the law, as it now stands, a member against whom an election petition is pending could not resign; and we have the report of the Committee to the effect that, under the circumstances, the Speaker perhaps was not to blame inasmuch as there appears to be something wanting in the law, and no official information was conveyed to him that the gentleman who tendered his resignation was not in a position to do so. It will be noticed that the Committee make no specific recommendation further than the recommendation that the repeal of the seventh section may be considered by the House. It did not come to any conclusion on that subject. It thought the matter was of sufficient importance to leave to the decision of the House, and I desire personally to record my opinion, as it exists at present, that the report does not in any way commit the members of the Committee to an expression of opinion, one way or the other, on that subject. It seems to me that the remarks of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) are apt to mislead in one respect. He says that, under the existing Controverted Elections Act, it is provided that if a member resigns the petition shall continue to go on against him, and that the seventh section of the Act, to which we had particular reference, seems to be in conflict with the Controverted Elections Act. There is no doubt one seems to be in conflict with the other; but there is this point I am not convinced about: Suppose there is a petition fyled against a member containing personal charges, and that section were repealed, he would be allowed to resign, and he might resign, a new Writ might issue, and he might be re-elected. Of what avail would it then be to proceed with the petition for disqualification for causes arising out of the previous election?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.)

Mr. GIROUARD. He would be disqualified for good.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But he has been re-elected in the meantime. I want to impress this fact on the House, that although there does seem to be a little difficulty in the matter, the two Acts have been in operation a good many years, and I do not think any very serious hardships have occurred. I see great difficulties which may occur if you repeal the section, but it may be, on hearing the argument at full length, I may come to the conclusion that the section ought to be repealed. At present, however, one thing strikes me, and that is if, while personal charges are pending against a member, he is permitted to resign, he might be re-elected and the trial go on. Being a member of Parliament how could you disqualify him for acts done during the old election, when he has been re-elected? There are a good many difficulties to be provided against before we repeal that section. At any rate, I want it to be distinctly understood that the Committee have arrived at no conclusion on the subject.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is true the members of the Committee are not bound by any expression of opinion. They decided simply to recommend the question to the consideration of the House; and the question is a difficult one to decide because we have no precedent connected with the British House of Commons, which is not only our best model but practically our only model. The question, however, is not so urgent as to require to be dealt with during the present session, and in the Imperial Parliament it is receiving some consideration as to whether there ought not to be a means provided there for allowing members to resign their seats. In all probability, before we are called on to settle this question, we shall have the light given by the further discussion of the question there and perhaps a model in the legislation they may adopt. Leaving the question of resignation out altogether there are other means by which a member can vacate his seat here, as he does in England, for instance, by the acceptance of office. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) said there would be no practical utility in following up an election petition unless for the purpose of personal disqualification after resignation. I do not think that that object will be frustrated by permitting a member to resign. By the legislation we propose, the Speaker will be informed of the fyling of the contestation, and he will, therefore, not think proper to issue a Warrant for a new Writ until that is disposed of, even though the member should tender his resignation and his seat be vacant in the meantime. This would not prejudice the constituency or enable the member to get a better title to the seat than he had before. The same difficulty is in the Act now, if it be a practical difficulty, because the member whose seat is contested may be appointed, for example, a member of the Government, and in such case he goes back for re-election and has his seat by a new title, but the petition goes on against him for the purpose of disqualification; and I suppose there is no doubt that if he should be disqualified, he loses his seat, notwithstanding the new election.

Mr. GIROUARD. I hope I did not convey to the House the impression that, on the subject of

resignation, I expressed the opinion of the Committee. I took special care to say the Committee did not express any opinion, and I intended to convey only my own view.

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS DUTIES.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 155) to amend the Acts respecting the duties of Customs. He said: I wish simply to-day to move the second reading, and to-morrow I will move that we go into Committee upon this Bill. There are two resolutions on ale and beer to be considered.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want needlessly to delay the hon. gentleman, but I propose, on or about the third reading, to take the sense of the House on one at least of the measures proposed; so that if no discussion arises now and no objection is made, I would ask the hon. gentleman to give me a day's notice before he proceeds. I suppose he will have no objection to arrange that before the third reading is moved?

Mr. FOSTER. I will do that.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

NORTH SHORE RAILWAY BONDS.

Resolution reported from Committee of the Whole for the cancellation and discharge of certain mortgage bonds of the North Shore Railway Company held by the Government, read the second time, and concurred in.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 170) respecting the North Shore section of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—THE CENSUS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not suppose that there is a single member of this House on either side or in either party who has taken the trouble to examine the returns which have recently been laid on the Table of this House affecting the population of Canada, who has risen from the task without a feeling of deep and profound regret. We may differ, and we probably will be found to differ very widely indeed, as to the causes which have led to these results, and also as to the remedies which may be employed to prevent a recurrence of these or similar disappointing statements, but I have no doubt whatever that we will all agree in this, that it is a matter for very profound regret that, in a country of the age of Canada, a country possessing the resources of Canada, possessing the enormous area of virgin and fertile territory, as yet undeveloped, which Canada does, we should find ourselves reduced to the level of the older countries of the old world in regard to the increase of population during the last ten years. But, though that is a matter of great regret to all of us, I am bound to add that those members of the House who have taken the trouble to study the subject, and to avail themselves of such pieces of evidence as were easily accessible to those who interested themselves in the matter during the last ten years, are by no manner of means surprised at the facts which have been disclosed. It is known to all the elder members of this House that for many years past I myself and many members of the Opposition have steadily and continuously called the attention of the House and of the country to what we considered the very gross exaggerations on this subject contained in the statements made by the Government in their official records, made by Ministers on the floor of Parliament, and made by that portion of the press which takes its cue from them and is well paid for so doing. The statements which were made by myself and others were no haphazard conjectures. On every occasion, besides stating the conclusions we had arrived at, we stated the grounds upon which these conclusions had been come to. We laid before the House and before the Government the proof of the facts to which we called their attention. In respect to some of these proofs, it was and is my opinion that they admitted of no satisfactory contradiction. In the case of others it was simply the ground of great probability which had to be accepted. For example, in the case of the great Province of Ontario, no man who knew the facts and knew how their statistics were obtained could doubt that I was justified in pointing out to the Government that the increase in that province was scarcely one-third of its natural increase. In regard to the North-West, absolute proof was given five years ago that the statements which had been made from this side of the House were not only no exaggerations, but that we had very largely underestimated the failure of the Government to throw population into those territories. As the House will remember, when my conclusions were challenged, I time and time again proposed to hon. gentlemen opposite to avail themselves of the opportunities which their position gave them, in order to obtain from reliable sources, and especially from the hierarchy of the Province of Quebec, such evidence on this point as I knew would satisfy them that the conclusions I had come to were substantially correct. Now, when statements of this kind have been made, not once or twice, but many times over and over again on the floor of this House, over and over again on every hustings through the two great provinces, over and over again through the press, and in every conceivable way; when the Government had the opportunity of judging of the correctness of the evidence which we have adduced; when the Government deliberately refused to avail themselves of the other sources of information to which I have referred; and when we find to-day that the statements which were made by me and by others on this side of the House have been verified absolutely and minutely, and that the statements contained in the official records have been absolutely disproved on the evidence of the hon. gentlemen's own census returns, then we are justified in pointing out to the country that the Government of Canada were either most grossly ignorant of facts which they ought to have known and ought to have appreciated when placed before them, or that the Government of Canada, for their own purposes, for political ends most probably, chose wilfully to shut their eyes to the facts and to persevere in a series of deliberate misrepresentations on a point of great moment and great interest to the people of this

country. I am not going to make assertions of that kind in respect to the conduct of the Government without submitting to the House absolute proof of the correctness of my statements. First, I will take up the returns of the Department of Agriculture. Now, the House knows well that these returns were continually impeached on the floor of Parliament. I have told the House over and over again that I did not believe that the returns of the Department of Agriculture, so far as regarded their statements of the number of immigrants who had come into Canada, were worth the paper on which they were printed. What are the facts? We find that that department published year after year the following series of statements: They declared that in 1881, 47,000 settlers had come into Canada; in 1882, 112,000; in 1883, 133,000; in 1884, 103,000; in 1885, 79,000; in 1886, 69,000; in 1887, 84,000; in 1888, 88,000; in 1889, 91,000, and in 1890, down to the 1st of January, 1891, 75,000 had settled in Canada. They declared, therefore, in their very last official record that in the last decade 886,171 immigrants had settled in Canada. Sir, they were shown time and time again, if ever men were shown, that these statistics were wholly false and misleading, that it was utterly impossible and out of the question that any such number of persons could have settled here; but, nevertheless, down to the meeting of this Parliament they persisted in publishing to the world the statement that nearly 900,000 persons had immigrated to Canada and had settled in the country. It was similar in the case of the Minister of Customs. In his Trade and Navigation Returns, he gives continually authoritative statements of what the Government considered to be the then population of Canada. On these statements he based numerous percentages. He based, and his colleagues based numerous arguments showing, as they alleged, the progress which this country was making. Now, Sir, I have taken his statements for the last four years, and I find that the Government, in the Trade and Navigation Returns, declared in 1887 that the population of Canada was 4,856,226 souls; in 1888 they declared that the population was 4,946,497; in 1889 they declared it was 5,075,885; in 1890—and the House will note that these statements go to the 1st of July only—they declared that the population of Canada was 5,220,632; and if the same line of calculation were applied, they must have supposed that on the 1st of April, 1891, nine months after that date, the population of Canada would have been 5,350,000; in other words, according to their official statistics, the Government of Canada were misinformed as to the actual state of facts, to the extent of overestimating the population by 520,000 souls. That is the statement from their own records, and I repeat, it proves one of two things, either gross ignorance or wilful and deliberate misrepresentation. Sir, a good deal depended on the way this matter was stated. In these very Trade and Navigation Returns I find they stated that the *per capita* amount paid by the people of Canada for Customs duties, was $4.60, showing a progressive reduction, according to them, in the amount of the *per capita* Customs tax. The real facts, as ascertained to-day, are that on the 1st of July, 1890, to which these dates referred, the average *per capita* collection for Customs would amount to $5.03 or thereabouts, fully 10 per cent. in excess of the statement made in their official records. They did more. Not content with publishing these statements they took upon themselves, and it is not too much to say that they instigated their henchmen throughout the country to denounce and vilify every man on this side of the House who dared to call their attention to the facts which had been forced on our knowledge in the course of our travels through this country, and which we had collected from those statistics to which I referred, and which I repeat, were as accessible to those hon. gentlemen as they were to me, and were time and again brought by me to their notice. That was the course of the Government, and I am bound to say they were ably supported by their subsidized press. Now, it has been a matter of notoriety that for the last ten or twelve years one of the most powerful means of misrepresentation which this Government has employed was through that half of the press whom they found it convenient to subsidize and to whom their supporters look for information. Sir, it is a well-known and excellent principle of English law that when a woman loses her chastity she is regarded in a court of law as a person whose evidence is exposed to most grave suspicion, and I submit to this House that when a journal chooses to become a subsidized pensioner of the Government, that journal sinks to the level of a political strumpet, and it is no more worthy of credence than a woman of bad character. Now, Mr. Speaker, no man has a greater respect than I have for an honest press, no man has a greater respect than I have for the press that does its duty. The press of every country now-a-days has been well described as the fourth estate of the realm, and no greater political crime can be committed, or ever has been committed, than the systematic and determined attempt which has been made during the last twelve years to debauch nearly one-half of the entire press of Canada. Sir, it has been said truly enough that history repeats itself. It is not the first time by many that we have seen in history how convenient it is for a Government to have a band of false prophets in their employment. Sir, the hon. gentlemen opposite, who are great Scriptural authorities, will correct me if my statistics are wrong in this respect, but, to the best of my recollection, in the days of Elijah there were 450 false prophets to one true prophet, and the 450 were fed at the table of Queen Jezebel. Now, Sir, on reference to the Auditor General's Report, I see that we are not quite so efficiently provided for, as, apparently, we have only 104 of those false prophets who feed upon the crumbs that fall from the Government's table. I do not profess—but there is no saying what new discoveries may bring out—but I do not profess to give accurate records of the rations they have received from Queen Jezebel, but I think I will not be very far wrong if I suggest that in the case of the 450 false prophets aforesaid, the champion liars who lied every day, and all day, probably, got from ten to twenty thousand shekels a year, and the baby liars who only had imagination enough to lie once a week had to content themselves with two or three hundred. Now, Sir, I regret that the mawkish modern sentiment of the day renders it impossible to apply to these false prophets the heroic remedy which the prophet Elijah applied to the priests of Baal, but I have a suggestion to make to my good friend the Minister of Justice who, I am told, is sincerely

desirous of bringing about a better state of things, and in whom we hope we will not be entirely disappointed. We cannot, as I have said, owing to the tenderness of modern sentiment, apply so thorough-going a remedy as that I have referred to, but we have a fashion in this country that when a number of parties form themselves into joint stock companies, in most of those cases the words "limited liability" are required to be printed in distinct characters and appended to the name of the company. My suggestion to the Minister of Justice is this: That he enact a short law, about three lines long—there is plenty of time to introduce it, we will facilitate its passage—to take the mask from those journals; I do not ask him to punish these people; all I ask him to do is this: that when a journal becomes a subsidized pensioner of the Government let us enact from this day forth that immediately after the title of that journal there shall be printed in letters not less than a quarter of an inch long, the sum it received last year from the Government treasury. In order to give my hon. friends some idea of how it would work, I will read to them a short list I have extracted from the Auditor General's Report. It will read as follows:—St. John *Sun*, $13,668; Moncton *Times*, $11,816; Halifax *Herald*, $12,001; Yarmouth *Times*, $4,587; Quebec *Chronicle*, $3,557; Charlottetown *Examiner*, $1,668; Summerside *Journal*, $1,561. Where to classify the Montreal *Gazette* I do not exactly know. In one part of the Auditor General's Report it figures for $5,921; in another part I see $12,000 are paid to it for printing the Geological Report, and in another place it gets $4,000 for lighting the Montreal post office. Now, Sir, I say that during the last few years the conduct of the Government, in devoting several millions of the public money, under one pretext or another, to the subsidizing of their press, has had this effect: That by means of subsidizing nearly one-half the press of Canada, an immense number of important and valuable facts have been kept from the knowledge of their supporters. I propose, Sir, to turn the search light of these census returns on a good many of the falsifications in which these people have been indulging indiscriminately for the last ten years. I say to my hon. friends beside me, I say to the Liberal press, that I know very well that, ordinarily speaking, it is quite true that you cannot interest the public in questions of statistics. But this is one of those rare exceptions when every inhabitant of Canada, every inhabitant of every municipality, every inhabitant of every town, village or city is really and seriously interested in knowing what progress his town, or municipality, or city has made during the last ten years; and such an opportunity has rarely been given to any party of calling the attention of its opponents to certain plain, clear and distinct facts which shed light on every single part of the Government's policy. When, some years ago, I took occasion to warn the House of the result of a policy of excessive taxation, I laid down these three propositions: First of all, I warned them that in a country like Canada, situated as Canada was, partially undeveloped with great resources but with those resources latent, that if you chose to impose excessive taxation on the people you would assuredly do these three things: First, you would intensify the exodus of our population, which we knew was already going on in a far greater ratio than this country could well endure. You would at the same time render it exceedingly unlikely that any large portion of the immigration, for which you were taxing the people, would remain in this country. I said also that this process of excessive taxation, applying it as you were applying it, would inevitably in its indirect consequences produce a huge depression in farm property from one end of the Dominion to the other, at any rate so far as the older provinces were concerned. And I said, in the third place, that although it was possible for you to alter the distribution of wealth by means of taxation, you would not increase it, that all you would do, and all you could do, would be to enrich a few favoured localities and enrich a few hundred individuals at the expense of the great mass of the community. Sir, I further stated, I here to-day deliberately repeat that statement and I challenge the fullest investigation, that, in so far as the older provinces of Canada were concerned, during the last twelve years there has been, in my judgment, no real increase in the wealth of the population. A small number of persons have grown rich, a few favoured localities have grown in wealth; but if you make an honest statement of affairs, if you put on one side the enormous increase of your federal debt, of your municipal debt, of your provincial debt, of your mortgage indebtedness, of your railway debt, and add to that the enormous depreciation of farm property and the enormous depreciation of value in the case of the majority of our towns and villages, and place on the other side all the growth that has taken place in a few localities, it is in the last degree unlikely that the result will show any advance during the last twelve years in the older provinces. We have been doing nothing better than marking time in that interval. That is another charge I bring against this policy of excessive and monstrous taxation. I direct the attention of hon. members beside me to the fact that they have in these census returns as absolute proof as can be given of the perfect accuracy of the statements I made with respect to the growth of Canada and the effect of that policy on the exodus and on immigration. Over and over again, from this very place, I have told the House, and I have made calculations based upon the statement, showing there was no reason to expect a greater increase during the past decade than 50,000 a year. Over and over again I have given that as the highest figure. What do these returns show? They show we have grown 504,000 in the last ten years, whereas I said the growth would be 500,000. These calculations, I repeat, were not guess work, they were based on statements and on information which I gave to the House at the time; and I contend, I think with reason, that if the results of this census have shown that I was absolutely accurate in my general estimate of the growth of population, there is reasonable ground for the belief that I will be found similarly accurate as regards the depreciation of land and the distribution of wealth. However, Sir, I desire to deal at present only with the admitted facts. I will, therefore, recite briefly the allegations which I have made at various times as to the movement of population. I have asserted, and I now repeat, that when we get the United States census returns there is, I am sorry to say, looking at the returns we have here, the strongest probability that I

will be proved to have been absolutely accurate when I stated that one man in three of the whole adult male population born in Canada during the last fifty years is to-day an inhabitant of the United States; that I was equally accurate when I stated that of the whole population of Canada, men, women, and children, one person in five will be found to be a citizen of the United States; that of the immigrants you have brought to this country, at a great charge to the people of the country, three in four will be found to have quitted our shores and to have gone to the United States. As I have said, the actual increase according to the corrected returns brought down by the Government amounts to 504,534 during the decade. The number of immigrants amounted to 886,171, being very nearly 400,000 more than the total increase ascertained by our census. The natural increase of the population, according to the best judgment I can form on the point, cannot be computed, and ought not to be computed in a country like Canada, at less than 2¼ per cent. per annum, which would give a natural increase during that period of 1,077,000. The natural increase of immigrants, allowing for the fact that only one-half of them can be considered as present during the decade, if we had kept the whole number 886,000, would amount at the same rate to 110,000. I may say that if any hon. gentleman desires to know the reason why I have placed the rate at 2¼ per cent. per annum, I have done so for this reason: not merely because theorists who write on this subject have invariably laid down some such figure or one approximating to it as a proper ratio of natural increase in a country like this, but because there is actual proof, both in our country prior to 1861 and even to 1871, and in the United States during previous periods of their history when they had no aid from immigration, that the natural increase was very considerably in excess of the rate I have named. I call the attention of the House to the facts of the United States census. From 1790 to 1820, as all American students know, there was, from various causes, almost no immigration into the United States. During the interval, their population increased during the first decade from 3,959,000 to 5,250,000; in the second decade from 5,250,000 to 7,300,000, and in the third decade from 7,300,000 to 9,600,000. In other words, during those three decades, instead of the increase being at the rate of 2¼ per cent., the increase was: for the first period, 35 per cent.; for the second period, 35 per cent.; for the third period, 30 per cent. I say nothing of the well-known fact that there is every reason to believe that the natural increase in the good Province of Quebec has probably largely exceeded the figure that I have named. Nor am I disposed at present to go minutely into the statistics which I have formerly given to show that, could we have kept our population in our own country, there was the strongest ground for believing that, between 1871 and 1881, and between 1881 and 1891, our natural increase would have fully equalled, if not exceeded the increase I have named. I will only say this: that in Canada, in 1871, I find that out of 3,485,000 inhabiting the older provinces, 2,476,000 were under 31 years old; and in 1881, out of 4,000,000 or thereabouts, 2,944,000 were under 31. This is in itself evidence that that is a very strong presumptive argument in proof of my contention that the natural increase could not, and ought not to be placed at less than 2¼ per cent. Now, Sir, I call the special attention of my friends to the general result of all this, and the general result is: We had 4,324,000 people in Canada on the 1st April, 1881; according to Government statistics, we added to this by immigration 886,000 odd; the natural increase in the first case was 1,077,000, in the second case it was 110,000, and the total results are these: Could we have kept our own people in the country, could we have kept these immigrants whom we brought from other countries into ours; instead of the census showing 4,829,000 souls or thereabouts, we would have a census showing 6,400,000 souls, and the loss which we have sustained under these circumstances amounts exactly to 1,568,000 people. If hon. gentlemen will compare the progress made in the United States under similar circumstances they will see that I am within the mark in stating that had we been able to retain these immigrants and to keep our own people, the chances are that our population, for reasons given, would have exceeded the figure I have named. Now, Mr. Speaker, with the materials at my disposal it would be idle to enter into a minute analysis of the result of this census. That must be done next year or whenever it is convenient for Government to supply us with the details, but there are certain broad and patent facts to which I am going to call the attention of the House. They have divided the census, and wisely divided it, in the returns in my hands, into three great groups consisting of the Maritime Provinces, the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and the Western Provinces generally. I shall deal with them in rotation, and first of all I take the Maritime Provinces. I have been accused of girding at my hon. friends of the Maritime Provinces, but I may say that no man regrets more than I do to see the showing which they make on the present occasion. It is a painful and a melancholy fact that the whole of the three Provinces of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick during the past decade show an increase of barely 10,000 souls. It appears that between 1871 and 1881 while Nova Scotia, as Sir Charles Tupper was wont to say, was being ground into the dust under the iron heel of an Ontario Finance Minister; Nova Scotia was wicked enough to increase by 55,000, against 9,900 under the beneficent and paternal rule of my hon. friends opposite; and, Sir, the Province of New Brunswick which ought to have been so highly favoured, which has grown so many Finance Ministers, the Province of New Brunswick increased by 35,000 souls from 1871 to 1881 and by 61 souls in the last decade. Now, I know that my hon. friend the Finance Minister is fond of averages and percentages, and I have made out one or two which I commend to his, and to his people's most serious attention. First, let me say that the Maritime Provinces during these twelve years have held the monopoly of Finance Ministers. No other than a maritime man need apply for the post of Finance Ministership. They were, or rather the gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces were, the most ardent advocates of the National Policy, and let us see how they have grown under the fostering care of four successive Finance Ministers from the Maritime Provinces. Nova Scotia, as I have said, grew 550 per cent. faster in the decade from 1871 to 1881 than

from 1881 to 1891, and New Brunswick grew 60,000 per cent. faster in the decade from 1871 to 1881 than in the decade from 1881 to 1891. It is a positive fact that the growth was just 600 times as much under my hon. friend here (Mr. Mackenzie) and myself than it has been under the hon. gentlemen opposite, and their own statistics are there in proof.

Mr. FOSTER. You so exhausted it, that it has not got over the effect yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All I can say is that I entirely repudiate such almost omnipotent power for mischief as the hon. gentleman would credit me with. Did I possess it, I should be tempted to use it, possibly not to the immediate personal advantage of some of my hon. friends opposite. Now, Sir, so far as regards Quebec and Ontario the case though bad is not quite so bad as this. The Province of Quebec seems to have lost less in proportion than any other province. In the case of Ontario our growth has been barely 50 per cent. in proportion to that which it made in the first decade I referred to. But what is very notable, and what deserves the special consideration of the House is: That that increase, such as it is, has taken place not at all in the country districts, but wholly and entirely in a few favoured cities and towns. I find that the hon. gentleman brought down a series of statements of the population of cities and towns, likewise divided in three groups; and even at the risk of tiring the House with figures, I must call their attention to two or three remarkable facts in connection therewith. I find the increase in towns and cities above 5,000 amounted to 298,000 in round numbers, but, Sir, I find that 158,000 or more of that total increase was absorbed by the cities of Toronto and Montreal and their suburbs, and I have reason to believe that this is a considerable underestimate of the true increase which ought to be credited to these two cities. I find that Victoria, Vancouver and Winnipeg account for 12,600 more of the increase, so that out of the total increase of 298,000 we find that 200,000 is taken up by those five cities alone. The population of all the rest in 1881 amounted to 440,000, on which there was an increase of 98,000, being considerably less than the natural increase per annum of births over deaths in an ordinary healthy community. The same is the case with towns above 3,000. There are five new towns here, accounting for about 17,000 of a total increase, and the result there is, that taking out the new towns which were not in existence in 1881, all the rest of the towns between 3,000 and 5,000, taken collectively, have done very little more than to maintain the natural increase of births over deaths, while below 3,000 the total increase is a good deal less than the natural increase of births over deaths. So that it follows, Sir, that out of a total increase of 504,000, at least 377,000, if not more, are due to the increase in towns and cities, and that practically the result of this census confirms in the strongest possible degree the statement which I have so often made, that the result of your policy of excessive taxation is to favour a few large cities and a few individual towns at the expense of the entire remainder of the community. As regards the whole agricultural population, not merely in the Maritime Provinces, but in Ontario and Quebec, it has practically stood still for the last ten years, and that, too, although you assert that you poured into this country immigration to the extent of nearly a million of people. Now, in this connection I dare say the House will remember that I was very virulently assailed by that portion of the press to which I have alluded, because last year I called attention to the fact that the rural population in some fifty constituencies of Ontario, which I mentioned, showed a marked diminution. Sir, we have now got the returns for those counties, and by deducting the population in the towns and cities as it is given, we find that there was only one error in the statistics which I quoted, and that was, that in most cases I greatly underestimated the amount of the decrease of the rural population in that magnificent group of counties to which I referred. Sir, I have here my speech on the Budget of last year, and, to give the House an illustration, I find that in the case of the great County of Huron, which I know well, I estimated the decrease at 3,000, whereas the statistics laid on the Table by these hon. gentlemen show the decrease in that magnificent county to amount to close on 9,000. Much the same is the case with respect to the population in Wellington, Lennox, Addington, Frontenac and other counties to which I referred. If I erred at all in the declarations I then made, it was not that I exaggerated but that, I deeply regret to say, I seriously underestimated the extent to which our rural population was being depleted under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. And mark, Sir, those counties in which this loss has occurred are no poverty-stricken counties. They are the very garden of Canada; they are inhabited, as I know well, by a right thrifty, intelligent and industrious population; and if there were any counties in Canada likely to maintain their rural population, it would be just such counties. And now, Sir, I come to the third group, the western group as it is called, composed of Manitoba and the three kindred provinces; and here there is a tolerable increase, judged by the percentage. But here we possess the advantage of having a census taken midway. We have not merely the census of 1881, but in the case of the North-West the census of 1885, and in the case of Manitoba the census of 1886, and it is to these that I propose to call the attention of the House. So far as the North-West provinces are concerned, I am sorry to say that the showing is not as favourable as we could wish. I find that in the three North-West provinces the total population in 1885 amounted to a little more than 48,000 souls. Now, Sir, allowing for the correction made the other day, the House will see that in six years which have elapsed from 1885 to 1891 that population has increased about 19,000—that is, at the rate of 3,200 per annum. Allowing for the natural increase, which would amount to 1,100, we find that in the three provinces of the North-West there has been an increase during the last six years at the rate of 2,100 per annum, or something like an increase of 700 per annum in each of those provinces, which I take it may roughly be described as being each a good deal larger than France. In the case of the Province of Manitoba, the showing is, I am happy to say, a little better. There in 1886 we had a population of 108,000; we have now a population of 154,000. The increase there has been at the rate of about 9,000 a year, from which has to be deduct-

ed the natural increase of 2,500, so that in that province we have had an increase of 6,500 a year from immigration, an increase which, though small, is still satisfactory as compared with other regions. But, after all, Sir, what does it amount to? It amounts to this, that with an almost unbounded fertile territory to settle, we have succeeded in importing about 10,000 people per annum during the last ten years, or 20,000 families, at a cost of $100,000,000, and an annual charge to us to-day of about $7,000,000 a year. Now, Sir, there are two very noteworthy facts in respect to these same immigration statistics. One is this: Every man who has taken the trouble to acquaint himself with the class of immigrants who have been leaving Canada for the last ten years will, I think, bear me out in the statement which I have often made, that of the immigrants who leave Canada for other countries, a most unusually large percentage are men and women in the very flower of their youth, and that the real loss to Canada is very imperfectly measured by the mere statistical facts. It is the flower of our population that we are losing. We are sending no residuum to the United States, but a very large percentage indeed of the very choicest and best of our population. If hon. gentlemen doubt that, let them go to any of our colleges and universities; let them go, for instance, to the Royal Military College at Kingston, where at a heavy cost we educate men who ought to be fit for the service of this country; and let them ascertain where the graduates of those colleges and universities have gone; and they will find that of the choicest pick and prime of our people a very large percentage are daily leaving our shores and becoming citizens of a foreign land. Then, Sir, these returns show conclusively the utter futility of our system of immigration—of the policy of spending millions to bring here immigrants whom we are unable to keep. Nor is that the worst of it. The same causes that tend to deplete Canada of the flower of her population tend to deprive us of the best immigrants who come here. Just as the choice of our people leave us, so the choice of the immigrants leave us; and what is worse still, after sojourning here for a short time and going to the States, they become anti-immigration agents; they tell other intending immigrants that they came to Canada and were unable to stay here, having been driven out by a policy of excessive taxation. The result is that every hundred thousand of immigrants whom you bring here and fail to keep, operate powerfully against you in the markets of the world. Now, Sir, Canada, as everybody knows, is not a densely-peopled country. Wholly apart from the North-West, we have great tracts of virgin territory wholly unoccupied. In the Province of Ontario alone we have an area of 180,000,000 acres, of which barely 22,000,000 acres are occupied, and not thickly occupied. I have never contended that the whole of that area is cultivable or available for settlement. But I do say that there is room in Ontario to-day for a rural population treble, or quadruple, or quintuple that which now find employment in it. And I say more. I say that there is no greater folly than the argument often used by hon. gentlemen opposite, that we may sit down contented with this disastrous state of things, because, forsooth, in the United States you will find old states, thickly-peopled states, from which the population migrates in much the same way as they do from us. But there is this vital and all-important distinction, that when a citizen of the United States migrates from his native state, he goes to another state, and remains a citizen of the same country: but with us, unfortunately, when we lose our people by emigration, they leave us to become the subjects of a foreign power. So far, I think, everybody will agree that the facts admit of no dispute. With the solitary exception of the question to which I have called attention as to whether I was right or wrong in estimating 2¼ per cent. as the true natural increase, I am not aware of any single fact which admits of dispute. Hon. gentlemen opposite may not like that: I dare say they do not; but I submit it is the idlest folly to blame me or gentlemen on this side, or to blame the Liberal press, for calling attention to these facts. You might just as well, if you were in command of a ship, denounce the look-out man for telling you there are breakers ahead; or, as has actually been done by these hon. gentlemen opposite, bring the charge against me that because I pointed out these facts, therefore I created them. The thing is absurd. We have called attention to facts which we knew. We have called attention to statistics with which these hon. gentlemen could have acquainted themselves as well as we. It is no fault of ours, though it may be in a very high degree a fault of theirs, that they would not pay attention to our warning and take steps in time to avert these disastrous results to which I am to-day calling attention. I hardly know which to wonder at most, the malignity or the stupidity of the charge advanced against the Canadian Liberal party of desiring to promote emigration. Why, Sir, who is it that loses by the exodus? Which of the political parties in this country is it that ought to desire most to put a stop to this exodus? Who constitute this exodus? It is to an unusual large degree composed of the most intelligent, enterprising and adventurous among the people of Canada. Now, I say that three out of four, perhaps nine out of ten of them are always Liberals. The fact of the matter is, from the nature of the case, the Liberal party must recruit its ranks from the youth of our population. That is the rule in all countries, and in none more than in the Dominion itself. I tell those hon. gentlemen that if these young men had not left this country, the party in power would have been thrice swept out of existence. It is within my knowledge that in fifteen counties of Ontario alone, something like 500 or 600 young Liberals apiece, on an average, were lost to this country by bad government in the course of four or five years. I believe that the reverse of the charge made by hon. gentlemen opposite that we desire to promote emigration is much nearer the truth. I will not say that the members of the existing Government have conspired together to drive the youth and the flower of Canada into exile, but I have strong reason to think that some of the more astute of their party leaders and politicians have looked with great complacency on the exodus of young men from Canada, knowing they would have a much better chance in dealing with the residuum than they could have, had we kept that class of our population at home. There is another consideration. Hon. gentlemen opposite may take the choice of two alternatives. Either they were grossly ignorant of the facts I have

called attention to, or, knowing them, they deliberately concealed and perverted them. But I have no doubt of this, that before the writs for the last election were issued, it had come to the knowledge of members of the Government that there was a great danger of the existing state of things being disclosed; and one of the reasons which induced those hon. gentlemen to commit what I call a gross outrage on the people of Canada and the Governor General by inducing the Governor General to dissolve Parliament under false pretenses, was a desire to hurry on the elections before the people could become acquainted with the facts of these census returns and certain other facts of great importance, now daily being disclosed by the Committees of this House. Sir, I think that was one of the main reasons why, one year and more before the legal term expired, the people of this country were hurried to an election without the possession of a vast mass of information they ought to have had. And I tell this House again, had I then had the official records I now have, had my friends then the official facts now in our hands, hon. gentlemen opposite know, and know well, there would be no majority behind the Treasury benches to-day. Now, it is time for us to investigate as well as we can the causes which have brought about this state of things. So far as I understand the situation, there are but three possible causes which could reduce a country like Canada to such a position as that which this return discloses. One of these possible causes is the inferiority of the country in soil or climate to its competitors on this continent. Do hon. gentlemen opposite assert that that is the cause? The second possible cause is the inferiority of the people in intelligence and enterprise. Do hon. gentlemen opposite assert that that is the cause, because if they do the success of the great number of our people who have gone to the United States contradicts them at once. But if they think it is not due to the inferiority of the country or the people, there remains the only possible cause, the third cause, and that is the inferiority of the policy and the administration of that policy. That is the only remaining cause, and that, I believe, is the real cause which has brought about the state of things we now deplore. Nearly twelve years have passed away since the people of Canada were persuaded to enter on the extraordinary fiscal revolution of 1879. The reasons for that revolution were based on two remarkable discoveries, then first promulgated to Canada by the gentlemen who occupied the Treasury benches in 1879 and by divers diligent missionaries of theirs, interested for more or less good reasons in promoting their success. The first of these discoveries was this: that the best way for a people to grow rich is by taxing themselves for the benefit of a few hundred greedy knaves. That was the first great discovery on which the National Policy hinged; and the second was like unto it, that truth and honesty were useless and needless in the case of the highest public servants of the country. On these two discoveries hung the success of these hon. gentlemen in gulling the people of Canada in 1879, and now Canada is beginning to understand what the results of that policy are, and it is well for Canada that she should study and record her experience there anent. What are its results? They are, first of all, the reduction of her rate of growth to a rate below that of most European countries, as evidenced by these returns. Next, the enormous increase of debt and taxation, as evidenced by the public accounts. Third, the demoralization of the entire Civil Service of Canada, as evidenced by the reports daily made to us by the several committees of this House; and lastly, the total failure of this policy, as evidenced by the results in attempting to colonize the North-West. In 1878, under my regime, the total taxation, allowing for deficits, would be about $18,500,000. To-day, the nominal taxation is admittedly $31,000,000, and the real taxation, that is the sum taken out of the pockets of the people, although a very large portion does not go into the treasury, cannot be estimated at less than $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 all told. We have had, for twelve years, a perfect carnival of corruption, as this country is now beginning to see. We are beginning to see what this boodling *in excelsis* means and what it costs. We have advanced $40,000,000, or $140,000,000 if you take the railway expenditure into account, for the construction of divers public works, and I venture to say that there has not been one cent expended that has not paid, in some shape or other, toll and tribute to their corruption or reptile fund. I have no time now to add more in regard to this subject except to refer to the manner in which we have been dealing with our public domain. We have some 400,000 square miles of fertile land in the North-West, and it is doubtful if more than one-eighth or one-tenth of the whole remains really at our disposal. We have a system of railway subsidies of which the end and inwardness is gradually being disclosed, and we are also subject to a combination which is generally known by the name of the Red Parlour which shows how, when elections come around, these men who have taxed the public for their private gain are in turn taxed by the Premier of the Dominion to help to keep the party in power from whom they derive their advantages. The people of Canada are getting a rude and grim waking up from the fool's paradise in which they have so long been slumbering. They are getting to learn what it is to leave their interests in the hands of knaves and charlatans, and also to learn what a great mistake we made in 1879, when we turned our backs on the English system and adopted a servile imitation of the policy of the United States. I have always felt that, while protection anywhere and everywhere is a mistake, yet, as Mr. Gladstone himself has admitted, if there be a country on the face of the earth in which, from its large and varied population, from its general circumstances, from the contiguity of its population, and from the nature of its productions, the system of protection could be successfully carried out, that country is the United States; and I have also felt that, by parity of reasoning, if there is a country in which, owing to the condition of its people, owing to the limited nature of its productions, owing to the natural separation of its people into different divisions, owing to the fact that they all live in the same part of the northern temperate zone and are therefore rather competitors than customers of each other, the experiment of protection is likely to result disastrously, that country is Canada, and the census records are the proof of it. I desire to call the attention of the House to another fact. If the Government do not choose to mend their ways and give up this sys-

tem of taxation and apply themselves without delay to the task of obtaining other and better markets for us, then we are very likely to lose those markets which we have. No one can look at the proposals which have been made by the United States to the peoples of South America and the West Indies without seeing that we are in imminent risk —and I make this remark especially to call the attention of the members from the Maritime Provinces to the question—of losing the markets of the West Indies and Mexico, and of the Southern parts of this continent, as well as that of the United States. That is a matter beyond doubt, and it will require the utmost skill and statesmanship to avoid that consummation, and, moreover, our position is going to be greatly worsened by the effects of the McKinley tariff on the farmers of this country. Those effects are going to be two-fold. In the first place, there is a positive tax on the farmers of this Dominion which they cannot avoid paying into the treasury of the United States, and, in the second place, the indirect effect will be that our prices will be cut down and there will be a heavy depreciation in the value of the articles which the farmers sell at home. True, there will be some benefit to those who purchase the goods, particularly to those resident in the towns and cities, but to the farmers that is no alleviation of the effect which that unfortunate piece of legislation will have on them. This year, by mere accident and in spite of this legislation, these effects will not be so much felt. We have had a good harvest taken generally, we will have fairly good crops, and we will be able to sell our productions at fairly good prices because of the unexampled fatality which has overtaken the crops of almost every nation in the old world. But our escape is due this year to no skill on the part of the Government, but to pure accident. I tell the Government that they cannot afford to go on pursuing this policy of isolation from the rest of the new world. I desire, and always have desired to have free trade with the whole world, but, if we are driven to choose between having free trade with the new world, and having that sort of restricted intercourse which alone is possible to us with the old world, then, I say, give us free trade with the rest of the new world. Practically, we would lose nothing by that. As matters stand, and the hon. gentleman knows it well, if we deduct our trade with England—and she is not likely to close her markets to us, because they are open to all the world, and they are open to us, not for our benefit, but for hers—then almost the entire of our commerce is with Newfoundland, the United States, the Spanish and British West Indies and South America. Take that away, and we have no trade left save the trade with England, and we have very little chance of developing any new trade. Now as to the remedy for this, because I feel it is only fair to state what our policy is, inasmuch as hon. gentlemen are constantly stating that we have no policy on the subject. We propose three remedies. First, the policy of the Liberal party is to prevent boodling and to punish boodlers of high and low degree. In the second place, we desire to reform the system of taxation, especially where it bears more heavily on the poorer than on the richer class. And, thirdly, we desire to find new markets for our produce as speedily as may be. The people of Canada ought to recognize first of all that she must be, by the mere force of her geographical position, an American nation and an American power. Let them recognize that fact and all which it implies. Next, they must recognize that we have been charged with certain duties, to which duties, involving as they do the necessity of providing for the defence and good government of half a continent, certain inherent rights are attached, and notably the right to make our own bargains and our own commercial treaties on the terms which are most advantageous to the interests of Canada. In the third place, they should recognize that it is in the highest degree our interest and the interest of the British Empire to cultivate friendship and friendly relations with the people of the United States, which can best be done by the adoption of a system of reciprocity such as that which the Liberal party have had the honour of proposing on several occasions. What is to be said on the other side? What offset have the present Government to make to the state of things which is disclosed here? We know what they promised us, and we know what their record has been. They have trebled our debt, as our public accounts show. They have, in effect, trebled our taxes, as the same public accounts show. They have, to all intents and purposes, thrown away the control of 400,000 square miles of fertile territory in the North-West; they have so mismanaged it that, whereas they pledged themselves that we should to-day be in receipt of seventy millions from it, they have not got enough out of it to pay the cost of the surveys of the territory. They have caused one rebellion there by their wilful mismanagement, and sooth to say, if the truth was known, I believe that their conduct has justified many more. That is what they have done; these are their sins of commission, and in the matter of omission they have utterly failed to colonize the North-West, for which Canada has made such huge sacrifices; they have utterly failed to stop the exodus of our own people from the country, which they pledged themselves so often to do; they have utterly failed to persuade the immigrants whom they brought into this country to stay here, and they are responsible to Canada for the loss of one million and a-half of people that ought to be added to our population to-day, if we had increased in the same ratio as our neighbours have done. And, more, Sir, their misgovernment, their corruption has gone very far—and I say it with shame and sorrow—to make Canada to-day an object of contempt to the whole civilized world. Sir, that is the result of twelve years of organized, systematic and continuous corruption; that is the result of twelve years of folly, falsehood and fraud, and in order that the people of Canada may have an opportunity of knowing briefly and tersely what the practical result has been, I move that you do not leave the Chair, but that it be resolved:

That it appears from the official returns recently laid on the Table of this House, that the total population of the Dominion of Canada on or about the 1st day of April, 1891, was 4,829,344.

That it further appears from the report of the Department of Agriculture for the year 1890 that the total number of immigrants stated by the said department to have settled in Canada from the 1st day of January, 1881, to the 31st December, 1890, was in all 866,171.

That according to the last census the population of the Dominion on or about the 1st April, 1881, was 4,324,810.

That the total increase of the population of Canada in the ten years now past was 504,534.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

That at the rate of 2½ per cent. per annum, the natural increase of the population of Canada during the last ten years would amount to 1,077,531 without any immigration.

That at the same rate of 2½ per cent per annum, the natural increase of the said 866,171 immigrants officially reported to have settled in Canada between the years 1880 and 1890 would have amounted to 110,432.

That had the said natural rate of increase been maintained and the said immigrants remained in Canada, the total population of Canada would now amount to 6,404,944.

That according to statements made by members of Government, in their places in this House, and according to official documents, at least 400,000 square miles of fertile territory heretofore unoccupied in the north-west portion of Canada have been made accessible and available for settlement within the last ten years.

That the said new territory amounts to 256,000,000 acres, being an area equal to twelve times the entire area of occupied land in the Province of Ontario at the present time, and being fully five times as large as the whole occupied area of the five Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island in 1881.

That it appears from the above-recited facts that the difference between the actual increase of the population of Canada and the natural increase, together with the immigrants officially reported to have settled in Canada, is 1,568,600.

That during the last ten years the actual taxation of the people of Canada has been enormously increased under the operation of the existing tariff.

That the deplorable state of things disclosed by the above-mentioned returns imperatively commands a radical change in the policy and methods of government followed by the Administration.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to pass briefly in review some, out of a great many, of the statements which have been made this afternoon in this House with reference to the policy of the Government in several respects, taking in, widely, the immigration policy of the Government, its management of the general trade and financial interests of the country, its governmental or administrative management of the country, all of which have been, in one way or another, woven into the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat: but all of which have been made, under his peculiar manipulation, to point to the one only purpose that my hon. friend had in view, namely, to further, if he possibly could, the interest of his own party, and to depreciate the party to which he is opposed. Sir, if there ever was an occasion on which one might well have looked for statesmanship to replace partizanship, might have looked for a cool and calm discussion and dissection of facts, might have looked for a discussion of economic considerations, and a fair desire to find out the causes, a fair desire to suggest reasonable remedies, surely it might have been upon an occasion of this kind when we are discussing the broad question of the progress in population and prosperity of the Dominion of Canada at large. It was a time when my hon. friend might have struck out a course, which I know would have been unusual to him, but which would have reflected great credit upon him, when he might have thrown off his own mantle of vituperation, abuse and partizanship and clothed himself even for a few moments with, if necessary, the borrowed garment of a broad and generous statesmanship. But from the time my hon. friend began his speech until the time he left it off, there has been nothing but one long-continued wail, broken by but one note of jubilation, and that was the note struck in the early part of his remarks, that at last one of the five hundred thousand prophecies which he has ventured to utter from the time he commenced his political career in this country up to the present hour, has come very near proving true; and in this case it is an example of the old adage that it is the exception that proves the rule, and this one single exception must be quoted by himself to prove the general rule that he has been times out of number a false prophet in regard to his predictions about this country. Sir, the hon. gentleman has gone to the Scriptures, and he told you what Elijah of old did to certain false prophets, and he ventured the humane wish that it was within his power to have treated hon. gentlemen opposite him as Elijah treated those false prophets. If that form and measure of punishment had been meted out to the false prophets in this country, before this year of grace 1891 my hon. friend's place would have been vacant, and he would not have had to-day the opportunity to have indulged in his present attack. Sir, he commenced, of course, with that charity which is so usual to him, and which I must say sits so naturally upon him, so much so that we and the country would be surprised if we saw anything else sitting upon him even for a few lucid moments, by declaring that this Government had deliberately falsified the estimates given from year to year with respect to the population of this country. No one knows better than my hon. friend, and his smiling face upturned to me now assents to the proposition, that there was no deliberate misrepresentation, that there was no conspiracy on the part of the Government, that there was no deliberate misrepresentation or conspiracy on the part of the department charged with making these estimates; but they took the percentage of increase which had been the rule in the preceding ten years, and in connection with that the returns of immigration into this country as well as they could be followed, and upon these two made what the country knows, and what we know and what this Parliament knows were simply estimates of the population, given as far as they possibly could be given in accordance with the facts, as they came under the knowledge of the department. With that same charity the hon. gentleman has chosen through his remarks, in order to give the partizan flavour to them, and in order to keep as far as possible from any broad ground of statesmanship, to call every man who has been opposed to him, and who has supported the Government for the time being, a henchman, and every newspaper that had for services rendered the payment that was due, a reptile press, a subsidized press, a press which was deliberately concealing or deliberately falsifying the facts. And the hon. gentleman went so far as to invade a province which neither he nor I, I suppose, has the right to occupy, and enunciated a principle of law, that as a woman who had once lost her chastity would be debarred from testifying on oath, so the party which he opposed if once caught in misrepresentation should not be thereafter allowed to testify in its own behalf. This I will leave the lawyers of the House to take care of, but I will simply call the attention of the House thereto, to give it, I think, a sufficient refutation. He declared next, by way of introduction, that every newspaper in this country which has received a dollar or a thousand dollars by way of payment from this Government for services done, is a part of the subsidized press, of the reptile press, utterly unable to discuss the facts or give the truth to the people. I will take the hon. gentleman on the ground of reasonableness, appealing not to him in his present mood, because just now he is very unreasonable, but the good sense of the

House and the broader sense of the people outside of the House. I will ask any sensible and honest man to answer this question: Whether, whenever the Government engage the services of physicians to attend its hospitals and look after its patients, and in return pays their wages, if it is fair and reasonable to say that these medical men are subsidized by the Government, are unworthy of credence and unworthy of support as honest men doing honest service and getting honest pay therefor? Is that a position which can be taken? I ask the hon. gentleman who sits opposite to me (Mr. Tarte) if he subscribes to that doctrine? I ask hon. gentlemen, not in this House, but outside of this House, some of them possibly in this House, who own newspapers in different provinces of the Dominion, which provinces are under Liberal Governments, so-called, for the time being, who advertise for the Government, who put in their bills and get their pay, I ask them if they are willing to sit under the undeserved, the unmerited and unreasonable imputations of the hon. member for South Oxford? Is it fair they should do so? If so, there is a large reptile press. There is a large proportion of men connected with the press in the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario who are doing these same services for the Provincial Governments, who earn their remuneration possibly just as honestly, who put in their bills just as reasonably, and get their pay; I ask whether or not it is fair, and whether the hon. gentleman's supporters think it is fair, that they should lie under these general allegations of untruthfulness with respect to this matter? We must be reasonable. We may belong to two parties. We may fight each other on a political field, but there is a higher forum and a wider jury we must appeal to in each case, and before that forum and that jury such contentions as these will not be held as tenable. The hon. gentleman must do first this thing: he must show that the moneys have not been earned, that the prices have not been reasonable, and that the services have been unreasonably requited, before it is open to him to asperse his fellow-men just as honest and upright as himself, and just as intelligent as himself, who are found in the editorial sanctums in all parts of this Dominion of Canada, and who give just as good services and as ill-requited services to their country as the hon. member for South Oxford is giving to this country now, or had given to his country at any previous time in his political history. Sir, my hon. friend, after having indulged in these preparatory remarks, mild remarks preparatory to the strong adjectives which he was bound to introduce in increasing ratio as he went on with his speech, pitched into, as everybody knew it was his design to do, the policy of the present Government. My hon. friend did not rise in this House with any idea of discussing fairly and candidly the reasons why Canada had not progressed more rapidly than she has during the last ten years. That was not his object, and he proved to the satisfaction of everyone that it was not his object, because he did not go upon lines of discussion at all. My hon. friend's object escaped him in the few words he uttered when he deplored the fact that he and his friends behind him had not had this club of census figures, which are not as satisfactory as he would have wished them to have been, to have done what? Not to have proposed means for the better government of the country, not to have proposed means for the better commercial prosperity of the country, but to beat the Liberal-Conservative party with at the elections and to have overturned them and put themselves in their places. That was the object, and that was the object which, before my hon. friend got through, he stated, and stated boldly. I will take up some few of the points made by my hon. friend and my remarks will possibly be as discursive as his were, while I am dealing with these several points. He declares that all our immigrants have gone somewhere away from us, and that the natural increase and the immigration together should have reasonably given us a larger number of people than we have to-day. That is a disappointment, he says, to him, and I am here frankly to say that it is a disappointment to this country, that within the last ten years, taking all the circumstances into account, the rate of progress has not been larger than it has been. But it is a disappointment, Sir, which it has not been simply our lot to experience. It is a disappointment which has been experienced by our neighbours across the line, it is a disappointment which has been experienced in Great Britain, it is a disappointment which has been experienced by other countries in the world. Let us look just for a moment at the United States of America. In the first place my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) took a very heavy percentage of natural increase—2¼ per cent. He cannot establish, nor will figures, nor will deductions from figures establish, that the natural rate of increase is so large as that. The United States do not maintain that the natural increase is so large as 2¼ per cent., and if you take the census of the United States you will find that in ten years 5,500,000 of immigrants came into that country, and although by the natural increase, assisted by the immigration, they ought to have had in that ten years an increase of 18,500,000 of population, they only had an increase, including immigration and all, of 12,500,000. Taking into account what they thought should be their natural increase and the known immigration into the country, the United States should have had at least 18,000,000 of an increased population instead of 12,500,000, and the disappointment at that result has been broadcast throughout the United States. My hon. friend may ask: Where has the other part of our looked-for increase gone; where have the immigrants gone, or how has the natural increase disappeared; but in the United States, as well as in this country, there has been a disappointment in that regard, there has been a lowering of the increase, and there has also been a lowering of the increase in Great Britain. My hon. friend, therefore, ought to have been honest enough to state, as the country will be wise enough to see, that there are certain causes broader than that of Administrations and of Governments; that there are certain causes deeper than that of mere fiscal policies, which are to be canvassed, if we will approach, in a broad and statesmanlike way, the question as to what reasons there are that in these new countries the percentage of increase, taking into consideration natural increase and immigration as well, has not been larger in the last ten years than it really has been. My hon. friend speaks of the effect of a policy as tending to drive people into the cities and away from the country, but he does not pretend to canvass these broad grounds of discussion which for the last three or

four years have been patent to every reader of the press and of magazines, where statesmen and economists, and men of political experience, have been engaged in discussing that wonderful problem which has been met in all civilized countries; and how best it may be dealt with, namely, the gradual crowding from the country into the cities and the going over from the rural into the urban population. My hon. friend has but one reason. He does not wish to waste time by discussion; and that reason of his is simply the National Policy, and the National Policy in Canada is to be saddled with driving the people from the country into the city. Will my hon. friend go back to Great Britain, where free trade has been the rule all these years, and will he find out some cause there for the very same phenomenon to an equal degree, as to why in Great Britain there is this general tendency of the people from the rural portions of the country towards the cities? This great growth of urban population has to some minds a threatening aspect, but it has to other minds no cause for sorrow and no cause for regret. It is utterly untenable, Sir, as a plain look at the subject will show, for my hon. friend to hold that the sole and only cause of the phenomenon in this country is the National Policy. That phenomenon is equally visible, and is equally canvassed in countries where a free trade policy is and has been the policy for years and years. I may point out, Sir, that there are other reasons which account for that press and tendency from the rural and less settled portions of the country towards the cities. There are first, the numerous attractions of city life over and above country life; and whatever be the policy of the Administration in any country, there are a set of reasons entirely independent of policies which yearly call with strong voice that is heeded, and press with a tendency which is felt and which is assented to, towards the cities; the centres of intelligence where, from social reasons, business reasons, and other reasons, there are attractions that draw a certain class of minds inevitably from the rural portions of the country to make their homes and spend the remainder of their lives in the cities which are near to them. Then, Sir, there is another reason why the population of the country does not increase with such rapidity as the urban population, and it is this: There has been a change in the general farming operations of the country. Twenty years ago, aye ten years ago, it was the hand labour of the individual that did the work upon the farm, but since that time there has come a complete revolution, especially in new countries, a revolution which has attacked even the most staid of the old countries of the world, whereby the great wealth of invention, a phenomenon of this century, has been utilized to make the farmer's hand, and the farmer's power, ten-fold, twenty-fold, yes, a hundred-fold more efficacious in the performance of his work than it had heretofore been. In proportion as you lessen the amount of labour that is required on the farm by the addition of labour-saving machinery, in that proportion do you throw so many that would otherwise be engaged upon hand labour in the country out of that kind of employment, and they seek other modes of employment in other directions, and gravitate largely towards professions, towards businesses and towards pursuits and avocations which are peculiar to city life. Then, Sir, there is another reason which is not to be found in the protective policy here, or in the protective policy of the United States, or in the free trade policy of Great Britain, but which comes from causes as much wider and broader as can well be thought of. That is, for a series of years in most countries of the world; at least in our country, and in the United States and in Great Britain, and I might name others, farming has come to be in some of its aspects more unremunerative than formerly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And therefore you tax it trebly.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going into the causes of that; they are world-wide, they are broad, they are patent, they can be canvassed, they are known to hon. gentlemen who sit about these boards; but that reason also has driven out of the country into other avocations which are peculiar to city life hundreds and thousands of those who in other conditions would have remained upon farms and done the work of farming. No one can have read the history of the New England States for the last ten years without being struck most strongly by that circumstance. In the New England States to-day, situated, some of them, as we are, what is the wail, what is the grievance, what is the burden of everyone's complaint who observes, who thinks and who expresses himself? It is that the best New England blood, which formerly went on the farm, which stayed and worked on the farm, has been drawn away to the metropolitan cities, to engage in a wider life and, to some extent, in a more intense life, where their mental faculties, and where that striving quality of the New England mind and constitution which all who have read the history of that people admire, would be called into more intense activity, and produce results more satisfactory to them in a monetary, an intellectual, social or business point of view. These are some causes why out from the country there is a press and tendency towards the cities; and that will remain, whether my hon. friend stops preaching blue ruin and seats himself on the Treasury benches, or whether he does not get on the Treasury benches and goes on, as he will, preaching blue ruin to the country. I now mention a sample statement, and it is well always to hold up a sample of my hon. friend's most unfair and exaggerated form of statement which he has affected so long that it has now become, as we say, almost second nature to him; and I very much doubt whether, without the strongest mental discipline, long continued, my hon. friend could get himself into a state of mind to make a fair, plain statement of the actual facts connected with the discussion of party politics in this country. What did he say? Things have been fairly successful in the North-West; you have put in there about 100,000 people in the last ten years, or 10,000 a year; that is very good; you commenced upon a small basis, and you have done that; but then you have not done anything like what you should have done; you have added about 10,000 people annually, and it has cost this country one hundred millions of money to do it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And more.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, my hon. friend has the courage of maintaining his assertion. He never

explains his misstatements, and his own friends, numbers of them, probably took down another as made not in a moment, not of weakness, but of frankness. He gave us to understand in the course of his argument that of the hundreds of thousands of Canadians who went from this country to the United States of America three out of every four were Liberals. There is the best of reasons for that. My hon. friend has, by dint of long years of studied practice, brought himself to the forefront of his party, where he stands as a stalwart exponent of the political and fiscal views of those who have been brought up in the clear old Grit doctrine which is taught by the *Globe*; and we know that my hon. friend and the *Globe* stand together, the one in Parliament, and the other in Toronto, preaching the same doctrines, making the same assertions, and carrying out the same policy, and leading those who read and listen to them. When they two unite their forces, the one exalting the other as the prophet of the party, it is no wonder at all that the combined efforts of the two have the effect which they most naturally and most necessarily must have; and although the effect is less seen amongst people of Conservative tendencies, because they have less faith in my hon. friend's assertions, the difficulty is that he is believed by the young men of his own party, and as soon as he is believed the young men of his own party leave the country as quickly as they can. Why should they remain in a country which is in the state and condition, as to its past, its present, and its future, that my hon. friend so vividly and so blackly portrays in this House and on the hustings of the country? But to come back again to the sample of my hon. friend's assertion, that we had added about 10,000 a year to our population in a certain number of years, and that it had cost us $100,000,000 to do it, I say that though he has given voice to numberless unblushing assertions he never uttered a more unfounded statement in his life. Say that $100,000,000 have been spent, have they been spent simply to put 10,000 people a year in the North-West for a period of five, or eight, or ten years? My hon. friend knows, and this country knows that the $100,000,000 has been spent to open up an inaccessible and unknown country which has in it the germs of an empire—that once for all the expenditure of that $100,000,000 has placed the iron horse within sound of almost every door in the North-West, and has opened up the highways of commerce and business to what will ultimately be a seething population of prosperous and contented people in the North-West; and it is within reason for me to say that that $100,000,000 has not been expended, to an infinitesimal amount, for the number of people who have already gone there, but is an expenditure for the ages, so long as this country exists and the North-West constitutes its very granary and heart, increasing year by year in population and prosperity. That was an expenditure by which this great domain was opened up, and a permanent addition made to the increasing prosperity and progress of the country to which we belong. Well, Sir, my hon. friend declares that immigrants come into this country and go out of the country, and straightway become active agents against us, and that they do so because they are driven out of this country by the fiscal policy of the Government. Now, I will again bring to his attention what has been brought to his attention many and many a time. He declares that these people go to the United States of America when they leave us. They go out of this country, which has a protective tariff of 30 per cent., and they go into a country, by his own assertion, which has a protective tariff of 50 or 60 per cent., and they go because there is a protective policy in this country. Why, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me most arrant nonsense for a man to declare that immigrants come into this country and straightway leave it because they have to take what my hon. friend would call a dose of 30 per cent. tariff, and go directly to a country where they have to live, as upon daily food, upon a tariff of 60 or more than 60 per cent. The mere statement of the fact is a refutation of the assertion which was made by my hon. friend. If it was a free trade country to which they went, if it was a country which had a lower tariff than our own, there would then be some reason to think it was our policy that caused them to go. But so long as they left this country for a country whose tariff is twice as high as ours, it is utterly absurd to argue that they left because of the fiscal and trade policy of this country. The hon. gentleman says the only cause for all this is the policy of the Government. He knows of no other, he seeks for no other, and he declares that several years ago the people of this country made two astonishing discoveries. One was that the best way to grow rich was to tax the masses for a few greedy knaves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to give again the eloquent, the polished language of my hon. friend, and I desire it should go to the country which for ten or twelve years has, with great unanimity and strong determination, supported that policy and the party which embodied it, that my hon. friend has no better words in describing that policy than to declare it exists for the benefit of a few greedy knaves and is kept up by corruption and demoralization.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it never was a discovery except in the brain of my hon. friend, that the essence of the National Policy was the assertion of a principle, if such we could call it, that this country was to grow rich by taxing the masses, and that it was to grow richer in proportion as it increased the taxes. But the principle that was discovered in 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, and was carried to a successful embodiment in the statutes of the country, was this, that what this country needed was more diversified industries, that what this country needed was to do its own manufacturing and carry on its own industries within itself as largely as it possibly could, and that it was not good policy for this Government, while we were taxed for the entry of our goods by almost every country, and especially the country nearest to us, to open our markets almost untaxed to those competing peoples, and thereby drain away the life-blood of our country itself,——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much does England tax our industries?

Mr. FOSTER—but that this country should create its own markets and carry on the business of manufacturing within its own borders by its own capital, paying its own labour, employing its own

people to do the work. That was the principle which was acted upon and which was accepted by the people, and that principle is dear to the people of this country yet; and so long as it is reasonably and fairly maintained, I believe the people of this country will sustain the party and the Government which embodies it. My hon. friend says that another discovery we made was that honesty and purity of Government were not desirable or necessary, and he has declared that it was a part of his policy and his party's policy to hunt out and punish the boodlers wherever found, be they high or low. My hon. friend might have found convenient ground for the operation of that principle of his and have commenced the campaign many years ago. I think it is not outside the memory of those present that, not very many years ago, that policy could have been very justly employed by my hon. friend and his colleagues on that side of the House. He has talked about the subsidizing of the press, but I do not know it has gone so far in latter days as in the days when, under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, a newspaper was subsidized which was owned, controlled and lived upon by their own elected Speaker, who presided over the deliberations of this House. My hon. friend and the leader of the Opposition have a high mission to punish boodlers and rid the country of them. Well, they will find a very convenient field for their operations in a province very close to them at this moment. My hon. friend has declared we rule by virtue of the Red Parlour and the contributions we demand from manufacturers; but it has not been shown yet that any Government, except one, actually conspired to so legislate, to so work their operations, as to put notes in the bank and take $100,000 of the people's money in order to furnish funds to enable the party which supports my hon. friend to contest the elections, in the Province of Quebec, of those who were opposed to them in federal politics. My hon. friend had better look after the Langeliers, the Pacauds, and the Merciers, who line the skirts of his own party, and who, if he had been successful last year, would not have been contented with sitting on the skirts of the party, but would have been in high places controlling the operations of the Government and controlling it upon a basis compared to which the revelations of the Province of Quebec at present would only be as a side show to a great spectacular drama. My hon. friend has declared that Canada must remain an American nation, and when he came to the close of his address, after having discussed his disappointment, after having discussed, as he calls it, the unsatisfactory state of the country as developed and shown by the census figures, after having discussed the policy of the Government and shown its ruinous results and tendencies, my hon. friend comes to what should have been the main part of his efforts in his discussion of this question. He comes to suggest a remedy, and the only remedy he suggests is that we shall go out of office and that he and his friends shall take our places,—that the country, after having all these things portrayed before them ought not to search for reasons, ought not to enquire into causes, but ought to take his *ipse dixit* and make all these matters well by simply turning the Liberal-Conservative party out of power and placing my hon. friend in power. That is the sole result he comes to. We have had that as a panacea for a great many ills which my hon. friend has discussed in this House from time to time. We have had his policy so indefinitely put, so absurdly put; we have had, from the statements of their policy and the definitions he has been pleased to give of it, such an indefinite, intangible, unworkable proposition put up for the acceptance of the people that no reasonable man would give it for a single moment his assent as a practical plan for carrying out the betterment of this country and for making its trade or commerce wider and better. We have discussed that question before in this House. We know the points in which it lacks, as my hon. friend does, and yet, after all this discussion of cause, or rather after all this lack of discussion of cause, and after all his wealth of assertion with reference to this matter, he has simply this to say: If you want improvement, you must change the Government and put us in your place, and we will make all things better. After having mentioned these few things, I want just to have the ear of the House for a moment or two while I call your attention to some differences between the propositions of the Liberal-Conservative party and those of hon. gentlemen opposite. He has declared, and declared rightly, that the reason we have not progressed more in population has not been due to the fact that we have not a good soil, that we have not a good climate, or, in broad words, that we have not a good country. He has declared that it is not because we have not an intelligent and enterprising people. Those two things are facts. We have a good country, and we have good people, and in the lack of these you need not attempt to seek any reason why the population of Canada has not progressed at a greater rate in the last ten years. But there are some reasons why we may come to the conclusion that, taking facts as they are, we could not have thought to have made amazing progress, and we may come to a conclusion that the policy which was inaugurated by this party and this Government has materially aided in preventing disastrous results,——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER—and in keeping the progress of the country up as well as it has been kept up during the last ten years. When my hon. friend and his party were in power, what did we find? We found the exodus at its height.——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. We found the revenue of the country going down year by year, the debt increasing and the taxation added to year after year. We found from one end of the country to the other, as set forth in the last financial statement my hon. friend made in this House, the state of the country was unsatisfactory in point of trade, of prosperity and of industry; but in that whole series of years my hon. friend and his colleagues had no single thing to propose except to go on in the same old way, to add to the taxation of the country and to borrow some millions in the old country for working expenses. My hon. friends went out of power after they had been tried in those five years and found wanting, and this party then set itself to find out the causes of this deterioration and to apply the remedy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason that our people left the country and went to another? They went because they could not find employment

in industrial operations of this country. The policy of my hon. friend opposite had the result of starving out the industries of this country without introducing any new ones to take their places. If, in the New England States, the cotton manufacturers, the woollen manufacturers, and the manufacturers of iron goods called to our surplus population—surplus in the sense that we had not employment for them—and beckoned them there, it was in order that they might get employment at their hands; and it was the policy of this Government to put on a reasonable protection and foster the industries of this country, a policy which has been fairly successful in building up the industries of this country and giving employment to people who otherwise would have had to go to other countries to seek it. There are not many sections of the country in which we cannot point to industries which are flourishing where they did not then exist, and where thousands of the hardy population of Canada are getting their daily employment and their daily wages and adding to the prosperity and the wealth of this country. That is what the National Policy was to do. There was another reason why people left this country. Young men in families where too many were reared to find their abiding home on the old farm, looked out to the fertile lands of the great West, and found their way to the western lands of the United States, where they engaged in agriculture under these better conditions of freer lands, and lands more easily cultivated. The policy of this party was to open up our own North-West where these broad lands lie, and, by bringing in facilities for travel, to drift the population away from the United States of America and direct them to our own North-West, where they would become settlers under the flag of Canada and would remain citizens of Canada. If my hon. friend points to the depletion of population in certain rural districts in the Province of Ontario, he points to a depletion which is different from what it would have been under his auspices, in the fact that the population have gone to the North-West and taken up lands there and remain our own citizens, whereas under other circumstances they would have gone to the Western States. There is no doubt that these are points which are practical and which the sense of the country easily perceives and gives the proper credit for. There is another reason. We are, by the very force of our position, close to a strong and progressive neighbour. The United States has had a national existence much longer and much larger than our own. They have gone into serious competition with us in these last ten or twelve years, when they were at their best and we were at a point certainly not our best, and, with the influences at work, with the wide facilities for traffic and travel and communication which they possess, with their open lands and the inducements they could offer, they were a competitor of great strength with Canada, and they inevitably drew upon our population. The first thing for Canada to do was to put herself in these respects as nearly as possible on a par with the United States and to open up her broad lands by easy rail communication, to build up her industries as I have stated, and to seek by these means to make a country which would offer inducements which would be fairly on a level with those which the United States could offer to immigrants and to settlers in that country. If we had not done that, would our position have been as good as it is to-day in competition with our neighbours? But my hon. friend quarrels with us because we have a debt and because we have a taxation. That debt and that taxation were inevitably necessary to make our country what within the last ten years we have made it, as a competitor with the United States, by means of these facilities for travel, by means of this railway building, this canal building and this opening up of its varied resources, not only in an agricultural point of view, but in other points of view as well. It was just at this period that this country had to adopt a policy which would place it in the vanguard of young nations, and it has done that, by the strain and stress of taxation and debt, I grant you, but a strain and stress it is well prepared to bear, because it brings us into a better position for competition for settlers from outside, and to keep them here when once we have them. There is another thing which may explain a certain disparity between what we might expect the figures of this census would have been and what the figures of the last census were, and that is, that we have this time a more honest census than before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. More honest, I mean, in that it comes closer to the actual population of the country than it did before. It is a matter of record, it is a matter to which any reasonable man will give due weight, that the instructions which were given to census enumerators this year were different from the instructions of ten years ago. Ten years ago they went to a family, they found out those that were there, they asked for those that were not there and were yet members of the family, and all those who were members of the family and of whom the head of the family, upon being asked the question, stated that although they were absent they would come back again into this country and remain here, were put down as residents of this country. This year a far different plan has been taken, and no names have been put on the list for whom the assertion could not be fairly and tenably made, that they had not been absent more than a year. That has a bearing upon the case of relative numbers, and any reasonable man will give that fact its due weight. It is impossible to estimate exactly how much difference that makes, but that it does account for much, especially in some sections of the country, every reasonable man, I think, will be bound to admit. Sir, might I be allowed, without wearying this House, and without prolonging this discussion beyond six o'clock, to call attention to another factor which has not been without weight in keeping immigrants from this country, and in driving out those who came into the country. Sir, I say it is morally impossible, it is actually impossible for damaging assertions to be continuously made with reference to this country by the leading men of any great political party, without their having some weight upon the people outside of this country, and upon the people within it as well. My hon. friend has not been the only sinner, but the chief sinner in this respect. When men like Goldwin Smith, a pessimist to the backbone, in their adopted country, dip their pen in ink and portray in the blackest colours the destinies and the future prospects of this country, couching damning assertions in elegant and chaste English, and backed

up by their literary fame, before every country in the world, it is impossible but that amongst the more educated classes who read these, there be a prejudice aroused against the country which is portrayed in such colours and by such means, and Mr. Goldwin Smith does not belong to the party on this side of the House. When men like Mr. Blake, great and strong in intellect, having qualities of mind which I would be the first to acknowledge as great and strong, use those great qualities in his commanding position to fulminate against the great work which was in reality the salvation of this country, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and so portray its effect upon the country as to lead those who follow him to believe that it will reduce the people to the condition of slaves and serfs, and that those who are not in the country had better keep out of it rather than come under its dominant sway and tyranny; when men like my hon. friend who spoke this afternoon, lose no opportunity of raising their voice in the country, or in this House, always in depreciation of the country, as he has done to-day, making assertions which are as far from the truth as they well can be, does he think that these are but idle whisperings of the wind which are heard now and die away an hour hence? No, Sir, they live in an enduring and permanent form in the public press of this country, they go into the homes of this country where hon. gentlemen, by virtue of their political position are looked up to as leaders of the people, and both in the country and out of it they have their direful and baneful influence continually against the country's well-being, and it is no wonder at all that members of the Liberal party, listening to the counsels, and predictions, and preachings of my hon. friend, should leave this country and seek an asylum in another land. It is no wonder, either, that men who live in other countries and hear these speeches, and know of them only that they were spoken by men standing high in political circles, are influenced in forming their opinion in reference to Canada, and consequently a prejudice arises in their minds in reference to it. These things have their influence, they have their weight, they are copied in a portion of the press of this country, they are believed by a portion of the people of this country, they are thrown broadcast among the people who read them, and I say it is impossible, actually impossible, to weigh the evil influence of such assertions as these, or of such predictions as these, inside and outside of this country, upon its immigration and emigration. The hon. gentlemen opposite must not think that I am merely throwing at them what has been thrown at them before, and for the mere sake of doing so. I feel, and a great section of this country feels it as well, that one of the most efficacious things that could take place in giving an impulse to this country would be for my hon. friends opposite to rise for a year or two above partizanship and become statesmen, and give the country a fair share of their sympathy and effort. I may add one more thought to that. It is this: That Canada has passed through its hardest period. For the last twelve years Canada has been engaged in a gigantic task, the task of opening up the North-West, of building its immense lines of railway, of completing its canals, of adding in its different lines of progress, its facilities for traffic and for communication. It has been taxing every energy in order to bring itself, as I said before, on a level with competing countries. And during all those years of arduous toil, it has been obliged to work, so to speak, with the trowel in one hand, and to guard itself with the sword in the other hand, in face of the competition of the United States and of the world. It has done these two things together, and within that period of stress and strain, within that period of unequalled competition, it has kept its position well maintained, and has arrived now at the point when there opens before it a more extended and successful career in the way of population, of commerce and of progress. It has been laying broad and deep its foundations, and has been building up the elements of a national feeling, of a strong love of country; and from that foundation, broad and deep, it has developed a new life which is pulsing through its veins, and more hopeful prospects are opening out for success than in any period in previous years. This has been gone through with. Hard has been the struggle; great has been the self-sacrifice. But to-day we stand in a position of vantage, and with our splendid communications, internal and external, with all this accumulated power and confidence which has been the result of the work of the last ten years, with these I am not at all afraid to say that the next ten years will see a progress in Canada which has not been witnessed in any previous decade of her history. What we want now is that we shall stand together, that men of both political parties should stand together so far as the country is concerned, making the most of its advantages, giving to the outside world the very best picture we can of its resources and its prospects. And what we do not want at this particular time, at this juncture of affairs, when we see men of both political parties exercised and worried with difficulties that have cropped up, and which we are trying to make right—what we do not want is for an hon. gentleman such as he who spoke this afternoon to declare in one breath that the entire Civil Service is entirely demoralized, and in another breath that Canada is a by-word and reproach among the nations of the world.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Some hon. gentlemen opposite may wish to spread that idea, they may take the responsibility of it. But I tell you, Sir, that history, before which the actions and professions of both political parties will hereafter appear, will not give the meed of praise to persons who so acted in a crisis in the country's history. Statesmanship will always in the long run commend itself to history rather than partizanship.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, before recess the Minister of Finance, in closing his remarks, appealed to members on this side of the House, as well as the Liberal party in the country, to stand together with the Government and to give the best picture possible of public affairs, and to say nothing against the country. Well, Sir, it is far from our intention to say anything against the country. We desire to give Canada that meed of praise which is its due, and in doing so we will ever assert that it is a glorious country, a country with great capacities, a country with great resources, a country which is calculated to furnish homes for millions of freemen

in the future, and we will very carefully avoid on the present occasion, as we have done on all previous occasions, saying anything against the country. But we shall probably have something to say against the men who have failed to secure for the country its best interests. We shall have something to say against the men who have retarded the progress of the country, who have burdened the country with debt, who have placed the country in such a position that in the race of progress with its great neighbour to the south it is handicapped with numerous disadvantages which do not rest on that people. We shall have something to say with respect to the policy of this country, and the bearing of that policy on the prosperity of this country, as shown by the census returns which have lately been placed on the Table of this House.

The Minister of Finance accused the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) of intemperate language, of vituperation, of bitter partizanship. That hon. gentlemen said that my hon. friend's speech, from the beginning to the end, was a prolonged wail, with one note of jubilation only, that in which my hon. friend referred to the fact that the census returns were proofs of the correctness of the predictions he had made. There is abundant reason for wailing over the fortunes of the country. I doubt not, if we lived in the time of the Israelites, we would not only wail, but rend our garments and put on sackcloth and ashes. And it was perfectly proper that my hon. friend should indulge in sorrowful reflections over the present position of the country, as evinced by these census returns.

The hon. gentleman charged my hon. friend from South Oxford with having made an untruthful statement in having asserted that the estimates of population furnished from year to year by the Government were misrepresentations. My hon. friend stated that these publications of the estimates of population were either misrepresentations, or they showed the greatest ignorance on the part of the Government, and the hon. gentleman is left free to take his choice as to which horn of the dilemma he will accept, that of gross misrepresentation or of gross ignorance. One or other of them he must accept.

The hon. gentleman disliked the charges made with respect to the policy of the Government in making large appropriations under various pretexts for the purpose of subsidizing the press. He informs us that this money is appropriated or paid on a business basis, and the papers gave value for the money they received. If the business is done on a business basis, how is it that not a Reform journal in the Dominion received any of the Government patronage? If the Government desire to advertise for tenders for public works, if they desire to place before the public advertisements respecting public works, why should they confine the publication of their advertisements to the papers of one party? If the business is done on a business basis, ought not the Government to employ the press indiscriminately and impartially for this purpose? But large sums of money are paid to the Tory press of this country, and that press is, in point of fact, a subsidized press, and the policy and purpose of the Government, in appropriating and expending this money, is to be attach that press to its fortunes as its slavish supporters and slavish vindicators.

Then the hon. gentleman told us that no doubt the member for South Oxford was very sorry indeed that the census returns had not been available for him to criticise before the elections, that he would fain have had them as a club in his hand for the purpose of influencing the elections, not that he wished to propose a remedy, but he would have used them to the detriment of the Government. It is natural that the member for South Oxford, and the members of the Liberal party should have desired to have been able before the elections were held to give the people as convincing a proof as is shown by these census returns as to the policy of the Government. The Liberal party had been engaged in criticising the policy of the Government, and it had made assertions with respect to the outcome of that policy, the results of that policy. We were unfortunately in a position in which it was somewhat difficult to prove that our assertions were true, and the census returns would have furnished exactly the proof required as to the truth of our allegations. We did propose to furnish a remedy, and it would have been more apparent than ever that a remedy was needed, if we had been able to place these returns before the people. We have been looking for years to furnish a remedy, and we went to the electors of this country at the last election with a remedy for the evils that exist. We have that remedy to propose still, and the census returns have emphasized the assertion we have made, that some remedy for the ills and evils this country labours under is necessary. The hon. gentleman tells us that the result of the census returns was indeed a disappointment, and I am not able to see how he could have said otherwise. But he says that the United States also felt the same disappointment at their natural increase. He says that they supposed they would have a natural increase as great as my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says is the normal natural increase of a country situated as this is. What was the natural increase in the United States? Their natural increase was nearly 14½ per cent., or about 3 per cent. greater than our total increase, and our natural increase was about 8 per cent. less than nothing, if our immigrants had stayed with us; because, according to the returns of the Agriculture Department, we received immigrants to the amount of 20·49 per cent. of the population of this country in 1881. Therefore, with a total increase of 11·52 per cent. we fall very far short of having any natural increase at all. Then the hon. gentleman tells us that the United States are not in a very satisfactory position. I suppose that the increase of population of 24·85 per cent. in the United States was hardly satisfactory to that country, but we must bear in mind that it was considerably more than as much again as the increase in this country, and in a young country like Canada, with a young and vigorous population, it is needless to say that an increase of 11½ per cent. is very far from what we might reasonably expect as the result of the census. We have also to bear in mind with regard to the United States, that it is claimed that in the census of 1880, there was a very serious mistake with regard to the black population, and that the actual population of the United States was one or two millions less than that given by the census of 1880.

The hon. gentleman next referred to the de-

crease of the rural population and the tendency of the people to leave the farms and drift into towns, and he said that this is a tendency manifested in all civilized countries of the world. He tells us that farming has become unremunerative, that owing to the invention of labour-saving machines, and the increased ability to produce food with a given amount of labour, there is an over-production, and that farming has become an unremunerative industry. Yet, Sir, in face of that fact, the policy of the hon. gentleman has been for years to pile upon the shoulders of the farmer, with his unremunerative industry and the prices declining, a vastly increased burden of taxation. If he wishes to relieve the farmer, if he wishes to increase his prosperity, surely it is not a good way to reach that result by increasing the burdens placed upon him, as has been done by the Government for the last twelve years.

Then, Sir, when my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) alluded to the $100,000,000 spent during the last twelve years, and stated that the results flowing from that expenditure in the North-West were of a very meagre and unsatisfactory character, the Minister of Finance tells us that this expenditure was made for the ages. Well, Sir, I judge that it will be some time in the future ages before we get a satisfactory return for it. It was unquestionably made for the ages, and the ages must roll around before we get the return that the Government has promised as a result of that expenditure.

The hon. gentleman goes on to tell us that it is somewhat singular that immigrants should leave this country, with a tariff of 30 per cent., and go to the United States where there is a tariff of 60 per cent., and that if they wish to escape heavy burdens and taxes it would be natural to suppose they would remain here. Now, Sir, the average rate of duties last year was 21¼ per cent. in Canada on the total importation, and in the United States 29·99 per cent. This difference has been largely decreased under the McKinley Bill by the readjustment of the tariff, but the burden of taxation from Customs duties in the United States is much lighter than it is in the Dominion of Canada. The *per capita* charge of Customs for the year ending 30th December, 1890, in the United States was $3.59, while the *per capita* charge in Canada last year, on the basis of our population then, was $5.03. The Customs taxation of Canada is $1.44 per head, or 40 per cent. higher than the Customs taxation of the United States. Although their rates of duties are somewhat higher, yet our importations are proportionately larger than theirs, and their taxation from Customs is only about two-thirds as much as in this country. Therefore, the statement made by the hon. gentleman that we have lighter burdens in this country than in the United States is not a correct statement. We should remember also that the expenditure in the United States is of a different character from that of Canada. Last year in the United States $106,000,000 were paid as pensions, and that money was spent in the country, It was equivalent to a gift of money to the people of that country. A large amount of their taxation was paid last year in reduction of the public debt and in reduction of taxation, and the consequence is, that the public burdens of the United States are very greatly less than ours; and a large portion of the money disbursed in the United States, from the Customs duties, is disbursed in the country—paid in pensions and spent in the country. The enormous sum spent in pensions, and serving to relieve the wants of a portion of the population, is quite a different thing from sending the money out of the country to pay interest on the public debt, or the expenditure of money in an ordinary way by the Government.

The hon. gentleman also told us in the course of his speech, in justification of his National Policy, that it was necessary to inaugurate a policy that would retaliate upon other countries, in consequence of their impositions on our commerce. If that were true, what imposition did Great Britain impose upon our commerce? We send our productions free, and without any restriction, into that country, and why was it necessary to retaliate against her? Why was it necessary to adopt a policy which discriminates, in fact, against that country and which is a most onerous burden upon her and her commercial transactions with us? While she does not impose a duty of a cent upon a single dollar's worth of the millions we send to her, we impose burdens upon the English commerce which lessens the volume of that commerce and is felt to be a grievous burden by the people of that country. Yet my hon. friend has said that the sole justification for his policy was to retaliate upon countries that had imposed burdens upon Canada by their fiscal policy.

Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman came around to the question of corruption, and he seeks to minimize the extent of the corruption existing at Ottawa, and he offsets it by what? Was it by Liberal corruption in the Dominion Government? Oh, no. He offsets it by the assumption, not by the proof, but by the assumption that corruption exists in some one of the provinces in this Dominion. Forsooth, because it is charged that corruption exists in the Government of the Province of Quebec, he thinks that exonorates the Dominion Government for the course of corruption which it has pursued since it came into office in 1878. The people of the country will not accept that justification of the conduct of the Government here. Two wrongs do not make one wrong right; the loss of chastity on the part of one woman would not justify another in losing it, and if the Government of Quebec had been guilty of corruption, which is not proved, it would not justify my hon. friend or his colleagues for having been guilty of the same thing.

He says the only remedy we propose for all these evils we have been complaining of is that the gentlemen on the right of the Speaker are to step out, and the gentlemen on the left of the Speaker are to come in. Well, I suppose that would be one of the necessary stops towards a reform of the abuses that exist. Of course, if my hon. friend will accept the policy we promulgate, if he will attempt to relieve this country of the embarrassment that weighs upon it, by adopting a sound and common-sense policy, we will be glad to aid him, as he has invited us; but if he refuses the remedy for our evils that we offer, it will be necessary for parties to cross the House, because it is necessary to inaugurate a new policy, and if the Government will not do it, the Opposition must necessarily be called upon to do it.

Then the hon. gentleman reverts adroitly to the old stock argument which we have heard here a hundred times or more. With regard to the small increase of population which has taken place in the

last ten years, and the unsatisfactory condition of the country, he tells us that matters are not worse than they were or as bad as they were. He says: In 1878 when they came into office they found an unsatisfactory state of trade, they found the country depressed, an excessive taxation, and a policy that had starved out the industries of the country, and they made a change that brought prosperity and created diversified industries. Now, let us examine the broad assertions made by the hon. gentleman in that portion of his speech. When the Conservative party came into power in 1878, what did they find the condition of Canada to be, as compared with other nations? It is true, trade was not in as good a state as we should have desired; it is true, Canada had laboured under a depression since 1873; but was Canada relatively in a worse condition than other countries? Were the reasons which caused that depression confined to Canada, or did they originate in Canada, or were the Government responsible for those conditions? They were not. The depression which existed in Canada existed to a greater degree in the United States; it existed to a greater degree also in England, in France and in Germany; it was a world-wide depression; all civilized nations shared in it; it had overtaken the whole commercial world, and Canada was in as good a position as any other country. Canada was struggling successfully with those difficulties; and the truth is, that the United States, during all that period of depression, having the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite adopted as a panacea for those ills, was in a worse position than Canada. There were half a million tramps roaming up and down the United States without employment; trade was paralyzed there and in England; and in Canada we had a careful, prudent Government, keeping down the burdens of taxation, carefully husbanding our resources, and waiting for the turn of the tide which was sure to come, and which did come in 1879. Had we a policy that starved the industries of this country? On the contrary, the manufacturing industries of Canada were more prosperous than those of the United States under a high protection; they were actually more prosperous than those of England. Under a revenue tariff of 15 per cent., increased in 1876 to 17½ per cent., we had developed a prosperous, diversified manufacturing industry in Canada. There is scarcely a branch of business in operation to-day that was not in operation in 1878; and a careful comparison of the statistics of manufacturing establishments shows that the manufacturing establishments of Ontario and other parts of the Dominion were paying from 6 to 25 per cent. dividends, and that they paid much higher dividends than the manufacturing establishments of New England during that crisis. Most of our manufacturing establishments were paying fair and in many cases high dividends all through that period from 1873 to 1878, and the manufacturing industries of the country were actually developing and growing, notwithstanding the depression that existed throughout the world. And yet my hon. friend had the hardihood and effrontery to say that the policy of that Government had starved out the industries of the country. Well, Sir, in what condition were our manufacturing industries in 1878? Why, Sir, in 1871 the census returns revealed the fact that we produced in Canada $211,000,000 worth of goods and employed 189,000 operatives; in 1881, according to the census returns, we produced $309,000,000 worth of goods and employed 246,000 operatives; and it was scarcely time yet for the National Policy to produce any material effect towards that great increase in the manufacturing industries of this country. So that we had a stable, prosperous, and firmly-established manufacturing industry of this Dominion under the policy which preceded the policy adopted by the hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches. Then, let us compare the burden of taxation. The Customs duties from 1874 to 1878 were:

In 1874	$14,325,000
1875	15,351,000
1876	12,823,000
1877	12,546,000
1878	12,782,000

That was the measure of the burden of Customs taxation imposed by the Mackenzie Government upon the people of this country. Now, how did my hon. friend and his colleagues manage this matter? Did they reduce the burden of taxation? Did they keep it where it was? Let us see. In 1880 they were fairly in the saddle; and in that and the following years the Customs duties show these increases:

In 1880	$14,000,000
1881	18,400,000
1881	22,582,000
1883	23,000,000
1890	23,968,000

They have nearly doubled the taxation imposed upon the people of this country in the shape of duties upon imports during their period of office commencing with 1879 and ending with 1890, the last year for which we have returns. Yet, in the face of this record, the hon. gentleman tells this House and the country that the policy of the Mackenzie Government had increased the taxation of the country. Why, Sir, an assertion of this kind is entirely destitute of a single iota of truth. Still more, an assertion so utterly false, so utterly misleading, is quite in character with the position taken with regard to the financial policy of the Government in almost every respect by the speakers of the opposite side.

Then, we are told that the change of policy on the part of the Government led to the swelling revenues which we have had. Well, it did, because it increased the taxation of the people. We are told that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie had deficits. So they had, because with wise foresight the Minister of Finance of that day realized that the prevailing depression was a temporary one, and that when prosperity returned and the volume of trade increased, the revenue of the country would increase, and that then the existing rate of taxation would be high enough; and so he forebore increasing the tariff, although perhaps he would have been wiser to have done so.

Mr. FOSTER. He did increase the tariff.

Mr. CHARLTON. He did increase the tariff in 1876, but from 1876 it remained at 17½ per cent., and the Government waited for that turn in the tide that would bring a return of prosperity in the commercial world and increase the revenue of the country. The change in the tariff in 1879 by the present Government was made too soon to ascertain definitely whether this would have been necessary or not in our case, but we have the experience of the United States, and the movement of Customs

duties in that country will illustrate pretty fairly what would have been the movement here if no change had been made, because no change was made in the tariff of the United States. Now, the revenue of the United States from Customs duties in 1878 was $130,000,000, and in 1879 it was $137,000,000. Then the tide turned, prosperity began to come back, and in 1880 the Customs duties amounted to $186,000,000. In 1881 they amounted to $196,000,000; in 1882 they amounted to $220,000,000, or $90,000,000 more than in 1879. Well, Sir, the same rate of increase in Canada, with our old tariff, would have given us a surplus of $4,000,000 or $5,000,000, instead of the deficit we had in 1878. The forecast of my hon. friend was, therefore, absolutely correct; and had the Mackenzie Government remained in power we would have had, from our tariff of 17½ per cent., not only sufficient revenue, but an overflowing treasury. There can be no question of the truth of that assertion.

Mr. FOSTER. That would have frightened you.

Mr. CHARLTON. We would have reduced the taxation instead of inaugurating a reign of corruption in order to spend the money. The late Henry Ward Beecher said that every boy, when he got a new knife, was bound to whittle; and when my hon. friends opposite got more money they were bound to whittle; and they did whittle down the surplus to a remarkable extent.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). When you got a new knife you whittled away the stick altogether.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Finance Minister has told us that our debt and taxation have enabled us to make the country what it is. That is as true as the Gospel of St. Luke. It has made the country what it is, simply that and nothing more, and the hon. gentleman has stated the truth. He said it has placed us in the vanguard—I do not know whether he means in the vanguard of colonies or nations, or in the vanguard of those governments that delude and plunder the people. I rather think the truth would be in the latter. It has placed us, he said, in the vanguard, and in a better position to get settlers. That is a most astounding assertion. The idea that the increase of the debt, the doubling of the debt, the doubling of the interest charges yearly, the increase of expenditure and taxation—the idea that these put us in a better position for securing settlement is an absurd and stupid assertion, quite in keeping with many other assertions of the hon. gentleman. It will not for a moment bear investigation. It cannot be shown to be even a plausible assertion.

Then, he told us that the Opposition raise their voices to deprecate the country. Well, suppose my hon. friend were ill and called in a physician, and that the physician made a diagnosis and gave a prescription, would he accuse him of being the author of his disease? That would be just as reasonable as the charge he brings against us. We raise our voices against the country? No, Sir. We raise our voices against the men that are ruining the country. We raise our voices against the policy that is destroying the country. We do not raise our voices against the country, but in defence of the country. We raise our voices against the cormorants that prey upon the country. That is what we do. And we hear that howl all over the country: Oh, you are doing all this mischief; you are driving the people from the country; you are destroying the country; you are defaming the character of the country. Nothing of the kind. We are attacking the policy of the party who have kept this country in the background and retarded its progress. We are attacking that policy which must be removed before this country fulfils the destiny Providence has designed it shall fulfil.

Then he told us that Canada has passed its hardest period; that it has built railways and canals, and can now go ahead. Well, Sir, we have heard assertions from that side before. We have heard something about the tall chimneys that were to rise in every little village in 1879, but we have not seen them yet. We were told that 640,000,000 bushels of wheat would come from our west alone this time, but it has not come yet. We were told that we would have a revenue of $70,000,000 from the lands of the North-West up to 1891, but we have not had a cent of it yet. And now we are told that we have passed the turning point, that the hardest struggle is over, and that we are about to enter upon an era of prosperity. No, Sir, we are now about to reap the fruits of our folly unless we change our policy. We have now reached the point when a heavy burden is upon us, when the interest on our debt must be annually met, when we have incurred enormous expenditure, which we find it almost impossible to reduce. We have reached that point when the fruits of all the sins and follies we have been committing are coming home to us. We are now in that position that the Government tell us that they cannot enter into a trade arrangement which would secure the prosperity of the country, because forsooth it would reduce our revenue somewhat. We are in that position that we can not forego one dollar of the revenue we now derive from this tariff which exacts from the people sums much greater than they are able to pay. No, Sir, we have not passed the turning point. The hardest is not over; we are not about to go ahead, but we have to pay the price of our folly. We are now about to be called on to pay from year to year for this great burden that rests upon us, and every year we must strain every nerve to meet the burden which the folly of my hon. friend and those associated with him in office have placed upon the people.

So much for the remarks of the Finance Minister, to which I intended to refer briefly only; and now I propose to give my attention for a short time to a question more particularly pertinent to the matter under discussion, the census returns. I may say, by the way, that my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, seems to have forgotten what the question before the House is. I think he did make one incidental allusion to it, but that was all. In approaching the discussion of this question the first thing we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to account for the fact that our increase of population has been very small. How shall we account for it? Shall we assert that the country has not the scope, has not the undeveloped resources, has not the facilities necessary to enable us to add to our population? Will we say that our resources are fully developed, that the limit of our ability to maintain population has been reached, and that now we have no choice but to serve as a hive, as the fully populated countries of the old world do, from which to send out our surplus population to the United States year after year. Will that assertion be made? I do not think it will,

for when we come to look at our country what do we find? If we start at the Atlantic coast we find first the Province of Nova Scotia, with its fisheries, and its lumber, and its agricultural resources, not fully developed, with its great stores of coal undeveloped, and with its coal mine owners, under the influence of the cowardice begotten of protection that leads them to fear open competition in the markets of the world and prevents there seeking the natural markets where they might sell millions of tons annually. We find in that province vast deposits of iron ore where iron can be made cheaper than at any other point, if we except Birmingham, Alabama; we find that province with room for millions of people, with room for indefinite expansion and development, and we cannot say there is no lack of room in Nova Scotia. We come to New Brunswick, and find there undeveloped resources and room for a great number of people in addition to those now inhabiting it. We come to Quebec, and we find a province controlling the Imperial highway to the great inland seas of this continent and the teeming west; we find cities placed where their birthright was that they should be great commercial entrepots and centres of the trade of this continent; we find great areas undeveloped around Lake St. John and in the St. Maurice district, and we cannot conclude that in that province the limits of population is reached. We go to Ontario, the most beautiful and fruitful of all the provinces, resting its southern border upon four great inland seas, with a stretch of country along Lakes Ontario, Erie, Huron and Georgian Bay, the finest, the most salubrious, the most productive section on this continent, not one-half of which is under cultivation, and with great stretches of uncultivated land in the Rainy River Valley and Algoma, with its stores of nickel, of copper, of iron, of silver, of gold, of structural material, a province infinitely rich in resources, one of the grandest commonwealths of this continent, and we cannot say there that the limitation of population has been reached, for there is room for a score of millions more. We go to the North-West, with its enormous tract of arable land, from a small fraction of which a score of million bushels of wheat will be sent to market this year, a country suited for mixed farming, and with great stores of petroleum, iron and coal, and certainly it is not there the limit of population has been reached. We go to British Columbia, with its grand mountains and its scenic wonders, with its agricultural lands in the valleys, with its mineral wealth, its timber, and its fisheries, and it is not there that the limit of population has been reached. In these various provinces there is room for at least four score million of people, and we have less than a quarter of a score of millions. We have the room for the people who are here; we have room for the increase of that people; we have room for the immigrants who will come from the old world; we have room for all these and for many millions more. Will we assert that our population is effete—that, like the population of the Sandwich Islands, the decree of fate is on them, and that they are doomed to gradual extinction? Not so. We have one of the most active, one of the most energetic, and, physically, one of the best races in the world here in British America. We are bound to conclude that this population should show the highest rate of natural increase, and that every immigrant who comes to our shores should find a home congenial to him. Then what is the matter? Have we increased as we should? The only gratification we can get out of these returns is something like that which the old Methodist minister got. He was preaching in the backwoods, and he sent his hat round for contributions, and the hat came back without a copper in it. He turned it up and looked into it, and then he said: "I thank thee, O Lord, that I have been permitted to receive my hat back from this congregation." We may feel this degree of thankfulness, that we have as many people here as we had ten years ago and very few more.

Now let us look the field over, and first we have the Maritime Province group. They have increased by 10,209, or 1·17 per cent., about one half the increase in the towns. Quebec and Ontario have increased by 315,626, or 9·60 per cent., about the increase in the cities and the towns and the district of Algoma. Then, we have the vast North-West, which has increased in ten years by 173,000 souls, including British Columbia, while just south of it is Dakota, with an increase of 376,350, or about double the amount, and Minnesota with an increase of 521,053, or three times the increase of our North-West, or in those two sections an increase of 897,403, or five times the increase of the entire North-West and British Columbia.

Now I propose to make a further analysis of our census returns, and as I embarked in this investigation it led me to results which surprised me. I revised them, I went over them, and yet the results were the same, and our increase is of a character more unsatisfactory than I supposed it to be. Between 1871 and 1881 the increase in our population was 638,314, or 17·31 per cent. During the same period the increase in the population of the United States was 11,597,402, or 30·08 per cent. In that period the number of immigrants to Canada amounted to 362,675, or an increase of 9·53 per cent. out of the total increase of 17·31 per cent. The immigration to the United States in the same period was 2,812,191, or a percentage of 7·29 out of the total increase of 30·08 per cent., that is, provided that in each case the immigrants were retained in the two countries. The natural increase in the United States was 8,785,221, or 22·79 per cent., or the natural increase in the United States was 15 per cent. greater than the natural increase in Canada in the decade between 1871 and 1881. The excess of the addition to the population of Canada over that of the United States from immigration amounted to 2·24 per cent., while the total excess of the increase in the population of the United States over that of Canada was 12·77 per cent.

Taking the present census of 1890 in the United States and 1891 in Canada, we find, as the first bulletin states, though that will be slightly varied by the subsequent statement of the Postmaster General, that our population has increased by 498,534, or a percentage of 11·52. The population of the United States has increased by 12,466,467, or 24·85 per cent. The immigration to Canada from 1881 to 1891 is represented to have been 886,173, or a percentage of 20·49 on the population of 1881, or 8·97 per cent. more than our total increase. We have an increase of 498,534 in the population, and we had an immigration of 886,173, showing a loss of 387,639, besides our natural increase. The immigration re-

ceived by Canada in the last decade was much larger in proportion to its population than that received by the United States. The immigration to the United States from 1880 to 1890 was 5,246,695, or 10·46 per cent. of the amount of increase. The immigration to Canada was 886,173, or 20·49 per cent. of the population in 1881. If the immigration to the United States had been equal in proportion to population to the immigration to Canada, it would have amounted to 10,985,779 instead of 5,246,695, or the United States required an additional amount of immigration to place them in the same position as Canada of 5,739,084. Take another view of the case, and you find that to place Canada in the same position as the United States we should reduce the amount of our immigration from 886,173 to 416,464, or we received 469,709 immigrants too many in order to place ourselves in the same proportion as the United States. Our excess of immigration over that of the United States amounted to 10·03 on the population of 1881. Had our natural increase equalled that of the United States in the last decade it would have amounted to 14·39 per cent., and if we had retained our immigration that would have amounted to 20·49 per cent., so that our total increase in the ten years, instead of being 11·52 per cent., would have been 34·88 per cent.

Now, I propose briefly to compare the results of the census of Canada for 1881 with the census for 1891. In 1881, as I have stated, our increase was 638,214. Now, deduct from this the immigrants received during that decade, 363,000, it leaves a natural increase of 275,000, or 7·78 per cent. That is the natural increase in Canada in the decade between 1871 and 1881 if we had retained the immigrants received during that period. Now, let us apply that rule to the last decade and see what the result will be. We will estimate that in the last decade we had the same natural increase that we had in the preceding one, and that we retained the immigrants received during that decade; that would have given us a natural increase of 336,476 during the last ten years; add to that the immigration, assuming that we retained it, of 886,000, and that gives the total increase for the last ten years of 1,222,643 souls. Now, we did increase in population according to the memo. that has been laid upon the Table of this House and upon which my calculations are based 498,534, so that we fall short of the population we should have, if our natural increase had been the same as it was during the previous decade, assuming that we retained our immigration—we fall short by 724,109 souls of the increase we should have secured in the last decade. Now, this is a bad showing. England and Wales, hives of industry, teeming with population, sending off swarms annually to Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, Canada and the United States—England and Wales show a larger increase than we have done. Their average increase since 1801 was 14·07 per cent.; the lowest increase between 1851 and 1861, was 11·93; the next lowest, between 1871 and 1881, was 12·11, therefore making a far better showing than we have done.

Now, my hon. friend from South Oxford this afternoon estimated that the natural increase of Canada was 2¼ per cent. per annum. Good authorities estimate the natural increase of Quebec at 4 per cent. per annum. I think I will be able to convince the House that it is reasonable to assume that a population such as that of Canada, a vigorous population, with ample room for expansion, inhabiting a healthful country, should have a natural increase of 30 per cent. each ten years. I assume that is the case, and I will give reasons for making that assumption. I will take the United States as a parallel case. The United States from 1790 to 1840 maintained a natural increase every ten years of from 29·33 per cent. to 35 per cent. In 1790 that country had a population of 3,929,000, just about a quarter of a million more than we had in 1871. Now, the United States received during the first 30 years of its existence a very small amount of foreign immigration. That country received only 250,000 from 1790 to 1820. That country, with a population of 3,929,000 in 1790, had a population of 7,219,000 in 1810. Upon the same basis, starting as we do in 1871, upon a quarter of a million less population than that country had in 1790, we ought to have very nearly seven millions of inhabitants 20 years afterwards without the aid of immigration; so it is evident from this parallel case that our increase has been ridiculously small. The rates of increase in the United States from 1790 to 1890 were as follows:—

1790 to 1800,	35·10 per cent.	1840 to 1850,	35·83 per cent.
1800 to 1810,	36·38 " "	1850 to 1860,	35·10 " "
1810 to 1820,	33·06 " "	1860 to 1870,	22·65 " "
1820 to 1830,	32·50 " "	1870 to 1880,	30·08 " "
1830 to 1840,	33·52 " "	1880 to 1890,	24·85 " "

Average 31·90.

Now, while there is no record of immigration to the United States from 1790 to 1820, it is certain that the natural increase of each of those decades was not less than 32 per cent., and in some cases 35 per cent. The first year in which we are able to make any comparison is that of 1830, when the immigration for the previous ten years had been 128,000. The total increase of population for the decade was 32·50, and the natural increase was 31·03, and that is the lowest figure of the natural increase in the United States up to that period. In 1840 the natural increase had only fallen to 29·33; in 1850 it was within a fraction of 28·12. Now, this comparison convinces me that the population of Canada, a population as vigorous as that of the United States at any time between 1790 and 1830, with conditions of expansion just as favourable as those enjoyed by the people af the United States, has lost a large portion of its natural increase. I assume if the population of the United States maintained a natural increase of from 30 to 35 per cent. for the three decades ending in 1820, and of from 31 per cent. in 1830 to almost 30 per cent. in 1840 and 1850, it is fair to assume that the native population of Canada would have a natural increase every ten years of 30 per cent. I assert that to be the case; there is not the slightest doubt that it is the case. I do not believe the population of this country is less vigorous, less strong physically, less likely to increase rapidly, than that of the United States at any period in the history of that country.

Now, let us see what we have been doing in this race of national progress. Upon that basis, instead of the natural increase being 30 per cent., we find this last decade is has been only 11·52, including immigrants. We received immigrants enough to make the increase 20·49 per cent. more, so that we should have had an increase of 50 per cent. in place of 11·52 this last ten years, if all the population of the country had stayed here, and we

had retained our immigrants. Now, let us see what would have been the result in ten years, if my assumption with regard to this matter is true. We started with 4,324,000 in 1881 : 30 per cent. increase in ten years would give 1,297,000. We had 886,000 immigrants coming into this country, and if they had remained here we should have had an increase of population, during that decade, of 2,183,616. Allowing nothing for the difference between the birth rate and the death rate of immgrants received during the ten years, what would be the result? Why, Sir, we should have a population in 1891 of 6,508,426. Assuming the natural increase was 30 per cent., which I believe it was, assuming that the immigrants coming to Canada stayed here, we would have an increase of population of $50\frac{4}{10}$ per cent., or an increase of 2,183,616, instead of 498,000, or a total population of 6,508,426. The population is 1,685,082 less than it should be according to these figures.

I propose to pursue this investigation a little further. I start with the assumption that the natural increase of the population is 30 per cent., that our people are just as virile and vigorous as the population of the United States were at any time in their history from 1790 to 1850, and I assume our increase was 30 per cent., because their increase was that percentage, and in some cases 5 per cent. more. Let us work that out for 1871, the first census we had after Confederation. We start with a population of 3,686,596, a quarter of a million less than the United States in 1790, and their population was over 7,229,000 in 1810. Add 30 per cent. to our population in 1871, and it would give us an increase of 1,105,978. We received during the ten years, from 1871 to 1881, 362,675 immigrants from the old world. So the population in 1881, with a 30 per cent. increase in the native population and with the retention in the country of the immigrants, without any allowance for the difference between the birth and death rate of the immigrant population, in 1881 should have been 5,155,249, instead of 4,324,000. Now we will start out in 1881 and compute the natural increase of 30 per cent. for the decade, which would give 1,546,574. The immigration amounted to 886,173. So the population by the returns which the Minister of Finance says are not entirely satisfactory should have been 7,587,996 in 1891, if there had been no emigration of native population or of immigrants. I reiterate what I stated, that this calculation makes no allowance for the increase of population from the difference between the birth rate and death rate of the immigrants arriving during that decade.

This is a bad showing. But there is something more. I am endeavouring to point out the effect of the exodus on the population for years past. At the commencement of this period, 1871, the point where I commence the calculation, we had Canadians living in the United States to the number of 490,041, they having been born in Canada. The census returns for 1871 give no return of children born in the United States of Canadian parents, the father or mother being a Canadian. The census of 1881 does, however, show this, and by that census it appears that there were 712,000 Canadians in the United States, that there had been 939,000 children born in the United States whose fathers were British Canadians and 931,000 whose mothers were British Canadians. On the data thus furnished, I estimate the number of children born of these 490,000 Canadians in the United States prior to 1871 at 627,000, besides the 490,000 people born in Canada. These figures give in the United States, in 1870, 1,117,040 of population properly belonging to Canada, if there had been no exodus. Add that number to the rest, and the result of the computation of the increase of population in 20 years, on the basis of a 30 per cent. natural increase, would give a total population now of 8,705,037. I make no allowance for the increase in the population on 1,117,041 Canadians and their children who were in the United States in 1871, during the two following decades, which at the rate of 30 per cent. in each ten years would be 770,754. If you add the natural increase of 30 per cent. each decade, amounting to 770,754, these figures would give as a population we should actually have in Canada 9,475,791 in 1891, if there had been no exodus from this country, and if we had maintained a natural increase of 30 per cent. each decade, which is less than the United States maintained for 50 years of its natural existence.

It is evident that something is wrong, and it is to be lamented that the interests and the future of a magnificent country like this, stretching from ocean to ocean, with all its resources in timber, soil, minerals and fisheries, a country capable of supporting 80,000,000 of people, a country starting on the race of progress with prospects so fair, should have had its interests so mismanaged by incompetency that in place of having what it might have had if it maintained the ratio of increase which the United States has maintained, and kept its people and immigrants at home, a population of 9,475,791, has less than 5,000,000. Truly my hon. friend was correct when he said that taxation and increase of debt are just the factors to produce the results we have in this country.

To recapitulate for a moment. This calculation may seem extravagant. I was led to this result step by step. First, I took the United States census returns and found that the natural increase there was over 30 per cent. every 10 years, and had been so for the first 50 years of their national existence. I enquired, Is there any reason why Canada should not present as good a showing? I could not find any reason, for I believe the Canadian people are as vigorous and as likely to increase in population as are the American people, and if any one can show a reason to the contrary I will revise my figures. But as I believe we are as vigorous a race as the Americans, I hold that we should show at this stage of our national existence what they showed for fifty years after their national existence began, over 30 per cent. increase every ten years, and I assume that our natural increase is as great. Assuming that point to be established, I go on then and show beyond peradventure that if our immigrants had stayed with us we should have had a population of 7,500,000, entirely independent of the number of people who have left Canada prior to 1871 ; and the whole calculation was thus worked out, and the result cannot be questioned. If the basis is right, the result is right. If we have a natural increase of 30 per cent., as the Americans have had, if we had retained our immigrants, as we ought to have done, and had had no exodus of the native population, we would have had the population I have indicated, which the census returns show we have not got.

So much for the general question. I desire to

refer for a moment to the section of country in which I am immediately interested. I find on examination of the partial returns brought down that the group of ridings along Lake Erie, commencing at the Niagara frontier and running as far west as Elgin, embracing Norfolk, Haldimand, Monck, Welland, Lincoln and Niagara, this group of ridings had in 1881 a population of 127,004. It has by the last returns a population of 115,810, a loss of 7,194, or 6 per cent. in 10 years. When I call attention to that portion of the country I think it will strike hon. members as strange that this should be the result. These ridings lie along Lake Erie. They are traversed by two through lines of railway passing from east to west, giving connection with Detroit on the west and Buffalo and New York on the east. They are excellent agricultural counties; they are excellent fruit counties; Lincoln and Niagara are the finest peach regions in Canada, and if any section should show an increase of population these ridings should show it, as they possess the finest soil and superior facilities for reaching markets. My own riding of North Norfolk has declined from 20,933 in 1881 to 19,400 in 1891, or a loss of 1,533, equal to 7.32 per cent. South Norfolk has decreased from 19,019 to 17,780, being a loss of 1,237, or 6½ per cent. Now, Sir, there is not a more beautiful country on this continent than these two ridings. They are abundantyl watered with pure spring streams and copious living springs; a magnificent fruit country, a country raising the finest wheat, a country admirably adapted to the production of fruit, and clover, and root crops, and barley, and oats, and all crops that grow in the temperate zone; the finest corn country in the Dominion, a country that is capable of being made a garden, a country not one-half of which is under cultivation at the present moment; and yet that country, situated as it is, with two great lines of railways traversing it from east to west, presents a loss of population of 6½ per cent. in one riding and 7½ per cent. in the other. That is surely a commentary on this National Policy that does not require further dwelling upon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was a time when the Province of Ontario increased in population at a satisfactory rate. That period was from 1851 to 1861, when we had for seven years of that period the benefit of reciprocity with the United States. Ontario increased during that decade from 952,000 to 1,396,000, an increase of 46·60 per cent. That was a satisfactory increase, and we never have had a satisfactory increase since. Quebec, during that same decade, increased from 890,000 to 1,111,000, an increase of 221,000, or 24·96 per cent. I repeat, Sir, that this was during the operation of a reciprocity treaty, because for seven years of that period, from 1854 to 1861, we had reciprocity. During the next decade the increase is not so satisfactory, but during that period we had the retarding influences of the American war, and for five years of that period we had no reciprocity. It was natural to suppose that the decade from 1861 to 1871 would not be as favourable or as satisfactory as the other. So, Sir, I affirm, from the data furnished here, from the fact that Ontario increased by 46 per cent. of population in the ten years, during a portion of which we had reciprocity, from the fact that it has not increased satisfactorily since reciprocity was lost to this country, I infer that reciprocity with the United States and access to our natural markets had very much indeed to do with the expansion of the population in that province during the period I mention. I assert that the showing of the present census returns is unsatisfactory, and I assert that it proves conclusively, when we come to examine it, that there is something wrong in the policy which is now prevailing in this country and which has prevailed for the last thirteen years. A country situated as Canada is, a country possessing the resources that Canada does, a country inhabited by the kind of population that inhabits Canada, is a country that should increase faster than at this snail's pace we have been going. Something is required to give an impetus to the progress of this country, something is required to secure for this country that measure of prosperity which it certainly has not enjoyed for the last twenty or thirty years.

While this last decade has been passing away we have been making progress in some respects. We have made satisfactory progress in the matter of accumulating our public debt. We started out with a debt of $155,000,000, and we landed at the end with a debt of $237,000,000. We have increased our debt $82,000,000, or 52 per cent., even if we have only increased our population by 11 per cent. We started out at the commencement of the decade with Customs and Excise taxes amounting to $23,942,000, and we ended with Customs and Excise taxation amounting to $31,587,000, or an increase of $7,644,000 in taxation. If we take the previous year of 1880, we find that we have increased our taxation by $13,107,000, or 70 per cent. since then, and we have increased our expenditure from $25,502,000 to $35,994,000, an increase of $10,491,000, or 41 per cent. increase. Here, Sir, are the results of this miserable fiasco called the National Policy. Here are the results of this political falsehood, of this fiscal confidence game, that enables the few to plunder the many, that makes the fishermen, the farmers, the lumbermen and the miners the prey of a very small portion of the population. That is the outcome of what the Government designates by the high-sounding title of the National Policy; and yet we are told by the Minister of Finance that under its operation for twelve years, with the evidence we have now before our eyes, that that policy has been a satisfactory one. What do we want in this country, Mr. Speaker? We want access to our natural market; we want to have done with this condition of things which has brought this country to the verge of ruin; we want to put a party in power that will manage the finances of this country with that prudence with which they were managed from 1873 to 1878, we want to put a party in power that will secure for this country such commercial treaties and such commercial arrangements as will give us access to the population of 63,000,000 at our doors, which is a matter of vital importance to us. We want, Sir, to inaugurate a policy that will put an end to that system of things that leaves us with a population of less than 5,600,000, when we should have a population of 8,500,000. This year we are likely to export to the United States, of the produts of Canada, a quantity very much less than in 1866, at the end of the reciprocity treaty. After the expiration of twenty-five years we will have a smaller trade with that great country than we had in 1866,

when it had only half the population it has now. We want to inaugurate a policy which will cease to require this country to act as a hive to send off its annual swarms to the United States, and which keeps our population down to low-water mark, with a beggarly increase of 11 per cent. in ten years, when there ought to be an increase of 30 per cent., in addition to the increase from immigration. We want, Sir, a policy that will drive from power the men who have doubled the public debt of this country, who have piled upon this country an extravagant, and unjustifiable, and unnecessary expenditure; the men who have made the name of this country a by-word among the nations of the earth, giving us a character for corruption, and peculation, and fraud, and contract sweating, the most unenviable reputation enjoyed by any civilized country in the world. I say, Sir, we want to drive from power the men who are responsible for this condition of things and whose garments smell very strongly, to say the least, of the odours that emanate from this foul sink of corruption. Sir, we want in short, and the sum of it all amounts to this, we want to participate on equal terms, and without impediment and without exaction, in the energies and in the activity that characterizes all the Anglo-Saxon people of this continent. We want, in place of having free trade with seven Anglo-Saxon nations under the British flag, to enlarge the number, so that we will have free trade with forty-nine. We want the market of 63,000,000 of people across the border; we want to sell them the productions of our mines, and our forests, and our seas, and our soil. If the Liberal policy is carried into effect, if that arrangement which the Liberal party is able to give to this country, and which the Liberal party if in power would secure for this country, if that arrangement is carried into effect, then, as my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, says, the turning point would indeed come; then we would have prosperity, and then Canada would show to the world all the things she is capable of; she would show to the world that with her grand resources, her extensive sweeps of fertile soil, her forests, her mines and her fisheries, that her energetic population are capable of accomplishing as much as any given number of people on the face of the earth is capable of doing. Sir, it is melancholy to see a noble young country like this, with all its magnificent resources chained down; it is melancholy to see it overburdened by debt; it is melancholy to see it in the hands of such men as we see sitting opposite us, incompetent, if not worse, who have brought the country to the verge of ruin; and unless they are driven from their place of power, unless their grip upon the country is released, we shall see even worse times than we have seen yet.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat has treated the House as usual to a long list of figures in the line of the argument which he has adopted. He can prove almost anything, if you only allow him to handle figures. He can prove by statistics at one time that protection is good for the country, and he can prove in the following year that the very reverse is the case. He can prove that there is an exodus in the population, and at the same that there is an increase, if you allow him to do it by figures. In fact, the hon. gentleman's demonstration from figures appears to be as intelligible to the country as the old professor's illustration of chemistry. A boy to whom he was attempting to explain the mysteries of chemistry asked the professor what was chemistry? He answered: "If you take an effervescent and add a deliquescence, there will be a precipitation: that's a conglomeration, which will amount to a demonstration." That is about as intelligible as the demonstration which the hon. member for North Norfolk has made regarding the condition of the country from the figures he has given us to-night. The hon. gentleman, before taking his seat, said that he was prepared to tell the country what change was needed in the policy of the country, and he wound up by saying, as representing the Opposition, that we want a policy that will drive the Conservative party or those incompetents from power. I said in response to the hon. gentleman that he and his party had been hunting for that policy for twelve years, and that they had failed to find it yet: but if they are ever successful in finding that policy I venture to say that the hon. member for North Norfolk will make a dozen affidavits that they will never let it go. They have failed to find it, although they have devised several policies and submitted them to the country; but fortunately the country did not think as they did. The hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be in the position of the insane man in the asylum, who contended that he was sane and the others around him insane, and when asked: How comes it that you are here if you are not insane? He answered: Simply because those who put me here are in the majority, and they keep me here. So the hon. member for North Norfolk says that the people are wanting in intelligence because they do not drive the present Government from power; but, strange to say, the majority are on the other side, and the Opposition, like the insane man, are kept where they are because the majority are against them. Then the hon. member for North Norfolk gave us several reasons why we have not a larger population. He drew a comparison between the increase of the population of the United States and the increase of the population of Canada, and what periods did he take? One would naturally suppose that if he were honest he would endeavour to submit to the House comparisons which would be considered legitimate and fair; but he drew a comparison between the increase of the population of the United States a hundred years ago and the increase of the population of Canada at the present time. He failed to compare the percentage of increase in the United States to-day with the percentage of increase in Canada, because it suited his purpose better to make the comparison between the United States of one hundred years ago and Canada to-day. The hon. gentleman went further, and drew a comparison between the increase of population in Dakota and Minnesota with the increase in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, taking the period from 1881 to 1891. Now, the hon. gentleman forgot to tell this House and the country that there is no fair comparison between those two sections of country to-day—why? Because Minnesota and Dakota draw their population from their own country: they draw it from the 50,000,000 people who occupy the eastern and middle states. The expansion of population in the east is so great, and the want of homes is so

strong, that the people go west and settle in Minnesota and Dakota much more rapidly than we expect to settle Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Another important difference is that Dakota and Minnesota have great markets at their doors, in the cities of St. Paul, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Chicago, and other cities; and the highways of commerce and the avenues of trade were opened up before 1881, so that the people who went to settle in Dakota and Minnesota were able to enjoy the advantages of civilization when they went there. Therefore, it is not to be wondered at that the influx of people into Minnesota and Dakota was much greater than the influx into Manitoba and the North-West. On the other hand, what was the condition of Manitoba and the North-West? Before 1881 the only access we had to the country was by way of the United States, and as our immigrants were passing through that western country they were allured away by the attractions presented to them by the agents for Minnesota and Dakota; and in this way we lost many of our valuable immigrants who started from here with the intention of going to Manitoba and the North-West Territories, on account of our not having railway connection. We commenced to build the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1881; but the larger part of the decade was spent in getting ready to build up the country. From that we have been going on year after year, building railways in that country for the convenience of the people going there, and we are only to-day, at the end of the decade, in a fair position to compete with Dakota and Minnesota by having those advantages which they had ten years ago. But because we have not attracted settlement to that western country as rapidly as Minnesota and Dakota have during the last ten years, with all those advantages at the commencement of the decade, the hon. member for North Norfolk and the hon. member for South Oxford say that this is on account of the policy of the present Government. I think that is most unfair; it is most misleading. It is unfair, not only to the men who are administering the country to-day, but to the country which these hon. gentlemen profess to represent. Then, again, we are asked to condemn the policy of the Government because we have not attracted as many immigrants to our shores proportionately as the United States have during the last ten or twenty years. Now, it will be necessary for us for a moment to direct our attention to the classes from which we have drawn our immigrants. We have been drawing almost entirely from one class, the agricultural class in the mother country—and why? Because we have been told by the Opposition in this country, year after year, that we were only bringing immigrants into the country to compete with the mechanics and artizans already here, who could not find employment; and, therefore, we endeavour to confine ourselves as much as possible to the introduction of the farming class into the country. We have been drawing from that small class in Europe only, while the United States, with their great manufacturing centres, with their woollen mills, and iron foundries, and machine shops, have been drawing hundreds of thousands and millions from the artizan class, simply because they could furnish them with spheres of employment, which we, being in embryonic state of manufacturing life, could not hold out to them. Hon. gentlemen opposite ought to lay this before the people, and not unfairly blame this Government because we have not attracted to our country as many settlers during the past ten years as the United States have. The Government are also attacked on the ground that the increase in our population has not been as great as it was anticipated it would be: but the hon. gentlemen who make that charge are not fair enough to admit that there are other causes in operation which would fairly account for a large portion of this, and which the Government cannot control. The Minister of Finance alluded to one, and it is a very important one—that is, the different method pursued in taking the last census compared with that followed in 1881. In 1881 the regulations provided that no matter how long the members of a family were absent from the country, provided the head of the family had reason to believe they would come back, they were to be counted as residents of Canada. It did not matter whether they were away one year or ten years, so long as the head of the family expected them to come back. That rule was not followed when taking the last census, but, on the contrary, all those who had been absent for over a year were not counted, no matter whether they intended to return or not. Let me give one illustration, which I will take from the County of Grey. In one family there four out of five of the sons are in the United States, but these four have all been earning money and sending it home to the eldest, who remained at home, to buy land, and the eldest son has bought a hundred acres of land, which he had nearly paid up last year, and then bought another hundred acres with money sent home from those members of the family who were away earning money for that purpose, in order to provide a home for his brothers, who intend to return and settle in this country. But as these have been absent for over twelve months they were not counted in the last census. In 1881, however, they would have been counted; and the natural result is, that these four members of the one family, who were included in the census of 1881, are not included in the present one, thus showing a decrease in this instance where there is really no decrease. I only cite this one instance, but I could give a dozen others of a similar character, though the numbers might be different, taken from my own locality. That fairly accounts for the decrease in population compared with what we would naturally expect at present; and it is to be regretted that we did not adopt the same system as that which we followed in 1881, or devise some other means whereby a proper and fair comparison of the increase in the last decade compared with the previous one could be arrived at. The present system not only does injustice to the country, but to the Government and those men who are endeavouring to do their best for the country, and furnishes our opponents with arguments which they will use te the detriment of Canada. There are other reasons which might fairly account for the small growth of the population of Canada, or for what the hon. member for North Norfolk calls the exodus. That hon. gentleman talked eloquently about the exodus, and he accounted for it by the National Policy. He accounted for it also by what he is pleased to call the incompetency of the men who are governing the country; but he hides from himself and the country the most important element in the matter. We have had here during

the last twelve years in this House and the country a class of men who have been constantly running down the country, who have been constantly decrying its public men, who have been constantly drawing comparisons between this country and the United States, to the disadvantage of Canada, so that it is not to be wondered at if the electorate of Canada, believing in the honesty and integrity of these men, have, many of them, left Canada to seek for homes in those elysian fields which have been painted so green and bright by the members of the Opposition. A few years ago when discussing the National Policy, in reply to hon. gentlemen opposite, I referred to the same argument, and I stated I would not be surprised to find that the constituencies represented by members of the Opposition—if we could only ascertain what was the trend of events or the drift of population—would show a larger exodus than those represented by members of the Conservative party. Looking over the census, what do the figures show? They bear out that contention very largely. I take the constituencies represented by Reformers in this House and those represented by Conservatives, and what do I find? I find that those represented by Conservatives, numbering in all forty-seven from the Province of Ontario—and I deal with that province, because I am better acquainted with it and with the political complexion of the men who represent it—and I find of those forty-seven constituencies represented by Conservatives, in only thirteen is there a decrease of population compared with the census of 1881. There are 42 constituencies represented by Reformers, and there is a decrease in the population of 26 of them, whereas there is a decrease in only 13 out of 47 represented by Conservatives. Does not that show that the arguments of the hon. gentlemen have been instrumental in convincing many of the people that there are better homes for them in the Western States than in Canada, and have tended rather to depopulate the country than to increase our population? Should not these hon. gentlemen be fairly held responsible for a large share of the exodus which has taken places in the last ten or twelve years? A few years ago some of the older members of the House will remember an immigration pamphlet which was got up, showing the advantages of Minnesota and Dakota for settlers compared with this country. Where did they find their arguments to prove that? They put a portion of a speech from the Hon. Edward Blake in that pamphlet, which was made decrying his country, and they put his photograph as a frontispiece on that pamphlet, and that was sent to England to show the advantages of the North Western States, and I think they had a speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) also. These pamphlets were thrown broadcast over European countries, and could we then expect to obtain our share of immigrants? We could not, because these men stand high in political life. They are able men; they are supposed to be honourable men and intelligent men, and their speeches were selected for this purpose—speeches by Goldwin Smith, by the Hon. Edward Blake, by the member for South Oxford, and the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who is now leaving the room because, I suppose, he is beginning to feel ashamed of his conduct. The only wonder is that we have not lost more of our population, and these men are to be held responsible for the limited increase which has taken place. Going further, I take the three ridings of Bruce. The north riding is represented by a Conservative, and there has been an increase of 3,388. The west riding is represented by my hon. friend over there, and there has been a decrease of 4,500. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Rowand) does not talk much in this House, but his people at home must believe in him, because 4,500 of them have gone away from the country, and that county has been represented by a Reformer since 1878. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) gave us an important lecture to-night, and his righteous indignation was raised to a pitch which knew no bounds. He used all the invectives and all the harsh language which he has so readily at his command. During the past few weeks he has been restraining himself, but his pent-up wrath broke out to-night. He talked about the vicious policy of the Government, the scandalous policy of the Government, the corruption of the Government, the ignorance of the people, because they did not put his party in power; the debauched condition of the constituencies, the subsidized press, the corruption in the Civil Service and out of it. That hon. gentleman has been following the same line of argument for twelve years, and in his own constituency he has succeeded in sending away his people. In 1881 the population of his riding was 24,771, and to-day it is only 22,421, so that he has succeeded in convincing 2,357 people that it was better for them to leave that riding and to go to those elysian fields which he pictures so graphically in the American North-West. The hon. gentleman is entitled to a medal, but I think it would rather be a leather medal than a golden one. The eloquence of the member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) has convinced 2,206 of his people that they had better find a home in another country. Prince Edward County was represented for eight years by Dr. Platt. In 1881 its population was 21,000 and now it is only 18,892. North York, which is represented by our eloquent and gifted friend (Mr. Mulock), had a population of 21,730 in 1881, while now it has only 20,284, representing a loss of 1,446, no doubt owing to his eloquence; and yet I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman will vote for the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford, condemning the Government because there has not been an increase in the population of the constituency which he has been convincing the people to leave. North Wentworth, in 1881, had a population of 15,594, and to-day it has only 14,491, so that the representative of that riding has succeeded in convincing 1,193 of his constituents to go to another country because this God-forsaken country is not a place to live in. Then take the three ridings of Grey. There is an increase in the population of North and East Grey, both represented by Conservatives, but my eloquent friend from South Grey has succeeded in inducing 2,037 people to leave his constituency in the last ten years, though that is the newer part of the county and should have increased more in proportion than the other two ridings. The hon. member has been preaching blue ruin, but the people in the other ridings remain in their places and are citizens whom Canada is proud of. Now, I take South Wentworth, and what is the condition there? It is one of the border counties

the member for North Norfolk spoke about, and he said that every one of them were losing their population during the last decade. It is represented by a Conservative, and I find that in 1881 it had a population of 15,500, it now has 16,731, an increase of 1,231; whereas the other riding, represented by a Reformer during the last twelve years, has lost 1,406. Is that comparison not a fair one? I say if it proves anything in the world it proves that the constituencies represented by those men who say that Canada is not the best country to live in, have lost in population, the people apparently believed their Liberal representatives, and have left this country for another country. Now, I take North Wellington, whose representative is, perhaps, the most assiduous member the Opposition have. He is invariably ready to condemn the Government for every thing, and I have no doubt that before this debate is through he will give this House a lengthy argument condemning the Government because the population has not increased in his riding. In 1881 North Wellington had a population of 25,400; to-day, although it has been represented by that hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) for eight years, it has a population of only 24,962, or a decrease of 438. Now the hon. gentleman's arguments cannot be as effective at home as he would like them to be, or he would be like many of his fellow members, and he would have succeeded better in driving his people away from the country. I take North Norfolk where the population has been decreased 1,533, by the eloquence of the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Charlton). Then I take East Huron, from whose representative we will probably hear. In 1881 it had a population of 21,112, to-day the population is 18,960 or a reduction of 2,752, showing how assiduous the hon. gentleman has been in convincing his people that there is a better country for them out of Canada. Then take West Huron, there has been a reduction from 23,000 to 22,000. Remember those constituencies have been represented for years by Reformers in this House. Then I take South Huron, and I find the population has decreased from 21,000 to 19,000. Take North Brant, whose representative (Mr. Paterson) is one of the ablest exponents of the Liberal policy, his county has lost in population 652 during the last ten years. Then take West Ontario, whose representative (Mr. Edgar) is not in his seat, and I find that in 1881 it had a population of 20,189; it has now a population of 18,792, or a reduction of 1,387, and it has been represented for years by a Reformer in this House. Then I take North Ontario, a part of the same county, and I find that it had a population of 20,000 in 1881, and it has increased by 599 during the decade. I go over the whole list, and I find that in almost every county where one riding is represented by a Conservative, there is an increase in the population of that riding, and where the other riding is represented by a Reformer, there is a decrease in the population. Now, I ask, who should be held responsible for whatever exodus there has been from this country, or if there has been no increase in the population? I give these facts because I believe they fairly account not only for the lack of natural increase, but for the decrease in many sections of our country. I believe it is a fair argument that no one can contradict. If any one will take the trouble to analyse the census returns of the various constituencies in Ontario, he will come to no other conclusion than the one I have drawn. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford treated the House to a little prophecy. Because he predicted last year there would be a decrease in the population, he comes now and says: "I told you so." He reminds me of the old lady who, when anything happened, always said: "I told you so." She blamed her husband for being responsible for everything that happened, and one day he came in and said to her: "The cow has eaten the grindstone." She said: "I told you so, you old fool; you would not put it in." And the hon. member for South Oxford, because his predictions happen to be right once in fifty times, comes and says: "I told you so." Last year, in the course of the Budget debate, he said:

"In fifty counties in Ontario the population has retrograded during the last nine years."

And he gives the figures. I have examined those counties and compared the figures with the census just taken, and I find that in about eight out of ten he is wrong. Now, we have heard his prophecies before. I remember that he prophesied in 1876 that if we increased the duty from 15 to 17½ per cent., it would raise enough money to carry on the affairs of the country. The duty was raised, but his prophecy did not prove correct. Then he came back and prophesied again; he said he could raise a greater revenue if they would only allow him to adopt his own means for raising it. The House allowed him to follow his own plan, but instead of having enough money, there was a deficit. In 1879 he prophesied that if the National Policy was introduced it would be a failure in raising a revenue, and he staked his reputation upon it. What was the result? It was proven that he was a false prophet; enough revenue was raised for all the purposes of the Government. He prophesied that the National Policy would signally fail in building up the manufactures of the country; but now he tells us about the bloated millionaires of the country whose fortunes have been built up by the National Policy. So that all his prophecies about the National Policy proving an injury to this country, about its decreasing instead of increasing our manufacturing interests, have remained unfulfilled to this day. I need not go over the various prophecies to which he has treated us during the last twelve years, but if you analyze them fairly you will find that in about 49 out of every 50 cases he has proven himself to be a false prophet. If the Scriptures were to be literally fulfilled we would naturally expect that the latter days were come, because it was foretold that in the latter days many false prophets would arise, and the hon. gentleman from South Oxford has proven his right to stand at the head of the list of false prophets. Now, because he has happened for once in his life to be right, he is encouraged to make other predictions and to tell us what evils will befall this country if we do not adopt unrestricted reciprocity, forgetful of the fact that his prophecies, as a rule, have turned out to be just the reverse of what has actually happened. The Minister of Finance said there must be an exception to every rule, and in this instance it was the exception that proved the rule, because the hon. member for South Oxford was notable for making false prophecies, and the exception was that one of them had been fulfilled. Now, I say that in every one of these lines, instead of holding the National Policy responsible for it, instead of holding the policy

of the Government responsible for it, instead of holding the immigration policy responsible for it, we can look to the sources I have mentioned as fairly responsible for what we have in the country at the present time. From 1878 to the present time we have been hearing complaints from hon. gentlemen opposite that the Government were spending too much money for immigration, that they were bringing in a class of people that were not needed. The Government heeded that advice too much, and cut down the amount for immigration. What has been the result? Although the expenditure has been reduced year after year, we have still more people brought to this country at a lower cost than was done by the Reformers when in power. During the 5 years of the Mackenzie regime 149,376 people were brought to the country at a cost of $8.04 per head. During the following 5 years there were 373,000 at a cost of $3.52 per head: during the last 5 years 425,000 people at a cost of $3.62 per head. But hon. gentlemen opposite say we have not kept them in the country. They are alone responsible for the fact that we do not find as many people in Canada to-day as we ought to find. They have been constantly decrying the country. Men come here with their two hands as their capital to work out the problems life. A young man starts out with the buoyancy of hope and endeavours to work himself forward and work out successfully his future. What sustains him through poverty, privation and hard work? It is hope which buoys up his spirits during those dark days. If you destroy that hope, which is the stock and trade of a great mass of the Canadian people, the only capital they possess to start in life with, that hope in his country and its destiny, it is not to be wondered at if he leaves his country and goes to find success in a foreign land. That has been the course followed by the Opposition during the last twelve years. They have been destroying that buoyant hope which keeps up our people during days of privation and hardship. The hon. member for South Oxford said that it was to be regretted that our people left the country, but it was doubly to be regretted that our rising generation were leaving it. The young men, when told that there was no hope for people remaining in Canada or for Canada itself, naturally went to another country in order to better their condition. No doubt the philosophy of the hon. member for Bothwell, the arguments of the hon. member for South Oxford, and the eloquence of the hon. member for North Norfolk have tended very materially to destroy that buoyant hope in young Canadians, and, therefore, they have left the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have taken away the most valuable capital possessed by those young men starting in life and that hope which buoys them up through privation and hardship and leads them on to success, and to become great and good men and valuable citizens in Canada. They have destroyed this hope at a time in the history of these young men when they were not able to contend against the argument presented, and they have thus sent them away from our shores in the early period of life.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why did you do it?

Mr. SPROULE. I say the Opposition have done it. If they want proof of it, let them take their own constituencies, where their arguments have been reiterated and they show the results of their arguments. Why have the people left those counties? It is because hon. gentlemen opposite have destroyed their hopes in the future of this country, and yet to-day hon. gentlemen opposite hold the Government responsible for this state of affairs. An analysis of the census returns will show who are responsible for this condition, and it is clear that hon. gentlemen opposite are driving their friends so rapidly out of the country that their ranks are being thinned from year to year, and if it continues long enough we may some day expect to find none but Conservatives returned from those constituencies. I need not longer occupy the time of the House, because many other speakers are to follow, but if I continued another hour I could address arguments equally strong, and contentions equally as weighty, as those I have presented. I have proved that the Opposition are largely responsible for the fact that our population is not as large as it was expected to be. I could use as strong arguments as I have used to account for the exodus that has occurred during the last decade. I could show that the Opposition are more responsible for it than any other class of the community. At the commencement of this decade and indeed through it we have been expending very large sums to improve our highways of commerce so as to enable our people to carry on life successfully. We have placed our country ready for the reception of immigrants, and it ought to give them the advantages to be found in older countries, the expenditure has been very large. We have accomplished the result admirably. We have the great Canadian Pacific Railway built through Manitoba and the North-West Territories, over the Rocky Mountains to British Columbia, and have opened up millions of acres of arable land to receive the teeming millions from European countries, with all the advantages that may be found in much older countries. We have built, besides this main line, various other lines throughout the western country. We have improved our canals and harbours, and placed within reach of the Canadian people all the advantages of modern civilization; and, therefore, we may naturally expect a larger immigration during the next decade, because, having made these improvements future immigrants will have the benefit of them. These results have been obtained in the face of great opposition. We have had to fight the Opposition at every step with respect to building the Canadian Pacific Railway, establishing the National Policy, keeping Canada for the Canadians, and maintaining that buoyant hope which Canadian should possess. The Opposition persistently decried our country and represented foreign countries as much better than ours, so that not only Canadians but foreigners coming here constantly heard that the Western States were preferable to Canada. Yet to-day, these hon. gentlemen turn around and hold the Government responsible for the results as shown in the census, using unfair, unmanly and unreasonable arguments. When the results of the census are analyzed, the sober second-thought of the people will declare that the present Government have done a great deal for the country; they will admit that the present Government are Canadian at heart, British in sentiment and loyal to the core, that they have done what Canada needed and will do it in the future,

and they will be maintained by the people in power for many years to come.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) will pardon me if I do not follow him in his long speech. The hon. gentleman said in concluding his speech that if he spoke for an hour longer he could advance arguments just as strong as the arguments he had advanced before. I agree with the hon. gentleman. I believe if he spoke for twenty-four hours one argument would be just as strong as another argument. The hon. gentleman in order to show that the census returns and the deplorable exhibition they make is attributable, rather to the Liberals and Liberal speeches and the conduct of Liberal members of Parliament, pointed out a number of counties represented by Liberals in which the population has decreased, and a number of counties represented by Conservatives in which the population has increased, and he attributed the decrease in the populations of these counties to the speeches made by Liberals to their constituents, in Parliament and in the country, on the trade policy and kindred questions. I am not prepared to say why it is that some constituencies that have returned Conservatives to Parliament have increased in population. It may have been because they did not read the newspapers. It may have been because there is not the general intelligence in constituencies of that kind that there is in constituencies represented by members of the Opposition; but the hon. gentleman was a little unfortunate in one or two of his references. The riding of East Huron was not represented for years by a Liberal, until 1887. For seven years of the past decade that county was represented by a Tory, and, I believe, if it had continued to be represented by a Tory, there would not have been as large a population there as there is now. West Huron was represented by a Conservative prior to 1882 and subsequent to 1887, for at least six years of the present decade, and, if the population has decreased in that county, it is certainly not because the constituency was represented by a Liberal. I would like to know what the Minister of Finance thinks of the hon. gentleman's argument; I would like to know what the Minister of Inland Revenue thinks of the hon. gentleman's argument; I would like to know what the Minister of Justice thinks of the hon. gentleman's argument. If the decrease in the population is attributable to disloyal speeches of members representing these counties, how is the hon. gentleman from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) going to satisfy the Minister of Finance? Why, the very moment the hon. gentleman uttered that sentiment, the Minister of Finance escaped from the chamber. He was afraid to remain, and the hon. gentleman frightened him from his seat. I find that the county represented by the Minister of Finance has decreased from a population of 25,617 to a population of 23,000, a falling off of 2,617. Now, the Minister of Finance must have been uttering some thoroughly disloyal sentiments in the County of King's, N.B., or the population would not have fallen off. He has been decrying the country, and he has been preaching blue ruin; how is the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) going to reconcile himself with his hon. friend who sits right behind him (Mr. Tupper). He had better go over to the adjoining seat and make up friends with the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He also must have been preaching blue ruin to the County of Pictou for the last ten years, and the result is that the County of Pictou has decreased from 35,000 to 34,000. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries ought to have been brought to account, because if the argument of the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is correct he has by his disloyal utterances in the County of Pictou preached 1,000 people into the United States. What has his friend the Minister of Justice done? Is he as great a sinner: he has got the reputation of being a little more eloquent and, perhaps, of having a little more influence in the Province of Nova Scotia than his colleague; his speeches have the reputation of being a little more telling, and his disloyal utterances for the last ten years have actually driven into the United States of America 2,000 Canadians from his own county of Antigonish. If the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) went on for another hour and gave us just such admirable logical arguments as these, we would not all be disposed to listen to him for long. Now, here is a thoroughly disloyal man sitting right in front of me (Mr. Mills, Bothwell,) who has been preaching these disloyal doctrines for twenty-five years, who has been preaching blue ruin according to the theory of the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and yet his county has increased in population by 4,000. The hon. member for East Grey must see how potent and how logical his argument is. Everybody with an ounce of brains knows that it does not signify what county you represent, the people read in every county. I know the Conservatives as well, I dare say, as the hon. gentleman; I know that a great many of them are reading men, and if disloyal sentiments are uttered in Parliament, or out of Parliament, or blue ruin is preached in Parliament or out of Parliament, it is read by them; and because one county represented by a Liberal happens to lose population and because another county represented by a Conservative happens to gain a few hundred, that is about the weakest kind of argument I ever heard in Parliament against the present amendment, but it is worthy of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Now, is it really possible in the Parliament of Canada and on the Treasury benches, where there are some able men, that there was not a single Minister of the Crown able to rise to his feet for the purpose of defending the Minister of Finance, and that the duty had to fall upon a prospective Minister of Agriculture? Is it possible that in the Parliament of Canada, upon the other side of the House, there is not a single member of the Conservative party who had the courage to get to his feet to relieve, or to attempt to relieve, the Minister of Finance from the difficulties in which he was placed? Is it possible that there is not to-night a single member of the Conservative party in this House who has the courage of his convictions, and who will tell the Minister of Finance to his face that the deplorable results presented by the census returns are attributable to two causes, namely, the vicious commercial policy of the Government, and the still more vicious administration of our public affairs for the last ten years? Is it possible that there is not a member of Parliament on the other side of the House who could suggest a remedy for the evils in which the country is now placed? It is true that

the Minister of Finance attempted to shirk responsibility for the deplorable condition in which the country now is, as shown by the census returns, by preaching somewhat the same doctrine as his follower from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and declaring that the speeches of blue ruin which have been made in Parliament and out of Parliament have everything to do with the loss of population? It is true, he told us that the speech of the late leader of the Liberal party in Parliament and out of Parliament, especially in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, had something to do with it. I challenge the Minister of Finance or any other member of the Government to lay his finger upon a sentence that ever the Hon. Edward Blake uttered in condemnation of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is true, he condemned the mode of construction; it is true, he condemned the outrageous and absurd conditions that the company exacted from the Government of Canada; it is true, he condemned the conditions that were imposed by the company upon the Government of Canada with relation to the North-West Territories; it is true, he predicted that if those conditions formed part of the charter of incorporation, they would strike a deadly blow at the growth and prosperity of the North-West Territories, and the Hon. Edward Blake never uttered a truer sentence than that. It is true, the hon. gentleman referred to disclosures being made in the Province of Quebec. I know nothing about those disclosures; I care nothing about them, except as a Canadian desirous that his country shall be pure and honest. We have enough to do at home, and the Minister of Finance will do well, before he makes observations with regard to charges pending elsewhere, to look about him, behind him, to the right of him, and to the left of him. Now, Sir, there is no thoughtful man in the Parliament of Canada to-day, there is no thoughtful man out of Parliament to-day, but must deplore the results as they are presented by the census returns laid on the Table of the House not long ago. There is no thoughtful Canadian in Parliament or out of Parliament that will not do more than the Minister of Finance did, or than his follower from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) did—pause and consider with care and deliberation what the causes of this deplorable condition are. There is not a thoughtful, honest, upright Canadian to-night who will not only feel disposed to pause and consider what the causes are, and whether remedies for that condition can be suggested. Sir, it is well for us that the facts are plain, and that the Minister of Finance admitted the facts: he could not do otherwise. He deplored the results; he could not well do otherwise. But admitting the facts, it is well for thoughtful Canadians, desirous for the progress, prosperity and welfare of the country, to pause for a moment and consider the reasons why Canada has not made the strides forward that Canada ought to have made, and if possible to suggest remedies for the admitted evils. Has our expenditure anything to do with the matter? Has the increase of our annual expenditure from $15,000,000 in 1871 to $37,000,000 or thereabouts in 1891 had anything to do with it? Has the increase of our national debt from $78,000,000 in 1871 to $237,000,000 or thereabouts in 1891 had anything to do with it? Has our expenditure which is now out of all proportion to the wants and necessities of the country, anything to do with it? Has our national debt, which is out of all proportion to the necessities of a new country like Canada, anything to do with it? From the observations of the Finance Minister one would conclude that he is of the opinion that the increase of the national debt and the increase of the annual expenditure being good things, are in no way accountable for the deplorable results revealed by the census returns. Sir, not only has our national debt and our annual expenditure increased out of all proportion to the wants and necessities of the country, but if the national debt and the annual expenditure had been devoted to proper and legitimate purposes, one would have little ground of complaint. But, Sir, there is something more than a national debt and an annual expenditure. There has been mismanagement and maladministration, there has been peculation, there has been jobbery, there has been contract broking, there has been plundering, there has been stealing from the public treasury, and hon. gentlemen know it. It is useless for them to attempt to stop their ears and close their eyes. Nobody knows better than the Minister of Justice that the history of Canada for the last ten years is a history of Government by corruption, a history of fraud, a history of peculation, a history of stealing, a history of contract broking and contract jobbing. The record is a long record, it is a black record; but as I believe it is one of the main causes of the deplorable results shown by the census returns, I shall venture to submit to Parliament, long and black as the list is, some facts which I think ought to convince even members of the Conservative party that the present condition of the country, and the decrease in the population of the country, are more attributable to the misgovernment and the mismanagement of our public affairs, and to the rank corruption which has permeated every branch of the public service, than anything else, during the last ten years. Will the Minister of Finance, or any other member of the Government, deny that in the construction of the Esquimalt graving dock and the Quebec harbour improvement works, there was a clear steal from the public purse of this Dominion, of well on to one million of money, a large portion of which was grabbed by a member of Parliament, and some it is alleged by a Minister of the Crown? Will anybody deny that it has been proven before the Parliament of Canada and before a Committee of the Parliament of Canada that in connection with the construction of the graving dock at Kingston there was a steal from the public purse of this Dominion of $190,000?

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has now proceeded to discuss the evidence given before a Committee of this House previous to the reception of the report. I have no doubt that the subject will be discussed when the report is received, but until then it is out of order.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman knows that I am not discussing what took place in the Committee. I do not propose to touch what took place in the Committee.

Mr. AMYOT. On the question of order, I will say this, and it is very simple. We had a discussion this afternoon on evidence received in the

Senate which has not yet been reported to this House; and if I rise on the question of order, it is because I intend answering the allusions made to that enquete by the Minister of Finance. I suppose the principle laid down by the Government in this discussion will not be changed during the very discussion itself, when it is used by hon. gentlemen on this side.

Mr. TUPPER. That does not make the case any better. The hon. gentleman may say that he proposes to violate the rule of order, but that does not put the hon. member for Huron in order. I raised the question, and it is for the Speaker to decide.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will not allude to anything which has passed in a Committee, but will try to confine himself as much as possible to the question before the House.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think I know the rules of the House as well as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and when I transgress the rules I am willing to be called to order. I have a right to refer to a matter discussed on the floor of Parliament and in the public press. I pointed out, in connection with the Kingston graving dock, that it was proved there was a clear steal in that matter from the public treasury of $190,000. I believe it will be proved, when the proper time comes, that, in connection with the construction of the Langevin block in this city, we have already paid $385,000 more than the contract price, and that before the end is reached we shall have paid $657,000 more than the contract price. I know these are delicate subjects with hon. gentlemen opposite. I know they touch them on the raw, but they furnish the true reason why the population of this country has not grown. Am I out of order in drawing the attention of Parliament to the fact that, in the construction of the Tay Canal, constructed, as I believe it was, for the benefit of the Postmaster General, there was a steal of at least a quarter of a million? Is it any wonder that, in the face of these things, we cannot retain our population, and that any immigrants we do receive flee from our country as if it were a plague-stricken spot? Am I out of order in drawing the attention of Parliament to the fact that you will find in the public press of this country the statement that a Minister of the Crown secured from a public contractor $25,000 to bonus a newspaper, his own organ? Am I out of order in saying that it is stated in the public press that the Minister's son-in-law received $3,000 for a newspaper he controlled? The evidence taken and submitted to Parliament and now in my desk shows that the Department of the Interior is reeking with corruption. The evidence taken before a Committee of this House, portions of which are submitted to Parliament, all of which is published in the public press, shows that the Department of the Secretary of State is a sink of the vilest fraud. We have one of the trusted employés of a Minister of the Crown peculating nearly $50,000; we have another employé stealing, for it is nothing else but stealing, from the plundered treasury, sums varying from $1,000 to $5,000. Where is Mr. Bronskill? Will the Minister tell us? Will he tell us the whereabouts of Mr. Senécal? Will he tell us the whereabouts of Uncle Thomas? Will he tell us the whereabouts of these men who have left their country for their country's good. These things are matters of notoriety; they have been matters of notoriety for years. Rumours of them were abroad in Canada, rumours of them go across the international boundary line, and rumours were abroad in the mother country. Is it any wonder that with these extraordinary facts published abroad the tide of immigration should be very narrow and should remain here but a very short time? Everybody knows that the Department of the Postmaster General is notorious from one end of Canada to the other—so notorious that it has been the subject of discussion in the public press? So notorious that it has been the object of denunciation from almost every pulpit in the land. The Postmaster General, a Minister of the Crown, charged with these offences, remains silent and dumb. If these Ministers of the Crown had the instincts of men and statesmen, they would bring their slanderers, if slanderers they are, before the tribunals of the country. They would there meet their accusers face to face and make them prove that the charges are true, or otherwise stand convicted of uttering vile slanders in the public press. So far, the first step has not been taken; so far these hon. gentlemen have done nothing to vindicate their characters, if their characters can be vindicated. Is it not notorious? Am I out of order in drawing the attention of Parliament to it? Am I out of order in drawing attention to the fact that the Department of Public Works is noted, throughout the length and breadth of the country, as the very sink, the very cesspool, from the highest to the lowest, of gross jobbery? While the master takes his share of loot in solid silver plate, garnished with $22,000 current coin of the realm, the understrappers of the department get their share of the loot in pleasure yachts, brass dogs and diamonds, and their family groceries and linen through one of the public departments, paid for out of the public purse, is it any wonder that in this condition of affairs, known and notorious everywhere, we cannot retain in the country the immigrants we do receive or even the natural increase in our own population? Is it not known, was it not charged in Parliament years ago, that a member of this House received from the Government he was supporting a bonus for a railway which was practically an insolvent concern, on the strength of which there was borrowed on the English market ninety thousand pounds sterling, not a farthing of which will ever be seen by the lenders? That was notorious in the Canadian and the English press. Is it not notorious that a year and a half ago Parliament substantially expelled a Conservative member of Parliament for public plunder? Is it not known that another Conservative member of Parliament was practically expelled this session for having been engaged in contract jobbing, and that, charged with public stealing, he is now a fugitive from justice? Is it not known that this Government pledged itself to a wild-cat scheme called the Chignecto Ship Railway, involving an expenditure of $3,000,000 or $4,000,000, pronounced by experts to be useless if not almost impracticable? Is it not known by everybody that the Minister of Finance, aye, the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), the future Minister of Agriculture, has driven the Minister of Finance out of Parliament by his speech, and he has not been here for half an hour? Is it not known that the Minister of Finance has been spending some $60,000

a year in bonussing vessels with the view of developing trade with the British West India Islands and the Spanish West India Islands, knowing all the time that the export trade of those Islands had fallen off $337,000 from 1878 to 1889? I expect next to hear of the Minister of Finance gathering up his travelling traps, taking in hand his grip sack, and rushing off to the great republic of Liberia, with the object of opening up trade relations with that important country. I commend the mission to him. I find that last year that republic exported to the United States 100 parrots, 25 snakes, and 150 monkeys. Why does not the Minister of Finance set to work to secure that important trade? He may acquire in that way the distinction which he has long had in view, the Grand Cross of St. Michael and St. George, and I recommend him to take with him one of his colleagues who has for some years had his longing eyes cast in that direction, the Secretary of State. That hon. gentleman has earned it now. The disclosures of the department show that he is eminently qualified for that distinguished honour. Is it not known—was it not charged in Parliament six years ago—that three Ministers of the Crown, two of whom are still Ministers of the Crown, had secured from the Government enormous bonuses for railways in which they had, if not a controlling, at all events a large pecuniary interest? That statement was scattered abroad from one end of the country to the other. Is it not known that two other Ministers have been charged with dabbling in the public domain, and one of them charged by a Conservative member of Parliament? Is it not known—I know it and everyone knows it—that by the criminal negligence, carelessness and indifference of an incompetent and imbecile Government, the people in the North-West Territories were forced into rebellion at a cost to this country of eight millions of money, the loss of two hundred precious lives, the entailment upon the people of a long pension list, and the decimation of the homes of the Half-breeds in the North-West Territories; and all that Canada got for it was the honour of having the Minister of War of this Dominion made a Knight of St. Michael and St. George, and the commander of the expedition also made a knight of the same order, with a bonus of $20,000 and the capture of Bremner's furs? Sir, is anyone surprised that this condition of things, existing and known to exist for the last ten years, known here and known elsewhere, known in Canada, known in the United States, known in England, notwithstanding what the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance say, the name of Canada should be to-day a by-word and a reproach, and that the tide of immigration from the mother country and the continent should have passed by Canada, and that we could not hold our own natural increase in this Dominion? The Public Accounts will show you, and the report of the Auditor General will show you that we have been spending, year in and year out, over $250,000 for contingencies, that we have been spending $16,000 for telegrams, that we have been spending $50,000 for extra clerks, that we spent last year $219 for luncheons for Ministers of the Crown. Let them pay for their own luncheons. They are well enough paid for what they do. Is it not known that we have been spending sums ranging from $180,000 to $200,000 to fee and keep alive and keep in existence the subsidized press of hon. gentlemen opposite? They live, they move and they have their being almost entirely from these subsidies of the Government. Will anyone tell me that without the enormous subvention that this Government hands over to the little daily published in Moncton it would live for 24 hours? No one who knows anything about the paper, its proprietorship and its necessities would venture to say that it would. We have been paying over $100,000 to fee Conservative lawyers to do Conservative work for a Conservative Government, and yet we have a Minister of Justice at our doors with a staff of employés who ought to be able to do this work. This condition of things is known to have existed for ten years, and I believe that the shocking way in which our affairs have been managed during that time has done as much if not more to deprive us of our population than almost anything else that has happened. We now see the effect of the policy of hon. gentlemen. We feel it to-day; we see it in the census returns which have been submitted to Parliament. Under these circumstances, would anyone be surprised that the vigorous, young, hale, hearty, intelligent, shrewd, level-headed Canadians will not live in a country which has been cursed for twelve years with such a Government as this is, and with which, judging by the vote of the electors at the last election, they may be cursed for four years more? To a thoughtful man, to an honest Canadian desirous of the progress, the well-being and the prosperity of his country, the condition of affairs is serious and grave. It is practically admitted that in every department of the public service we have corruption the most appalling, we have waste the most shocking, and we have extravagance the most startling that ever marked the pages of the history of any country in the known world. I have said that to thoughtful Canadians it is a matter of regret, but it is also a matter for reflection. To patriotic Canadians it is a matter of serious enquiry whether or not there is a remedy for all these grievances and all these wrongs. There is one thing which is proved in my judgment beyond a peradventure, and that is that the trade policy which hon. gentlemen have kept on the Statute-book for twelve years has proved a complete and thorough failure. The census returns show that your policy is one which has not brought peace and prosperity to this great country of ours. It shows further, and it shows so plainly that he who runs may read, that you cannot, at the end of the nineteenth century, successfully adopt and carry out a trade policy obsolete in the mother country 50 years ago; it shows that you cannot keep successfully in commercial and political slavery, free Canadians living in a free land; it shows further that every pledge, that every promise that you made to the people of Canada, when you introduced the National Policy, and every assurance you gave them subsequently to the introduction of the National Policy, have been violated, grossly violated, by you. Your late chief promised, on the introduction of the National Policy, that by putting on a substantial tariff we could encourage every industry, whether agricultural, mining or manufacturing. Your encouragement to the agriculturists of Canada, and especially of the Province of Ontario, is shown by the fact that your policy

has had the effect of depreciating the value of farm lands by at least 25 per cent.; your encouragement to the agriculturists of the Dominion of Canada, and notably in the Province of Ontario, is shown by the fact that of the farms in that province, 75 per cent. are mortgaged. I know this statement was made in Parliament before, I know it was denied upon the floor of Parliament before, and I propose to put the question beyond doubt by giving official information upon the subject. I hold in my hand a certificate from the registrar of one of the best counties in Western Ontario. He selected three of the best townships in the county of which he is registrar, and at the beginning of this year he wrote the following letter :—

"BARRIE, 25th Feb., 1891.

"DEAR SIR,—It would not be possible for me to give you an exact or very reliable statement of the amount of mortgage indebtedness against lands in this county from the books of this office, as I have no means of knowing what has been paid on the mortgages.

"I have, therefore, not attempted such a statement, but merely send you a statement of the number of farm lots or parcels into which the townships are divided (exclusive of towns or villages), together with the number and percentage that appear to be held under mortgage.

"The mortgages range from $300 to $7,000 or $8,000; the probable average would be $1,000.

"The three townships you have selected are the richest and most prosperous in the three ridings of the county, and are almost wholly settled and owned by resident farmers.

"Yours truly,
(Signed) "SAM. LOUNT.

"COUNTY OF SIMCOE REGISTRY OFFICE,
"BARRIE, 25th Feb., 1891.

"The books of this office show:

"(1) That the Township of Tecumseh is divided into about 647 parcels or lots, as held under patents from the Crown. Of these 647 lots 432 are mortgaged and 215 are unencumbered, or 67 per cent. mortgaged.

"(2) That the Township of Nottawasaga is divided into about 623 patented parcels. Of these 490 are mortgaged and 133 are not mortgaged, or 78 per cent. mortgaged.

"(3) That the Township of Oro is divided into about 569 patented lots. Of these 399 are mortgaged and 170 are not mortgaged, or 70 per cent. under mortgage.

(Signed) "SAM. LOUNT,
"*Registrar.*"

I think that certificate, from an official, showing the condition of the farm lands in the Province of Ontario, ought to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite, —I know it does the people of this country—that not a single promise, not a single pledge made to the people of Canada by the Government on the introduction of the National Policy, so far as the farmers are concerned, have been redeemed. Is it any wonder, then, that men should desire to get rid of their encumbered farms, and leave their old homesteads and seek other homes elsewhere? You did more than that; you deceived the people of this country in many ways, and I propose to prove that you deceived them in two or three ways. Your late chief said the moment that policy was adopted, the effect of which was to keep Canada for the Canadians, prosperity would return. How did you keep that promise to the Canadian people? Do prosperity and progress reign in this country now? No, Sir. The farmers of Canada, in their despair, appealed not long ago to hon. gentlemen opposite. Their appeals were unheeded; hon. gentlemen who pledged themselves to do wonders for the Canadian farmer and the Canadian producer, turned a deaf ear to the appeals of the farmer. The Central Farmers' Institute of Ontario passed the following resolution and memorialized the Dominion Government to this effect :—

"Whereas we consider the present high tariff is very injurious to the agricultural interests, making what we buy proportionately dearer than the products we sell; and whereas the present high tariff has given us to the combine system, by which competition is to a great extent prevented; and whereas the agricultural interest is suffering under serious depression and unable to bear the strain occasioned by the tariff and the combine system aforesaid, and as the agricultural interests represent the large majority of the population: that,

"Therefore, this, the Central Institute, do respectfully ask the Government to reduce the tariff on articles of prime necessity to the farmer, such as iron, steel, coal, cottons, woollens, rubbers, sugars, corn and salt, to such an extent as to relieve the agriculturist of the unequal burden under which he is now labouring."

Your friendship, your generosity, and your liberality to the farmers were shown in the reduction of the salt duties and the reduction in the sugar duties, still leaving the farmer handicapped even in that respect. You kept your promise to the business men of this country, to the traders, when you promised them that the moment that policy was adopted prosperity would return, by driving into bankruptcy more men during the eleven years of your policy than became insolvent during the preceding twenty-two years. I have in my hand, certified as correct, the report of Dun Wiman & Co., giving the number of insolvents, together with the amount involved in every case for the last eleven years. It is important reading for the House, and although figures are tiresome, I shall venture to read the statement that has been placed in my hands to the Parliament of my country :

Years.	Number.	Amount.
1880	902	$7,449,063
1881	631	5,675,807
1882	787	8,587,000
1883	1,384	15,872,000
1884	1,308	18,939,770
1885	1,247	8,743,049
1886	1,233	10,171,384
1887	1,366	16,070,595
1888	1,667	13,974,787
1889	1,747	14,528,884
1890	1,828	17,856,017
1891 (3 months)	575	6,048,234
	14,875	$143,916,590

Thus we see that in the last year, just before the general elections, and when hon. gentlemen opposite were telling us from the stump, the platform, and the school-house, that prosperity and progress followed the introduction of the National Policy, the number of insolvents had gone up to 1,828, and the capital involved to $17,856,000. For the first three months of this year the number had gone up to 575 and the capital invested to $6,048,234, and taking the same ratio for the remaining portion of the year the amount involved would have been $24,000,000. Is it any wonder that in the face of these startling and extraordinary facts, culled from official documents and placed in my hands by the authorities already mentioned, that the tide of immigration is not directed towards Canada, and we have not been able to maintain our own natural growth? Sir, the disclosure is shocking, it is startling, it is enough to make thoughtful men pause and consider. It shows clearly to hon. gentlemen opposite that the National Policy has been a complete failure, that it has no friends in this country except the protected manufacturers, that it has not advanced the growth or prosperity of Canada. If you want to retain Canada for the Canadians, if you want to encourage

and increase the population, abolish your National Policy altogether, and carry out a broader, more liberal, and more comprehensive commercial policy than you have had in force for the last twelve years. For five years you have been hoping against hope. The Minister of Finance, as anybody could see, has been whistling to keep his courage up. For five years you have been playing the part of the political bully and braggart, endeavouring to inspire your followers with the courage you did not feel yourselves. The census returns placed on the Table the other night leave you in a hopeless muddle, leave you in the mud, unable to extricate yourself. Your late chief told us not long before his death that "this policy of protection has been so successful that former hamlets were now large villages, villages towns, and towns were claiming to be cities." The moment the National Policy was introduced, you knew then and you know now, people fled from the land. You know it now, you knew it then, that when the National Policy had been on the Statute-book for three years, people in the far east and far west left Canada as if it were a plague-stricken country. The Port Huron *Times*, three years after the National Policy was introduced, published the following :—

"Some idea may be gained of the manner in which immigration to this country is increasing, by the fact that for the quarter ending 31st December, 1879, the total number of immigrants entering this port was 22,600, an increase of 15,284 over a corresponding period in 1878. Of this number 14,937 were males and 7,663 were females. The number of children under five years of age was 1,808 females. The nativity of these immigrants was as follows :—

England	480
Ireland	81
Scotland	58
Germany	163
Sweden	30
Norway	64
Denmark	60
France	102
Russia	17
Quebec and Ontario	21,336
Nova Scotia	157
New Brunswick	52

"Of this number 176 were cabinet-makers, 741 carpenters 2,804 farmers, 482 farm labourers, 7,505 labourers, and 134 shoemakers. Nearly all of these immigrants brought with them enough money to give them a start in the new world to which they have come."

A Michigan paper published in Detroit said :

"The new tariff is discouraging the Canadians with their country, and they are flocking by thousands to this."

A paper in Liverpool, N.S., said :

"It is estimated that 260 farmers with their families left Liverpool a few days ago to take up land in Texas. Most of them were fairly provided with means."

A newspaper published in Prince Edward Island said :

"It is estimated that over 300 people have left Summerside within the last 8 months, and only 7 new immigrants have come to it. The National Policy has not helped Prince Edward Island or Summerside so far."

The moment your policy was introduced that was the result. It had not been in force for more than three years until the people were flocking from the country. They have continued to leave since, annually, by thousands, as is shown by the returns placed on the Table of the House. I was glad to see some sign of feeling on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite when these returns reached the House. It is a sign of improvement, a satisfactory sign of the times to find hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches touched by the terrible disclosures made in their own census returns. The jaded and faded face of the Minister of Finance after the census returns were placed on the Table the other night, challenged the sympathy of every Liberal on this side of the House. For the remainder of the session he could not maintain a perpendicular for five minutes. Questions showered across the House at the hon. gentleman were answered by him from his comfortable seat on the Treasury benches. Hamlets have grown into villages, villages into towns, towns into cities! Have they really? Are these mere words used by Sir John Macdonald, or are they realities? Let us consult the record and see who is right, and whether the statement made by Sir John Macdonald to his followers is shown by the census to be true. I find the following villages and towns, some of them in Nova Scotia and some in my own province, show a falling off in population during the last 10 years. The first of these is Pictou, the shire town of the county represented by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Is it possible that there is a falling off in population there? Is that the town in whose interest the Government spent $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 to construct a railway to save a distance of 40 miles, when it only saved 4? Yet the population of that town has fallen from 3,403 to 2,999. The list is as follows :—

	1881.	1891.	Loss.
Pictou	3,403	2,999	404
Dundas	3,709	3,546	163
Lauzon	3,556	3,551	5
St. Mary's	3,415	3,416	
Napanee	3,600	3,434	246
Strathroy	3,817	3,316	511
Paris	3,173	3,094	79
Whitby	3,140	2,705	355
Kincardine	2,876	2,631	245
Listowell	2,688	2,587	101
Thorold	2,456	2,273	183
Amherstburg	2,672	2,279	393
Mitchell	2,284	2,101	183
Dunnville	1,808	1,776	32
Iberville	1,847	1,719	128
Port Perry	1,800	1,689	111
Harriston	1,772	1,689	85
Fergus	1,733	1,519	214
Berthier	2,156	1,537	619
Cobourg	4,957	4,829	128
Goderich	4,556	3,839	717
St. John City	41,263	39,179	2,184
Charlottetown	11,485	11,374	111
St. Catharines	9,631	9,170	461
Three Rivers	8,670	8,334	336
Lévis	7,597	7,301	296
Port Hope	5,581	5,042	539

In every one of these twenty-seven villages and towns there has been a falling off in population. The natural increase is gone, the immigration is gone, as well as a considerable portion of the population that they held in the year 1881. What is the cause of all this? Will the hon. gentleman point me to a single cause except the vicious commercial policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as the still more vicious administration of the public affairs of this country by the Government for the last ten years? If the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the administration of our public affairs by hon. gentlemen opposite has been ruinous to the hamlets, the villages, and the towns, it has been disastrous to the rural constituencies. I shall not trouble the House with a long list of rural constituencies. I shall refer to three counties, formerly united counties, and I venture to say without fear of successful contradiction, that they

are three of the best counties agriculturally in the wide Dominion of Canada ; three counties in which there is hardly a hundred acres of land that might be called waste land ; three counties in which the population is intelligent, vigorous, active, thrifty and industrious ; and in these three counties the condition of affairs is simply astonishing. Bruce, in 1881, had a population of 65,218, and in 1891, 64,604, being a loss of 614 ; Perth, in 1881, had a population of 48,146, and in 1891, 46,311, being a loss of 1,835 ; Huron, in 1881, had a population of 67,223, and in 1891, 58,172, being a loss of 9,051. This loss is a direct result, according to my humble judgment, of the commercial policy of the Administration and their vicious management of our public affairs. The loss in these three counties alone, besides the loss of the natural increase and the loss of immigration, amounts to 11,500. In other words the Counties of Huron, Perth and Bruce, taking the natural increase at only 7 per cent. in ten years instead of 14 per cent., loses 12,641, and taking the immigration at 5 per cent. instead of 10 per cent. the loss is 9,029. We lose in immigration and in natural increase 21,670, and we lose, of the old population, 11,500, making a total loss of 33,170 in these three counties. Such are the effects of your maladministration of the public affairs of this country, such are the results of twelve years of a vicious trade policy, such are the results of twelve years of contract-jobbing, stealing, peculation and robbery from the public treasury. Sir, there is a sovereign remedy for all this. That sovereign remedy does not consist of annexation to the United States of America. It does not consist of commercial union with the United States of America. It does not consist of the independence of Canada. It is a much more speedy, a much more effectual, and a much more drastic remedy than any or all of these. The remedy I propose is : Remove the present incompetent Administration, dismiss the present thoroughly corrupt Government and replace them by men that are purer and more honest, and you will have an end to the days of boodling, corruption, fraud, contract-jobbing and forgery, and all the other crimes known to have been perpetrated by this Government. Sir, there is only one man in all Canada who can do this, and that man is the leader of the Liberal Party. A man strong and resolute in his convictions, honest and pure in his everyday life : a man who to-day is the idol of the Canadian people : a man who to-day is encouraged by the masses and rejected only by the classes : a man who in the country is supported by a powerful and unbroken army of prominent Liberals, and a man who in Parliament is aided by as devoted and united a band of men as ever followed a leader. The hon. gentleman shall succeed, the hon. gentleman will succeed, the hon. gentleman must succeed, and to-night, the prayer of every honest Canadian is that success may soon crown his patriotic efforts.

Mr. MACKINTOSH moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 3rd September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUPPLY—THE CENSUS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster : That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply ; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. In moving the adjournment of the debate last night, I did so for two reasons. First, the late hour, and secondly, that the House might have an opportunity to recover from the flood of political Billingsgate and vituperation which the hon. member for Huron let loose upon us last night. That hon. gentleman's speech was notable solely for irrelevance and lack of logic. Had he instead delivered a relevant and sincere speech, I am sure it would have had its influence both within and without these walls. He began by an attack upon the members of the Administration for not having named a Minister to reply on behalf of their colleague the Minister of Finance. But that hon. gentleman had no reason to ask a colleague to stand up and defend him, since he delivered a logical and able speech, one which commended itself not only to this side of the House, but to the other side as well. We, as Canadians, owe a duty to our country as well as to our party. We owe a duty to the people outside these walls as well as to members who have their seats in these precincts. That duty is ill discharged when for hours we stand here attacking and vilifying one another, indulging in abuse and insult, thus leading the people to believe there is a better class outside than inside the walls of Parliament. To my mind, the speech of the hon. gentleman was more like a Kentucky hoe-down than a political deliverance. It was a speech in which he ran the whole gamut of political abuse and vituperation, although the object was one which called for serious, well-considered effort, and although the occasion was a solemn one, when every man, be he Liberal or Conservative, should calmly consider the position Canada occupies to-day. The hon. gentleman appeared to have been drilling for a great field-day of abuse : he attacked every committee of the House and every department, and never said anything at all about the census, concerning which the hon. member for South Oxford moved his motion. We must regret that the census does not show as large a population as we anticipated, but it demonstrates what this country, with its population under 5,000,000, is able to do : it shows that this small number of people have built up the country we see to-day and made contentment reign throughout the land. The hon. gentleman attacked the Postmaster General, the Minister of the Interior, and nearly every hon. Minister present, and then said what was wanted to save the country was a change of Administration. There was a change of Administration on one occasion, when we had a Liberal Government in power, from 1873 to 1878, and the hon. gentleman knows the result. He knows that the people condemned the

policy of that Government and approved that of their opponents. He knows that, election after election, the people approved of the policy of the Conservative party, and yet he tells the House that what the country wants is a change of Administration. The hon. gentleman made me think of a little couplet, as he indulged in unstinted abuse of hon. gentlemen on this side:

"In a crowd of rogues, the thief
Is he who loudest calls 'stop thief.'"

The hon. gentleman did not give fair-play to his opponents, nor do we ask it, but we ask that public questions should be discussed on public grounds, free from personal attack and vituperation. The hon. gentleman offered a most peculiar reason why our population has not reached the estimate made by the hon. member for South Oxford, of six millions and more. He said that Senécal had been guilty of peculation. Although the census had been taken and we had all the figures before these peculations were discovered, he asked this House to believe that because there had been irregularities in a department, the falling off in the census was caused by these transactions. That was the only reason he gave, save that what was wanted in this country was a pure Government. I will not discuss that subject; I will not go back to 1874, I will not go back to the time when a pure party was in power; I will not go into their record so far as the chronicles of the country and the records of this House show; but I will say, that so far as this Government is concerned, having remained in power for years, it is not to be wondered that some irregularities should have occurred, when we know that they equally occurred during the five years the Mackenzie Government was in office. That Government was not altogether to blame, nor is the present Government responsible for the irregularities. The only thing the Government can do is to purify the departments, and the one thing hon. gentlemen opposite can do, if they are honest, patriotic, and sincere, is to assist the Government in carrying out that policy of purification. The hon. gentleman pointed to the fact that there was a Liberal-Conservative Government in power therefore there was a falling off in the population, that in consequence of this there was a disappointment in the amount of the anticipated increase. The hon. gentleman appeared to forget that, in regard to domestic legislation, the Local Legislatures in every province are concerned, and that there are six of the provinces which have Liberal Governments. There are Liberal Governments in Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and Ontario, and it would be as reasonable to say that the shortage in the population has resulted from the policy of those Governments as to say that it is consequent upon the policy of the Dominion Government. This has not been done. We did not attack the Local Governments, although hon. gentlemen opposite know that some of those Provincial Governments have done all they possibly could to injure the Federal Administration, to spread disunion among the different provinces, to favour repeal and prompt some to believe in annexation to the United States; yet we on this side have not used this as an argument in the discussion or in any other discussion this session. The hon. gentleman challenged us to say that Mr. Blake at any time opposed the Canadian Pacific Railway. We are not here to discuss what the Hon. Edward Blake may have said,——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKINTOSH—but I assert that I could prove, if important, that Mr. Blake not only called British Columbia a sea of mountains, repeating the expression once used by another, but that he contended for the building of the railway through the prairie country alone and not from ocean to ocean. But, in considering Mr. Blake's record, we forget the mistakes he once made when contemplating the great right he did when he left his party in 1891. We have now faith in Mr. Blake's fealty to his country, and only hope that there are some other hon. gentlemen who may be actuated by the same patriotic instincts. The hon. gentleman said that Canadians were fleeing from Canada as if it were plague-stricken; but immediately turned and asserted that the Government ought to have brought a larger population into Canada. As an illustration, let hon. gentlemen opposite take the prices of Dominion securities in 1878 and compare them with the prices in 1890, and see whether the capitalists of Europe look upon this country as a plague-stricken spot. The hon. gentleman selects certain expenditures making comparisons between the course of the two Governments. It must be remembered that when the Liberal party were in power there was no Auditor General, and it was proved that thousands of dollars were expended upon the simple certificate of Ministers of departments. More than that, when the hon. gentleman attacks the Government on the management of the Printing Bureau, he forgets that certain contractors got a judgment amounting to more than $100,000 against this country for printing which was given out by hon. gentlemen opposite to outside parties when they were in power. He forgets, when he mentions the sum of $250,000 as having been expended by this Government for contingencies, and holds up his hands in holy horror and asks why another Government should not be put in power to change such a state of affairs, that the Public Accounts of 1873 show that for extra clerks the Government expended $13,704, and that in 1876, when the hon. gentlemen were in power, the amount expended was $31,751. He forgets that, while in 1873 the total departmental expenditure on contingencies was $231,717, in 1876 it was $301,602. That was at a time when the nation was depressed and suffering, but the party men received their rewards, not out of the pockets of hon. gentlemen opposite, but from the public treasury. The hon. gentleman boldly asserted that the Conservative party never fulfilled a pledge they had made, that the lamented chieftain who led that party but has now gone to his long rest, did not fulfil his promises. The hon. gentleman may slander the dead, but he cannot do it before the living, who knew him so well. We are here to defend Sir John Macdonald and his acts, and Canada understands well what he accomplished. Now, Sir, I ask any hon. gentleman to rise and state a solitary case in which the Liberal party, as a party, carried out one pledge they made before they came into power. I ask any hon. gentleman to stand up now and mention one great reform in administration which that party carried out after all the promises they made. The reason why they have remained in Opposition so

long is that the people discovered their weakness and knew they were not in earnest, and preferred keeping in power a Government which did not profess to be immaculate, a party which was human and did not live on promises, than trust a party which was always promising but never performing what it professed. The people of Canada, election after election, have shown that they cannot endorse hon. gentlemen opposite, and, while they challenge the purity and the honesty, and the integrity and the patriotism of gentlemen on this side, they should go back and look at their own record, say they are sorry for their sins, that they are contrite and penitent, and then, perhaps, hon. gentlemen on this side will not be sorry to see them occupy the Treasury benches. The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is one which they have pursued for years, one which defeated them at the last election, namely, a policy of maligning the farmers of this country. I attended a meeting which was held at Lakefield during the last general election. An old gentleman eighty-two years of age was the chairman. A Liberal speaker declared that Liberal hearts were bleeding for the poor farmer, and the chairman of the meeting got up and said that every word was untrue, that he admitted there were mortgages on the farms, but he said those mortgages were for the purpose of improving farms; that he had six sons, every one of them occupying a farm of 100 acres and doing well, not one farthing of a mortgage on them; and it is needless to say that they sent my hon. friend Mr. Burnham to represent East Peterborough. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) spoke of the insolvencies which had taken place in this country. I would like hon. gentlemen to look over the insolvencies from 1878 to 1891, to look over the list published by Dun, Wiman & Co. They will find that, from the day Mr. Wiman became the advocate of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, the figures in regard to insolvencies in Canada were 20 per cent. higher than those given by Bradstreet. More than that, according to Mr. Wiman, in 1878 the amount of failures represented $23,908,000: and according to Bradstreet last year, the amount was $12,482,000, or only one-half. Now, I find in Wiman's report figures representing $18,000,000 instead of $12,482,000. Perhaps some hon. gentleman can explain the discrepancy. I have thus briefly dealt, Sir, with all the salient points discussed by the hon. member in his address last night, save and except the abuse and vilification that he indulged in. But, Sir, there is another hon. gentleman, the financial leader of the party, who, I think, should exercise a little more discretion in the assertions he makes regarding Canada, for there are thousands of people in this country who look upon him as a financial authority, and every word he speaks detrimental to the interests of Canada, strikes a blow at our immigration policy, for those words of his are sent broadcast by rivals throughout Europe. I have seen, in documents and pamphlets of the Northern Pacific Railway, quotations from the remarks of Sir Richard Cartwright, and from other hon. gentlemen opposite, and from articles in the Toronto *Globe*, praising Kansas, Dakota and other states and territories of the United States. Sir, he gave us yesterday a resolution in which he proceeded to perform the national obsequies, as though the ceremony were really funereal in all its details. Everything was dark, everything gloomy, everything despondent. He told us that he had prophesied all this, and the Finance Minister naturally criticised his jubilation over making one prophetic bull's-eye out of about 5,000. He told us in 1879 that Canada would be ruined by the National Policy; he talked about national misery in 1882, but on both occasions the people, by an immense majority, supported the policy of the Government. In 1891, we were again told that this policy would be the utter annihilation of Canada. They had had an opportunity of scattering their pamphlets throughout the country, and many people believed a great deal of what they said, but the young men of the country, the thinking farmers of the country, and the artizans of the country, in one strong combination, kept them out of power and declared that they believed in the policy of Sir John Macdonald, and that they believed in the honesty of the representatives of the Conservative party sitting behind that great statesman. But the hon. gentleman was answered in 1891. Then he came back to this House, after preaching despondency with all his power, after endeavouring to intimidate the people, after endeavouring to make Canadians despise their native land, and was met by a surplus of $4,000,000 and a prosperous country, and turning, took another tack. He commenced on the census, and seized that as a choice morsel for a party banquet. Hon. gentlemen opposite must then see the unfairness of the comparisons which the hon. member makes. We have as yet none of the commercial statistics, we have none of the comparative statements, we have only a skeleton to work upon, therefore can well imagine the position hon. gentlemen opposite will be in when the whole body of the census is brought down to this House? Hon. gentlemen know that in point of wealth, in point of prosperity, in point of contentment, the census returns will show Canada to be in as good a position as any country in the world. If hon. gentlemen will go through the census returns for 1890 of the New England States, they will find that there has only been an increase of 2 per cent. in the farming population of those states: they will find that many people from the country districts gravitate towards the large cities where there is work for the artizan, and where the consumer toils to sustain the farmer. The hon. member for South Oxford spoke of press subsidies. Well, he may be a better authority on that subject now that he has become somewhat of a journalistic gentleman himself. He has invested in a large and very prominent and influential organ, and no doubt may see how much money gentlemen who have stock in newspapers get out of a Government. Well, I can say at any rate that any one who depends upon this Government to get wealthy from press subsidies, will die a very poor man. Now, the hon. gentleman talked about a reptile press. Does the hon. gentleman not know that here in Canada the journalists are as free, are as independent, are as honest and fearless as the men of any other profession? Those gentlemen who sit in the gallery, as I sat in it at one time, are as honest as the journalists of any other country. I have learned from intercourse with them that they are as honest, as plain-spoken as much above reproach, and as unapproachable by

bribes, as the journalists of any other country, or as any other men whom you will find in Canada to-day. I consider it unjust for the hon. gentleman from South Oxford to stand here and slander the press, and call it a reptile press, and ask the Minister of Justice to introduce a change in the Joint Stock Companies Act. The hon. gentleman knows that he himself countenanced a change in the law respecting members of Parliament holding interests in newspapers. The hon. gentleman will remember when his friends Mr. Vail and Mr. Jones were in trouble, and when the case of Mr. Anglin occurred. He knows that when the case of Mr. Vail was spoken of, when the case of Mr. Jones was spoken of, in Parliament, they were in danger of losing their seats because their paper had received $25,000 of what the hon. gentleman calls a reptile subsidy. And what did we see? They were sent back to their constituents. Mr. Vail was beaten, but we find a change was made in the Independence of Parliament Act to suit the interest of the pure, and honest, and elevated Liberal party. I will quote from the Independence of Parliament Act of 1878, 41 Victoria, chapter 5:

"This Act shall not extend to disqualify any person as a member of the House of Commons, by reason of his being a shareholder in any incorporated company having a contract or agreement with the Government of Canada, except companies undertaking the contract for the building of public works, and any company incorporated for the construction or working of any part of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

So after all, it was members of the Liberal party who were charged with being in joint stock companies, and it was the hon. gentlemen opposite who put a clause on the Statute-book protecting these stockholders, and the member for South Oxford was the Finance Minister in that Administration. Sir, what is the object of this discussion on the census returns at present? Why does the hon. member introduce his resolution now? Simply because he knows that the Government in October next is to negotiate with the authorities at Washington: he knows well these negotiations must proceed, and he takes advantage of the census to attack and discredit the Government and the country; he proceeds to taunt Conservatives for not having adopted unrestricted reciprocity; he proceeds to say that the only way out of our difficulties—if there be difficulties, which I very much question—is for this Government to bend the knee at Washington and admit that the country is ruined; he virtually proceeds to tell the people at Washington that there is only one way of salvation for Canada; when these gentlemen go to Washington, if the Washington Government will put the screws upon them, our Government will have to succumb. Sir, is that the language of a Canadian patriot? Is that the language of a statesman feeling an honest interest in the progress of this country? Sir, I believe that throughout the length and breadth of Canada the language of the hon. gentleman opposite in lauding the United States and belittling our own country, will meet with a stern rebuke from the people. When those hon. gentlemen complain that we have not enough population in Canada, I ask them what they have done to assist the Government in promoting the interests of Canada? When in 1879 Sir Charles Tupper, the present High Commissioner, moved in this House a series of resolutions asking that one hundred millions of acres of land be granted to a Canadian Pacific Railway Company to assist in building the road, did not the hon. gentlemen opposite denounce the project? When the contract was let, did they not denounce the Government and denounce the company in almost every newspaper belonging to that party? Did they not proceed to belittle the country, and did they not say that a reign of terror virtually existed in Canada? The remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford were copied in various newspapers; and still hon. gentlemen will say that that is a proper and righteous thing to do. Then the hon. gentleman said we were turning our backs on England by the National Policy. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) bows responsive to that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We say so still.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. But the hon. gentleman forgets that Great Britain has not complained, and it has been proved that we buy largely of the manufactures of Great Britain. The hon. gentleman knows that instead of sustaining us in that policy, he and his friends proceeded to work with Mr. Wiman and his friends in Washington. Now, the hon. gentleman from South Oxford said in 1879 that he stood by Great Britain. He said:

"We have had renegade Englishmen supporting the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite."

I do not know who the renegade Englishman was. It may have been Mr. Phipps, who is now a friend of the hon. gentlemen, because they are in favour of unrestricted reciprocity; or it may be Mr. Goldwin Smith, who is also their friend, so far as their policy is concerned. He goes on to say:

"Not because, as they avowed, they thought it wise or good; but because they believed it would speedily render the position of Canada intolerable, so that we should soon be forced to seek refuge from the position we had brought ourselves into, in annexation to the United States."

That this policy was going to end in annexation with the United States. Then the hon. gentleman further said:

"But a few weeks have passed since both sides of the House were united in expressing their gratitude to Her Majesty for having confided her child to our care. If that illustrious lady should return to England, I am afraid she will be obliged to tell her royal mother that the practical outcome of all this loud-lip loyalty was a policy directly antagonistic to the interests of Great Britain, a policy which, whatever may be the intentions of the hon. the Minister of Finance and his colleagues, in its practical results, especially designed to injure British interests and hamper British trade."

Now the hon. gentleman says that is correct. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) said on that occasion:

"It was an insult to Great Britain in 1879. When Sir Charles Tupper's resolution in favour of setting apart 100,000,000 acres of land for the Canadian Pacific Railway, the then leader of the Opposition earnestly denounced the tariff legislation and charged the Government with having legislated wholly against Great Britain and in favour of the United States, such legislation being a direct insult to the mother country, an insult thrown in the face of British statesmen and the British people and a defiance; and that were he a British statesman, acting in the interests of British commerce and British workmen, it would be impossible for him to extend a particle of consideration to the proposal of the Canadian Government."

Time wore on, the interests of the country prospered, and the nation progressed. Sir Leonard Tilley was able to say in 1882:

"To-day we stand here, not with any doubt of the tariff's revenue-producing power, but with evidence of the last year before us, with the public accounts and statements on the Table of the House, showing not only no de-

ficit, but instead of an estimated surplus of $2,000,000, there is a surplus of $4,132,743 in the Treasury!"

The following taxes were taken off: Tax on tea and coffee, $1,000,000; tax on stamps, $200,000; tax on newspapers, $45,000; articles placed on free list, $100,000. The hon. gentleman will see the effect of the policy. But he does not wish to see it. He wishes to delude the people, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) attempted to delude them last night in regard to the receipts from Customs. He did not tell the House that the people had not money with which to buy goods, and that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had added $3,000,000 to the taxation, and had declared that if there was any possible way of levying another tax he would do it in a more direct manner. Despite the fact of the admirable showing made by Sir Leonard Tilley, the member for South Oxford said in reply:

"Why, Sir, I tell them to-day that Canada is a country in which no man is free to buy or sell, to eat or drink, to travel or to stand still, without paying toll to some extortioner or another."

When Sir Leonard Tilley proclaimed that Canada was prospering, when the Canadian Pacific Railway was being built, and when the Minister of Finance was able to remit $1,325,000 of taxes, the hon. member for South Oxford declared that Canada was a place where a man was not free to travel or to stand still without paying toll to some extortioner or other. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us to-day that the increase in population has not been so large as was anticipated. I ask if language, coming from hon. gentlemen opposite, such as that quoted, is likely to induce people to come to Canada and settle here? All remember that in 1885, we sat during the summer months expecting every moment to hear that some of the best and bravest in the land had fallen, and the member for East Durham, Col. Williams, died, performing his duties in the North-West. When we required every patriot to be true to his country, to British institutions and the British flag, while law and order had to be maintained, what took place? An official of the Mowat Government wrote to Mr. Scholes, also an Ontario Government official, at Manchester. The letter appeared in the Manchester *Guardian*, as follows:—

"TORONTO, 13th April, 1885.

"DEAR SIR,—....The snow keeps coming down to date. The ice is solid in our inland waters, and has not even as yet shown any perceptible sign of loosening its frigid grasp on the harbour of Toronto, so that the opening of navigation in Canada is, so far, a thing of the future. The situation as respects business generally, and as respects the labour market in particular, shows but little, if any, change from that of the past winter, nor is there any likelihood of any material change for the better for some time to come. And as if to add to the gravity of the situation, the present serious rebellion in our North-West has paralyzed the chances of that unfortunate country as a field for immigrants, either from the older Canada or Great Britain, for years. When the Indians of Canada have gone so far as to murder those whom in the long past they have revered, in the persons of Roman Catholic priests, it lies not in the mouth of any person (even though he be a Government or a steamship agent, and such persons can elongate the truth considerably) to say that this trouble is not much more than serious. Bearing this in mind respecting this North-West, of long and lonely distances without railway communication of any extent; sparse population; hostile Indians and semi-savages, none other than the most gullible of innocent mortals will venture under any pretense to emigrate thereto at the present time, with the intent of making it a home.

(Signed) "D. J. O'DONOGHUE."

This gentleman was receiving payment, year after year as a sessional clerk of the Mowat Government, and this letter was addressed to an official of the Ontario Government in Manchester. I will ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they consider that this letter was a proper one, and I could repeat page after page from various newspapers from 1884 to 1887 containing statements detrimental to the interests of Canada, and when the journalists gave up, I will not call them journalistic reptiles, then some hon. members in this House proceeded to furnish further information for the benefit of Canada and in order to increase the population. At that very time Sir Charles Tupper, as High Commissioner, had written to the Canadian Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite can see there a protest by a high official in the Canadian service in these terms:

"It is right, I should say, that there is no person so timid as an intending emigrant, and a portion of the decreased emigration may, perhaps, be attributed to some injudicious and incorrect newspaper articles that have from time to time appeared in Canada, and subsequently republished here, and to statements made through other channels, which are eagerly seized upon by the detractors of the Dominion, in support of their misrepresentations."

The English newspapers spoke out on the question, as will be seen by the following press opinions:—

"Those who have tried Canadian winters, tell us no more than the truth when they say that the variations of the English climate are more to be dreaded than the equable lowness of the temperature in the Dominion."—*The Times.*

"We believe that, as a rule, the probabilities of emigrants getting on are in favour of British Colonies. * * The immense reach of fertile and unoccupied land awaiting the plough, between Red River and the Rocky Mountains, ought to be sufficiently inviting to all Welsh as well as English subjects seeking a home abroad."—*Daily Telegraph.*

"It is astonishing to see the ignorance of Englishmen generally respecting the true character and resources of this splendid colony. In each of the farms is a mine of wealth, and it only needs strong arms and clear heads to develop it."—*Daily News.*

"It certainly is pleasing to reflect that thousands of families have found independence, if not comparative wealth, in our Canadian possessions, who, had they remained at home, might still find difficulty in procuring the means of living. A large and still augmenting class of farmers have here attained to competence and ease."—*Morning Advertiser.*

The English press fought our battles then while hon. gentlemen opposite were inducing their newspapers to oppose the Government and injure our national interests, and we had to look to the mother land, as we have had to look before in times of tribulation, for protection and salvation. We vainly appealed to hon. gentlemen to stand by the country as true Canadians and to act as patriots. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) just declared that the policy of the Government was inimical to Great Britain. At one period, I was tempted to believe there was some truth in the assertion, but, like all their assertions, when examined closely, this also proved utterly inaccurate. If the hon. gentleman does not believe me, let him turn to the London (England) *Observer* of January, 1890, which says, dealing with Dominion Trade and Navigation Returns for 1890:

"Adding together the values of the goods which Canada is obliged largely to procure from the United States, it will be seen that they amount to $29,543,342, as against $2,378,506 from Great Britain. Deducting these sums from the gross imports from the two countries, the balances are $22,748,631 and $41,011,645 respectively, or $18,263,014 in favour of Great Britain. An interesting feature of the returns is the indication that they give that

the shipment of American produce, by way of Canadian ports to Europe, is a business which is continually growing. The value of such produce in 1886 was $5,745,606, while in 1890 it was $12,714,705. This growth has not been spasmodic, but each year has shown a considerable increase over its predecessor. The articles so exported consist largely of cheese, butter, wheat, flour, and canned meats. It is in itself a tribute to the facilities offered by the Canadian route; but in part it possibly arises from an endeavour on the part of some of the United States' shippers to get their wares into the European markets as Canadian produce, especially when, as in the case of cheese, the Canadian product brings a higher price."

Still the hon. gentleman says our policy is inimical to Great Britain, while an English trade journal which knows more about the subject, as it affects the British market and British trade with Canada, than the hon. gentleman does, gives the very opposite opinion. The Manchester *Courier* of January, reviewing the fiscal policy of Canada, says:

"There is a feeling in some quarters that the fiscal policy of Canada had been detrimental to British trade, as compared with that of the United States. The discussion on the McKinley tariff, however, led to an examination of the Canadian returns, and the analysis made did not bear out that view. At first sight the figures are not at all encouraging, but a closer investigation reveals them in a different light. The following table shows the imports into Canada, from Great Britain and the United States respectively, under the low tariff in operation from 1874 to 1878, and under what is called the 'National Policy,' which was inaugurated by legislation in 1879:

	Great Britain.	United States.
1873	$68,522,000	$47,735,000
1879	30,993,000	43,739,000
1889	42,317,000	50,537,000

"It will be seen that between 1873 and the time the present tariff was inaugurated, the imports from Great Britain declined about $37,500,000, and those from the United States about $4,000,000; and that, under the higher duties, the imports from Great Britain have augmented, since 1879, to the extent of $11,300,000, as against $7,000,000 in the case of the United States. Coming to the great manufactures, Great Britain easily puts the United States in the shade, as the following tables will show:—

	Great Britain.		United States.	
	1888.	1889.	1888.	1889.
	$	$	$	$
Cotton manufactures	3,326,324	3,457,846	761,623	672,146
Woollen	9,140,940	9,557,569	142,370	131,216
Silk	2,448,075	2,606,994	142,818	121,192
Fancy goods	1,247,415	1,298,172	240,351	250,158
Flax, hemp, and jute manufactures	1,304,280	1,415,415	31,189	48,743

"These figures demonstrate that the importation of British manufactures into Canada is increasing, while those of the United States are decreasing—a slight increase being shown only in fancy goods, and flax, hemp, and jute manufactures from the latter country."

Now, while the British trade journals state distinctly that the policy is not detrimental to Great Britain, and is not an insult to Great Britain, and does not justify the antagonism of British manufacturers, the hon. gentleman would have us believe that of his own knowledge he can prove that it is detrimental, simply because for party purposes he desires to make the country believe so. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition issued a manifesto during the general election, and did not scruple to tell the people of the Province of Quebec in that manifesto that the country was rapidly decaying. He said:

"Sir John asserts, and seems seriously to assert, that the National Policy has made the country prosperous; that the manufacturing industries of our great centres have revived and multiplied; that the farmer has found a market, artizan and labourer employment and good wages. I take issue with the Prime Minister upon such statements. I characterize them as false in every particular."

Yet, gentlemen opposite assert, when the census comes down, that the effect of that policy is to crowd the cities; and why is it crowding the cities? Simply because the artizans are going to the centres of production and are becoming consumers in the city, thus assisting in utilizing the products of the farm and of the farm yard. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) said that to declare the National Policy a success was false in every particular, while he had before his face the banking returns for 1890, while he had before his face the enormously increased deposits in the banks, while he had before his face the enlarged local markets by reason of the National Policy, and while at the same time, he has now, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has now, the more than suggestive and significant fact that the great artizan vote of the country went for Sir John Macdonald's Government and the Conservative party in March last.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but his leader went further than that. His leader said:

"It cannot be expected: it were folly to expect that the interests of a colony will always be identical with the interests of the mother land."

Granted; but it altogether depends upon what interests are to be sacrificed—what interests involved. Well, the hon. gentleman has forced this question upon the House. He has asked us to discuss somewhat irrelevant matters, because in debating the census returns he has distinctly pointed out to us as the only remedy, Washington and the people of the States, and unrestricted reciprocity with the States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is your remedy?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. My remedy is that the very best minds of the country should stand by Canada; my remedy is to ask every man, be he Liberal or Conservative, to forget that he is in Opposition or in power and to rally around a policy which is for the good of the country, and which every man with the heart of a man, and the soul of a Canadian, should help to make successful and permanent. The hon. gentleman opposite formulates a policy, but the hon. gentleman's policy is office, while that of Conservatives is to make Canada progressive. When the member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) issued the manifesto I referred to, he must have known at that time that unless he gave the Americans control of our tariff, it was impossible to have reasonable reciprocity with them. He knew that during that election Mr. Wiman was forced by his inspirers in the United States to issue a letter, which appeared in the New York *Independent* a few weeks before the election, and which was headed: "The conflict in Canada." Mr. Wiman states in that letter:

"True, it is proposed to keep up the Custom houses along the border, in order that smuggling from outside should not be permitted, and especially that Canada should not be the back door by which foreign goods could be brought into the United States free of duty. But the tariff of Canada must necessarily be as high as that of this country, against the outside world, for by the free admission of American goods (even now with a heavy duty, now half her imports) her revenues from Customs would be so reduced that as against foreign goods the rates must continue fully as high as those in the United States. Indeed, the condition of equality of tariffs must always prevail, else there would be no safety for the revenues of either country."

And he went on to say:

"But aside from this tariff, as against the rest of the world, there will, under unrestricted reciprocity, be to trade no impediment whatever on the whole continent of North America. Practically, the Customs line that now cuts the continent in two will be lifted up, and placed right around the continent."

Remember, gentlemen, the McKinley tariff must be placed around the continent, a girdle of extreme protection, and hon. gentlemen opposite, professed free traders, were willing to support the McKinley tariff. But they were going to do more. Mr. Farrer wrote to Mr. Wiman at that time :

"Whatever course the United States may see fit to adopt, it is plain that Sir John's disappearance from the stage is to be the signal for a movement towards annexation."

Mr. Speaker, we are of those who believed in Sir John Macdonald ; we are of those who knew him to be a patriot ; we are of those who knew that he devoted his life to the interest of his country ; and while like every human being he had his weaknesses, Canada and the British Empire were ever in his heart. Therefore, we had confidence in him ; and though he has disappeared, though the banner has fallen from the hands of our dead chieftain, we who loved him well have enlisted beneath it, and will continue to bear it proudly towards national supremacy ; and if we cannot achieve victory under it, we will never disgrace it ; never submit to an ignominious capitulation. Therefore, when hon. gentlemen talk of discrimination, we can point to the splendid record of Sir John Macdonald, the patriot Conservative statesman, the link between Canada and the British Empire on this continent, the influence of whose life, I trust, will shield us from the infamy of jeopardizing the Dominion or trifling with national autonomy. The hon. member for South Oxford made an assertion that is not borne out by facts, and boldly asks this House to do violence to all that is fair and reasonable by endorsing it. In his resolution he declared :

"That during the last ten years the actual taxation of the people of Canada has been enormously increased under the operation of the existing tariff.

"That the deplorable state of things disclosed by the above-mentioned returns imperatively commands a radical change in the policy and methods of government followed by the Administration."

As that assertion has been made over and over again, and as it should not go to the country uncontradicted, I would ask hon. gentlemen to look at the Public Accounts, while I make a comparison from them of the taxation from Customs, Excise and stamps when hon. gentlemen were in power, as against the taxation under the present Government, and see the result. Under the Liberal regime from 1874-75 to 1878-79 this taxation was as follows :—

1874-75	$20,664,879
1875-76	18,614,415
1876-77	17,697,925
1877-78	17,841,938
1878-79	18,476,613
Making a total of	$93,295,770
Add the deficits during those years, amounting to	5,491,270
Making a total actual taxation of	$98,787,040
An average yearly taxation of	$19,757,408

Or an average taxation per head on a population of 4,100,000 of $4.82. The deficits may fairly be added, because those in power should have collected the money instead of leaving it to their successors to collect. I now come to Conservative taxation, from Customs and Excise—stamp duties having been struck off in 1882—which was as follows :—

1879-80	$ 18,479,576
1880-81	23,942,139
1881-82	27,549,046
1882-83	29,269,689
1883-84	25,483,199
1884-85	25,384,529
1885-86	25,226,456
1886-87	28,687,002
1887-88	28,177,413
1888-89	30,613,523
1889-90	31,587,072
Making a total of	$294,399,654

Permit me to add a statement showing the receipts and expenditure under eleven years of Conservative administration :

Year.	Total Receipts.	Total Expenditure.
1879-80	$ 23,307,407	$ 24,850,634
1880-81	29,635,298	25,502,554
1881-82	33,383,456	27,067,104
1882-83	35,794,650	28,730,157
1883-84	31,861,962	31,107,706
1884-85	32,797,001	35,037,060
1885-86	33,177,040	39,011,612
1886-87	35,754,993	35,057,680
1887-88	35,908,464	36,718,495
1888-89	38,782,870	36,917,835
1889-90	39,879,925	35,994,031
	$ 370,283,066	$ 356,594,868
	356,594,868	
Surplus	$ 13,688,198	
Total taxation as above for 11 years		$ 294,399,654
Less surplus as above		13,688,198
		$ 280,711,456
Yearly average of the 11 years		$ 25,519,223

An average yearly taxation per head on a population of 4,829,000 of $5.28 ; or an excess of 46 cents per head over that which existed during the time of hon. gentlemen opposite, when people were starving or working half time, and when depression and misery prevailed throughout the country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not so. You are slandering the country now.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I am not slandering the country. I am speaking of the country as it was, and I can now speak in a different tone of the country that is.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Hon. gentlemen opposite in this House and on public platforms say that there is a largely increased taxation, and the hon. member for South Oxford asks this House solemnly to endorse that statement. But giving those hon. gentlemen every advantage, they can only show an excess of 46 cents a head, and for that we have a splendid canal system, magnificent public works and public buildings, and an enormous amount of capital expenditure paid out of revenue. Then, let us consider the public debt. The hon. gentleman says that by adding to the public debt and the interest charge, the Conservative party have almost ruined Canada. I ask hon. gentlemen to consider these figures taken from the Public Accounts :—

Net liabilities, 1st July, 1874	$108,324,964
do do 1879	142,990,187
Increase in 5 years	$ 34,665,223
Net liabilities, 1st July, 1890	$237,533,212
do do 1879	142,990,187
Conservative increase in 11 years	$ 94,543,025
Liberal expenditure on capital account for 5 years, 1875-79	$ 33,982,568
Liberal increase of debt as above	34,665,223
Conservative expenditure on capital account for 11 years, 1880-90	$102,108,981
Conservative increase of debt as above	94,543,024

Yet there are hon. members of this House who tell the farmers and artizans of this country that the Conservative party have increased the debt, and that we would have no debt at all if we had not a Conservative party. Well, if we had not a Conservative party, we would have had no debt because we would have had no country. Now, there is no better criterion to judge our debt by than the interest the country is paying. and it must be borne in mind that the provincial subsidies are a fixed charge on either party. I will ask hon. gentlemen to bear with me for a moment while I make a statement in respect to our interest account. The hon. member for South Oxford forgets that loss on loans which he made in Great Britain on two occasions, by which we were supposed to have sacrificed a large amount, should be charged against his Administration; but I do not take account of this. Now, the average net debt bearing interest in 1874, 1879 and 1890 respectively was as follows:—

	Debt bearing Interest.	Interest Charges.
1874	$117,311,167	$ 6,122,844
1879	156,616,536	7,281,018
1890	269,521,806	10,566,352
Average interest on net debt, 1879		$4 52
do do do 1890		3 75

The net debt in 1879 was $142,990,187, on which the net interest charged was $6,664,253, or an average of 4·52 per cent. The net debt in 1890 was $237,533,212, and the net interest charged was $8,904,945, or only 3·75 per cent., showing that, while the net debt has increased more than 66 per cent., the net interest paid increased less than 34 per cent. Now, this is a question which any hon. gentleman can investigate for himself; these are figures which any hon. gentleman can work out; and, if I am mistaken, I shall be glad to learn it, because I may use these statements on other occasions, and do not wish ever to deceive an audience, for rely upon it, among the people there are always some who know the facts as well as the speaker who addresses them. One of the hon. gentlemen pointed last night to the fact that the Conservatives were spending a large amount of money in collecting revenue. But if hon. gentlemen opposite, not for the sake of curiosity, not for the sake of change, not for the sake of sympathizing with the Conservative party, not for the sake of forgiving the present Administration any small efforts that were unsuccessful, would take the figures of revenue and cost of collection under the Liberal regime and under Conservative rule, they would find material for wholesome reflection. If we take the last fiscal year 1878-79, when hon. gentlemen opposite were

Mr. MACKINTOSH.

responsible for estimates, we find that the Customs revenue collected amounted to $12,900,659, and that the cost of collection was $719,711, or 5·56 per cent. In the last fiscal year, 1889-90, the amount of Customs revenue collected was $25,968,953 and the cost of collecting it $873,400, or less than 3·63 per cent. And yet this is the Government which is charged with extravagance and corruption, this is the Government which is responsible for our not having a larger population. If hon. gentlemen will draw a comparison between these figures and submit it to the country at large, the people will soon tell them that it is not the Conservative party nor the expenditure of the Government, but the false and partizan statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite regarding the progress of Canada and its institutions which account for our not having a larger population. At the same rate of expenditure as that of 1879 it would have cost us $1,135,229 to collect last year's Customs revenue, had a Liberal Government been in power. You will see, therefore, how wise the people were in their generation when refusing to let those hon. gentlemen collect the revenue. It would have cost $461,829 per year more than it actually cost if the Liberals had continued in power and maintained their old policy. The cost of collecting the Customs duties since 1879, which amounted to $241,685,747, would have been $13,437,728 instead of $8,713,617, the actual figures, showing a difference of $4,724,111 in favour of the present Administration. During the five years under Liberal regime we had one surplus amounting to $935,644, and four deficits amounting to $6,426,959, showing an excess of deficits over surplus of $5,491,315. During the eleven years the Conservative party have been in power we have had seven surpluses, amounting to $24,116,085, and four deficits amounting to $10,427,829, or an excess of surpluses over deficits of $13,688,196. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, in all fairness, if that is a statement likely to keep people from coming to this country? Let hon. gentlemen opposite discuss squarely and above board the showing of the Public Accounts, and prove where I am wrong, and where the policy of the Government has been wrong, not only with regard to taxation, but the collection of the revenue. Another cause why people have not come to this country is the warning sent out by hon. gentlemen opposite that this is not only a highly-taxed country, but that it is taxed doubly as high as Great Britain or the United States. My hon. friend from Bothwell seems to acquiesce in that statement, but I think I will prove the very opposite. You will remember, Sir, when the hon. member for South Oxford was Minister of Finance. At that time, in spite of the depression and gloom throughout the country, he came up smiling every session and said that the worst was over, but he would never admit that Canada was taxed as heavily as the United States. He would point to the federal debt, the state debt, and the municipal debt, and show that the debt of New York alone was more than the entire debt of Canada. The hon. gentleman did not deplore the condition of Canada then. He said, in his Budget speech of the 20th February, 1877:

"Now, comparing the result of our fiscal policy with the result of the American fiscal policy, I say boldly, that so far as these figures show, and so far as the facts are known to us they show we have no cause to dread a comparison. As for the home market, I have said before,

and I now repeat, that the number of persons employed in manufactures in the United States is not greater relatively to population, if indeed so great, than the number employed in Canada."

And these unfortunate men were working at 50 cents to 60 cents per day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman says "no." I was Mayor at the Capital in 1879, and know, that men were then willing to work at 60 cents per day. Carpenters were glad to get 75 cents per day and bricklayers $1.25 per day, and shanty men were only getting $7 per month and their board. If the hon. gentleman denies this, let him enquire at the lumber mills, let him go to the City Hall and see the prices that were then paid the labouring classes. I will give him proof from a Liberal friend of his, a gentleman who was his candidate in 1878 for this city, Mayor Bangs. When that gentleman was running as a candidate of the Liberal party, he said:

"Every morning when I came down to the City Hall, I found from 20 to 100 men seeking assistance—men who were willing to work, but who had families starving at home. I distributed tickets amongst them. Some of them were not able to earn 25 cents per day, but still I sent them up to Mr. Henderson, the Superintendent of Works. Mr. Henderson would come down and say: 'Don't send another crowd that can't do anything.' I replied: 'These men are starving and may as well be supported by the Government as by the city.' I had gone afterwards with Mr. Goodwin and asked Mr. Mackenzie that some work be started in Grenville. Mr. Mackenzie replied that there was no appropriation, but I told him that, notwithstanding this, the country would bear him out in it, and that there must be something done, or else there would be trouble and even riots in the city."

The hon. member for South Oxford went further in his defence of his policy of free trade and remaining in office. He said:

"And not only do they not employ more men, but they do not, at present at any rate, pay them one whit more. Indeed, I doubt much whether the purchasing power of wages in the United States is at all as great as that of similar wages in Canada; while as to the condition of the general labour market, it must be a matter of common notoriety to every hon. gentleman in this House, that if there is (as there unfortunately is) depression in Canada, there is still greater depression in the United States; and if there are, unfortunately, men now unemployed in our large cities, in New York alone, on the other hand, it is reported that something like one-fifth or one-sixth of the entire adult male population are unemployed and clamouring for employment at the public expense."

That was the picture the hon. gentleman drew of the United States when he was in power and the people were starving. What does he say now? He tells us we ought to encourage unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, a reciprocity so undefined and indefinable, that I challenge any hon. gentleman to state what it is, where it is, or whence it came. At that time, when the hon. member for South Oxford spoke, Canada was being made a slaughter market for the people of the United States. We saw our workingmen walking about with their hands in their pockets while the bloated monopolists of the United States were sending us their surplus goods, which they sacrificed here for hard cash, and then turned that cash into goods to suit their own market, and thus saved themselves from any loss. The hon. gentleman went further. He said in a speech at Simcoe in 1877:

"I find that in Ontario during the last year the people paid about $5,500,000 for municipal purposes; and knowing as we do how much the wealth of Ontario exceeds that of the other provinces taken collectively, how much more perfectly your municipal system has been carried out, I think I am perfectly safe in saying that the sum total levied elsewhere in the Dominion cannot by any possibility exceed the sum the people of Ontario are paying: and that, therefore, if to the $23,000,000 paid into the Dominion exchequer you add for the whole Dominion the sum of $11,000,000 you will have fully covered, if not more than covered, the sum total of the taxation levied on our four millions of people. I say, taking all these into account, by no possibility can the burden of the people of the United States be less than $800,000,000 a year, and I can well believe that it largely exceeds $1,000,000,000. The greatest curses of the United States are their municipal extravagance and their perverted fiscal system, which together have inflicted such burdens on them, that almost every American family at this moment is obliged to contribute in one form or another something like $125 in taxes, or at the lowest estimate $100."

No change has taken place except to the advantage of Canada, except that our factories have been developed, our industries are flourishing, our farmers have large crops and are happy and contented; but despite all this, the hon. gentleman said that in a time of commercial depression we would do far better to endanger our capital by opening our markets to the United States. Then the hon. gentleman, in a speech delivered in this House—and I am only dealing with this matter because the hon. gentleman has deliberately introduced questions which had no relation to the main question at issue in regard to the census, because he took advantage of the opportunity to send these statements to the country, and because we hope to send the other side of the question—said, on the 22nd February, 1878:

"The taxation for all purposes borne by the people of the Dominion of Canada is probably barely one-third of the taxation inflicted on the people of the United States under the operation of their municipal system and of their tariff, and in any case is barely one-half of the sum which we know to be paid by them in hard cash; while as compared with the British Islands with their present estimated population of about 33,000,000, paying in what are known as the Queen's taxes about $330,000,000, our taxation may be fairly computed as barely one-half."

The hon. gentleman at that time solemnly stated that our taxes were barely one-half. I want to call attention to the sudden change in the views of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when he was in Opposition. In 1888, he again referred to Great Britain, and this is what he said:

"We in Canada, a young nation, and by no means as wealthy a nation as the United States or England, for those controllable services which are under the special charge of the Government and Parliament, and in which economy can be exercised, require to-day per head about three times as much as is needed in England or the United States."

If the hon. gentleman desires to give information to the House, he should have gone further and should have stated that there are laws in Great Britain dealing with municipal taxation. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is no doubt aware of that fact. If you turn to a work on "Local Government and Taxation," published by Mr. Rathbone, M.P., and Mr. Pell, M.P., you will find the following statement:—

"The total of local indebtedness was, at the close of the year 1879-80, $684,680,000, and at the close of the year 1876-77, $530,255,000. So that in the latest period of six years, for which the figures can be accurately ascertained, the apparent increase in our local debts was no less than $215,500,000, which supposes an average annual increase of $36,000,000. In times of profound peace and economic Government, we have been able to reduce the national debt by about $40,000,000 a year; but taking one year with another, our seasons of peril and our fits of extravagance, along with our intervals of security and endeavours after thrift, we do not diminish our national debt by anything like the sums which we add to our local debts."

We find the same admission laid down in an article in the London *Times* on the growth of local indebtedness, dated 18th May, 1891 :

"For many more novelties we are prepared; and most of us lately learned without much surprise that the entire local debt had risen to £195,400,000, or about a fourth of the national debt."

Hon. gentlemen do not tell us anything as to the local debts in the parishes and towns of Great Britain, which have to be met by taxation on the people, and the London *Times* shows that that taxation in England for local purposes amounts to nearly one-fourth of the national debt. The hon. gentleman has pointed to the fact that our natural market is in the United States. I think, if the hon. gentleman opposite desires to deal with the whole question, before asking Canadians to say that this country has not progressed, he should show us his reasons. He says we would have progressed more rapidly if we had reciprocity with the United States. I wonder whether Mr. Harrison, the President of the United States, should not be preferred as an authority on that point to the hon. member for South Oxford. In his last message to Congress, on page 19, Mr. Harrison says :

"From the time of my induction into office the duty of using every power and influence given by law to the executive department for the development of larger markets for our products, especially our farm products, has been kept constantly in mind, and no effort has been or will be spared to promote that end. We are under no disadvantage in any foreign market, except that we pay our workmen and workwomen better wages than are paid elsewhere—better abstractly, better relatively to the cost of the necessaries of life. I do not doubt that a very largely increased foreign trade is accessible to us without bartering for it either our home market for such products of the farm and shop as our own people can supply, or the wages of our working people."

The hon. gentleman will see that the President of the United States says he will not sacrifice the products of the western farmers and of the eastern manufacturers, and I hope he does not expect that we should blindly condemn this Government for not having obtained what it is evident is not contemplated by the President of the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman say what they are going to Washington at all for, under these circumstances ?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I can understand that the negotiations going on, which were commenced by the United States——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. If hon. gentlemen will allow me, I was going to say that the United States has been negotiating treaties with other countries, with the West Indies and other Governments in the south. When certain disputes arose between the Imperial Government and Canada as against the United States, was it not natural that diplomatic efforts should be made by those interested to settle the whole question ? Then commissioners were sent to Washington.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But you quote President Harrison to show that their mission cannot succeed.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. If it depends on the sacrifice of the Canadian producer or the Canadian farmer, in order to get reciprocity with the United States, then we will leave the United States out and fight for national interests. President Harrison said :

"The value of our exports of domestic merchandize during the last year was over $115,000,000 greater than the preceding year, and was only exceeded once in our history. About one hundred millions of this excess was in agricultural products."

That being the case, does not the hon. gentleman see that the Government require the aid of every man in this House if they are going to succeed in securing a reasonable treaty ? If hon. gentlemen are anxious to get a reciprocity treaty, why do they state that the Government made a failure ? Why do they, by their actions, weaken the hands of the Administration ? Why do they not say : We will work with you, we will go hand in hand with you, and do all we can ? I remember another reciprocity treaty, when the hon. gentleman was supporting the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) ; I remember when every hon. gentlemen opposite stood up and said : "Yes, we have sent the Hon. George Brown to Washington, he has met an Imperial official, but not one solitary thing shall be done detrimental to the interest of Great Britain. Every word of that treaty must provide for the same fair trade towards Great Britain that is given to the United States ; there must be no discrimination against Great Britain." Hon. gentlemen opposite know that while the Conservative party was willing to assist in negotiating a treaty—the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) shakes his head. Had I not already spoken so long I would prove that what I say is correct. The hon. gentleman knows that Sir John Macdonald expressed a hope, when the address was being debated, that the treaty would be a success. But who were the gentlemen who opposed that treaty ? Did not every Board of Trade, with exceptions, oppose it ? One of the leading merchants of Canada, a man who was honoured wherever he was known, a man who occupied a high position in this House, and became afterwards a Senator—I refer to the late John Macdonald, sounded the loudest note of alarm. Mr. Macdonald issued a circular in which he said :

"It needs but little reasoning to prove what the results will be when the American goods referred to are admitted duty free into our country. To the Canadian manufacturer—Ruin. To the Canadian dealer—Loss. To every projected manufacturing interest—Stoppage. To the Canadian consumer—Direct taxation. To the entire trade of the country—Disturbance, uneasiness and uncertainty. The flooding of our own country with American goods—the building up and enrichment of American manufacturers and jobbers. If the legislation of a country is intended for the protection and benefit of its subjects, for the fostering and development of its industries, the treaty as it now stands cannot pass. Nor will the attempt be made, we think, when it is found that its workings are so ruinous to the men who have accomplished so much in making Canada the manufacturing country which it is to-day."

But there was another gentleman, also a member of the Liberal party and also a Senator, Mr. Reesor, who, on the 25th of February, 1875, said :

"If they had a market for American produce, surely they must have one for their own. All this had been done without the benefit of free trade with the United States. Our duties had been taken off western products in order to allow people to avail themselves of this market. They evidently were not taken off to benefit the American. He was perfectly satisfied that we reaped a large profit from this trade. If the Americans wanted to act in like manner with our trade, let them do so. For his own part he thought we were in a prosperous condition, and that there was no need at all of the proposed treaty."

So I tell the hon. gentleman that those who opposed the treaty were his Liberal friends and supporters. Every Conservative said : As long as Great Britain

is not discriminated against and Canadian rights are maintained we will support the treaty. As I have said, the hon. gentleman knows that every board of trade in the Dominion of Canada denounced that treaty. The hon. gentleman knows that the Hon. George Brown would not support that treaty if it discriminated against Great Britain. More than this, hon. gentlemen must know, that under that proposed arrangement, it was agreed that nearly $5,000,000 which Canada afterwards received from the Washington Treaty arbitration was to have been surrendered; they must know, that, after Sir John Macdonald was condemned for agreeing to that treaty, four or five of those who voted for it, were taken into a Liberal Government and became the colleagues of the hon. gentlemen who had asserted that by it Canada's interests were sacrificed. The hon. gentleman knows that the hon. member for East York, then the head of the Government, stated in the House of Commons that instructions were given to Mr. Brown, as follows:—

"It is, however, understood that no proposition affecting the introduction of manufactured goods shall be finally determined upon prior to reference to the Imperial and Dominion Governments. As a natural production, salt may be added to the former free list. * * * Mr. Brown will communicate this view to Sir Edward Thornton, accompanied with the representation that the Government of Canada do not propose any modification in matters of trade and commerce which would in any way injuriously affect Imperial interests."

Yet the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), in issuing his manifesto to the people of this country, said that we must not be hampered by the mother country's interest. The member for South Oxford said the same thing. When the Liberal Government were in power they said they were opposed to anything like discrimination against Great Britain, but now they say that Canada must look out for herself, and Great Britain must take care of herself. I can say that many leading men in the United States, who were not bitter partizans, stated that the treaty had been immensely beneficial to the United States, and hon. gentlemen know that all they did was to express a willingness to admit a few articles free and to surrender the four or five million dollars that we were to get under the Washington Treaty. When the hon. gentleman interrupted me and asked something regarding the reciprocity treaty, which I did not intend to refer to, I was about to show how unfair it was that hon. gentlemen opposite did not assist the Government in solving the problem of new markets, where the Canadian farmers and manufacturers could sell their goods at a profit. Looking over the British Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that in foreign countries the following goods are in demand and purchased every year, to a noticeable extent: As regards cheese, the United States and Canada supplied a value of nearly $20,000,000, as follows:—United States, $10,407,730; Canada, $9,571,160, out of a total of $24,876,170. Hon. gentlemen know that our cheese is sent from Canada to Great Britain, and even American cheese is branded as Canadian and sent to the English market, such is the demand for the Canadian product. Yet, hon. gentlemen opposite say that our farmers cannot compete with the farmers of the United States. Take the demand for eggs. From the Trade and Navigation Returns it appears that England imported eggs as follows:—Germany, $4,343,275; Belgium, $2,925,160; France, $6,350,460; other countries, $3,525,115—total, $17,144,010. Canada has not hitherto exceeded a few hundred dollars per annum. Did time permit, I could show from the records recently published by the Montreal *Bulletin* that Canadian eggs stand next to French eggs in the English market, realizing 7 shillings as compared with 7 shillings and sixpence for French eggs per great hundreds. The result is that the following are required by Great Britain:—Butter, $53,034,240; cheese, $24,876,170; eggs, $17,144,010—total, $95,054,420, out of which trade Canada has only secured business not exceeding $11,000,000. Does the hon. gentleman tell me that by the application of a strong and vigorous policy, a policy endorsed by the Opposition, a policy which hon. gentlemen opposite assist the Government in framing, we cannot find a market in England for our goods and arrive at a decision as to the best products to be sent to that market? Do hon. gentlemen tell me that we must surrender to the United States farmer and make no further effort? Then I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that there are other products they should look at. Take butter: England received from Sweden, $5,868,610 worth; Denmark, $22,012,275; Germany, $2,722,355; Holland $4,363,930; France, $14,235,720; Canada, $303,965; United States, $1,511,925; other countries, $2,167,720—total, $53,034,240; out of which Canada supplied only $303,695 in value. Do hon. gentlemen mean to say that if they would devote themselves in assisting the Government in formulating a policy, instead of wasting their time in hampering every industry in the country, we could not enlarge the Canadian market? Do they fail to realize that as statesmen they are bound to do so? Do not hon. gentlemen opposite see that there is a land there that we can enter and occupy, and find a market for our products? Why, Sir, look at little Denmark, with a population of 2,200,000—supplying the English market with over $20,000,0000 worth of butter. Every Canadian, seeing these figures, should at once say that before we try experimental legislation, before we submit even to a partial sacrifice at Washington, if the Americans will not grant us our rights, we ought not first to see what Canada is capable. To throw responsibility on the Government, in view of all facts, is unjust, unfair and dangerous. Conservatives have always had faith in Canada and Canadian possibilities. We have 14,000 miles of railway, magnificent canals, a rich soil, healthy climate, and a hardy and industrious population; and with these need we fear any nation of the world? I say no. Then there are other products sent to the English markets by the United States. Look at some of these: Bacon—the United States sends $24,500,000; fresh beef, $18,000,000; hams, $12,500,000; preserved beef, $7,000,000; and in fresh mutton even Australasia ships over $9,000,000. Horses, Great Britain purchases annually a number of horses. In 1890 she brought from various countries the following:—Stallions, $275,370; mares, $358,750; geldings, $1,044,360—total, $1,678,480. Live animals: Great Britain, total living animals in 1890, including oxen, bulls, cows, calves, sheep and lambs, over $55,000,000. Recapitulation: Butter, cheese and eggs, $95,054,420; meats, bacon, &c., $69,000,000; horses, $1,678,000; living animals, $55,000,000; corn and wheat, $117,000,000; barley, oats, pease and Indian corn, $96,000,000—grand total, $433,732,420. And yet the hon. member

for South Oxford says there is no future for Canada. The hon. member for South Oxford said we are asked to be content, and to do nothing more. Perhaps there is too much of that in Canada. Perhaps, relying on the past, we may not have been sufficiently careful to provide for the future. I have confidence that the Government are alive to the circumstances of the country, and so long as we have a progressive policy Canada need fear no danger. On the question of immigration, the hon. member pointed to the census and said that the population is not so large as it should have been. What has been the immigration policy? It has been to exclude artizans and practically the labouring class. The consequence is that thousands did not come into the Dominion. But, at the same time, our population is more thrifty, the wealth is larger, the country is more progressive, and we will see what the future has in store for us if we study the future of Canada as we should. I think, so far as immigration has a bearing on the census, it is the duty of the Government to do all they possibly can to develop the North-West. I believe that Canada's future is dependent, to a great extent, upon the future of the North-West. But, when we rise in our places and say so, as we did some years ago, what is the result? We are charged with doing everything for the North-West. I call to mind what the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), when this question came up on 24th June, 1885, said, as reported in the Official Debates:

"The circumstances of the Maritime Provinces are such that they require the special attention of the Minister (of Agriculture), and the same remark applies to Ontario and Quebec in some measure. While the money of the people in these provinces is being expended, and a large portion of it squandered in immigration, these provinces do not receive any attention, all the attention being given to the North-West."

I ask hon. gentlemen if that is the Canadian spirit, if that is the Canadian idea? If we build a railway in any of the provinces, we believe it will be not only sectionally, but nationally, advantageous to Canada. More than this, is it Canadian, is it patriotic, is it wise, to endeavour to impress upon rival countries the idea that we are not a united people? Take the language of the leader of the Opposition in this House, 5th April, 1888:

"Twenty years ago we united the British provinces on this continent with the view of making them a new nationality and with the view of making them a nation. It was then a union on paper. It was expected that it would be a real union. The union has lasted 20 years and what is the result to-day? What have we achieved during those 20 years? I say that to-day, after 20 years, the union, which, in 1867, was a mere union on paper, is to-day still a mere union on paper. The hearts of the people by the sea are not in the union!"

The hon. gentleman said the hearts of the people of the Maritime Provinces are not in the Union. The people of the Maritime Provinces, however, showed in the last contest conducted by the late chief of the Conservative party, that their hearts are in the Union, and they are represented here by a solid phalanx, to support, not a sectional, but a national policy. The United States are looking to Canada for a market, but are not dealing fairly with us. Unless they can get control of Canada, I am convinced they will, as much as possible, avoid entering into any treaty arrangement with Canada. I say this because Canadians will agree to no sacrifice and desire that their country shall not be compromised by those who go as ambassadors or negotiators to Washington. When the Minister of Finance went to the West Indies, he was sneered at by the American press. The New York *Tribune* of 11th July, 1891, published an article entitled: "A Reciprocity Study," with comments upon Canadian assurance, as follows:—

"The light-fingered Canadian gamblers who have been seeking to draw the British West Indies into a quiet little reciprocity game of their own, wherein they would have all the aces, kings and knaves in their sleeves, have been greatly demoralized this week by the announcement of the successful negotiation of a treaty between the United States and Spain. This treaty confers upon Cuba and Porto Rico the advantage of a permanent free market for their sugar. The question which British West Indian planters are now asking is whether they can afford to be deprived of the free market for their sugar by the operation of the retaliatory clause of the reciprocity amendment. They are selling $13,235,500 of their sugar in the United States, to say nothing of coffee and hides."

Light-fingered Canadian gamblers, indeed, because we as Canadians endeavour to enlarge our trade relations! Again:

"Mr. Foster, when he was in the West Indies, offered on the part of Canada to establish two steam lines—one a monthly service between St. John and Demerara, touching at the principal Leeward and Windward Islands, and the other a monthly service between Halifax and Kingston. These lines will undoubtedly enlarge the trade between Canada and the West Indies, but the service will not be better than that already existing between the Islands and New York, although that ought to be improved. Even with these new transportation facilities, for which subsidies will be paid at both ends, 5,000,000 Canadians cannot hope to compete with 63,000,000 Americans."

Hon. gentlemen will see that while the United States are looking for other markets they are doing everything possible to injure and belittle the Dominion, and it is the bounden duty of every Canadian to also seek other markets than the United States, and to ask himself if, failing to make reciprocal arrangements with the United States, we cannot find some other means and methods of disposing of our products. The New York *Tribune*, editorially, on 11th July, said:

"It is not a market, however, that suffices for the industrial requirements of a population of over 63,0000,000, comprising the best working stock in the world. On this continent alone there are hives of population, nearly equal in numbers to our own, as is shown in the following table:

SOUTHERN COUNTRIES.

	Population.	Foreign Trade.
Mexico	11,388,664	$ 83,726,738
Central America	3,131,728	35,942,119
Colombia,	3,878,600	21,848,344
Venezuela	2,234,385	39,210,218
Brazil	14,002,335	260,695,050
Argentine	4,046,654	280,690,000
Chili	2,665,926	119,258,332
Uruguay	641,112	57,485,702
Guiana	364,118	23,141,499
Peru	2,621,844	14,024,453
Paraguay	329,645	5,878,365
Bolivia	1,192,162	14,258,332
Ecuador	1,004,651	15,539,047
Spanish West Indies	2,306,393	138,875,344
Hayti	600,000	13,624,769
Sant Domingo	610,000	4,513,867
British West Indies	1,313,241	55,956,690
French West Indies	357,573	16,007,584
Other West Indies	79,717	.....
	52,778,748	$1,200,676,453

Does this not prove that the authorities at Washington desire to drive a hard bargain with the Dominion, and will only yield to firmness and the necessities of the occasion? I have referred to the desirability of finding other markets and have shown where they can be found, if we possess sufficient self-reliance to secure them. I now desire to refer briefly to the wholesale denun-

ciation by the hon. member for South Oxford of land and money subsidies to railways which he dwelt upon at some length last evening. The hon. member for Bothwell knows, for he was a member of the late Liberal Government, that the system was one adopted by the Administration of which he was a member. He knows that one hon. gentleman rose in my hearing, for I was then in the press gallery of the House, and told the Mackenzie Government that unless he could get old rails enough to rail a certain railway he would not support the Administration. That was the language of Mr. Ferries, then member for Queen's. The hon. gentleman knows more. I think the hon. gentleman will remember that a Bill was introduced by him as Minister of the Interior on 27th February, 1878, a colonization railway Bill. Now, the hon. gentleman knows that in the provisions of that proposed amendment was laid the foundation of the railway subsidy policy, and the present Government coming into power after the lapse of a few years, said: Rather than give rails and have the rails laid on the track we will have an inspector, and we will give these roads money enough to buy new rails. The hon. gentleman knows that at that time he was willing to honeycomb the North-West with railways having rails of 56 lbs., iron or steel. He knows that he offered to each railway five miles of land on each side of the track, and he made provision for twenty miles, so long as it ran from the Peace River to the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was not then built. The hon. gentleman knows also that if he allowed these companies to be formed, 10 per cent. only being required to be deposited to entitle them to form a company, he knew that the Americans having an interest in that country would have prevented the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway by honeycombing that country with railways, and he withdrew that Bill, happily for him and happily for the country. We have never been told why the Bill was withdrawn, but we know that the Bill was hurriedly withdrawn after a speech made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Section 6 of that Bill says:

"Sec. 6. Such articles of association shall not be filed and recorded in the Department of the Minister of the Interior until at least fifty per cent. of the stock required shall have been subscribed in good faith, and ten per cent. of the amount so subscribed paid to the Receiver General, and there is endorsed thereon, or annexed thereto, an affidavit made by at least three of the directors named in the said articles of association, that the amount of stock required by this section has been subscribed in good faith, and ten per cent. paid, in cash, as aforesaid, and that it is intended, in good faith, to construct, maintain and operate the road mentioned in such articles of association."

The hon. gentleman knows that the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) fully approved of the Government policy of land grants to branch railways. He may remember an interview which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) gave, when the Canadian Pacific Railway was almost built, and which appeared in the Toronto *Globe*, and in which that hon. gentleman strongly approved of the policy of aiding branch lines by land subsidies. The member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) said, in reply to a reporter of the Toronto *Globe*:

"Q. What do you think of the late announcement by the Government, that they will give land grants to the branch railways?

"A. While in the territory I expressed myself at a public meeting favourable to making grants absolute instead of merely making a sale at a reduced rate, where the roads are eventually to be of public service in settling the country. At present several companies have obtained grants of 6,400 acres per mile at a nominal price of one dollar per acre. The removal of that price, granting the land free, would have the immediate effect of facilitating the construction of roads now much wanted. It may be that the Government in the new announcement mean to carry out this plan."

The Government carried out that plan so approved of, but now the hon. gentlemen opposite denounce the Government because they desire the Government to state what price shall be put upon the lands; that is one of their points. They must admit, however, that the general policy of the Government with regard to subsidizing railways was never denounced by them when it was initiated; but to-day they have changed their policy. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in the course of a speech delivered in 1878, stated distinctly that it would pay to give away half the lands of that country, or at least a large portion of them, for building railways. I need not quote the speech, if the hon. gentleman will admit it, but it may be as well to let the House know what he then said:

"They were told these railway claims were going to absorb the whole of the North-West. Under no circumstances could they absorb more than half of it, even were parallel lines to run so close to each other that these grants joined, for in that case even the Government would still have each alternate section."

They were then willing to give away one-half the lands of the North-West, and to-day they denounce the Government—the Canadian Pacific Railway having been built, and no danger to be feared from that quarter—for endeavouring to open up the entire country in the North-West by subsidizing railways. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said at that time:

"It would be found that the progress of any state had in no way interfered with the progress of settlement of another. He had no doubt whatever that if our territories in the North-West were opened up to the people, free to go in any direction they chose, settlements would rapidly grow in extent, which would form a nucleus for the development of all the provinces. The only effect of undertaking to prevent people from settling where they chose, to confine them to particular localities, would be to exclude a large population from the territories which would, no doubt, under different circumstances settle there."

While the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as well as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was anxious that half the lands of the North-West would be given away, while he was willing to have railways built and to endorse the subsidy policy, he also said that the only way to build up the North-West and to make it progressive and prosperous was to aid these lines by large subsidies, while at the same time the people who might form these companies might have formed 500 companies if they liked, for there was nothing to prevent them in the Act, as any fifteen men could form a company. That policy might have prevented the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and United States railways, by forming small companies, might have had a monopoly of the North-West; but that policy undoubtedly meant dropping the Canadian Pacific Railway, except through the prairie sections. That seemed the principal object of the Bill. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) withdrew his Bill; but it does not lie in his mouth now to denounce the policy of the Government, nor does it lie in the mouth of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr.

Charlton) to denounce the Government for subsidizing railways either by land or money, when he agreed that so far as he was concerned the Government might sell the land so long as the companies received out of the grant $10,000 a mile for it. The hon. gentleman will, I think, admit that I am correct in that. I have enlarged on the subject simply for the reason that hon. gentlemen opposite have introduced issues into this debate that do not properly belong to it. Hence I shall answer these points that I think more salient and more important that the country should know precisely the record of either party, and when a reply comes I shall be very glad to hear it. Hon. gentlemen opposite have sneered at the National Policy, and said that it was a mischievous policy, and detrimental to the interest of the country. Well, it is a farmer's policy. The hon. gentlemen know, just as well as I do, that when they were in power they were implored to introduce that policy by the farmers of this country: that the farmers told them that their tariff arrangements, so far as the United States were concerned, were utterly suicidal and destructive to their interests. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) shakes his head, but does he remember what Mr. Hill, master of the Dominion Grange, testified before a committee of Parliament, when asked the following question:—

"Question: Do you think that the farmers would be benefited were the Canadian Government to impose upon the United States farm produce entering Canada for consumption, a duty corresponding to the duty levied by the United States Government upon Canadian farm produce exported into that country? Answer: I do."

Yet hon. gentlemen opposite point to a petition which has been sent by the farmers, stating that they have been injured by a policy which they themselves endorsed and asked for. In 1876, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, they will remember that Parliament also received a petition, and that the Dominion Grange Association, in a document sent to this House, stated as follows:—

"That whereas agriculture is a prominent interest in this Dominion, and the prosperity of all classes largely depends upon the success of the farmers, it is desirable to enact such laws as shall ensure that success. As practical farmers we cannot but view with regret our markets filled with American produce, free of duty, while Canadian produce is heavily taxed when sent to the United States. Your petitioners respectfully pray for such protection as will secure the home market for the home producer, &c."

Hon. H. G. Joly, then Premier of Quebec, in answer to the question as to whether it was wise to admit American produce free while Canadian producers paid duty, replied:

"Answer: No, it is against the interest of Canada. I humbly think we should not admit anything free of duty except the raw material required for our manufactures."

The hon. member for South Oxford did not believe in that policy; he was perfectly candid about it: he never made any reservation. He told the people that they did not clearly understand the question, and that he as Finance Minister was legislating in the best interest of the country. At the same time, the hon. gentleman knows that the farmers of this country asked for this policy, and they got it: they endorsed that policy in 1878, they endorsed it in 1882, they endorsed it in 1887, and they again endorsed it in 1891. The hon. gentleman knows that, yet why does he declare that the farmers of this country are opposed to the National Policy? He produces nothing to show it, except a petition which he mentions. Well, we have heard a great deal about the mortgages resting on the poor farmers in Canada. Hon. gentlemen will remember that in 1880 Kansas was an Eldorado and Dakota a paradise, in the opinion of the party opposite. We were told in this House that we could not hope to compete with those States. Well, what is the fact? The other day, reading an interview with a mortgaged Kansas farmer, in the Cincinnati *Star*, I found him speaking to the reporter in the following way:—

"Eastern people can say what they please about the kick now being made against the two old parties. If they had the same conditions to face that we have they would kick, too. Now, let me give a few facts. The State of Kansas is composed of farms, towns and cities, of course, and nearly every inch of it is mortgaged for more than it is worth at present. The indebtedness is $707 for every voter, so you can see at present the position the people are in. Interest and taxes and the necessities of life are grinding us into the earth, and where was once a prosperous and flourishing people is now a half-starved crowd of broken-hearted wretches who can hardly be recognized as the same people who lived in that country a few years ago. * * * But now look at the effect of the boom. My own experience is an example of what that did for us. In 1880 I bought a farm of 400 acres for $8,000. I had $4,000 to invest and gave a mortgage for the balance. The first year my crops were a total failure, and I mortgaged my chattels to live on. This was a fatal step, but I had a family, and what else could I do? I struggled along, and at last the mortgage was closed on me and my farm was sold for $4,000. I had nothing left. The boom had met me and passed on. * * * In our state there is no law that provides for stay of execution. This is extreme cruelty, and already one-fourth of the farms have been sold for debt and two-thirds of the remainder are ready to be sold. In Pratt county, where I live, the April term of court just ended sold 172 farms at forced sale. Now, when you consider that this is only one county, you can form some estimate of the position the people are in."

That is a portion of a paradise to which hon. gentlemen opposite used to point. They painted the prosperity of the United States in the brighest colours, and dwelt upon the number of Canada here; and their speeches were printed in pamphlet form and sent abroad all through that land of promise. To-day they see Canada flourishing and prosperous, while Kansas is mortgaged to death, and the people are fleeing from Dakota; and yet they have not one word to say on behalf of the young giant of the North which is fighting here a good and brave battle for national life; they have not a word to say in the interest of Canada, but they have everything to say in the interest of the United States. Let us look also at the cities of the United States. We see no misery in our cities. Take Chicago, for instance, the Mayor of which the other day issued a circular, in which he said:

"The fear that the deplorable experience (of workingmen in Philadelphia in 1870) will be repeated in Chicago prompts the issue of this warning. A workingman without work and without money will starve to death in Chicago as quickly as elsewhere. Our private and public charities are now unable to relieve the destitute who are now resident here. Hence, others coming here without means of self-support may expect no help."

Then look at what the Toronto *Globe* says; I do not know whether it is one of the journalistic reptiles to which the hon. member for South Oxford referred; but at the same time I will take his opinion in good faith. A telegram appears in that paper on the 30th May, 1891, as follows:—

"Dakota bankers and other business men are so greatly alarmed at the prospective exodus of farmers from that state to Manitoba and the North-West that they are circulating pamphlets depicting this country as a waste of snow and ice, and drawing equally ridiculous and exaggerated pictures of the condition of things here. In contradistinction to this it may be stated that four or five business men who came over to have a look at the country

were so pleased with the general appearance of prosperity and bright prospects of the country that they have decided to follow their agricultural brethren who have immigrated and taken up land. There are at present a considerable number of delegates and prospectors in this country spying out the land, and these publicly announce their complete satisfaction with the country."

We hear no such statements from hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for West Huron states distinctly from his place in Parliament that the people are fleeing from the country as if it were a plague spot: but the fact which I have just read is the reply to his assertion. The hon. gentleman does not send forth to the people of Canada the message: "Look up; be of good hope, and take courage;" but for party purposes he defames and depreciates his own country. Then, I find a North Dakotan correspondent of the Seaforth *Expositor*, writing in the endeavour to prove that there has been no exodus from that state, and yet saying this:

"Of course, we must admit that Manitoba has a good deal lower taxes than we have at the present time, and I believe they have a better market for their stock."

We do not see such statements as this in many Liberal papers, and we never hear them quoted by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I suppose we would never hear them quoted if it were not by members on this side; I suppose that is one of the reasons why we are sent here. Now, the hon. gentleman, in speaking of the census, has pointed to the fact that the towns and cities are growing. I was very much struck by an admission which appeared in the Toronto *Globe* the other day in regard to the great prosperity achieved by the towns and villages near Toronto. On the 25th of July last that paper contained the following:—

"Toronto Junction is the name by which Canada's most enterprising town is known. Where now stands a substantially built town of upwards of 5,000 population but eight years ago was only a race-track. In the very places used as cow pastures less than half a decade ago mammoth factories now stand and the hum of machinery heard on every hand makes it hard to realize that Toronto Junction is but a 'new' place; but it is not alone as a railway centre that Toronto is distinguished. As a manufacturing town it already has an enviable record. At the present time there are no less than fifteen factories in active operation employing an aggregate of 661 hands, as follows:—

Wilkinson Plough Works	75
Dodge Wood Split Pulley	50
Canada Wire Mattrass	30
Auston Lace Works	30
Dominion Show Case Co.	75
Heintzman & Co.	150
Hess Manufacturing Co.	40
Wagner Planing Factory	15
Stewart's Planing Factory	8
Grant's Planing Factory	6
Attwood's Brass Foundry	12
Strachan Boot and Shoe Wooks	40
Vermilyea Corset Factory	60
Hat Works	20
Barnum Wire Works	50

The brick yards give employment to over 200 additional men. This is not taking into account the large number of men employed in connection with the railways and otherwise."

Now, what does that mean? Simply an expenditure of at least $250,000 per annum by those workmen, who consume the products of the farm—the field and the factory going hand in hand, each performing its function of adding to the prosperity and promoting the interests of Canada. But we have not heard these statements quoted by hon. gentlemen opposite. They make assertions and give no proof. They make assertions, in the hope of defeating the present Government, forgetting how exceedingly detrimental to them and their interests such gross and extravagant statements are. They know that the necessities of Government must be provided for; they know that the public works and railways must be built: they know that they must make the people progressive; they know that they must give employment to a certain number; yet they seek to weaken confidence in the country, though happily they cannot do it. If these hon. gentlemen got into power, in that deplorable period they would find the people becoming hopeless and without confidence in their own country; and in a very few years the electors would ask them to return again to the Opposition benches. Sir, it seems incredible that hon. gentlemen opposite, continue such a policy, when contrary evidence confronts them at every step. We have this record of the growth of Toronto, taken from one of the Toronto papers:

"The amount of building that has been done in Toronto during the last 8 months is almost phenomenal. The following figures show an increase of $2,132,783 over the value of the buildings for which permits were taken out during the corresponding period last year:—

	1891.	1890.
January	$226,950	$ 59,500
February	144,600	105,450
March	236,440	172,625
April	769,680	167,000
May	692,600	212,625
June	446,275	161,225
July	500,060	138,925
August	273,400	145,075
	$3,290,005	$1,157,225

Yet hon. gentlemen say this country is rapidly declining. I have referred to Dakota, of which hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken as a place destined to be a paradise.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When was that said about Dakota?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. In 1882 it was said by members of this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Eleven years ago.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Precisely, I refer to it to show what false prophets these gentlemen are. They painted that country as a paradise, as an Eldorado, as a land of promise, and said that we could never expect our North-West to equal it. I am well aware that the hon. member for Bothwell has been more liberal in his views of our great North-West. That hon. gentleman, I must admit, is usually logical and reasonable in his remarks during debate, because he realizes what it is to be a Minister of the Crown; but I am afraid some of the hon. gentlemen behind him will never realize that, if they continue to act as they do. I am not finding fault with the hon. member for Bothwell, but with the general policy of the party which strives to make Canadians imagine that far away fields are green, and that we will never find a panacea for our troubles except in closer connection with the United States. I have read the hon. gentleman's speeches, and know that when a cry was raised against the importation of labourers and artizans he pointed out that such a policy was dangerous, and no doubt that policy had the effect of keeping many workingmen out of the country and thus reducing the population we would have had otherwise.

Mr. AMYOT. What are the names of the members who said that in this House?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I think Mr. Blake spoke of Kansas, and the hon. member for East York spoke of Dakota, and pointed out the immense tracts of land to be had there. I have referred to 1879, when Sir Charles Tupper introduced his resolution.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is mistaken. He will find no such sentiments as he has attributed to the hon. member for East York and the former member for West Durham in those speeches to which he has referred. The hon. gentleman's friends have read those sentiments into the speeches, but they are not in them.

Mr. AMYOT. If they are not there, will the hon. gentleman tell us where we can find them? I would like to ascertain these facts.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Being only human, I may err; but my impression is, I will not only be able to produce the speeches of the hon. member for West Durham, but the other speeches which the hon. member for Bellechasse, in such a refined and gentlemanly manner, asked me to produce. I know the hon. gentleman is anxious to have the information, and I will get it for him.

Mr. AMYOT. I want no false information, but true information.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I will give the hon. gentleman two copies when I get them. I have not failed to realize how anxious the hon. gentleman is to do justice under all circumstances. I assure the hon. member for Bothwell I did not purposely misrepresent the matter, but I have seen the Kansas speech, and the hon. gentleman knows that in 1884 a speech taken from *Hansard* of 1880, was published by some land company with the Hon. Edward Blake's likeness upon it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Published by Belford, at Toronto.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I do not know who the land agent was, but I know when I was up in Lennox and other counties you could see it in almost every shop window, and find an impress of the likeness on every stick of taffy and every pound of lard. I am quite positive about the Kansas speech in 1880, but am not so positive about the Dakota speech; however, it must be a relief to hon. gentlemen opposite to imagine it was not said. I would call attention to a copy of the testimonial, signed by numbers of farmers in Dakota, who, having been unsuccessful there, left recently for our North-West:

"YORKTON, N. W. T., May 12, 1891.

"We, the undersigned, formerly residents of the State of South Dakota, and now located in townships 30 and 31, ranges 9, 10, 11 and 12, west of the 2nd Principal Meridian, being what is known as the Touchwood District, hereby certify that the representations made by Agents W. A. Webster, Alfred F. Holmes and E. E. Pettit, have been carried out in every particular. That we find the land and location to be better than represented, in that there is more timber, better water and finer soil.

"And we hereby express our thanks to the Canadian Settlers' Loan and Trust Company for the facilities given by them to enable us to get to this country. Also to the Canadian Pacific Railroad Company, and the Manitoba and North-Western Railroad officials, for the courtesy and assistance given us to Yorkton from the boundary. And the same to Mr. G. H. Campbell, Dominion immigration agent, for his kindness to our wives and children in Winnipeg.

"And we desire that this testimonial may be printed and circulated among our former neighbours in Brown, Macpherson, Edmunds and Marshall counties, in South Dakota, and we confidently recommend that they can have the utmost confidence in the representations made to them by Agents Webster, Holmes and Pettit, as we have found them more than borne out by the facts in every particular.

"Taxes are only for school purposes, and do not exceed four dollars per quarter section, and money can be had at 8 per cent. per annum. The present address of the undersigned is Yorkton, Assiniboia."

I need not take up the time of the House by reading all the signatures. Mr. Alex Smith, Manitoba Government immigration agent at Winnipeg, reports as follows:—

"The arrivals of immigrants and effects in Manitoba during 1890, up to June 30, were:

	Settlers.	Cars of Effects.
Via Port Arthur.....	6,870	418
" Gretna.....	324	..
Total.....	7,194	418

"During March, April and part of May the arrivals were mostly from Ontario, since which time the majority have been from Great Britain and Europe, all of them being of a good class. Among them were several parties of young men, desiring to learn farming, many of whom have been sent through this office to good farmers throughout the province. The French and Belgians have mostly settled at Cypress River, Treherne, St. Laurent and Oak Lake. The Scandinavians and Germans have settled along the Manitoba and North-Western Railway lands. The settlers from Ontario and Great Britain are pretty evenly scattered throughout the province."

That was the testimony of those gentlemen who came from South and North Dakotas. But I have detained the House too long, and must close by very brief reference to other subjects. I am desirous of impressing upon the Government as well as the Opposition the necessity of more united action with regard to peopling our North-West and Canada generally. I believe that in reducing the expenditure on immigration every year, in consequence of objections made by members of the Opposition and even on this side, we committed a fatal mistake. The duty of the Government is to consider the policy of fast sailing facilities by ocean, and a board of immigration and commerce in England, if necessary, to work in concert with our High Commissioner and Mr. Dyke, so that our North-West may be peopled, and that we will not only find markets for our products but find consumers in the North-West for the manufactures of eastern Canada. The saving in immigration expenditure is a penny-wise-and-pound-foolish policy. We have no organization such as should exist, and so long as the Government allow public opinion to sway them against such expenditure, the results will be disappointing. To be effective, it must be systematic, self-reliant and aggressive. I believe the North-West will yet be the right arm of the British Empire. I believe we will have to look there for our supplies, and if we fill that country up with immigrants, we will make Eastern Canada also prosperous from a manufacturing point of view as the North-West will be from an agricultural point of view. I regret to have kept the House so long, but could not speak more earnestly in the interests of Canada than I desire. I wish to impress upon the Government that we cannot remain still and live on the past. The member for South Oxford has said that we must advance or there will be a retrograde movement. In this I agree with him. It is our duty to work in the direction of progress, thus promoting the inter-

ests of Canada at large without any idea of sectionalism. I have faith in Canada's possibilities, faith in her present, and faith in her future, and an undying belief in the fealty of all classes to the British Empire, coupled with confidence in the capabilities of their native country.

Mr. AMYOT. I must congratulate the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) upon his imagination and upon his resources. He has been occupying two hours and a half of the time of this House in order to explain why the population of this country is not increasing in the normal proportion that it should increase. He has occupied that time trying to find some means to enable us to hope in the future, and what is the explanation after all? We have the explanation that the population is not increasing because we on this side of the House prefer annexation.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I never said a word of the kind. The hon. gentleman must not make my speech for me.

Mr. AMYOT. If the hon. gentleman has not done so, I am ready to wait for his explanation. What is the question before the House? The question is, that it appears by the census that the population of Canada is not increasing at the rate it should increase, that we do not keep the number of immigrants that arrive here. The motion states that, if we had increased by the ordinary increase of population, we would have a million more of people in this country, and it states that the policy of the Government should be changed so as to obtain better results for the next census. If the hon. gentleman has only to lay before the House the speech he desired to make on a previous question, he cannot complain if it should be criticised, and it amounts to this, that we are not increasing in population because he now admires Mr. Blake, we are not increasing in our normal proportion because the next census will show great prosperity, we are not increasing because we have had four millions of a surplus, we are not increasing because the people are prosperous, because the journalists are honest, and because the Government are going to negotiate a reciprocity treaty; we are not increasing because of the rebellion of 1885, because Sir John was a great man, because we have a small taxation, because we had, some years ago, soup kitchens, because the Hon. George Brown would not discriminate against England in 1884. These are the reasons given by the hon. gentleman why the population of Canada is not increasing in its proper proportion. This is the greatest avowal of the adoption of a wrong policy on the part of the Government that could be made by one of its most able and ardent supporters. I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman in every word he uttered. The acoustics of this House are bad, and I am not capable of understanding the English language perfectly, so that I could not follow him exactly; but the principal object of my few remarks will be to say a few words in answer to the Minister of Finance in what he said last night. The hon. gentleman from Ottawa gave us the history of an old man of 80 years of age who presided at one of his meetings, and explained that he had six sons who were all farmers, and they were all happy. I congratulate him. I saw an old man of 85 years of age whom we made president of a meeting, and he said that, since the treaty with the Americans had ceased, his children had gone first to the cities to earn some money, and, when the manufacturers could not employ them, when they were so filled up with goods that they could not sell them, they had to go to the States; and, said he, if you could obtain a new treaty with the States you would see the American money in this country again, and farming would pay, and I would have a chance to see my children once more. That is the history of three-fourths of the people in this country. They tell us—these great loyalists—that we prefer annexation. We say that those who are disloyal are those who ruin the country, those who steal from the country, those who chase away the population from this country, those are disloyal, while those who want to purify the political atmosphere and to have a natural commerce with our neighbours are loyal to the Crown and are the true citizens of the country. In practice we must decide that Canadian interests must prevail first, and we say that Canadian interests demand that we should have a market near to the production of the soil. It is very well to have big titles and to say that we want to sell our country to the Americans. No, we do not. We want to be able to live under the British flag, but we want our money to be saved from the rotten contracts which are given by Governments, we want something better than the system of corruption which throws millions in the hands of a few individuals in order to buy a majority of the electorate. This accusation that we want to adopt annexation I repulse with contempt as it deserves. The hon. gentleman says that he admires Mr. Blake, who has proved himself a patriotic man and a good citizen in the last open letter which he published. Will the hon. gentleman make a bargain with me and take the opinion of Mr. Blake on the existing state of things and stand by his decision, if he were asked whether the existing corruption should be maintained or whether the existing Administration should not be changed at once? Will hon. gentlemen opposite stand by Mr. Blake's judgment in regard to the actual politics of the Government? Then I will be willing to abide by Mr. Blake's decision; but you take an isolated part of one of his letters which perhaps you do not fully understand, and you put that in contradiction with the whole of his life. That is not the proper way to treat a man or to treat his words. The Hon. Mr. Blake, who is a glory to this country, who is pure, who has no stain on his past record, equal in that respect to our present worthy leader—the Hon. Mr. Blake would tell you that the present state of things, if endured much longer, will corrupt our population to the very bones; he would tell you that it is time, if you do not want to demoralize the population of Canada completely and for long generations, it is time to do away with the entire administrative system as at present conducted, so as to cut the corrupt tie that exists between the heads of the departments and the officers of the departments; he would tell you that it is time to pass the sponge everywhere, to put in high places new men with new principles; and he would tell you that under our system of constitutional government it is not good for any country that the same party should remain too long in power, and recent events have fully exemplified that principle. The Hon. Mr. Blake would tell you that you car-

ried the last general election through fraud and misrepresentation, saying to the people in one portion of the country that you were opposed to reciprocity, that you were going to continue the protective policy, and in other parts of the country telling the people that you would give reciprocity to the farmers; in one section of the country saying that you had been invited by the Washington authorities to go down there and negotiate a treaty, which was not the case. He would tell you that you have abused your high position to deceive the people of Canada, to state as fact what was untrue, and he would tell you that you have been the cause of Canada's public men being snubbed in Washington by the Government of a neighbouring power. The Hon. Mr. Blake would tell you that during the whole of your administration, and in all your electoral organizations, you aim, not to enlighten the people, but to deceive people by false promises, and to stifle their conscience with rotten money and corruption. You invoke his name. I wish he were here to help us; I wish he would come fresh from the country and tell us what the people think of you, tell us what is the public opinion in Ontario regarding the scandalous developments that have recently taken place. You appeal to him; perhaps your voice will be heard, and he may answer you. You want to take him as a judge. For my part, I would take his decision with the greatest pleasure. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) says that we are rich because we have a surplus of $4,000,000, and the people are prosperous. Mr. Speaker, what is this surplus? It is the balance unexpended of the money that is paid into the treasury by the people, that is the surplus. Does that prove that the people are prosperous? I know that in my section of the country the people are not prosperous. I represent a rural constituency, and I know that a great many houses are closed and their owners have gone to the States. Look at the City of Quebec, where I live. Quebec West has diminished in population, and the two other divisions of the city have very slightly increased. Is that a sign of prosperity? Is it because a few contractors receive public money, is it because a few hundreds of manufacturers make millions of money? Is it because some of the public employés supplement their salaries with large bonuses, and testimonials, and presents of all kinds—is that the reason that the people are prosperous? Surely you will not pretend that the million of people who have left this country are all fools, and that if they had been prosperous here they would not have remained. Here is a fact that confounds you at first glance. The census returns prepared by the officials of the Government prove to us that over a million of people have left this country. And why? Is it not because they could not live here during the ten years just passed when the hon. gentlemen have been telling us: We are happy, we are prosperous, Canada is rich, Canada is increasing in wealth and in population? The contrary has been proved to us. We can prove, not only by the statistics of the registration offices, and by the amount of mortgages on farm property, but we can prove by their own figures, that over a million of people have gone away, and if we go on at that rate much longer a majority of the people of Canada will be in the United States. Very soon, before twenty-five years, if the people do not help us to bring about a change, there will be more Canadians in the States than there are in Canada—yet they come and tell us that we are prosperous! During the last ten years they have been telling us that, they had the boldness to affirm whatever they pleased, but to-day they have their own census which proves the contrary. Still, they are bold enough to come and say: We are prosperous. Even though the sheriff were to raise his flag at the door of every house in the country, still they will say: We are prosperous.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Probably some of them are prosperous.

Mr. AMYOT. No doubt; some of them like power, some of them like to sit near the highly-favoured Treasury benches, some of them like to have the ear of a Minister, some of them like to know when a contract will be given—not for themselves, they are too good, too pure, but for their friends: and as long as their friends surround them with millions at their disposal, they will say: We are prosperous. And that word "we" means whom? Themselves. Let the people emigrate, let the people go to the States, let the people suffer; never mind, we are prosperous, because our friends are ready, whenever we want a cheque—not for us, but for our friends—to give it. That is the prosperity they mean, for there is no other. The hon. member for Ottawa City dares to tell us that we are prosperous. Why, Sir, he sits next to Ministers who will not dare to appeal to the country now, because, in their own provinces, they will have to admit that the great prosperity they have been telling us about has driven away so many of the people of those provinces that they will have to be represented by four members less; and still they talk of prosperity. Well, they will go on saying that for a few days, a few months, a few years, until the next census, if they remain there, but they will not. They would go on, if they remained there, saying: We are prosperous. But the cold fact is known now that the policy followed by the Administration has been fallacious, it has been proved beyond the shadow of a doubt. Suppose I was walking along the street with one of those hon. gentlemen, and he should say to me: "Look at that tree; it is an apple tree." I would say, "No; those are strawberries." He replies: "Never mind; it is an apple tree." I would say: "No; it must be a strawberry plant, because it bears strawberry fruits." Thus we judge a tree by its fruit; we judge of the policy of the Administration by its results, and what has been the result of the policy of this Administration? And what have been the results accomplished by the Administration? I have heard theories very long, very powerful, very learned, accompanied by statistical statements of all kinds. I am not a statistician. I take the census, and I say those were right who said the present policy would bring ruin to the country, and those were wrong who said it would bring prosperity. This is the matter in a nutshell. All the calculations in the world, all the results of prosperity elsewhere, all the details are useless as compared with that brief statement. When a young country like Canada is prosperous, the population increases. If in a young country like this the population decreases, it is absolute proof that the country is not prosperous. And if the country is not prosperous, it must be so because the fiscal policy is wrong. Will hon. gentlemen opposite pretend to-

day that the Government cannot assist the prosperity of a country? I am at liberty to speak freely on these questions. Do they remember how much they spoke about the "fly on the wheel," and what long and brilliant speeches they delivered on that subject? Will they pretend to say that this Government is the "fly on the wheel" and cannot help the prosperity of this country? If they pretend that, I tell them then: You are of no further use; you are of no further use if you cannot prevent money from being lavishly expended; you had better go out of office and give an opportunity to others. We are told that our population has been increasing sufficiently. Are we answered? I do not know exactly what the member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) meant by the expression that journalists are honest in this country. I suppose that remark applied to journalists on both sides. Let us put their honesty aside. They become mere helps to the chiefs of the parties; one set declare a thing is black and the other that it is white. They express opinions on different sides, and who is right and who is wrong, admitting that all are honest? Those who contend with us that we should have reciprocity with the United States and a wide market for our products are right, and those who support the Government, who say that in order to be happy and prosperous we should support the manufacturers, are wrong. That is an answer to the question. I do not see what help it can be to the Government that the press is honest. We may thank God that if the press supporting the party to the right of the Speaker has remained honest during this storm of scandals—it is very lucky for them. I do not exactly understand the position taken by the member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) with respect to the negotiations of this Government this fall. What does he mean? Is a treaty with the United States good or ill? The hon. gentleman pretends that the United States will not grant a treaty. Then, why go there? Why try to obtain a treaty? What is the Government's policy in regard to this question? They stated before the people in certain parts of the Dominion that they did not want reciprocity. Why, then, are the Government going to Washington? In other parts of the country they said they wanted reciprocity. Why do they not admit it to-day, and declare before this House and the country—that we on this side of the House are right in asking reciprocity with the United States? There must be some logic on their part as well as on ours. I cannot understand their arguments on this point. Then the hon. gentleman said if, as shown by the census, the population has not increased sufficiently, that is due to the rebellion in 1885. Mr. Speaker, you are a most intelligent man, and I wish you would try and get me out of the difficulty. What has the rebellion in 1885 to do with the population? I admit there were over 200 men killed. There might have been in the country those 200 men and 400 or 500 more children. But what has the rebellion to do with the census? I admit we had a rebellion; but hon. gentlemen opposite should never speak of it. They should remember that if we had a rebellion it was due to their maladministration, to the tyranny of their officials in the North-West, to the persecution of the poor half-breeds. We do not know yet perhaps all the troubles and hardships to which they were exposed through those officials. They should know that there never would have been a rebellion by those quiet, peaceful and honest men, the children of the prairie, but for the tyrannical conduct of those officials. They know another fact, which is already historical, and it is this, that if there was any blood shed, that if there was a gun fired it was due to our not sending forward a friend with the white flag to try and induce those poor children of the prairie to return to their homes. But we sent our mounted police. Our police went there and the half-breeds assembled; but they were quietly assembled. Who fired first? Even before reading the Riot Act the Mounted Police fired; and we became murderers of the half-breeds there. We went into the war without necessity to satisfy, I will not say what sentiment, although I suspect it; and when we were there with an army we went there to satisfy the glory of one man, the general, and we worked for the glory of another man who was quietly sitting here seeing that millions were spent. That war could have been stopped very easily. One intelligent man inspired with good-will, by going into that country, could have prevented it. No, it was necessary; somebody in this country wanted to destroy that little body of people. They hoped to destroy them. They pushed those people to rebellion. They harassed them so much that at last they sent for whom? For a poor fool, who had been half his life in an asylum, but who was the son of a patriot, and who, when in his right mind, was a patriot himself. His father had helped those people against the exactions of a large and powerful company, and they knew he held the same sentiments, and they sent for him. We were the provokers and fired the first shot and entered upon the war.

An hon. MEMBER. Question.

Mr. AMYOT. Who says "question?" I will send that hon. gentleman to Texas at once, but I will remain in this country. If the debate has taken this turn, it is not my fault. Who spoke of the rebellion of 1885? Did the hon. gentleman shout "question" when his friend spoke. It is quite right for hon. gentlemen opposite to say what they please, but when we speak they cry "question," "order," "do not speak of that question." I am answering the hon. gentleman who preceded me. If the hon. gentleman who interrupted me is not pleased, he knows where the smoking room is.

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

After Recess.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) asked us in a very solemn way: What the members of the Opposition in this House had done to help the Government to promote the interests of Canada? I was rather surprised at that question. Surely, the Government cannot hope that we will assist them in a policy which we do not find conducive to the public good, and in a policy which will not ensure the future prosperity of this country. They cannot hope that we will support them in their wrong and foolish administration. We give them the general features of a policy which in our minds is destined to develop all our resources, and to help the farmers, without destroying the manufacturing interests. I will go a step further than that. Those hon.

gentlemen opposite must remember that some years ago Sir Charles Tupper, the representative of Canada in England, went to France and obtained from that great country her consent to give to Canada a treaty which would include us in the privileges secured to the most favoured nations. Sir Charles Tupper succeeded in his mission to France in this respect, and when he returned to England, England consented at once that Canada should be included in the benefits of the treaty already existing between France and England. When the question came to Ottawa, who refused to accept this privilege, and who said "no," to this concession made by France? Who said that Canada should not be benefited by a treaty with France, and who was the obstacle to our obtaining the markets of France, if not the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald? I told that to the hon. gentleman himself in this honourable House, and nobody dare to contradict my statement then. Let me point out to the House that we are spending hundreds of thousand of dollars to open up new markets for Canada that we are going everywhere to countries beyond the seas to try and obtain their markets, but that at the same time, we are refusing the immense markets at our very doors, and that we have refused the market offered to us by France; that nation which keeps in the front ranks amongst the greatest commercial and industrial nations of the world. France was ready and had consented to trade with us, and it was the present Government of Canada, and the Ministers now sitting on the Treasury benches, and their late chief, who refused that great boon that we could have so easily obtained. They declined that offer from France in spite of our protests on this side of the House. How, then, can the Ministry say to-day that we do not help them to advance the prosperity of the country? They have no justification for so saying, because it is the present Tory party who is responsible if we cannot now send our goods to the French market. I am informed that our Canadian cheese is to-day sent to England, and that the Canadian trade mark is taken from it there and replaced by the English trade mark, to be sent to France and to benefit the pockets of the English merchants. That is due to the fact that this Government has refused the French market, and what excuse can they offer for that? I hope that some of the hon. members on the Government benches will find at least a kind of excuse for their action in this regard. Now, Mr. Speaker, our worthy leader of the Opposition has been asking for many years that we should obtain the right to make our own treaties with other nations; and who refused to look for that privilege? Who desires to keep this country as it were in a state of infancy, and to proclaim to the world that we are not intelligent enough to transact our own affairs with other countries and without the interference of an office in London, in which our letters sometimes remain for years without being answered, who is responsible for that except the Tory party of Canada? Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we have done nothing to help them. We have suggested many ideas, we have given them the key of the situation, but they have refused to use it. If Canada has to transact business to-day with the United States, we have first to seek the English Ambassador at Washington, and this plenipotentiary has to telegraph and to write to London to receive his instructions. We have three intermediaries for any negotiations between the United States and ourselves, and the consequence is that often we lose our chances to make beneficial arrangements for ourselves and for our trade with the United States. What care does England take of our interests in her treaties with other nations? When has she taken care that the interests of the Canadian people should be looked after, when we are ready to overlook our commercial interests for her sake? What care has she ever taken that we should benefit by her treaties with other nations? What right have gentlemen opposite to tell us that we do not help them when we have told them that we are ready to join hand in hand with them so as to obtain from England the privilege and the right which we are entitled to—knowing our interests as we do, and knowing our strength as we do—to make our own treaties? We are ready to help the Government in that, but the Government refuse to benefit by our aid. Let them give us some good reason why they refuse this offer; but in the meantime let them not throw out the insinuation that we do not help them. Let the Government propose some good measure upon any subject whatever, and they will find us ready and willing to extend them our aid. But we cannot help them in maintaining a policy which consists in keeping this country depopulated, and in keeping it in poverty, so that it may be bought easier at election times with what remains of the public money in the public chest. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very fond of telling us about the soup kitchens in 1877. Are the hon. gentlemen sure that at the bottom of these demonstrations there was not some help and some advice given by certain members of their party? Are they sure that some prominent members of their party were not exciting the people of Ottawa, and inducing then to come to the gates of this Parliament House to ask for bread? Was it not a political dodge organized by some of their party? I think I heard something about it then, I think I heard somebody boasting of the good trick they had played upon Mr. Mackenzie. It is always very easy in a city to tell some roughs to join in a demonstration of that kind; and to say to them: We will give you a glass of whiskey. It is very easy to tell a crowd to come to the gates of the House of Commons and to say that they are starving for bread and that they want work. That may be done by some people in any city of this Dominion. They may gather a crowd of 200 or 500 or 1,000 people to go to the Government and say: We want bread or we will starve; but that is no evidence whatever that there is distress in the country. At all events it is no answer to the deplorable results of the census of 1891, to say that in 1877 some shops were closed in Ottawa and some people were asking for money and bread. We are told also, that if, as proven by the census, the population has decreased, it is due to the fact that the late George Brown when he went to the States to obtain a reciprocity treaty had instructions not to discriminate against English goods. What was the cry in the last elections, Mr. Speaker? The cry of the Government and their supporters was that if the Liberal party obtained power immediately, they would pass legislation which would discriminate against England and which would be disloyal to Canada and to the mother land. We tell them that since we have seen the development of their policy, it has been understood by the country at large that the first interest we must

observe is the Canadian interest. In spite of that, they say that they will not discriminate; that is, they will protect England, whilst England refuses to protect us in other countries. Well, that principle, though laid down in the elections, was not fully understood everywhere, but it will be soon understood so well that it will be impossible for hon. gentlemen opposite to derive any benefit from it. With regard to the press, I speak in my own behalf, without binding anyone, when I say that I see no harm in the press of this young country, where the population is small, being encouraged—not in a corrupt way or by undue favours, but by having access to public contracts, duly advertised and given to the highest tenderer. I do not approve of the principle of having a national printing establishment, and taking away from private enterprise the printing work of the country. It is a wrong principle; it is putting into the hands of the Government too much patronage; it is taking away from the courageous men of the printing industry a source of revenue which ought to belong to them. We have seen with what terrible results the working of the Printing Bureau in Ottawa has been accompanied. I would prefer that the printing of the public documents should be done by tender by the ordinary printing establishments. Besides, the press of the country deserves to be encouraged. We have seen during this session what an immense amount of expense must have been incurred by the press in sending long telegraphic reports of sittings of the House lasting for many hours, and during a session lasting over four months. Can we expect that the proprietors of those papers will not find their resources exhausted? Why not, if we may do it honestly, grant them some help by giving them a share of those revenues which accrue from honest contracts? They have to keep here a staff of intelligent and hard-working men; they have to pay for the editors who receive those reports and superintend the composition; they have to pay immense sums to the telegraph companies. Then, where is the harm that a little of the public money should reach them? It would be much preferable to seeing thousands of dollars going fraudulently into the hands of the chiefs of those bureaus which have been created against the public interest. If we find a way of giving honest help to the press, we should do it. What we complain of, is that a certain press receive preferences without tender, for the purchase of their influence. The press that receives that cannot be independent, cannot have that freedom of action and thought necessary in dealing with the powers of the state. I only said these few words in answer to the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh). I rose more especially to answer a few words which were delivered last night by the hon. Minister of Finance, who I regret to see is not in his seat, though I declared from my place that I would refer to his remarks. I was not here when he delivered that speech. I was enjoying the hospitality of our ex-Speaker, one of our worthy military men, and admiring the rifle range at Ottawa and the gallant officers and men who were there exercising themselves in the art of shooting. While there, I could not avoid thinking of our poor target in Quebec, which is closed by the stubborn action of the Minister of Militia. I saw how well it was to encourage those men who gave so much of their time and money to promote the militia of the country, and who are prepared to fight the fights of the country whenever they are called upon. But I regretted to find that while I was there the Minister of Finance had made a most extraordinary attack upon a Government of which no member was present in this House, a Government which in no way forms a branch of this Parliament. I will first read what he said:

"Sir Richard might have a high notion of punishing boodlers and putting down demoralization. Surely the leader of the Opposition might find a very convenient field for the operation of this policy with the Government of his friend in a province that was very close to him at that moment. (Cheers.) Sir Richard had deplored that the present Government was ruled by virtue of the Red Parlour and contributions taken from manufacturers, but it had not been shown that any other than one Government so legislated and so worked their plans by using notes in the bank as to take $100,000 of the people's money in order to protest elections in the Province of Quebec and assist the hon. leader of the Opposition in this House. (Liberal groans and Ministerial cheers.) Sir Richard had better look at the Langeliers and Merciers and Pacauds who lined the skirts of his own party and remember that if his policy had been successful in the last election these men would have been in high places instead of being mere side shows in a great spectacular drama. (Cheers.)"

Mr. Speaker, these words involve four principles. The first one is that we have a mission and jurisdiction to investigate and pass judgment upon the policy and administration of the Local Legislatures.

An hon. MEMBER. That is true.

Mr. AMYOT. Who is the member that says "that is true"? I would like to know him. Is it Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn)? Well, he did not make a good bull's-eye centre there. He is a great man, that we know; he has a right, with his bright intelligence, to pass judgment on anything in this land. He will go to the United States, to Europe, to Africa, and everywhere else, and dominate at the height of his genius. I congratulate him on the talents which Providence has bestowed upon him; but he had better wait and hear what I have to say, so as to understand the question. The second principle involved is that we approve of the action of the Senate in holding an investigation on the mode adopted by the Local Legislature of employing and applying its moneys. The third principle is that this House should take cognizance of investigations held before a Committee of the Senate, even before that Committee has reported the evidence, and before its conclusions have been adopted by the Senate itself. Fourth, that it is not fair and loyal to pass judgment *ex parte* upon persons not even invited to appear, not accused juridically, not put upon their defence. Mr. Speaker, I deny the soundness and the propriety of every one of those four propositions. Each Parliament is supreme within the limits of its jurisdiction. No one should encroach upon the other, and no encroachment can be productive of good. Forsooth, each has quite enough to occupy the whole of its time and to strain the whole of its energy. We will not have here one-quarter of the time required to unearth the scandals, embezzlements, misappropriations, prevarications, thefts, forgeries and other crimes being daily brought to light, and by means of which the past and present Administrations have been maintained in power, if we may judge by the events which have been discovered recently. It is, besides, grossly improper and indelicate to pass judgment against another power in the state quite as legally existing as the Federal Government itself. Among the

divers Parliaments of Canada, the laws of nations should prevail. What would be said if the Government of Russia were to pass judgment upon the Government of England? Or if the American Congress were to declare that the Dominion Administration was rotten to the bone and following a ruinous fiscal policy, and unworthy of individual or collective respect? Does he not know that, as between power and power, the greatest courtesy is necessary? Men may be in a wider field, but they remain human, and the principles which apply to a large number of men aggregated under the law apply equally to a smaller number of men so aggregated. We have no jurisdiction to judge the Administration of a province, and we commit a gross impropriety when we do so. If such an abuse should be often resorted to between the divers provinces of Confederation our union would be soon shaken. We would injure Confederation itself. Besides, there are two other reasons why we should not approve of the action of the Senate in the enquete held by its Committee upon the Administration of the Province of Quebec. The first reason is that the Senate has no more right than we have ourselves.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. AMYOT. I am called to order. Why did the hon. Minister of Finance base his argument upon an enquete held by the Senate?

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not understand the Minister of Finance to refer to anything that took place in the Senate. But the gentleman is referring directly to what took place in the Senate.

Mr. AMYOT. I am speaking of the rights of this House. I contend that we have no right to approve or to blame the action of the Senate. I hold, as a conclusion from the same principle, that neither this House nor the Senate has the right to enquire into the administration of another Government.

Mr. SPEAKER. A member of this House mus not refer to what took place in another branch of the legislature in disparaging terms, respecting the action of that branch.

Mr. AMYOT. Very well, I will say this: The Senate believe they have the right to investigate into the administration of the Quebec Government. They have all the rights we have, and I say we have no right to investigate facts which concern another Government. I understood the Minister of Finance to have approved the action of the Senate, and I say he had no right to do so, because if he had the right to approve their action he would have equally the right to condemn it, and he has no such right. Now, if we had the right to approve or condemn the action of the Senate, what would be the consequence? We might go on criticising their actions, some bitter feelings might ensue, we might quarrel with them about their doings, and they would retaliate and condemn our acts, and the time of each body would be spent in discussing the words and actions of the members of the other, and in that case what would become of the public interest? Our time, which costs so much to the country, would be entirely taken up by such recriminations. If we have no right to discuss the acts of the Senate, *a fortiori* we have no right to discuss the actions of other Governments. This is a most serious question, and I was astonished to see the stand then taken by a Minister of the Crown, who is supposed to represent the views of Her Majesty, and Her Majesty is equally supposed to dictate the actions and words of Ministers of the Crown in a province as well as in the Dominion. I say it is too early to judge the merits of the enquete taken by the Senate. Would it not be decent to wait until the final report of the Senate investigation is submitted to us? What would we say of a court that would pronounce judgment on an incomplete record? Is it worthy of this House to disgrace its record by bitterly attacking and censuring absentees, who were not called upon to present their statements of facts and the evidence in support of the same?

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is reading his speech.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak in French without reading my notes, since, in the hopes of cutting the thread of my speech, some one has the indelicacy of refusing me the indulgence of reading a few notes which I have made. Owing to the importance of the subject, I will resort to the right that I have here, the right given me by the constitution, I will speak in French, and take all the time necessary for my purpose. These petty means, which are unworthy of a strong party, will not succeed in dislodging me from my position, nor make that party right. In my own language I have no need to prepare my speeches in writing. I can express my humble thoughts as I please, and at great enough length to annoy some of the hon. members, and you will be none the richer. But it will be known to my countrymen, that before coming to Ottawa, to the centre of this confederation, into which we have been dragged under false pretenses, one has to learn English; that otherwise one is not equal to the situation. You want to take advantage of us on the knowledge of the English language. And yet you will not be able to come amongst us and defend yourself when we tell of your conduct, while if you undertake to attack us we will be capable of meeting you and unmasking you.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must address himself to the Chair.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is what I am doing; I am telling, through you, to the hon. member that no one in this House will prevent me from expressing my views, on account of my want of proficiency in English. I know what are the rules of the House, and I know what is a question of order. These means will no longer take. When you are through scraping your desks with your feet, which are worth more than your heads, I shall proceed with my speech. Mr. Speaker, since I am not allowed to speak in English, as I am able to, I will ask you in French, to secure for me the same silence you obtain when Englishmen are speaking. I will demand, since we are forced to speak French in this House, that we are respected. Through deference for the majority we make efforts to speak English, notwithstanding our lack of proficiency. But if this is not acceptable and we are forced to speak in French, why, then, we must require that we are listened to.

Mr. SPEAKER. As an old parliamentarian, the hon. gentleman knows he must not read his speech; but he may refer to his notes.

Mr. AMYOT. I will bow to your decision, Sir, and will express my admiration for the liberality of my hon. friends opposite. I do not usually read even my notes, but this point is so very important that I would not like to risk giving it in any language other than my own without notes, because I understand that the question we have to deal with here is a most important one, concerning, as it does, the relations and intercourse between two Governments of this Dominion. I regret that the judgment passed and the words uttered by the Minister of Finance received such hearty applause from his party. His words are fraught with danger and are a precedent which at any moment may be evoked to justify very unfair, and unpatriotic, and obnoxious interferences; and I fear for a party which does not understand these principles; I fear for the country which would support that party, when it was properly informed. Now, I come to the facts of the case. The hon. Minister has gone into questions of fact, and I am bound to follow him, with the evidence which I could gather. I have no official mission to do so; I have no personal interest in doing so; but I have the right to do so because the right of attack implies the right of defence, and I have more right even than the Minister, because I belong to the province which he has attacked, and he does not. We do not apply the same laws in our province that he does in his as to morals and civil obligations. I respect his convictions, though they could not be mine. I will speak freely, because I will speak in my own personal name without binding anyone, but I know that my views are the views of a great number, and will be supported by the people at large. The hon. Minister invited my worthy leader to occupy himself with the punishment of local boodlers. That course would be in a line with the course of encroachment on the provinces which prevails on the other side of the House, but, suppose there would be something to punish, it would not agree with those who, for the sake of Confederation, are autonomists and who believe in the principle of wisdom which says: Mind your own business. The hon. Minister has qualified as boodle the obtaining of $100,000 to contest certain elections, and he has associated with that act the names of Messrs. Pacaud, Langelier and Mercier. I may state here that, if any corrupt act has been committed, proper justice will be applied. The National party of Quebec, formed of the best elements of the old Conservative and Liberal parties, will shirk no enquiry, will shield nobody, they will not soil their flag nor punish the small to save the big, they will apply equal justice to all, they will employ no lawyer to try to induce the witnesses not to speak or to refuse to give access to their books. Allow me here to remind the hon. gentleman that, if any corrupt act has been committed, we have the right to bring his friends, his colleagues, his party *en garantie*, to tell them: You have so much demoralized the public at large by your policy since 1882 that some persons may have been led astray, may have been induced to look upon public property as *res nullius*, as being lost properly belonging to the first occupant. If some wrong has been done at Quebec, which we do not know yet, I say to my hon. friends opposite, be fair and just, consider in what state you have put our people at large, consider the hundreds of thousands of dollars, even the millions, which you have taken from the public treasury to corruptly give to your chief organizers. You have corrupted the public mind, you have induced the people, or a great many of them, to believe that it was fair and just to steal the property of the public, and you are responsible for the state of the public mind in that regard; but is there anything to warrant us in declaring that there has been such boodling, such demoralization, such misapplication of public money, such corrupt bargains as far as Messrs. Langelier, Pacaud and Mercier are concerned? What are the facts? As far as we have had communication of the facts, they are the following:—There is a railway called the Baie des Chaleurs. It was formed by members of this House. Since its formation, one of them, then a member of this House, has withdrawn from politics, another was appointed Lieutenant Governor and is now in the next House, for whom I have such a deep respect, and another still belongs to this House—no, I mistake—a few days ago he sent in his resignation. But the three were ardent supporters of the Government, and they obtained subsidies from the Government. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) is there, and will correct me if I am wrong. They obtained subsidies from the Federal Government first, and then from the Local Government. Those devoted gentlemen who organized that company subscribed each of them the immense sum of—nothing at all.

Mr. LANGELIER. And paid it.

Mr. AMYOT. Yes; they paid nothing at all. Those organizers got some contractors—we will have a few words about that very soon coming from another Committee. But there was a sham beginning, they received subsidies for the first 60 miles, that is the first 20 miles, and then the 40 miles, of about $900,000, an amount sufficient to pay over $15,000 per mile. According to the engineers, the total cost of construction would be about $15,000 per mile. But, Sir, when they had received enough to pay for the whole construction, what do we find? We find that they owed to Mr. Macfarlane $190,000 for work done, and they owed Mr. Armstrong $298,000. It would require to complete the road something like $60,000, making in all $548,000. Where has that money gone? They have received enough to pay over $15,000 per mile, and they still owe $548,000. Where is it? There is no Local Government boodling here. It is not Langelier boodling, it is not Pacaud boodling. Where is the money? Oh, you watchful guardians of public property, now is your time! Now, apply your knowledge, your intelligence, to find out where is that $548,000.

Mr. COCKBURN. Is the hon. gentleman asking me the question?

Mr. AMYOT. No.

Mr. COCKBURN. If he is, I will suggest that he ask Mr. Mercier.

Mr. AMYOT. I hope the hon. gentleman will give us the pleasure of an answer.

Mr. LISTER. He is as sharp as a razor.

Mr. AMYOT. Yes, now is your time. When we are trying to find out where the public money has gone, here are millions abstracted from the public purse—where has it gone? It has not been put into the road. The Government has paid for all the work that has been done, but the road is not built—where has the money gone? I was not a party to that investigation. I find that I am a most humble member of this House, perhaps I am not worthy to take part in that enquete, but there were some members of this House who were more highly favoured; they were there, and they used their influence, they had the ear of the Senators, they could be understood by your press. What became of the money? I am not speaking under oath, but I think that the oath of others has elicited the facts I now give. I want to find out where is that money. That is the question. If this House, which has the same rights as the other House, may enquire into the money voted by this Parliament, and if in doing so it has to find out about the money voted by the Local Parliament, then so much the better for the truth. I know that if an enquete had been held by this House—because I am not allowed to speak about the Senate—we would not have limited our investigation to the $100,000 of the Government of the Province of Quebec: we would have gone further, and we would have insisted to know what became of the rest of the money voted by this Parliament. Now, when the Government of the Province of Quebec shall be impeached by the Opposition, when a declaration is made by some member of the Opposition questioning the honesty of the Government, and when they have an investigation, if their money has been mixed up with the money of Ottawa, they will be obliged to do what we should be obliged to do, if we were holding that enquete, that is, to enquire about all the facts. Well, they have a chance to find out the truth about the whole concern. At all events, this is the first transaction. Of the $900,000 voted by the two Governments, a great part has disappeared. The Government of the Province of Quebec adopted the policy of favouring the construction of railways. The Mercier Government decided to help the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. They began by paying the poor workingmen, those who had dug the earth and opened the ditches to make the roadbed. These were not paid, and the Mercier Government began by paying them. Then, they decided to grant a sum of over $200,000. But they said to themselves: The present Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company is not a serious one, not a genuine company, they have not put one cent into the enterprise, we do not know what became of the money, the labourers are not paid, the sub-contractors are not paid; we want a new company because we want the road. Then they said: We will give so much to a new company, composed of sound and solvent men, who will undertake to build the road. A new company was formed. Mr. Thom, of Montreal, was the secretary of that company, composed of solid men. Mr. Thom said: Our company will undertake to build the road provided we can get rid of Mr. Amstrong, or at all events we want to get possession of the road without any claims upon it. Then begins the transaction against which the Finance Minister makes his charge. Well, what occurred? Mr. Armstrong asked Mr. Thom to pay him his claim of $298,000. Mr. Thom and Mr. Amstrong together, without the interference of anyone else, figured Armstrong's claim at $175,000. Mr. Amstrong's claim was certified to by the engineer of the company, by the officers of the old company and by the engineer of the new company itself. So the claim existed, it was a legal one and an accepted one by the old company. Mr. Thom obtains a reduction, as I said, of Armstrong's claim to $175,000. Then Mr. Thom goes to the Government of the Province of Quebec; he goes to New York to meet two Ministers who were on their way to the Southern States. I suppose there is no Minister in this House who believes that a trip to the Southern States is wrong. They were going there, after the session, for their health. Well, Mr. Thom meets Mr. Langelier and Mr. Robidoux in New York, and they exchange a few words, but nothing is done. When they returned from the Southern States they go to Quebec, and there Mr. Thom meets the Executive in the room where the Executive holds its sessions. Is Mr. Pacaud there? No. Is Mr. Armstrong there? No. Is it done at once as an affair settled beforehand? No. Many sittings and many interviews take place. The thing is discussed, proposals are made, and finally Mr. Thom and the Ministers come to an understanding, and, upon that understanding, Mr. Thom writes an official letter as a proposal, which is accepted by the Government, and the Government pay to Mr. Thom $175,000 out of the subsidies voted by the people. Where is the boodling in that? I ask it of any impartial man. I do not see there was any boodling in the transaction, and I say there was nothing to justify such a charge. Up to the present we know that between Mr. Thom and the Local Government there was a straightforward contract for the payment of the subsidies voted by the people. Between Mr. Thom and Mr. Armstrong I do not see there was any boodling. What occurred? Mr. Armstrong goes to Mr. Thom and says that he wants a cheque accepted, because he wants to pay a certain amount which has been borrowed with the guarantee of Mr. Pacaud. Later on, we see that Mr. Thom pays to Mr. Armstrong the amount of $100,000 on the reduced claim of $175,000. What occurred after that between Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Pacaud? What do we know about it? Mr. Pacaud was not here to defend himself. But there was a letter from the Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec stating that he had told Mr Pacaud: Go, deny the jurisdiction, but state everything that occurred. If Mr. Pacaud had thought that the Senate were encroaching upon the jurisdiction of the Local House, and if he would not postpone his contemplated trip to Europe, that is his own lookout, and he must account for it. I am not here to defend him or to approve of his actions. But I say that up to the present time we only know what I have indicated. We know that the transaction was as follows:—A payment was made by the Government of the Province of Quebec to Mr. Thom, according to the statute, without any undue interference, and after a prolonged discussion between Mr. Thom and the members of the Executive. This is the first part. Where is the justification for a Minister of the Crown, relying on that evidence, taxing Mr. Mercier and Mr. Langelier with boodling? It is all very fine for him at this moment to do so, and he was cheered by his party; but the matter is not over. It will come before the people

and another judgment will be passed, and if the enquete turns against his pretensions, if the enquete should prove that Mr. Thom told the truth, where will he be? He will be in the position of a foul calumniator, who, without evidence, throws out all sorts of accusations contrary to the facts. That will be his position. What was the second transaction? Mr. Thom got Mr. Armstrong to reduce his claim from $298,000 to $175,000. It was a *bonâ fide* claim. He paid Mr. Armstrong $100,000 out of that. Where is the harm? Is there any Pacaud or Langelier or Mercier interference? No. Where is the harm? He had received that money specially to make that payment, and he made it. What right did it give the Minister to say that a Minister was boodling when Mr. Thom was paying Mr. Armstrong a legitimate claim and paying according to the purpose for which he had received the money. We must be careful when we speak of the position of a Minister or a Cabinet in view of the intercourse between the two Governments. The hon. gentleman has evidently forgotten his dignity and his responsibility. He had judged that the enquete was over, that it was complete, that the parties had been put on their trial and had given their evidence. He had decided the case beforehand. The position of hon. gentlemen opposite must be terrible if they have to resort to such means as that: it must be desperate indeed. They must be at a loss for arguments with which to answer the charges that we fairly make in the public interest when they resort to an attack on mere rumour. The House will remember that if I go into these details it is to answer the charge made by the Minister in a few words. It is very easy to say "you are a boodler." It forces us to face public opinion, to enter into details, and to show it is false even from the data which we have before us. We have to do it. I throw the blame on the hon. gentlemen, if I have to go into details. I do not admit our jurisdiction, but I want to prove not only that the case is beyond our jurisdiction but that the statement of the Minister was contrary to the facts, and that he gratuitously insulted the Prime Minister of another Government who was not here to defend himself. Well, then, what occurred between Mr. Pacaud and Mr. Armstrong? As I have said, we do not know yet; but I deny that it is possible to find any crime in the transaction up to now, or that an indictment could be based on the facts we possess. Can we find any corrupt bargain in what has been done? I should like to know what is a corrupt bargain in the mind of the hon. gentleman opposite. Surely, he would not associate himself with colleagues and would not fight under a chief guilty of corrupt bargains? In order to find out exactly what he understands by a corrupt bargain, we will proceed by analogy and by comparison. I have been brought up in the Conservative school, as has the district of Quebec. The vigour of my youth was devoted to Conservative interests. I had unlimited faith in my chiefs, in Taché, in Cartier, Belleau, and in Langevin, who put on Cartier's mantle the very day of his funeral, when his ashes were still warm. It did not then occur to me that my chiefs could prevaricate. The Pacific transaction sprang up in the midst of my most complete and enthusiastic admiration for my chiefs. I hardly conceived there could be any such doings on the part of those worthy men as would justify the appellation "scandal." What, then, was the Pacific affair? It is important to recall the facts to our memory so as to apply the facts occurring to-day to the principles laid down then. I will give these facts, not to blame this present Administration, but to remind them of the rules laid down by themselves, and which they must apply to themselves if they want to be fair and just, if they want to be looked upon as sincere. I will read first a letter dated 30th July, 1872, sent from Montreal. Unfortunately it is "private and confidential," but, as I said the other day, the principle is now admitted that when a letter is marked "private and confidential" it is to be published at once, wrongly and incomplete, if necessary. The letter is as follows:—

"MONTREAL, 30th July, 1872.

"(Private and confidential.)

"DEAR SIR HUGH,—The friends of the Government will expect to be assisted with funds in the pending elections, and any amount which you or your company shall advance for that purpose shall be recouped to you. A memorandum of immediate requirements is below."

"GEORGE E. CARTIER."

Here is the memorandum of the sums required:

"NOW WANTED.

Sir John A. Macdonald	$25,000
Mr. Langevin	15,000
Sir G. E. C.	20,000
Sir J. A. (additional)	10,000
Mr. Langevin	10,000
Sir G. E. C.	30,000

But now we have the evidence of Sir Hugh Allan, given a few months afterwards, who says in making up what he paid it amounted to:

To Sir G. E. Cartier's committee	$85,000
To Sir John Macdonald, towards election expenses in Ontario	45,000
To Mr. Langevin, towards election expenses in Quebec	32,600
	$162,600

I thought there was nothing paid for elections in Ontario, but they got more than Quebec. That does not look to be fair. Sir Hugh added:

"I also paid for the assistance of other friends of my own, in connection with the elections, between $16,000 and $17,000. These sums with the preliminary expenses on the Pacific and various railroads in which I was engaged, more or less directly connected with the Pacific enterprise, made up the amount of my advances to about $350,000."

So, if we take Sir Hugh Allan's evidence the whole of the subscriptions amounted to about $350,000; but let us go on. We have got the evidence of a man against whom I have never said one word, a man who must be respected by any one of my hon. friends to your right, Mr. Speaker, a man of talent, of energy, of ability, and a most honourable man. Let us see what he said then. Let us see what he understood by a corrupt bargain and what is not a corrupt bargain, for I want to exactly understand the ideas of my hon. friends opposite, to be able to judge the actual facts. With the utmost admiration for the man whose words I will quote I will proceed. I suppose my hon. friends have already anticipated that there is only one man in the country who could have so much admiration on my part, and that is Mr. Abbott. On 30th July, he said:

"We then rose to leave and were leaving the room when Sir George addressed Sir Hugh on the subject of money in the manner which Sir Hugh has described. He said in an off-hand kind of way, 'Are you not going to help us with our elections?' Sir Hugh said he would, or words to that effect, and said, 'How much do you want?' or 'How much do you require?' or something like that. I understood Sir George to say that there would be a considerable sum required, as there was so much opposition on various

grounds. Sir Hugh said, as far as I can recollect: 'Well, write down what you want.' Sir George said very rapidly: 'You know you won't lose it all. Our party will make up the greater part of what you give, but we want it now,' or something like that. My memory is very imperfect as to the exact phrases used, as I never endeavoured to recollect them until lately, when the matter became the subject of conversation. Sir George then said: 'Very well, come back this afternoon. Let Mr. Abbott write a note requesting you to advance this money and telling you that I will see that you are repaid, and come back this afternoon at such an hour and we will close the whole matter up.' We left upon that."

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope my hon. friend can see the relevancy of the remarks which he is making, but for my own part, I confess I cannot see what bearing they have on the motion before the House.

Mr. AMYOT. The relevancy according to me is to apply the principles necessary to qualify the bargain to see whether it is corrupt or not. I am comparing the bargain made in 1872 by the then Administration, with the bargain which Mr. Pacaud and Mr. Mercier are accused by the hon. Minister of Finance to have made in Quebec. I want to show by comparison, that if one is not corrupt, the other should not be corrupt either; and if the other is corrupt, then the present Government do not properly apply the right principle. I want to guide myself, because I may have been led astray since I left the other side of the House as to my views, and I want to recall to mind the principles of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. SPEAKER. I call the attention of the hon. member to the motion under discussion. In the first place the motion declares:

That it appears from the official returns recently laid on the Table of this House, that the total population of the Dominion of Canada on or about the 1st day of April, 1891, was 4,829,344.

And it goes on to say:

That during the last ten years the actual taxation of the people of Canada has been enormously increased under the operation of the existing tariff.

That the deplorable state of things disclosed by the above-mentioned returns imperatively commands a radical change in the policy and methods of government followed by the Administration.

Mr. AYMOT. I am very thankful to the hon. Speaker for having read the motion to me, but I happen to know it, because I translated it for a newspaper last night. I am trying to prove that the statement made by the Finance Minister yesterday, from his seat in this House, qualifying as boodle the transaction in the Province of Quebec was wrongly called boodling by him. The arguments I bring forward would have no weight if they were my own arguments, or my own way of applying the principles to facts. I dare not do that before this honourable House, but I am taking the principles of the Government themselves, the principles by which they stood in 1872 and ever since, and I think I must be allowed to do that. If I am travelling beyond the question before the House I think it is too late to find that out. It should have been found out when the hon. Minister of Finance himself went beyond the question. I admit that he was not speaking to the question, and I know that he had no right to say what he said, and that it was not fair for him to say so; but, as he has done so, the right of attack means the right of defence, and I feel that I am bound to prove that he is wrong. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will not be long now. There is a nice little part to come and it would be better to let me give it to the House. I will make it as short as possible. If I were blaming the Government I know it would not please my honourable adversaries, but I am not blaming the Government. I am only stating their own principles so as to apply them, and nothing else. It is a compliment which I pay them and they cannot blame me. I say: Gentlemen, here is a mirror of your virtues, look at them. It goes on to say:

"I had a conversation early in the session with Mr. Langevin about the expenses incurred in the elections at Quebec. Mr. Langevin mentioned to me that at the previous general election he had been obliged to expend a very considerable sum of money, not very large in itself, but large comparatively, and he said he did not think it fair that the burden of these elections should rest entirely on him. He said he thought he ought to have a share of any funds subscribed in Montreal for election purposes to assist in Quebec, which he had not had in previous elections, and that they could not expect much of a subscription from Quebec to help the Government. I agreed with him in thinking that it was unfair that he should bear the burden of the Quebec elections, and I told him that in so far as I could have any influence in the matter I would try that he should have a portion of any fund which might be got up in Montreal for general election purposes."

Then the following questioning took place:—

"Q. You were acting as confidential agent to Sir Hugh Allan with respect to the money?

"A. No: I don't think I was. Sir Hugh asked me to assist him in this affair. I think the preponderance of his motive was that my professional practice had led me in the direction of this kind of business—the organization of companies. I also took an interest as a public man in this particular railway, but I considered I was acting more as the solicitor of Sir Hugh than in any other capacity I can describe. I never was in any sense his agent.

"Q. I think you were made the medium through which the moneys were paid for election purposes?

"A. Only while Sir Hugh was in Newfoundland. I never had anything further to do with the moneys than this. I was present when those letters which I have described were talked about, and signed, and when Sir Hugh left for Newfoundland I was made the medium of communication with him with respect to three or four transactions."

He declares here that he had asked some receipt from Mr. Langevin but he was refused. The hon. Minister of Public Works was very prudent. It is always easier to deny anything when there is no receipt given, and he did not give any receipt, but we have incontrovertible evidence that he received the money. Let us go on:

"To my own mind Sir Hugh Allan's motives as described by him are perfectly clear. He is interested in the carrying trade to an enormous extent. About $3,000,000 of his fortune is invested in the carrying trade alone. I mean in sea-going steamers alone. He has also a large amount of money invested in the inland carrying trade. He was forced, as he imagined, and not unwillingly perhaps, to enter into an organization for an extensive series of railways providing for a second communication between the sea-board and the interior of the country. He had taken up with a vast deal of energy and enthusiasm this Pacific Railway scheme. He had been himself a member of the canal commission, if not the chairman of it, and had taken a great interest in that. On every one of these subjects the Government had a policy which was favourable to his views, and in my opinion three times the sum would have been well spent if it had been necessary to keep the Government in power which had, according to his views, and my own too, the improvement of the country so deeply at heart as this Government appeared to have."

These, Mr. Speaker, are the views of the hon. leader of this Government, whom we are so sorry not to see amidst us in this honourable House. If I had time I would go on with those quotations; but I will leave this ancient history, and I will come to more recent events. But at all events you will remember this: The principle laid down by the Hon. Mr. Abbott is this, when the Government have a good object in view, a good policy, it is right for them to say to a man give us $350,000

to help us in our elections, to enable us to corrupt the people, to buy the majority, and we will repay you with public money under the form of a public contract. This is the principle applied by the hon. gentleman; and is there a man on your right, Mr. Speaker, who will dare to get up in his seat and condemn the views of his chief? Is there a man on your right who will say that the Hon. Mr. Abbott, the chief of this wise, pure, honest Government, has badly interpreted the common law and the common sense in regard to contracts? He says that when the Government have a good object in view, it is right to sell a contract, to make a corrupt bargain with contractors. He lays it down most distinctly. We do not know what Mr. Pacaud has done. The only thing we can suspect is that he shared money with Mr. Armstrong—not corruptly, not in bargaining for a contract with the Government. While those gentlemen in 1872 and 1873 found that there was no harm in selling public contracts provided they could by that means sustain themselves in power, how can they throw blame and censure upon Mr. Pacaud to-day? Equally without proof they cast censure, and insults, and blame upon the Local Government of the Province of Quebec, who, according to the evidence given up to the present time, are in no way concerned in the transactions between Armstrong and Pacaud, who only had to deal with Mr. Thom, and not between Mr. Thom and Mr. Armstrong. But, Mr. Speaker, if this is ancient history, I will come to more recent events, I will read from the *Empire* of yesterday. What do we find there? I find the continuation of an examination of a gentleman who is well known, Mr. Rolland, of Montreal:

"The examination of Mr. Rolland was then resumed. In answer to Mr. Lister, he said he knew Mr. C. A. Dansereau, of Montreal, but he denied that he had ever paid him any money personally, except for election funds."

Here is a large paper manufacturer who furnishes paper to this Government to the value of, perhaps, $40,000 a year, and who admits having furnished funds for the elections. But let us go on, and we will see what principle is applied to that transaction by the Minister who gets so indignant when Mr. Pacaud's name is mentioned. There was an objection, one of the Ministers contending that the Committee had nothing to do with subscriptions to election funds:

"Witness, continuing, said that he might have paid money to Mr. Dansereau as a representative of the Conservative Association of Montreal, but he had never paid him any sums for himself."

And further on I read:

"Hon. Mr. Chapleau said that Mr. Rolland's explanation was perfectly satisfactory. He was not ashamed of his intimate friendship with Mr. Dansereau. He was a man anybody might be proud to know. If Mr. Lister asks if Mr. Dansereau has received anything since he has been in the public service, it will be enquired into. He admitted having himself asked Mr. Rolland for a subscription to the election fund last spring. He was not ashamed of it."

Here is the principle laid down not later than yesterday or the day before, that it is right for Ministers of the Crown to ask for subscriptions from contractors who furnish paper or any other things to the Government of this country. There is no danger that the Ministers will think of recouping those subscribers, as was promised in the Pacific affair. They do not think of that danger at all. They do not think that public money may be wasted through gratitude towards those generous subscribers. At any rate, this is the modern idea which this Government applies, and I am sure that no hon. Minister will get up in this House and say to the hon. Secretary of State: If you are not ashamed of doing that, we are ashamed of you. None of them will do that. These are their principles. Well, there is another one. We spoke a moment ago about the transactions in connection with the Baie des Chaleurs. Let us take some recent actions in connection with that affair. I read from the *Citizen*, which is a good paper, I suppose—a sound paper, which never departs from the truth:

"In regard to purchasing Mr. McGreevy's stock in the road, witness said that he paid him $10,000 in cash and $32,000 out of the subsidies, and still owed him $8,000."

What? A member of this Parliament, not even through the medium of Mr. Thom or Mr. Armstrong, but directly from the subsidies of the Government, received $42,000, and expects $8,000 more, though he has not furnished one cent! And this is fair, and honest, and right; while because Mr. Pacaud is supposed to have had some monetary dealings with Mr. Armstrong, that fact is sufficient ground for a Minister of the Crown to stand in his place in this House and say that Mercier, Pacaud and Langelier are boodlers, and you, Mr. Laurier, should spend your time in punishing boodlers. These are extraordinary principles to be applied on one side and denied on the other. Now, let us see another gentleman. All that Mr. Robitaille got was $24,000 from the new company. $24,000 was all that senator got, who did not put a cent in it. I admit he worked for the road; but when a political man works for his country and has gained the gratitude of his people he has all the reward his heart can desire. Surely, he does not expect to be paid in money besides, but all he received was $24,000; and that must have been paid him out of the Government subsidies, because outside the Governments of Quebec and this Dominion no one put any money in that enterprise. But we do not hear a word against Mr. Robitaille. No; they say you are an honourable man; we will respect you; just as they said to Mr. McGreevy: you are an honorable man, we will respect you. You belong to us and we will lay down in your favour the principles we applied in the case of the Pacific scandal. But when they come to deal with the Pacauds, the Merciers and the Langeliers, they apply another principle. They say you do not belong to our party, we will apply other principles to you; and without evidence, against evidence, we will tax you with being corrupt, and we will call on the chief of the Liberal party, whose energies are all taken up in finding out our own corruption, to exert his energy in punishing those boodlers, who do not exist in fact.

An hon. MEMBER. Question.

Mr. AMYOT. I suppose the hon. gentleman who says "question" finds I am rather far from the census. That is true, but I have been driven from it. These hon. gentlemen should have called "question" when the Minister of Finance took up that subject. He thought his statements would be circulated in the press of the country without being challenged, and now it is too late to call "question." It should have been called yesterday, and then my

remarks would not have been rendered necessary by the improper speech of one of the Ministers of the Crown. But perhaps those who call "question" are afraid that I am going to speak of the iniquities in East Northumberland. However, I will not go into that question, except to assert that the same principle has been applied there by hon. gentlemen opposite as they have applied elsewhere. It was understood in that county, if we can believe the witnesses, that public offices, paid out of public money, belong to the friends of the Administration.

Mr. DENISON. I rise to a point of order. I wish to ask whether the hon. gentleman is in order in referring to a matter which is before a Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member must know that he has no right to refer to proceedings before a Committee of this House.

Mr. AMYOT. I only refer to the press which supports them. Now, I want to know who are the hon. gentlemen who attack us in that way? We have seen their participation and the participation of their hon. chief in the Pacific scandal. I do not refer now, because I do not want to refer to the sittings of a Committee which has not yet reported to this House, to the graving dock at Lévis, and the cross-wall, and the dredging contract, and the thirty-five cent contract, and the Esquimalt contract. I will not say that the accountants appointed by the Committee have found that a profit of about $1,000,000 was made on a work costing $2,000,000. I will not go into that, but I will say that it has been proved before this House that the Intercolonial Railway, under the management of hon. gentlemen opposite, is used to qualify the same electors in many counties, and to carry them gratuitously from one county to another on election day. It has been proved before this House that the Public Works Department grants contracts to fictitious persons, and that the Government, by means of the votes of its supporters in this House, has declared to the people that it is right to forge the name of another party or a party not existing. I find that principle laid down by this same Government which brings in a statute declaring forgery to be an infamous crime deserving the penitentiary. I will say it has been decided by the majority of this House that it is right in this Dominion, under the British flag, for any one to say: I will take a contract under the name of another; give it to me, as otherwise if I did not use the false name of another, my tender would be higher. I will take it at a lower rate, but understand you will give me some large extras sufficient to make up the difference. Then the other party says: But the money you promised me for the elections, hand it over now, and the money will come very soon. Then without referring to the committees which have not reported to this House, without referring to the contracts of the printing department, I might speak of that paper *Le Monde* which, according to the statement of one hon. member of this House, has cost $80,000 of public money. This is not the regular aiding of the press, but it is a wrong and corrupt use of public money to create and sustain a paper which has no other *raison d'être* than to deceive the people. It is simply the using of public money to corrupt the public mind. I might speak of the contractors who are so useful in election times, and the subsidies to steamers, and the superannuations made in order to place political friends whom the Government desire to reward. I might speak of the subsidies to railways increased during election times. I might speak of the revising officers, of the manufacturers, of the officials of all the departments, used to influence directly and unfairly the electorate of this Dominion; and the men who practise this system are the pure men who go out of their road to look into the affairs of those with whom they have nothing to do and accuse and condemn them without evidence and against the evidence. And whom do they accuse? That Local Cabinet which is their *bête noire* is composed of Mr. Mercier, who was absent and concerning whom not one word of proof is brought to show that he knew anything of the whole transaction. And it is under those circumstances that a Minister of the Crown here comes forward and says he is a boodler. What respect does that Minister think we can have for his word? Is there one word of truth in his statement? Then there is the Hon. Mr. Ross. Who does not know this respectable citizen? He is universally esteemed, not only by the people of Quebec, but in all the places of this Dominion where he is known, he is looked upon as the most honourable citizen that Canada has ever produced. Then there is the Hon. Mr. Garneau. Where is the spot on his reputation? Is he not one of our leading citizens, who sacrifices his time and energies to foster our industries in the City of Quebec? Then there is the Hon. Mr. Duhamel, a young man of much talent, a self-made man, who was bright at the bar when public confidence called him to the Executive of his province. And the Hon. Mr. Robidoux and Mr. Boyer—what have they to say against them? Do these hon. gentlemen opposite think that they have the monopoly of purity and political virtue and capacity? What right have they to insult gratuitously these gentlemen? Then they have the Hon. Charles Langelier. He was one of our colleagues here. Would the hon. gentleman have dared to say in his presence what he said when he was not here? I am sure he would not, but he knows that Mr. Langelier is far away, and it serves his purpose to attack and condemn him from afar. There was no jurisdiction, no justification, no wisdom, and there was the greatest possible impropriety in that gratuitous charge and accusation and condemnation, which was not called for, coming from the hon. Minister, and he should apologize to the country for it, and he should at least regret it in his heart, and I hope my humble remarks will call him back to the sense of dignity and honour which must be maintained in this House. I know that the object of this sudden and uncalled for attack is to divert public attention from those enquetes which hon. gentlemen are so much afraid we will speak of. It is to call public attention to another scene. They hope that, by saying that in the Province of Quebec there is the Pacaud-Langelier-Mercier boodling, the public of the Dominion will have its mind driven away from the enquete, the result of which will soon be reported to this House. They are mistaken. The people of this Dominion have their eyes wide open. When these matters in the Province of Quebec come up, the Legislature of that province will pass judgment upon them without fear or reproach, but this Parliament will pass judgment in regard to the enquete which it

ordered, and in regard to which it has jurisdiction. The hon. Minister has found fault with the statement that this $100,000 has served for deposits for election protests. Where is his evidence of that? How can he justify that statement? I go a step further. Where is the harm? The Government of the Province of Quebec is ordered by the Parliament of Quebec to spend $200,000 odd. Within the limits of their obligation and duty they paid $175,000 to Thom. That is their transaction. Thom pays out of that, $100,000 to Armstrong. Armstrong repays Pacaud, or lends him, or gives him money—I do not know which—and part of that serves to contest certain elections. What is the harm? I do not see anything which we can reproach any one with in that. This may be given by Mr. Pacaud or Mr. Armstrong, who I am told is a Conservative, and I will not be afraid to face that before any public meeting in the Dominion. I say that after those untimely elections were imposed upon us during the winter in spite of the solemn promise of the Government, exhausted as we were in protracted sessions, the party had a right to expect that those who had some money would give them some help to contest the elections of our adversaries who had used all sorts of tricks in order to postpone the contestation of our elections to a later date than theirs. We had a right to contest their elections and to show that, if the Opposition were not in power, it was due to corruption, the same system which has been applied here, having been applied to the people at large. Besides, in the district of Quebec all the elections which have been contested by the Conservative party have been contested, with the deposit of $1,000 in each case, by the same man, a notary in Quebec who was a poor man when he came there, and is supposed to be a poor man still. Where has he got the money? Give us the enquete, and I believe we can prove that the money comes from the immense boodling which comes from Ottawa. And yet these are the men who attack us because this money was given to contest their elections. I now conclude my remarks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. AMYOT. If the hon. gentlemen are not satisfied, I have some more notes, and I can go on, but I will take that "hear, hear" as an approbation of all my remarks and I will thank them for it. Having explained the true principles of the Tory party and the circumstances of the case in regard to the Province of Quebec, I expect that the object of the hon. the Minister of Finance in throwing these gratuitous accusations ard condemnations against that province will not attain its end.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to the remarks of my hon. friend the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), and, like yourself, I have failed to find any relation between them and the motion before the House. We must be thankful, however, to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) for having giving the House, through his motion, an opportunity of discussing the census figures. The question of the population of the country, is important from the standpoint of the country's advancement; as without increase of population—for all our country may have increased in wealth, and the individuals advanced in welfare—the prosperity of the country is not complete. If the population of the country does not increase in proportion to its territory, the country cannot be considered as prosperous. The arguments offered by the hon. member for South Oxford, and the other hon. members of the Opposition, are altogether false, inasmuch as they throw upon the fiscal policy of the present Government the whole responsibility for the disappointment consequent upon the fact that the population has not increased according to our wishes. We believe that the protection given to our agriculture and our national industries has been the cornucopia which has proved our prosperity over the country. It has permitted this Government to develop our great natural resources, and the railway enterprises which have opened up the immense territories of the North-West, and made possible an influx of an intelligent population, which, in the near future, will turn these territories into rich and prosperous provinces. In the opinion of the hon. members of the left, the protective system is no more nor less than the equivalent of the plagues of Egypt. It is Pandora's box from which came out innumerable evils which desolated the country, while nothing remained in the box but the hope for the country of having one day at the head of its Government the hon. leader of the Opposition and his faithful Achates, the hon. member for South Oxford, and his other companions in misfortune. But, Mr. Speaker, I consider that the increase of population in this country, or rather the lack of increase in the population of this country, does not rest solely with the Governments of the Dominion. We have not merely one Government in this country. We must not forget that we have a Local Government for every province of the Confederation, and that these Local Governments have a share of responsibility in the development of our material resources and the progressive march of our population. In fact, Mr. Speaker, under the control of the Federal Government are all matters concerning commerce and industry, and all those concerning the rural community are in the hands of the Local Legislatures. None of the hon. members of the Opposition have shown this House that with their policy of 1878, or their improved policy of 1891, unrestricted reciprocity, no one, I say, has offered any argument tending to prove that with their policy our population would have increased more during the last decade. Mr. Speaker, it is to be noted that in the older provinces it is principally in the rural districts that the population has failed to increase. It is the agricultural population which has moved to the towns, which has migrated to the North-West, to secure lands more fertile and of easier cultivation. To what is the migration to the cities due? Where does the responsibility rest? Has not the Federal Government done its duty towards the development of our national industry, towards the development of our inter-provincial commerce and our foreign trade? The hon. members find that the Government has given too much protection to our national industries. They find that we have too much of a market, for they complain of the protection which we have given to the industrial classes. Mr. Speaker, the industrial classes are the very ones which make agriculture remunerative by consuming its products, thus saving it the trouble of seeking distant foreign markets. Therefore, the Federal Government and the Conservative

party have done more to favour the farmers, by creating a local market for their products, than the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would have done if they had put into effect their free trade policy, which would have driven our working classes to foreign countries. Mr. Speaker, the Government has done what was in its power to increase the local market, to develop its importance and to enlarge the number of consumers. What more could it do? As I said before the Local Governments have their share of responsibility in the development of our population and in the administration of our territorial domain. The Local Governments have the absolute control of the real estate in their respective provinces, the Local Governments have absolute control of public instruction in their respective provinces, the Local Governments have the control, it may be said, of the intellectual progress as well as of the material progress of the provinces that they govern, by the fact that, in the first place, all the civil rights are within their jurisdiction. They regulate the land rights. And then to them it is that belongs the mission of giving the people the instruction and education which enable it to carry out profitably its trades or its arts. I say that if our rural population has decreased in the old provinces it is not fair to lay the whole responsibility of it upon the Federal Government, which has, so to speak, no land control, which can do nothing to increase land value, and which has no power to do anything in the way of legislation, in the matter of civil rights, to better the condition of the citizens of those provinces. Mr. Speaker, I say that if the Local Governments had done their duty, if they had had at heart their misssion and done as the Federal Government strove to do in its sphere by developing commerce and industry, if, on their part, the Local Governments had given the same care to what was under their absolute control: land rights, public instruction, agricultural instruction, I say that, perhaps, instead of having diminished in certain rural districts, our population would have largely increased, that we would have kept our people at home in their respective provinces. I say, further, that if the population turns away from agriculture to-day it is due to its lack of instruction and to the lack of effort on the part of Local Governments to teach the art of agriculture. Mr. Speaker, our rural districts cannot be thickly populated unless the people are sufficiently enlightened and capable of preventing the depreciation of the soil that they live on. For that they have to work it rationally, intelligently and increase its fertility. To do this they should be instructed in the art of agriculture. The Local Governments have not fulfilled their mission in this respect. They have taken no interest in developing in the community the taste and affection for this noble art of agriculture, which all educated men should strive to foster. Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the Local Governments had done their duty by giving the people new agricultural knowledge, by keeping them constantly informed of all the agricultural improvements, by means of lectures and by agricultural education systematically popularized, we would not to-day have to deplore this abandoning of the farms in the old provinces. And why is land so deserted? Because the economic means of improving the soil are not known, because the kind of cultivation to be adopted is not already understood. The farmer does not know by what particular cultivation he can make his land remunerative and better. Mr. Speaker, those who now exert themselves to find that the cause of the desertion of the soil in the older provinces comes from our mode of taxation here in Ottawa, commit a grave error. I even believe that they have not reflected at all, and that they are inclined to adopt such a view only through the mere desire of serving political passion. That is the reason why they blame our mode of taxation. They do not dare go to the root of the evil. And why, Mr. Speaker? Because at this moment, the Local Governments are all in the hands of the friends of the hon. members of the Opposition. I verily believe that if these provinces had been under the control of the Conservative party, my hon. friends of the left would have taken the trouble of reflecting, and they would have involved the Local Governments in their motion of condemnation of the policy of the Conservative party in the House of Commons. Now, Mr. Speaker, to be a good farmer, to love agriculture, one has to know agriculture. And in order that agriculture be known, agricultural instruction has to be vulgarized and spread amongst the farming classes, by the efforts of the Local Governments, who alone under our constitution, have the power of diffusing it. I say that the depopulation of our rural districts, the lack of increase of population in our rural districts, is due to a want of agricultural instruction. The farming community, in Ontario as elsewhere, has not been taught to love the art of agriculture. I say that the Local Governments have not spent enough money in that direction, while they have spent too much in building railways and opening up of commerce, when railways and means of commerce were within the sphere of federal action. Mr. Speaker, I invite my hon. friends of the Opposition to study the question more seriously than they have done, to discuss it from another standpoint and to ask themselves if the Conservative party at Ottawa have not greatly favoured the farming classes by protecting national industry, by developing our commerce, by enlarging our centres of consumption, and by giving the farmer the means of selling at a high price the large quantities of produce that he can put on the markets. The hon. members of the left insist that our prosperity must depend solely on our commercial relations with the neighbouring republic. I differ from them. I even differ a little in this respect from the Government which I support. I am still much of the opinion expressed by my hon. friend the member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), in his famous pamphlet of 1872. I believe that before thinking of the Americans or the English we must think of Canadians, and make a tariff which will suit ourselves. What would we gain by unrestricted reciprocity with the United States? First, it has been proven, until evident to the fullest degree, during the debate which took place in this House, by my colleagues who took part in the discussion, that our industry would inevitably perish under the shock of the competition of the American industry, which is stronger and more powerful than ours. We would then lose our consumers, and our workingmen would take the road to exile. Then my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) could indeed and sincerely weep, he who has so much affection for the agricultural classes. I will tell my hon. friend that he

brought upon himself a share of the responsibility for the scandals of the Government of Quebec. He has shown, until evident to the fullest degree, the solidarity of a large number of his political friends, and perhaps of himself, with the boodlers of Quebec. He has shown his solidarity with them by putting in all his time defending them this evening, while the question he had to deal with before this House was that of the increase or decrease of our population. My hon. friend has thought fit to make a diversion and speak exclusively of matters which took place before a committee which, while holding of Parliament does not hold of our House, in order to try and justify the boodlers of the Quebec Government. In spite of all my hon. friend could say, in spite of all his energetic efforts to put public opinion off the question, authentic evidence, found in the press of the country, evidence given under oath by honourable men is there to establish that the Quebec boodlers have committed acts of plunder, the most scandalous that have ever been perpetrated in this country. My hon. friend has thought fit to divert the attention of the House, and treated almost exclusively of this subject, although it had nothing to do with the motion before the House. I say that my hon. friend, by taking with such ardour the defence of these boodlers, who can only be defended by those who have participated in their plunder, or by those who glory in such rapine, has established a solidarity of his friends with them. My hon. friend's virtue seemed indignant at the sight of boodlers in the Conservative camp. Let my hon. friend keep his indignation and his vigour for the chastisement of those who are nearer to him than his political opponents. Mr. Speaker, I will pass over the mass of figures given by the hon. member for Bellechasse, in connection with the affair of the Baie des Chaleurs Company. I believe, as he does, that this affair will be ventilated in another place than this, in a proper place, before persons who will have complete authority to condemn the guilty. Here we have no interest in the matter, and if the affair came before Parliament, it was only incidently, in connection with another matter. But in this House, or in the other House, when the question comes of adopting a Bill, and the Bill meets with opposition, I contend that this opposition should be heard and that the motives which dictate it should be made known before the committee of the House, or before the House itself. That is what has been done in this matter of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, and that is what so sorely vexes my hon. friend for Bellechasse and the companions of his misfortune who sit by his side. Mr. Speaker, let us put aside all these questions foreign to that which should occupy us exclusively now, namely—the increase or decrease of our population, the increase of our population to a figure which may be satisfactory and testify to the prosperity and advancement of our country. Let us speak of this question only, and let us continue to establish our share of responsibility in the matter, and to seek means, for the next decade, to ensure rapid progress in population as well as in industrial and agricultural prosperity. I say, Mr. Speaker, that by diffusing agricultural instruction, that by fostering with the population the love it should have for an art as noble as that of agriculture, farming will be made remunerative. By developing knowledge, and giving the farmers the means and the necessary light by which to improve the soil, the aim will be reached. I believe that my hon. friend for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) shares my views in this respect. I heard him say the other day that in order to improve our worn-out lands, it is important to foster the growing of the sugar beet, and to establish the beet-root sugar industry in this country. For, he said, with the refuse of the sugar manufactories, we will be able to fatten quantities of cattle, which will give our farmers the necessary fertilizer to bring back their impoverished lands to their original fertility. What is wanting with most of our farmers is knowledge, it is the means of knowing which product will sell best. I know of no industry just now which can pay better than dairy farming, and the production of meat for local consumption and export to the English market. Mr. Speaker, with the system of unrestricted reciprocity, what shall we gain for the farmers? Let us study what is wanted for our agriculture in the older provinces. Let us glance over and find the system which should be adopted to make farming a paying business, to give our lands, which in many places are worn out now, their primitive fertility, and if this mode of cultivation is about the only reasonable, the only remunerative and the only practical one, let us adopt it. If unrestricted reciprocity is calculated to injure such a system of farming we must not adopt it, it being injurious to the interest of agriculture, and consequently injurious to the interests of the country at large. What system of farming is suited to impoverished lands? For a long while, in the press, in Parliament, in the Legislatures, in the agricultural societies, in the great agricultural conventions and meetings, it has been mooted that our lands are growing poor, but no remedy is offered for this state of things, which must inevitably result in the depopulation of our rural parts. The evil is complained of, but no remedy is suggested. Mr. Speaker, after having conferred upon the matter with distinguished agriculturists of our Province of Quebec, I will make bold to say that, in the present state of the markets, we can only compete with the western provinces in the manufacture of cheese and of butter, in the production of beef and pork, the raising of horses, cattle, sheep and fowl. These industries are the only ones which will give impoverished lands the fertilizers that may restore them to their original fertility. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the members of the Local Legislatures to this important point. We must give back to the soil of the older provinces its virgin fertility by inducing our farmers to give their whole attention to the manufacture of butter and cheese and to the raising of cattle, sheep and horses. I say that by the cultivation of grain and the exportation of hay we simply export the fertility of our lands. Learned agriculturists have proven that when you export $1,000,000 worth of wheat, you remove from your soil $240,000 worth of its fertility. That is to say, in order to give back to the soil its fertility you would have to buy artificial fertilizers to an amount of $240,000. On the other hand, when you export $1,000,000 worth of cheese, butter or meat, you only export $240 worth of the fertility of the soil on which you have produced this butter or cheese or raised the cattle. There is a difference of 1 to 1,000 in the impoverishment of the land by the two systems of husbandry which I have mentioned. I say that the choice is easy to make. I draw to the matter the attention of

my colleagues in this Parliament as well as of the members of the Local Legislatures. Now, Mr. Speaker, in what position will the farmers of the older provinces be, who manufacture butter and cheese and export cattle, if you put them in competition with the Americans of the Western States? The answer is simple, it is clear, and evident, known beforehand. We shall be no longer able to furnish pork and beef to our own markets, at our very doors. Meat will come from the Western States at such low prices that our farmers can no longer produce the meat which our workmen will consume, as they cannot afford it. Take, for instance, pork, which in Chicago sells for $3 or $4, and which can be put on our markets for $4.50. Take beef, which can be sold for one or two cents per pound, according to quality. Is there in Quebec or Ontario, one farmer capable of meeting such competition? On the other hand, would our farmers, with their impoverished lands, be able to compete with the western American farmer? I say no, Mr. Speaker, and I say that the only way of increasing the population of the older provinces is to restore to the soil its fertility, to improve it. And this will only be done when the population knows more than it does, and that will only be when means are given it of acquiring knowledge. Those who advise unrestricted reciprocity in the interest of the farmers make an enormous mistake. They bring upon them American competition. It is easy to see what happens in the States of New England. Many times in this House it has been shown that farming in those states has been ruined by western competition. Well, the facts which we find in the New England States, in the empire state of New York, we shall find in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and in the Maritime Provinces as well. We shall have the same competition to face, that is the competition from the Western States, the soil of which needs no improvement, as it is still virgin soil of greatest fertility. It is said that we shall be able to sell to the United States, certain articles which we do not sell to-day, or have to sell cheaper. But all these questions have been discussed, and so well discussed in this House already, that I do not intend to re-open the debate on these points. I only wish to observe that in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, we have a great interest in the improvement of the soil if we wish to see an increase in our rural population; for it is proven beyond doubt that hundreds of acres of well improved land are worth hundreds of acres of land unimproved. Now, if the Local Governments spread agricultural instruction which will enable our farmers to improve their lands, to cultivate them in a profitable way, of all necessity shall our rural population increase, for it will no longer take one or two hundred acres of land for a family to live on, but the same family will easily find a living on much less ground. Now, Mr. Speaker, with the National Policy, with the protection of our industries and the development of our manufactories in proportion to the increase of our rural population, we have the means of keeping the owners of the soil in the country, we have the means of developing the resources of our older provinces. Let us hope for the day when the Local Governments—at present all Liberal Governments, by the way—will go to work and do their duty by the people instead of banding together as they do to overthrow the central Government. They will end by studying better the means of fulfilling the mission given them by the constitution, to develop the intellectual resources of the population. For developed intelligence is worth more than mere material force. If our people are allowed to remain ignorant of the progress attained around them in the foreign countries, in the United States and Europe, it is easy to conceive that from day to day it will become harder to fight our enlightened neighbours and beat them in the foreign markets. The only way to cope with them to advantage is to educate our farmers so that they will know how to produce what is wanted in the countries we are to deal with. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Bellechasse has not only taken up time in defending the Quebec boodlers, as they have been called and as they are now known in the country, but he has exhibited all his virtuous indignation against what he called the corruption of the Conservative party. There was a time, Mr. Speaker, when my hon. friend and I were fighting for the same principles, were fighting for the same men, were fighting for the same protective system which he berates to-day. And when the Pacific scandal came out, when the hon. leader of the Opposition at the time, together with those who formed the Liberal party, succeeded in taking the place of the Macdonald-Cartier Government, we had the hon. member for Bellechase in our ranks. He did not then find cause for indignation in what he now calls the Pacific scandal, but what he then called, as we did, the great Pacific conspiracy against the Conservative party. My hon. friend has changed, he has cast aside his old opinions: but I do not despair of him. My hon. friend makes his evolutions with so much supleness that I do not yet despair of seeing him come back to his first love, and defend again, some day, the old Conservative flag, which he often fought for with so much frenzy. Mr. Speaker, we are harangued about corruption. I heard the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) attack the hon. members of the Government, throw insult in the face of the Conservative party, and pose as a champion of virtue and morality before this House and the country. Surely, I said to myself, this member for West Huron must be an exceedingly scrupulous man, and his career must be pure from his birth. However, to my great disappointment, on that very day, I read in a newspaper that the hon. member had himself confessed before a court of justice to having spent $14,000 in a little electoral district of Ontario, and that he had been guilty of the most shameless corruption. Here, Mr. Speaker, are those apostles of virtue. Here are the men who grow wrathful over the least peccadillo of their political opponents. Those gentlemen who do not mind wading in corruption up to their lips, steeping themselves in it, are those who here show the most scrupulous, the most fanatical in that respect.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) What paper said that?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The *Empire*. It seems to be recorded elsewhere too. But the *Empire* mentions one of the civil courts of Ontario, where the case of the hon. member for West Huron was tried, in which the hon. member declared, under oath, that he had spent $14,000 towards moralizing the electors of his electoral division. But there is more, Mr. Speaker, if we want to

speak of corruption, if we want to speak of money spent in elections, it is only necessary to recall the past of the Liberal party, the new allies of the member for Bellechasse, in the Province of Quebec. We will see that, in many instances, they chose millionaires to fight the Conservative candidates in Montreal and elsewhere. The Liberal appetite was so modest that it did not take long to ruin these millionaires. One may mention Mr. Jodoin, who, in the County of Chambly, spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for the Liberal party, and threw into that county from twenty to thirty thousand dollars in every election. Mr. Jodoin himself finally went under, and ended his career by being disqualified in the courts. In 1874 the hon. members of the left in this House got hold of the reins of Government by hoodwinking public opinion, by promising the people a prosperity which they took good care not to give. Such are the means which they employed all over the country to ensure the purity of elections. We have seen in this House a Major Walker, full of indignation against the corruption of the Tories of Ontario and of the whole Dominion; and before the session was over, I am told, Major Walker, whose election was protested, was himself convicted of personal corruption and disqualified. It appears that he had spent $3,000 or $4,000 to moralize the city of London, Ontario. Such is the morality of the Grits and Liberals when they are in power. They are in power in the Province of Quebec. I know that the Liberals here do not like to hear mentioned the policy and the corruption of their party apart from that practised to reach this House. But, Mr. Speaker, how have the hon. members reached power, how could they overthrow the Conservative party and come to be the rulers in the Local Legislatures? By fallacious promises. Here they say to us: Give us the power and we will reduce the public debt, we will reduce the taxes. In the Province of Quebec, in order that Mr. Mercier should secure power, we were promised all that. My hon. friend, the member for Bellechasse, was one of the promisers. They were to reduce the taxes, they were to reduce the public debt, which, according to Mr. Mercier, were taking proportions enormous, alarming for the province. And yet the public debt of the Province of Quebec has reached a figure which I do not like to qualify, and on which I do not wish to pass an opinion, but I call it a dangerous figure for the country. I say that instead of keeping the promises which the Liberal party had made, of reducing the public debt and the taxes of Quebec, of putting an end to corruption in elections, the Quebec Government openly, audaciously, violated all laws of morality, and bought electoral districts wholesale by remitting the municipal loans. It remitted nearly $700,000 to secure the election of one of its friends in a county of that province—Shefford—which adjoins the one which I have the honour to represent. And the same corruption was practised elsewhere. When a county could not be carried by the purchase of individuals, they would try to buy *en masse* the poorer classes of electors, by voting grants for public works and employing everybody. I am grieved, Mr. Speaker, that the members for the Province of Quebec should have raised these accusations against the Conservative party in this House. I would fain not have exhibited here the sores that eat us up in our Local Legislature. If I was forced to do it, it was to justify myself and my Conservative friends who are dishonestly accused by members who have played such a sorrowful *rôle* in order to gain power for a Government which has given the measure of its audacity, its effrontery, its corruption and its power for evil in electoral matters and otherwise. I say that all these charges that I bring rest upon testimonies given under oath,——

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Gossips.

Mr. DUPONT (Translation)—testimonies from friends of the hon. members of the left, from bank cashiers, men enjoying high credit and responsibility, who came here and established, under oath, that a shameful traffic had been done in the Province of Quebec, with grants voted by the House for the building of railways. And if I wanted to cast upon the Quebec Legislature injurious suspicions, I would say that we have here, in the Baie des Chaleurs affair, a sorrowful example of how the friends of the hon. member for Bellechasse and of the hon. leader of the Opposition conduct the affairs of the Province of Quebec. It would be fine, to-day, to see these gentlemen repudiate all solidarity with these parties, but they do not do it. We see my hon. friend, the member for Bellechasse, here, not as a serious man, not as a man who has studied the documents which have been published in the whole press of the country and the testimonies which have been given and of which he cannot be ignorant of, we see my hon. friend from Bellechasse, I say, with a levity unpardonable in a lawyer and a man of his position, come and tell us that the Quebec Ministers have not been heard, that the enquiry was an *ex parte* enquiry, made in order to condemn them, in order to convict them at any price, and that they have not had the advantage of defending themselves. Why did not my hon. friend say that his friends were shunning justice? Why did he not say that the Quebec boodlers, in their anxiety to put themselves out of reach, thought it was not enough to run to the United States, and wanted to make sure of their safety by taking steamers to Europe, and putting between themselves, in their newly adopted land, and the justice of their country, an ocean of thirteen hundred leagues? When summoned before a committee of the other House, if we are to believe the papers, why did the Quebec Ministers refuse to answer the summons? Why did they refuse to come and justify themselves? The public will believe that the reason was that their conduct could not be justified. Such is the public sentiment, and all the noise which my hon. friend may make to show that this case was carried on *ex parte* is of no avail. It was *ex parte* because the accused had caused the witness for the prosecution to escape.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Who caused him to go?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) It is Mr. Mercier who gave him permission to go. It is Mr. Laurier, who, in a letter published by the papers, said that, at the time, he had given Mr. Pacaud permission to go to Europe.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Now, these are two misstatements of facts.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The letter of the hon. leader of the Opposition was published in

the press. He made excuses. He said that at the time he did not know the enquiry was taking place. And the investigation had been going on for several days.

Mr. AMYOT. No, no.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Wait now, Mr. Member for Bellechasse. Do not be too tickled. You will see that my sentence was correct, and my thought also. The investigation had been going on for several days, Mr. Pacaud was in New York. Since the leader of the Opposition had so much power over Mr. Pacaud that the latter could not leave the country without his consent, why did not Mr. Laurier cause Mr. Pacaud to come back? No, Mr. Speaker, let us leave Mr. Pacaud's affairs aside. We have only spoken to him because the hon. member for Bellechasse spoke of him with so much bitterness. He did not speak of the responsibilities of the Local Government regarding the small increase of the population in their respective provinces. He preferred a subject foreign to the debate. The burden of his speech—which proved the complicity of the Liberal party—was the justification of the Quebec boodlers. Was he also under instructions from the hon. leader of the Opposition in attempting this diversion and in this effort? Was he in the same position as Mr. Pacaud? Was he under instructions? I do not know. But, at all events, my hon. friend from Bellechasse made a single sentence of the hon. Minister of Finance the occasion for a whole speech, in which he ignores the motion by the finance guardian of the Opposition, which yet deserved all his attention.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I treated the question for a whole hour. If you were absent, it is not my fault.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Well, Mr. Speaker, I say that my hon. friend from Bellechasse, and all the other scrupulous ones of his kind, in spite of their clamours, will not have, in the public's opinion, the weight and the authority of the men whom they accuse. For their past, their contradictions, their own scandals—old or new—are so glaring that it does not behoove them to accuse anyone. When people live in glass houses, as they do, they should not throw stones at their neighbours, because of the risk they incur for their own houses.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I rise for the purpose of making a few observations in reference to what was said at an earlier portion of this debate by the Minister of Finance, and to-day by the hon. member for the City of Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh). The hon. member for the City of Ottawa addressed to this House a speech indicating a great deal of research and of labour, but it seemed to me that it had not a great deal of relevancy to the subject under discussion. His speech seemed to have been prepared with a view to another resolution, and to a debate that transpired some time ago. So there is a great deal contained in the speech of the hon. gentleman which might have called for an answer if it had been addressed to the House on another occasion; therefore, it is scarcely necessary to revert to it on this occasion. However, the hon. gentleman stated, or rather, in my view, misstated, facts upon which it will be necessary to animadvert. The Minister of Finance admitted, in the speech which he addressed to the House, that the census figures were not altogether satisfactory. The hon. gentleman could not very well have said less. He admits that there are something like ten or twelve hundred thousand people in the Dominion less than there ought to be, having due regard to the natural increase of population and to immigration from abroad. But the hon. gentleman states that notwithstanding this condition of things, the country is in a highly prosperous, in a highly satisfactory state, that the National Policy had accomplished for us all that he, at all events, had expected from it. One would suppose, from the observations of the Minister of Finance, that a large majority of those who had gone abroad had grown wealthy, that they had gone abroad to enjoy travel, to acquire information, and to learn something more about the world than they could have known if they had remained at home. So I would infer from his observations yesterday that he expected a large number of these would return. Well, Sir, the speech of the hon. gentleman was, as all his speeches have been this session, composed largely of great expectations. Yet the hon. gentleman admitted that there was a very great disappointment felt even by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, at the result of the census. The numbers were not at all as large as the hon. gentleman supposed they would be. But he assured us, however, that he had a great deal of consolation in the fact that there was a people to the south of us who were in a position not much better than we were. The hon. gentleman says it is true that we expected that the census would have disclosed a very much larger population, but it is equally true that our neighbours across the border have also been disappointed in that they expected to find a very much larger population than is shown by their census. The hon. gentleman says they expected 18,000,000 of an addition to the population, and they only had 12,000,000. Well, Sir, we ought to have had something like 1,700,000 of an addition to our population, and we have about 500,000. So the hon. gentleman will see that our disappointment is very much greater in proportion to our population than theirs. Now, the hon. gentleman also ignored the very important fact that the population of the United States is about what those who have given most attention to that subject expected it would be. The coloured population of the south, according to the census of 1880, was reported as very much larger than it actually was. When due allowance is made for the mistakes in reference to the coloured population in the south, and looking at the large increase that has taken place in the population of the country, the present census of the United States discloses a population about the same as a proper estimate would have given. But the hon. gentleman will see that while their census, for the last decade, disclose an increase of something more than one to four and a half, ours disclose an increase of something less than one to nine; so that we have made less than half the progress in proportion to our population that our neighbours have made. Now, the hon. gentleman has undertaken to find a reason for this disappointment. He has undertaken to explain to the House why it is that the population of this country is not as large as the Government were entitled to expect. The hon. gentleman began by

telling us that the tendency in modern times is from the rural districts to the cities, that there is a diminution of population in the rural districts and an increase in towns and cities. He says that this is not due to the fiscal policy of the Administration; he says that the same tendency exists in England where there is free trade, and there is the same tendency in the United States, where they have protection to a very much higher extent than we have here in Canada, and we have this tendency in Canada. So he tells us that it is one of the unsolved problems in modern political economy and in sociology—this disposition of the people in our day to desert the rural districts and flock to the towns. It is a problem that economists have not yet solved, it is one of these things which, as Lord Dundreary would say: "No fellah can understand." Now, I do not agree with that view; I do not think it is an unsolved problem, I think that the causes which are in operation both in the United Kingdom, in the United States and in Canada, are such as may be well understood. We understand the tendency in the United Kingdom, because there the people are most profitably employed in the manufacturing industries of the cities. There is an illimitable field for manufactures, whereas the field for agricultural pursuits is limited. The population will remain in the rural districts to cultivate the soil to the utmost extent, looking to the present condition of rural estates, that it is probably capable of. But, Sir, in the towns and cities manufacturing industries continue to grow. The English market is constantly increasing, new industries are being established, new appliances are employed, new markets are being opened, and the products of English industry, and English enterprise, and English capital are finding their way into districts more and more remote, in the centre of Africa and in the central regions of Asia; so that if you are to give employment to people profitably in the United Kingdom, and employment to capital, you must give that employment in those industries and those pursuits for the products of which a market may be found. When we come to this side of the Atlantic we see that it is not the natural tendency here as it is in the United Kingdom. The causes which are in operation there are perfectly obvious. But I would ask any hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches, or behind them, whether he thinks, if you were to withdraw protection, if you were to establish the principle of freedom of trade, if you were to allow every man to engage in whatever business he thought best, and to find a market wherever he pleases—whether he thinks there would be a tendency of the population to the cities and a desertion of the rural districts? The question is here, as there, in what respect capital can be most profitably employed; and if you undertake to burden one kind of industry and to give premiums or bonuses to another industry, of course you will divert capital from the one and bestow it upon the other; you will change the direction of industry. There can be no doubt whatever in regard to that, and the extent to which you do that shows the extent to which your efforts have been successful. Now, I say that in this country, by the imposition of great burdens upon the agricultural population, upon the ordinary agricultural operatives, by the premiums you have bestowed, in high taxes and in other ways, upon those engaged in manufacturing pursuits, you have diverted capital from agricultural pursuits, and you have secured its investment in manufacturing enterprises. You have made that, by artificial means, profitable which, under ordinary circumstances, would not have been profitable. You have secured an investment for capital in certain industries far beyond the market you can find for the products, and so you helped the cities far less than you have hurt the rural sections; and so, too, you have seriously affected the income of the population, the aggregate income is less, you have diminished the income of tens of thousands, and increased the income of a few hundreds of the people. The forces which are at work increasing the population of the cities at the expense of the rural districts, which ought not to be in a new country, are perfectly obvious; they are plain to anyone who will give ten minutes' study to the subject, and the same influences are operating on the people of the United States. A few years ago an American economist pointed out that, if you draw a line south of Pittsburg, down to 1865 the progress of wealth east of that line was as to the progress of wealth west of that line in the proportion of 1 to 2½. The growth of wealth by investment in agriculture, by the number of people settled on the lands, converted waste districts into farms yielding a moderate income to those who took possession of them. Since 1865, when the protective policy came into operation, which led to the establishment of manufacturing industries, which led to the watering of the stock invested in various industrial pursuits, the growth of wealth east of that line is as to the growth of wealth west as 2½ is to 1. The very reverse of what was true during the first 80 years of the growth of the American republic is true from 1865 to the present time. The hon. gentleman said that part of our disappointment is due to the change in farming operations. I deny that. It is true that in the United States, before the war, the mechanical appliances for carrying on agricultural operations were nothing like so efficient as they have been since. Hundreds and thousands of those engaged in agricultural pursuits were withdrawn to constitute the armies of the north and south; then those who remained behind were obliged to exercise their ingenuity for the purpose of accomplishing the same result with a smaller population than had accomplished it before. That did not prevent as large a number being employed as before. It merely enabled them to produce the same result with a smaller population. But the unfailing genius that secured that result in agriculture would secure that result as regards manufacturing industries in this country, if they were left free to fight for their own existence. It has been well observed by a writer in a scientific work that the improved appliances employed in manufacturing boots and shoes had increased the practical power of labour in a year 55 per cent., and so if you were to retain a tariff which would prevent that stimulus sending its products into your market you would require a 55 per cent. tariff to do so, or to enable you to compete with a country which introduced those new appliances. So you are simply fighting against an advance in industrial appliances when you undertake to establish a protective system, which will continue old appliances, which will always allow the energy of the people to go to sleep and to secure profits which only ought to be secured by keeping abreast with the progress of the times. The hon.

gentleman said farming has been less remunerative than formerly. If you have improved appliances to carry on agricultural operations, if you are able to accomplish the same results with far less labour, then agricultural employment ought to be more remunerative than before. Why, then, is it not more profitable? The hon. gentleman talks as if there had not been a very great falling off in prices. Prices, he told us, were made better by this process of protection. Why, then, is farming less profitable when the appliances are more efficient than they were before? They are less profitable because the agriculturist has had taken from him a part of his profits, which were bestowed without any compensation on some one else. That is the cause, and it is the very same cause which has led some agriculturists to desert the rural districts and seek employment in towns and cities, and has induced thousands of others to leave this country and engage in agricultural pursuits where labour is more remunerative than it has been here. The hon. gentleman says it is true we are losing our rural population, but they are losing their rural population in the United States. When did they begin to lose their rural population in the United States? The hon. gentleman speaks as though there was a coincidence in point of time between the changes in the United States and here. That is not so; the census shows it is not so. Look at the census for the decade between 1870 and 1880, and what do we find? You find several of the New England States absolutely declining in population, to say nothing about rural districts—they all declined in that decade. Did they decline in Canada? No; because the system of protection had not been applied in Canada, though it had been applied in the United States. So the change in the condition of things in the United States dates from the introduction of the protective system, and the change in the condition in Canada dates from the introduction of the present protective system here? You introduced it later, and the results appear here later, and you have them travelling together as the shadow travels along with the substance. The hon. gentleman has said we have been preaching blue ruin. What does the census of this country preach at the present time? Does it proclaim the prosperity of the country, that this is a country where men can receive large rewards for their industry? Does it mean that all classes of the population stand on a footing of equality in these respects? Not at all. We have lost our population. Men do not leave the country where large sums of money are being made. The thousands and tens of thousands who went to the gold fields, did so to make fortunes quickly—in a shorter time than they could be acquired in industries elsewhere. The same influences that will lead men into the mining field will draw them into agricultural districts, if our agricultural industries are as profitable in this country as elsewhere. The hon. gentleman says we have preached blue ruin. I am not perfectly cognizant as to the colour. I do not care whether the hon. gentleman calls it blue or red, whether he looks up or down for the colour he has discovered. But I say we have preached the truth, which is an important thing which the people require to know. No people are ever injured by knowing what is true with respect to their position. It is a false idea of life to pretend to be more wealthy and prosperous than other people, when you are less wealthy and prosperous: to say you need nothing, when the people are leaving the country to escape the condition they find prevailing here. The hon. gentleman says: It is true we have lost 1,200,000 people in ten years, but what does that signify when we have spent $140,000,000 of money, and we have railways to every man's door throughout the whole territories of Canada? Well, Sir, what good is a railway in a solitude; what advantage are hundreds of miles of railway built in this country along which no settlers are found? Of what advantage is it to expend millions of money to increase the burdens of the people of this country and to diminish the value of property for the construction of railways, when the construction of these railways does not secure to you a population? I ask the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches to consider this: You have built railways, you have furnished appliances for the settlement of the county, and why do not the settlers come? Is your climate against you, is the soil incapable of sustaining the population, or what is the matter? Everybody admits that there is nothing wrong with the country and that it is capable of sustaining a large population; and why, then, have you been unable with all this expenditure to retain even the people that were born in this country during the past ten years? How is it that you have lost the whole of that population, and 300,000 of those who have come from abroad? How do you explain that fact? Why, Sir, it cannot be explained on any other theory than that the policy of the Administration has not been favourable to the progress and settlement of the country; and that policy and that system should be changed. Is not ten years long enough to try the experiment? You have tried it for ten years and with what result? Look at what you have promised and what you have performed. Look at the condition of the country at this moment, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no country where there is parliamentary government, or where there are free institutions, where the condition of the people is less hopeful than it is in Canada at the present time. It is not a question of ruin, blue or red; it is a question of fact. There is your own census, there is what your officers have reported to you. They state to you that the population of Canada has increased half a million instead of 1,800,000. Where are the rest of our population? Why, Sir, they are like the Blue Bonnets, they are over the border. How came they there? They are driven there by the policy which you have adopted and which you have eulogized this session. You tell us that we have preached the people out of the country, but what have the gentlemen on the Treasury benches been doing? Who preached them out of the country from 1873 to 1878? Who was it that talked about soup kitchens and about unemployed people? If the people of this country were unemployed between 1873 and 1878, why did they not go away? The Minister of Finance told us that that was the period when we lost the population, but why did not the census of 1881 show it. Compare the progress of the country in population from 1871 to 1881 with the progress from 1881 to 1891, and which is the more favourable? In which is there the largest increase in population? Can there be any doubt as to when the population was lost? The returns of the United States, which have been verified in a variety of ways by examin-

ations here, show that you lost in one year since you adopted this policy, a larger number of people than were lost during the five years of Mr. Mackenzie's regime.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says "no," but I say "yes." I say that during the five years that we were in office 123,000 people left this country for the United States, and I say that in the year 1882 there were 125,000 left this country to live in the United States. There were 2,000 more in 1882 than during the whole five years of Mr. Mackenzie's Administration.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If the hon. gentleman would allow me, I would like to say this: An examination was made by officers of the Canadian Government into the American statistics, and the result of the examination was sent to Washington. So satisfied was the American Government that the American statistics were inaccurate, that since 1885 the American returns have ceased to include the immigration from Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentlemen may cheer that statement but it would be of far more consequence to them, and of far more consequence to the country if they would undertake to ascertain its accuracy. I have looked into this question with a great deal of care, and so did the late member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and it is perfectly obvious, when you take the census of 1870 of the United States, and take the census of 1880 of the United States, and make the ordinary allowance for deaths, you have a number very nearly corresponding to the representations of the Bureau of Statistics at Washington. I do not care where they got across the border. I state the fact that they have crossed the border and they have settled in the United States. Now, Sir, let me state another thing. The Deputy Minister of Agriculture was called here before a Committee to contradict the American statistics with regard to the number of persons who immigrated from Canada to the United States, and that gentleman did contradict these statistics, and he stated that that population went into the North-West Territories, and that they had settled there. His report showed that there ought to have been 183,000 people there, when there were 120,000 odd short of the number when the census was taken in 1885. That statement of the number of immigrants settled in Canada compared with the census which has just been takens hows how utterly worthless are the statistics of that department taken under its present deputy. I say that the whole thing brings discredit upon the administrative action of the Government in that department. The hon. gentleman said that the people have not left Canada on account of the tariff. He said: We know that because the tariff of the United States is twice as high as the tariff tax in Canada, and it is preposterous to suppose that the people would leave Canada on account of the burdens of taxation, and go to a country where the taxation is so much higher. That was the argument of the hon. Minister of Finance. Well, the hon. gentleman has had pointed out to him again and again that the United States extend from the tropical regions into the high northern latitudes; that east and west, north and south, you have almost all the various natural products of the world embraced within the republic: that altogether you have a high tax against all the rest of the world, you have absolute free trade between forty nations, and the principles of free trade have operated very largely to neutralize the mischiefs that would otherwise flow from the policy of protection. Then again, they have active competition in most of their manufacturing industries. Their institutions are old, they are competitors with each other, and so far as these articles are concerned which are likely to be seriously affected by taxation, there are causes operating which tend to give them in a large degree the advantages that flow from the principles of free trade. The hon. gentleman persists in a policy of taxing the masses for the benefit of the few, and my hon. friend from South Oxford spoke about those who favoured this system of taxation, and for whose benefit it has been established, as knaves. Well, Sir, I am not going to use that expression. I say this, that knowing what we do of human nature, one refuses to see anything wrong in those things which largely benefit one's self. There is no doubt that many good men were slave-holders in the south and upheld slavery, regarding it as a system right and proper in itself; and the experience of the United States with regard to that matter, as well as the experience of every country which imposes high taxes and bestows for the time being large profits on particular industries, is that this prevents them seeing anything particularly wrong in the matter. Men do not read the moral law with any very great clearness through a profit of 40 per cent., and knowing that that is the case I opposed the introduction of this policy. I am satisfied that it is much easier to produce mischief than to get rid of it. I feel that men will much more certainly resist wrong which does not affect them personally than they will wrong in which they have a very deep financial interest; and so I think it was greatly to the interest of this country that that policy which the hon. gentleman and his friends have eulogized should never have been introduced into this country. The hon. gentleman said that there is nothing impure in the introduction of this policy; that the methods which have been adopted to raise money for election purposes are legitimate; that there is nothing improper, nothing wrong; that the wrong that was done was done long ago. Well, Sir, I am not going to discuss this question to-night. It is too large a question to discuss incidentally in connection with a consideration of the census. The hon. gentleman says: We are pure now, but public opinion and public men were not pure in your day. Why, he says, look at your Speaker, Mr. Anglin, he was a boodler; he was corrupted by a contract that was bestowed upon him by the Post Office Department. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman could have asked the Minister of Customs, and he would have told him that he had been tainted in the same way—that under a Government which existed from 1867 to 1873 he had published in his paper advertisements for the Government, to the value of several hundred dollars, and that he was sitting in Parliament at the same time. He could have told him that Mr. James Beaty, who was the proprietor of the *Leader*, was an extensive publisher of Government advertisements and that he received several thousand dollars from the public treasury while he sat on the floor of Parliament. He could

have told him that Mr. Rufus Stephenson, who was for many years the member for Kent, also had entered into printing contracts with the Government while he was a member of Parliament. He might have gone further, and he could have told the hon. gentleman that years ago, when Sir John Rose was a member of this House, a Mr. Bell had been elected for Russell, that Mr. Bell had a printing contract with the Government, that his seat was contested on that ground, and that Sir John Rose and others, who constituted the committee, reported that that contract was an exception to the independence of Parliament, that it did not come within the purview of the Independence of Parliament Act, and that Mr. Bell was allowed to retain his seat. When Mr. Anglin accepted a contract from the Post Office Department, he accepted it with these facts before him. He knew that Mr. Rufus Stephenson, Mr. Mackenzie Bowell, and Mr. James Beaty had all been contractors under the former Administration, and that they had sat in Parliament at the same time; and he knew also that when a Government was in office, of which Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Cartier were the chiefs, Mr. Bell, a supporter of the Administration, had his seat attacked in this House on that ground and nevertheless held his seat; and so Mr. Anglin, in accepting the contract, if he made a mistake, was misled by what had been done, and what had been decided by the leader of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put one question to him? Does he think that the conduct of Mr. Anglin in accepting that contract was proper?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say that according to the rule that had been laid down and observed for a long series of years, the conduct of Mr. Anglin was proper.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I ask the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I recognize that I speak only by courtesy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Anglin resigned his seat.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He could not help it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, because the very gentlemen who had whitewashed Mr. Bell, notwithstanding his contract, the very men who gave contracts to Mr. Mackenzie Bowell, Mr. Rufus Stephenson, and Mr. James Beaty, all of whom were supporters of the Administration, were the men who said that their former ruling was all wrong, and that Mr. Anglin did come within the purview of the Independence of Parliament Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I suppose you thought it was all right?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly, I think the law ought to be as it was; but, I think, Mr. Anglin was justified in looking at the law as he saw it had been settled, and in accepting the contract at that time. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to call his attention to another thing? He thinks Mr. Anglin ought to have vacated his seat, and gone back to be elected. Did Mr. Bowell go back? Did Mr. Stephenson go back? Did Mr. James Beaty go back? Did any hon. gentleman on that side of the House urge these men to resign, or point out the propriety of their resigning at that time? No, Sir; hon. gentlemen opposite have a different rule of morals and a different rule with regard to the independence of Parliament, to be applied to that side of the House, and as applied to this. Let me take another case. There was an hon. gentleman, a member of this House, who accepted an office of emolument. Afterwards he said: I will not take the salary; but, every hon. gentleman in this House knew that he had vacated his seat by accepting that office, the moment he accepted it. Did he go back for election? Did he say: By accepting the office of High Commissioner while I was a member of this House, I ought to recognize the fact that my seat was vacated, and go back for election? Not at all. What did hon. gentlemen opposite do then? They introduced a Bill by which they declared that in spite of the law he should hold his seat. They gave him the seat. He was not elected to this House by the people of Cumberland, he was elected by the vote of this House—by an Act of Parliament which received the sanction of the Crown. That is the way hon. gentlemen opposite undertake to apply the law with regard to the independence of Parliament. Then, Sir, I think there are gentlemen in this House who are in a worse position than Mr. Anglin was. I understand there is one hon. gentleman here, a supporter of this Administration, who organized a company to escape the independence of Parliament Act; but he has $5 of stock subscribed outside of himself, and he has received some $20,000 from the public treasury while being a member of this House. Do hon. gentlemen think that that complies with the law? Do they think that a fraud of that sort is a compliance with the Independence of Parliament Act? And what is the position of the *Gazette* newspaper? The hon. gentleman is no more independent with large printing contracts with the Government for ten years, because there are a few stockholders real or nominal connected with the *Gazette* besides the hon. gentleman himself, who has a seat in this House. Well, I am not going to discuss that subject further. There will be a more appropriate occasion for its discussion. But I say to the Minister of Finance that he travelled outside of the record, when he discussed what he called the boodle propensities of the Merciers, the Pacauds and the Langeliers. The hon. gentleman ought to remember the rule, that he who does not govern his own house well denies the faith and is worse than an infidel. Why does he undertake to regulate the affairs of Quebec, when he has so much to occupy his attention at home? I am inclined to think that the hon. gentleman's own conduct might be vastly improved. Does the hon. gentleman think it is quite in accordance with the law of Parliament and with his duties as Minister of the Crown to enter into a solemn contract with a party to do certain work for the Government for $4,100, and then turn round and pay to the same party $6,150. Is that a square transaction? Is there no boodling connected with that?

Mr. FOSTER. Will you take the responsibility of affirming that there is?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I tell the hon. gentleman that I do not believe that is an honest transaction.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you make a charge?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) I do not believe that is an honest transaction.

Mr. FOSTER. Make your charge and prove it. The man who does not do that is a coward.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And the man who did it is guilty of a breach of public trust.

Mr. FOSTER. Could you prove that I did it? Will you dare attempt to prove that I did it?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman paid out of the public treasury $2,050 for each round voyage which he had no more right to pay than I had.

Mr. FOSTER. You are a mean insinuator.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; take it back.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that to be allowed in parliamentary life? I rise to a point of order. Is this House to understand that you, Sir, will allow language such as that to be used against any hon. member?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I wish to ask you, Sir, and it is not necessary that I should strike the desk to do it, whether it is in order for an hon. member to accuse another of having taken dishonestly $2,000 out of the public treasury?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say so.

Mr. FOSTER. He did in his mean way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no necessity for an hon. member to strike his desk. I am here to keep order and see that the rules of the House are observed. No doubt the hon. member for Bothwell has gone a little too far in casting insinuations, which I do not think he should have cast. On the other side, the hon. Minister of Finance has used very strong language, and I think, therefore, both hon. gentlemen were a little out of order. An hon. member addressing the House should not make insinuations. I trust the hon. member for Bothwell will not make further insinuations—I hope he will not criticise in advance my decision, but listen to it—and that he will limit himself to discussing the question now before the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not going to criticise your decision, Sir, but I am stating a fact of very great public importance. I say that the hon. Minister of Finance saw fit to charge members outside of this House, representatives of the Crown in another Legislature over whom we have no control, and over whose conduct we have no jurisdiction, who are responsible to another body, with being boodlers and with having misappropriated public funds. I say we have to deal here with the public moneys of this Dominion of which the hon. gentleman is a trustee, and I say that he came to this House and asked for $60,000, for four services, that he entered into contracts for three, and that he did this in a most irregular and in my opinion improper manner.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say in my opinion. I entertain that opinion and shall ask the judgment of the House on the matter at a later period. And I say the hon. gentleman had made a contract with certain parties, by which the Government agreed to pay them a certain sum for certain services which were to begin in the one case on the 15th of November and in the other on the 25th of December, and he paid out, contrary to law and the provisions of the contract, $15,000 for services performed by these people voluntarily, not included in the contract, and which this House was under no obligation to pay, which he as trustee of this House had no right to pay out of the public money: and I charge him with applying that money to the payment of obligations that have no existence, so far as this House is concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. You do not go quite so far this time as you did before.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman may say that he paid that money to those parties.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It may be that he did, or it may be also that he did not. We do not know and we have a right to know.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, who is an old parliamentarian, must know that he is out of order, and that he is not at all dealing with the question before the House. A moment ago he stated that this question would come up by-and-bye when the accused would have an occasion to defend themselves. I hope, therefore, he will, as much as possible, keep to the question before the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was answering the hon. gentleman. He charged the Government of which I was a member with improper and dishonest conduct. I threw that charge back in his face, and told him that his own conduct was far from being, not only above suspicion, but above reproach. That is my right, and I am confining myself to my parliamentary rights in answering the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman had no right to speak of a former Administration as he did. That Administration was open to the criticism of those who sat in Parliament while it was in existence. He is the responsible party now and to this House he is responsible. I am calling his attention to the fact that he is not in a position to bring insinuations against his predecessors in office in this House, and much less is he in a position to bring charges against a Government that cannot constitutionally answer here the charges he brings against them. The Legislature of Quebec is the guardian of the public moneys of Quebec. It is that body which will have the right to investigate the wrongdoings of that Government if any wrongs have been done. That Government is responsible to that Legislature and not to us. I am not defending it, but I am defending the constitution of this country. I say that the constitution of this country ought not to be prostituted to any such purpose as the investigation of charges against Mr. Mowat, or Mr. Greenway, or Mr. Mercier, or any other person outside our jurisdiction. It is the business of this Parliament to investigate charges against this Administration, to take care of its own affairs, to guard its own money and protect its own interests. The hon. gentleman is not going to divert public attention away from the conduct of the Government here to the conduct of a Government somewhere else. I apprehend that the people of Quebec, as the people of the other provinces, are capable of self-government, and will take care of themselves. We are for certain purposes one people, we have a common fund as one people, and it is our business here to look after the expenditure of that fund and to leave other legislatures to dis-

charge their own duties and assume their own responsibilities in precisely the same way. The hon. gentleman told us that the country needed diversified industries, and so he was going by a high protective tariff to secure a diversification of the industries of Canada. I want to know whether the industries of Canada will not be diversified without Government interference. Look at the condition of things. Were there no blacksmiths in Canada, no waggon makers, no shoemakers or carpenters until the National Policy called them into existence? Is it necessary to call these industries into existence by the imposition of high taxes? I say there is no more necessity to do that in the case of a cotton manufacturer than in the case of a blacksmith or a shoemaker. They are all on an equality. The hon. gentleman cannot point to a new industry which has been called into existence since 1879 by the policy he advocates. We had cotton mills before 1879, and we had woollen mills, and we had manufactories of agricultural implements. There is not any class of manufactures brought into existence which was not in existence before 1879. The hon. gentleman admits that we have a good country, but he cannot deny that we have a very sparse population in that country. How is it that these people from abroad do not come here, or that those who do come here do not remain? How is it that we lose so many of our own people? It is simply because the hon. gentleman and those associated with him have misgoverned this country. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues produced a rebellion in the North-West and wasted eight millions of the resources of the people of Canada in putting an end to that rebellion. They goaded the half-breeds into rebellion, and then they say: You have kept the people out of the North-West Territories, when the people were kept out for a number of years in consequence of the course the Government took on that occasion. The hon. gentleman says we have a larger increase of population than we suppose, because our former census was very inaccurate. Ten years hence, if the hon. gentleman is then in power, he may tell us the same story. Who took the previous census? Under whose auspices was it taken? Under the auspices of hon. gentlemen who are now on the Treasury benches. Were they new to the business? Why, they took the census of 1871 as well as the census of 1881, and there is not an argument that can be used to show that the census of 1891 is accurate that will not apply to the census taken on the two previous occasions. We require a change of policy. The hon. gentleman reminds me of a story told by Disraeli that, when you want to travel on a new road, you had better not employ your old coach horses because they are sure to get off into the old track; but the hon. gentlemen have not proposed to take a new road, but they take the road they have been travelling for the last thirteen years. It has been pointed out to them that they have been driving the population from Canada, but they have not changed. They are going to adhere to their policy, as the doctor in "Gil Blas" adhered to his policy, which was that of bleeding every one of his patients though he might kill them in the operation. So they are going to adhere to the National Policy no matter what disasters it may bring on the country. The hon. gentleman has said that the course taken by the Opposition has led to the large exodus from Canada. It is not the Government who are to blame; it is the Opposition: and so the hon. gentleman would have the country believe that the Opposition exercise a far more powerful influence and are more trusted than the Government. That may be, but the Opposition have not proclaimed the propriety of the people leaving Canada. They have proclaimed the propriety of getting rid of the Administration, not because hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are anxious to occupy the Treasury benches——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Here are ninety members on this side. They do not all expect to get into the Government, but they are all anxious that the hon. gentlemen opposite should leave the Treasury benches, and that is because those hon. gentlemen have shown themselves utterly incapable of governing this country aright. They have had a trial over and over again. They have been given every possible opportunity of vindicating their policy and redeeming their pledges, and they have egregiously failed, both with regard to their policy and with regard to the pledges they have given. They assured the people that they would give them economical government, and they have added to the cost of governing this country over fifteen millions of dollars, for the hon. gentlemen have charged year by year large sums to capital account which should appear in the ordinary expenditure of the country. The hon. gentlemen have told us that they were in favour of closer trade relations with the United Kingdom, and they say they have not discriminated against the people of Great Britain and in favour of the people of the United States; and what evidence do they undertake to give to the House to establish the proposition they lay down? They say our trade with England was smaller in 1876, 1877 and 1878 relatively, as compared with the trade with the United States, than it is to-day, and that, therefore, it is evident that they have not discriminated against Great Britain. That is no evidence of anything of the sort. No such proposition can be established by such proof. The truth is that, in 1877 and 1878, the manufacturers of the United States were harder up than the manufacturers of the United Kingdom, and so they cut down the prices of their goods, and a larger amount of American goods came into Canada because the manufactures of the United States were more depressed than those in the United Kingdom. When prosperity was restored, a change began to take place, and it was a proof of the difference in the prosperity of the manufacturers in the two countries from which we imported our goods, and not any proof of the effect of the tariff imposed by us upon American and English goods. Take English goods. English blankets pay a higher tax than American blankets. English shoddy goods pay a higher tax than the lighter goods which we get from the United States. Sir Francis Hincks, who was thoroughly conversant with our tariff, pointed out again and again, when he was editor of the *Journal of Commerce*, that the tax upon English goods under our tariff was necessarily higher than that upon American goods nominally of the same class. That is true, and it is as true to-day as it was in 1879, and in 1881-82, when Sir Francis Hincks discussed the question. I shall not weary the

House by discussing all the various propositions that were enunciated by the hon. member for Ottawa. He said there were thousands of people leaving Dakota and going into the North-West Territory. I should be glad if that were so: but I remember this, that Dakota and the North-West Territories and Manitoba began their settlement about the same time; that in 1870 there were about 13,000 people in each; that to-day Dakota consists of two states, and that the northernmost of those states has something like half a million people at the present time. Now, it is said that those states have a larger population to draw from than Canada has. That is a mistake. If these were the only states that are being settled there might be some force in that argument, but settlement is going on in Kansas, in Nebraska, in Texas, in California, in Wyoming Territory, in Montana, as well as in North and South Dakota. In Minnesota and Wisconsin there is a rapid progress in settlement, and if you take any one of them and compare it with the progress of settlement in our territories you will see that an incomparably greater progress has been made in population in any of these than there has been in the North-West Territories or in Manitoba. So I say that the progress of this country has not been at all satisfactory. Hon. gentlemen admit that, and I asked this House now seriously to consider the causes of this stationary condition of our country. I say that that cause is largely due to the tariff that the Government has imposed upon the people of this country. You have undertaken, by highly artificial means, to stimulate branches of industry that do not require your stimulus, or if they need it, they were unsuited to the country. You have undertaken to apply to a number of provinces that lie in the same latitude, that have the same products, a policy that the United States have undertaken to apply to a territory embracing almost every variety of climates and every variety of natural productions. The policy which is sufferable there, which is not advantageous anywhere, but which is less mischievous there, than, perhaps, in any other country in christendom where it could be tried, is wholly inapplicable to Canada. You require to change your policy, to reduce your taxation, to enlarge your trade with the neighbouring republic, to minimize your expenditure, to dismiss a large number of your officials, to quit your boodling operations, to quit your contract business, out of which these boodling operations spring, before you will secure the confidence of the people of this country and secure population from abroad. As long as this policy which you at present pursue, out of which so much evil must necessarily spring, is continued, just so long will there be serious mischiefs connected with the government of this country, and just so long will you fail to secure settlers in the rural district which now require occupation. You admit that thousands of miles of railway have been built in tracts of country where there are no settlers. How are you going to secure the settlement of that country? There is an amount of capital that is latent to-day; there are hundreds of millions of capital existing by nature in the soil of this country. Why not, then, permit it to be utilized? Why undertake to burden all those who undertake to settle that territory, in the interest of a few people who go to the towns and cities of Canada? If we had in Canada to-day a population of eight or ten millions in our rural districts our towns and cities would be larger, they would be more prosperous, you would produce a natural prosperity, you would have a natural as opposed to an artificial growth, and you would have a very much healthier condition of things than you have at the present moment. Let your towns be the emanation from the wants and necessities of the rural districts. But you have kept your rural districts a solitude; you have, by a series of burdens upon the people of this country, sought to stimulate the growth of population in the towns and cities. I say that is a most unsatisfactory condition of things and I shall support cordially the resolution of my hon. friend from South Oxford, because that resolution points to a policy preferable to that which is pursued. Hon. gentlemen opposite smile complacently, as if they possessed all the wisdom of christendom. Sir, hon. gentlemen might do that after a boom, such as existed in 1882, when you imposed, by your boasting, upon the unthinking portion of the population of this country. But during the past eight years can hon. gentlemen say that the National Policy has been a success? Look at the condition of the North-West, look at the value of real estate, look at the present pecuniary or financial condition of the agricultural population of this country, and say whether the policy you have pursued is one that is satisfactory or not. Sir, the people of this country have no confidence in the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. They have pronounced against the so-called National Policy.

An hon. MEMBER. When?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They pronounced against it in 1891. In the last election campaign the hon. gentlemen were obliged to talk reciprocity: they were frightened into talking reciprocity: they misstated the relations between Canada and the United States upon that question. They sent a deputation to Washington that remained there five minutes and then returned, and they promised a deputation in October. The hon. member for the City of Ottawa says that deputation will not succeed, that it cannot succeed, that, if it were to succeed, it could only do so by ruining the agricultural interests of this country, and by seriously and injuriously affecting the manufacturing interests. And so I ask: What are the hon. gentlemen going to Washington for? Are they going down to say that they do not want a treaty? Why, Sir, they got Mr. Van Horne to say, last winter, that a treaty would be a very disastrous thing, that reciprocity would be a very disastrous thing for everybody but a powerful railway corporation. I think that it is an advantage to a railway corporation to have trade with the United States, and I think that what is good for a railway corporation would be good for every person in this country. So we say that the occupants of the Treasury benches ought to be dismissed; they have been weighed in the balance and found wanting; they have proved themselves "flies on the wheel," utterly incapable of governing this country, utterly incapable of managing the affairs of this country. Why, Sir, according to their own representation, the administrative business of this country is run by men in the public departments over whom they have no control, for whose conduct they are not respon-

sible. Now, the people of this country want a Government that will be responsible for those who are serving under them, and such a Government the people of this country are entitled to have.

Mr. CRAIG. I have no intention of talking long at this hour of the night, and at this stage of the discussion. We have listened to several very long speeches, which have wandered in a great many directions and covered a great deal of ground. I will here express the opinion that I consider it very unfortunate that we cannot discuss a question of this kind without so great a display of party feeling. I regret exceedingly the scene which occurred a few moments ago, and consider it was quite unnecessary. I will endeavour, in the short time I shall address the House, to confine myself strictly to the subject under discussion. I do not suppose I can say anything new on the subject; I do not pretend I can suggest anything very original, but I do intend to confine my remarks and any suggestions that have occurred to me as to the cause of this small increase in our population to the question under consideration. In considering the matter at this stage of the debate, the question has occurred to my mind, what is the object of the Opposition in raising this question? One might expect that in the House of Commons both parties on a matter of this importance, on a subject that concerns the whole country, might join together and consider seriously the cause of the small increase in the population of the country. But, unfortunately, it is too evident that the object of the Opposition in raising this question is not to find out the cause I have referred to, but it is to create a feeling in the country against the Government in power. This, perhaps, is what we might expect; but at the same time I think it is rather unfortunate on an occasion of this kind. What reason has been given by hon. gentlemen opposite when discussing this question for the small increase in the population? We have had one reason given, and one only, and that is the bad government of this country by the Conservative party. We have had the National Policy held up to ridicule; we have heard a great deal about boodling, about corruption. But I maintain this view is entirely one-sided, and when the National Policy is assailed, and when its ill-effects are depicted, and when the small increase of population is attributed entirely or almost entirely to that policy, I maintain that it is entirely an assumption on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. If they could prove this they would have accomplished something. But they have no proof. I admit they would have some ground for this assertion if under their regime the times had been better then they are under ours. But what are the facts of the case? Were they better? We all admit they were worse. We can assume with much more reason that, except for the National Policy, our population would not have increased as much as it has increased. We heard a good deal about cities and towns attracting population from the country. I am very glad our cities and towns have increased their population, and I think the Minister of Finance was perfectly correct when he said that in this age there is a tendency to go to cities. This is the age of cities. We find it so in all the countries of the world. I am not surprised at this. We all know what attractions cities offer to young men of enterprise and to young women who want to go out and see the world. There they find interest and excitement, and they learn about great fortunes being accumulated. A great many men who have gone to cities would have done better to have stayed away from them. Many think that they too would accumulate large fortunes. They find to their disappointment that such are only accumulated by very few. But at the same time these things tend to draw away from the farm and from the smaller towns a large portion of our population. I said I intended to speak very briefly, and so I will not discuss at length any points I may raise. We have heard about the United States attracting the population of this country. I am not surprised at that, and I hold one of the great obstacles in the way of an increase of population in this country is the very fact that lying alongside of this Dominion is a country like the United States. It is a great country. We all admit that. It has an enterprising people; it possesses large cities about which we hear a great deal; not only so, but their advantages are much exaggerated by those who live there. We in this country find some of our newspapers and some of our public men decrying our country. But I think we would look in vain over the whole of the United States to find any man or any newspaper decrying their country. They all unite in praising the country; they say it is the greatest country under the sun, and while a great deal they say is true, a great deal is exaggeration; but at the same time this exaggeration has its effect on the young men and women and they are drawn there, and when they get there a great many stay there. But while a great many young men have left this country and gone to the country south of us, I hold a great many more would have gone and been compelled to go had it not been for the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party. I do not see how that admits of any contradiction or of any arguments. I look back a few years before the National Policy was inaugurated, and what do I find? I find depression existing on every hand. We have had reference made to the failures recorded by Dun, Wiman & Co. I was in business at that time, and was almost afraid to open any circular that might come from Dun, Wiman & Co. on account of the number of failures that were occurring, and almost every business man found some of his debtors failing from day to day. I will say here that while the United States possess great advantages, and while a great many young men who go there succeed remarkably well, and I am proud of the fact that Canadians who go there succeed well, at the same time I wish to say that from my observation and experience those who go there work a great deal harder than they did in this country. I have heard it stated by many who have lived there that if our young men worked as hard as they do there they would do about as well here as there. While I do not admit that the National Policy is the cause of this small increase of population, there are some reasons which may be given for this small increase. We have already heard the reason given that the census was taken this time in a different manner from 1881. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said that we say that the census was not taken accurately in 1881. That is not our contention; but we say the census then taken was taken on a much more liberal basis than in 1891, and, therefore, a large part of the decrease is due to that fact. But there are other reasons why our population has not increased more

rapidly. We all know there has been a great emigration to South America. The Argentine Republic has been talked up exceedingly, and a few years ago emigration was directed largely in that direction. We know the efforts made by Australia to secure emigrants from the old country, and the unrestrained efforts put forward by the immigration agents of the United States. Those agents depreciated Canada; they talked about its climate, and they represented that there was nothing but winter all the year round. I remember a few years ago visiting New York—I was living in Toronto at that time—and some merchants who had never visited Canada asked me how deep the snow was in Toronto, imagining it was seven or eight feet all through the season. When I told him that there was no more snow in Toronto than in New York they did not believe my statement. The people when they are leaving the old country are met by these agents and are told that Canada is a country with a very severe winter, and that they could not live there. I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases they are able to back up their statements as to Canada being a poor country by the speeches and writings of hon. gentlemen opposite and their party on this country. I know that these hon. gentlemen disclaim this, but to my mind it is perfectly clear that the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite—I will not say all of them—and that some of the articles written in their organs, have a tendency to keep people from this country. I am quite satisfied that if I were in the old country and read some of these Liberal speeches, and the articles published in the Liberal newspapers, this would be the last country I would come to. Another reason why our population has not increased more rapidly is that desirable immigration is falling off even to the United States. A short time ago I read a magazine article which stated that the desirable immigration has very much fallen off for the last few years and that the undesirable immigration has largely increased, and in the United States they are considering the desirability of excluding that class of immigrants altogether. I am not surprised, therefore, that there has not been a larger immigration to this country. Sir, I regret as much as hon. gentlemen opposite can do that our population has not made a greater increase, but at the same time I think we ought to rejoice that it has increased as much as it has, under all the difficulties this country has had to contend with. I cannot vote for the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), because I do not believe that our policy has had the slightest effect on our small increase. In fact, I believe the very opposite. I find that there are fifteen towns and cities in Ontario which have made an increase in their population of 2,000 and over during the last ten years, amounting to an aggregate increase of 150,000; and, Sir, the thought occurred to my mind that the National Policy was in a great measure the cause of the increase in these fifteen cities and towns. In these fifteen cities and towns, as I have said, there has been an increase of 150,000, and it appears to me that this constitutes a very good home market. That amount at the very lowest estimate would represent a consumption of about $200,000 worth of food a week, or we might say $10,000,000 a year, which is an increase of $10,000,000 a year in our own market in the Province of Ontario during the last ten years. I do not think that is a very bad testimony as to the effects of the National Policy. I object to unrestricted reciprocity, the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite, because I believe firmly that unrestricted reciprocity would destroy this home market. If the United States make a treaty of that kind they would make it for one reason, and one reason only. What they are looking for is an outlet for their manufactures, and I am informed that in the United States they can make enough boots and shoes in six months to last a whole year. While we hear that country puffed up a great deal, and while we hear it said that protection enriches the few at the expense of the many, I wish to say in reference to that large and important industry in the United States, that it is said by an excellent authority that if the manufacturers come out this year with undiminished capital they will be doing very well. I regretted very much to hear the remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who stated that the Civil Service is all corrupt. I think it is most unfortunate that such a statement should be made, because I consider that this statement is unfounded, uncalled for and unjust. There are in the Civil Service many honourable men. I may say more than that: the most of the civil servants are honourable men. We admit that there have been some cases of which we are ashamed; but, I for one, am determined that I will not defend any wrong-doing wherever I find it. At the same time, Sir, I am determined as well, that I will not condemn without proof. Why, even a murderer has that chance; he is not condemned without proof, and are we to condemn the whole Civil Service because a few have been found guilty? I repudiate such a doctrine, and I will maintain the Government in their expressed determination to have the country governed under business principles. I am glad to see that the Premier stated that this was his intention, for I believe it is the true way to govern this country; but I must condemn, and I think every member in this House ought to condemn such wholesale charges of corruption as are made for party purposes and without the least foundation. Now, Sir, what is the remedy offered by hon. gentlemen opposite, and how do they say the population of this country would be increased? Their remedy is very simple. They say: Put us in power and everything will be right. If we had a guarantee that this would be so we might be quite willing to take them at their word and put them in power; but, Sir, we have no such guarantee. Our opinion is directly opposite, and judging by the past we have a right to form that opinion. What is the policy of the present Government? Their policy is moderate protection for all classes. We not only protect the manufacturers of the country, but we also protect our farmers to a very large degree. The policy of this Government is the encouragement of the agricultural industry, and the Government of the country deserves credit for what they are doing in this respect. Our policy is also honest and economical government. I know that some hon. gentlemen opposite will say that they have not seen much signs of that; but, Sir, I am satisfied from what I have seen that we will have an honest and an economical government, and so far as recipro-

city goes, we are willing to have reciprocity with the United States, to the extent that it is advantageous to both countries. To hear some hon. gentlemen opposite talk about free trade with the United States, one would think that this country had a McKinley tariff. I regret that the United States saw fit to adopt such a tariff; but I believe that in a very short time the people of the United States will see it to their interest to reduce that tariff, and to make it correspond more nearly with our own. Although our population has not increased to a greater extent I do not despair of the future of this country, but on the contrary, I look with hope to the future. We have a great country. I believe, Sir, that Canada is the best country in this world. I believe that the people of this country are as comfortable as any people on the face of the earth. I believe that taking the people of this country as a whole, in our cities, in our towns, and upon our farms, they are more comfortable than any other people in the world. If we want to find distress we must go to New York, or Chicago, or Kansas, or Dakota, but we cannot find it in this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes try to make people believe that this country is on the road to ruin, but they cannot succeed in that: because while people are in the enjoyment of comfortable homes, and are making a comfortable living, it is very hard to make them believe any such doctrine. I believe, Sir, that the advantages of this country will soon be recognized. It is only within a few years that we have had a highway to the North-West. Before that, immigrants had to go to the Western States, but we find now that the emigration of our farmers, and farmers' sons, from the older provinces, is largely to our own North-West. This North-West will gradually fill up, and the best immigration agents in the world are men in the North-West who do well, and who write to their friends in the old country to come out and do as they have done, and I anticipate from the bountiful crop which the North-West is producing this year a large immigration in the next year or two, and I am satisfied that we shall see it. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the people of this country imitate the people to the south of us. Let us not be ashamed to praise our country. Sometimes I think they are given to braggadocio and boasting; sometimes I think they have too much spread-eagleism; but, on the other hand, I think that in this country there is too little of that sort of thing. In this country we are too modest; we are ashamed of ourselves, I do not know why. Let us not be ashamed to praise our country wherever we go, and tell its virtues and advantages; let us have faith in its future; and I believe that those who live to see another census will have cause to rejoice in the country's progress.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Before entering upon the discussion of the question under consideration, I wish to congratulate the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Craig) on the moderation with which he addressed the House. I really believe this important question of the decrease of population, which we have to consider, should, as the last speaker said, be discussed without any party spirit. But, unfortunately, if we have witnessed in this debate a little more heat than there should have been; if personalities were brought in to the discussion the hon. member must especially attribute it to his own friends, and not to the members on this side of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to the House with a motion blaming the Government for the fact that the population of the country has not increased in a rational and reasonable manner, and stating that the Government is responsible for it. To this, instead of answering in a straightforward manner, instead of explaining away the figures that were submitted, the hon. Minister of Finance contented himself with saying that the Quebec Government was only composed of boodlers. I ask, Mr. Speaker, if that was a proper answer to the accusations that had been brought against the Government? Therefore, if we have had a somewhat acrimonious discussion, if party spirit has sprung up in this debate, it is due to hon. members on the other side of the House, and especially to the hon. Minister of Finance, who began by launching accusations against our friends. I think I ought, just here, answer a charge which has been brought against the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) by the member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont). Here is another man, who, instead of debating the question in a serious manner, has made it his mission to fling the most unfounded personal accusations right and left. The member for Bagot told us that the member for West Huron, who had spoken of corruption, was perhaps more corrupt than those he accused, because it had been found in a trial that he had spent $1,400 to get elected. And the hon. member for Bagot pretended having taken this information from a newspaper, which he said was the *Empire*. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the Montreal *Gazette*. The *Empire* and the *Gazette* are two papers that get from the same source their inspirations and the information they serve to their readers. Now, the *Gazette* had published a few days before that very accusation brought out against the hon. member for West Huron by the hon. member for Bagot. And what do I find in the *Gazette* of the 1st inst.? The *Gazette* is obliged to retract, to say that it published an untruth, and that what it had written against the hon. member for West Huron was wholly unfounded. And yet, in face of this, we see the hon. member for Bagot renewing this charge against the hon. member for West Huron, when the very newspapers where he had found his information were obliged to take back the filth they had thrown at the hon. member. Here are the words of the Montreal *Gazette* on the subject:

"On the 24th ultimo there appeared in the *Gazette* a letter signed "Ex-Huronite," asking if Mr. M. C. Cameron, M.P., was the man who, in the days when the Liberals undertook to elevate the standard of public morality, 'spent $20,000 corrupting his constituents, was unseated and disqualified and afterwards whitewashed by the Mackenzie Government,' and concluding with the assertion that, if Mr. Cameron was this man, 'a more corrupt man does not disgrace the House of Commons.' As a matter of fact, it has not been established that Mr. Cameron spent $20,000 corrupting his constituents; he has not been disqualified, and, of course, did not need to be whitewashed. The expressed belief that he is 'one of the most corrupt men in the House of Commons,' was, also, of course, uncalled for. The letter should not have been printed."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is useless for me to insist any further upon this point. I quote this article to show the hon. member who has just taken his seat that he should have listened to his friends, that he should have heard what was said by the hon. Minister of Finance first, and then by the hon.

member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh), and the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont), before accusing us of throwing party spirit into the debate. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that our population has not increased as it should have. There is no doubt that in that respect we have been considerably disappointed. This has been admitted on both sides of the House. The question now is to find out what the cause of the evil is. The question is to find out what causes have brought about this decrease of population. We had in 1881 a population of about 4,300,000. This year the census gives us a total of 4,800,000—that is to say, an increase of 500,000 merely. There is no doubt, that from the reckonings of all the authors on political economy, and from the record of the past in our country, such a small increase should be a great disappointment. Instead of a paltry increase, the population should be almost double what it was in 1881. I will only quote one author, who corroborates his own opinion by the opinions of three other authorities, to show that the increase of the last ten years is not normal. Mr. Garnier, quoting the opinion of J. B. Say, of James Mill and of Rossi, contends that the increase in population of a country should triple itself every twenty-six years. Here are his words:

"Experience teaches us that about half of the human beings perish before the age of twenty-six. * * * This shows that if every couple cannot bring up twelve children, able to reproduce themselves, they can bring up six who are capable of populating as much as the first couple did; from which it may be concluded, that, where there is no obstacle to this multiplication, the population of a given country would triple itself in twenty-six years."

And this opinion, Mr. Speaker, admitted by all authors on political economy, agrees with that advanced yesterday by the hon. member from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that is to say, that our population should have increased 2½ per cent. per annum. Well, instead of that, what do we see? Instead of an increase of 2½ per cent. a year we barely have an increase of 500,000 in the period of ten years; therefore, we find ourselves considerably short of the reckonings of all the political economists and all the persons who in their own country are interested in these matters. We must, then, look for the cause of this depopulation, and find a remedy for the evil. It is the important question which imposes itself now, and it is the only one that I intend to deal with. There is no doubt that there is an evil, and that it should be remedied. What is the evil, and where does it exist? Is it in the decrease of births? Is it to be found in a large emigration? Or does it rest in the financial administration of the country? I believe that we must look for the cause of our disappointment more especially in the two last propositions. The hon. member from Bagot has contended that we should not look only to the Federal Government for the responsibility of this state of things. Let us take note, Mr. Speaker, of this important admission from a Conservative. He holds that the Federal Government is, to a certain degree, responsible for the small increase of our population, since he says that we must not hold the Federal Government totally responsible for it, but also the Local Governments. Here is an indication of admission—I may say a complete admission—coming from a Conservative fully devoted to his friends, and who is forced to admit that if our population decreases we must attribute it partly to the Central Government. I do not need to enter into the question of what is the cause, in the Central Administration, which has brought about this decrease of population. This suffers no doubt, and has been many times asserted. We owe it to the famous National Policy, inaugurated in 1878, a policy which was to bring us prosperity, and which was to protect the farmer as well as the manufacturer, as the hon. member for Durham just said, but which, after all, has only protected a few monopolists at the expense of the public at large. This is the cause which is responsible for this decrease of population. Let us examine a moment the proposition of the hon. member for Bagot, who contends that the Local Governments, and particularly that of the Province of Quebec, should be held responsible to a certain extent for this decrease, or rather for the small increase of the population during the last decade. Mr. Speaker, I fail to see what influence a Provincial Administration could have on the population. The hon. member for Bagot said that it is the Local Governments which control matters of property, of civil rights, and of public instruction, and that consequently they should be held responsible for the decrease of population. Well, I ask, was such an absurd proposition ever heard of? Because the Local Governments have control of the rights of ownership, they should be responsible for the decrease of the population! But what bad laws have they passed touching property which must have had this result? He mentions none, and yet it seems that if he wants to show the responsibility of the Local Governments on that ground he should mention where lay their faults. And he did nothing of the kind. Let us now examine the other point. The hon. member says that the Local Government, in their administration of public education, have failed to spread instruction sufficiently among the people. The people have not been taught enough, and that is why the population has decreased. Well, I challenge my hon. friend to find in any treaty on political economy a theory so absurd. The instruction given the people can in no way influence the increase or decrease of population. No fact, no figure can be called to service and prop up such a theory as this. But will my hon. friend deny that the system of public instruction which we have in the Province of Quebec has, to a great extent, been organized by his friends while they were in power? Does he not know that the fundamental law of public instruction, in the Province of Quebec, was passed in 1874, when his political friends were at the head of affairs, and he himself was, I believe, a member of the Quebec Legislature? Is the law which obtains now not due to the Conservative party, and not the work of a Government counting the hon. Secretary of State as one of its members? Well, Mr. Speaker, if public instruction is defective in the Province of Quebec, if it was defective until the time the Mercier Government came into power, we owe that entirely to the Conservatives who were in power at that time. But we are told the Local Governments do nothing to spread public instruction. Well, we only have to examine what the Mercier Government did since 1887 to convince ourselves that there never was in that province a Government which did as much for the diffusion of public instruction. What has the Mercier Government done? First, he opened night

schools in order to allow the workingmen of the cities to get instruction. Then, he also opened, in agricultural centres, in country parishes, night schools where the farmers can go and get instruction. These schools are free, and any who wish to learn may attend them. Can it be said after that that the Mercier Government did not do as much as it was possible to do to spread education? But I find supremely ridiculous the position taken by the hon. member, when he says the farmers of our province are blockheads, incapable of knowing the requirements of agriculture. I must resent this gratuitous insult flung in the face of our farmers. I assert that they are altogether as intelligent, as capable, as well educated as they could be desired to be under the economical conditions of our country. One must be at his wit's end to say such things. And the one who says that is a representative of farmers in this House. It is the hon. member for Bagot, the mandatory of those farmers, who has the audacity of declaring in the face of this House that his constituents are imbeciles, that they are incapable of understanding agricultural interests. The hon. member for Bagot contends that the reciprocity advocated by the Liberal party cannot be expected to remedy the present situation by increasing our population. He contended further that the present Federal Government has done all in its power to reopen commercial relations with the United States. Well, I would like to know where is a proof to be found of this assertion. Did that take place in 1878, when the Government imposed on goods coming from the United States such high duties as to render it impossible for the Americans to export anything into this country? Was it when it raised between Canada and the United States a Chinese wall which is still standing to-day. Was it, then, that the Government tried to establish commercial relations with the United States? Could this Government hope for any favours from the Government of the United States when it treated our neighbors as it did? Is it possible for this Government to renew a treaty, to reopen commercial relations with the neighbouring republic, when insults and libels are constantly hurled at the United States, as they were by Sir Charles Tupper and the principal Conservative chiefs during the last election? Was it by such a conduct that the Conservative party shows its intention to renew commercial relations? For my part, I fail to see in this any proof of the statements of the hon. member for Bagot. Mr. Speaker, it is contended that the effect of reciprocity would be to ruin industry. I am far from believing in that. On the contrary, I believe that if we had reciprocity this day, instead of seeing the manufacturing industry ruined we should see it developing. And this is the reason why: We know that the manufacturing industry is declining, that in a few years the industries that have not lived exclusively on monopolies, the industries that have not subsisted on the people's money, shall have mostly disappeared, and poverty, the most dire that we have ever witnessed, shall spread over the country. I need no other proof of this than a short dispatch which I clipped this morning from the Montreal *Gazette*, a Conservative paper, whose mission it is to favour as much as possible the interests of our opponents. This dispatch refers to a cotton factory at Dundas, in the Province of Ontario. I believe that this manufactory is not very far from the place of residence of the hon. member who has just spoken, and he ought, before having taken his seat, to have given us some information about it. Here is the dispatch:

"Yesterday afternoon the Dundas Cotton Mills were sold by auction for $150,200 to Mr. Thompson, of the law firm of Thompson, Henderson & Bell, Toronto. The mill cost $800,000 originally."

Now, it is contended that the cotton industry, which is protected by our opponents, is prosperous. And here is a cotton mill, having cost $800,000, being sold for a paltry $150,000; and this is called a prosperous country; and industry is represented as prosperous. Well, Mr. Speaker, with such eloquent figures as these under our eyes I cannot conceive how such conclusions can be reached. I was just saying that industry is not only declining, but it will be completely ruined in a short time. Under what condition do we find it now? It has to meet serious competition, a competition which it certainly could not resist. For instance, in the county next to mine, in Chambly, there is a manufactory, which at first made much money, but which competition has caused to sustain considerable losses during these last years. Large manufactories have now been inaugurated through the country, and they can find no outlet for their goods. There is an excess of production, and the manufacturers are obliged to sacrifice their goods or keep them on hand. This latter alternative is not very favourable, I well understand, but the former is no better. The consequence is, that far from being prosperous, the manufacturing industry is in a precarious position. It is imperative that we should improve the situation and restore healthy conditions of trade. And what is to be done? Only one remedy exists, and this remedy is in the policy advocated by the hon. leader of the Opposition, in unrestricted reciprocity. With unrestricted reciprocity, Mr. Speaker, we will have markets where to send our surplus of production, where to send what now remains on our hands. While if we remain in the position in which we now are the farmers shall be ruined, the manufacturers shall be ruined, as I have shown, and most of us will be forced to emigrate to the United States to earn a living. I have much pleasure in endorsing the views expressed by the hon. member for Bagot in respect to encouraging sugar beet growing. I understand that this industry can give the Province of Quebec most important returns. I understand from the investigations made by the Mercier Government that the Province of Quebec is certainly one of the countries the best suited for the satisfactory production of the beet. And since, owing to the policy of the present Government, we cannot have a market, since we cannot export our hay to the United States, I will understand that we should try to remedy this state of things and find something to take the place of the growing of hay. The growing of the beet is the one which offers itself most favourably. The best hay lands are also those which can best be turned to beet growing; and it is to be noted that in France and Belgium the land given to the growing of the sugar beet is for the most part the land which was formerly given to the raising of hay. Why should we not profit by the example? Why should we not adopt the policy of the Mercier Government, which consists in encouraging the cultivation of the beet? I see that the Government has this year

consented to give for two years to the beet a premium equivalent to the protection which it formerly had as a raw sugar material. As was observed the other day by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), it was a step in the right direction, but it was an insufficient one. We know that the Government is opposed to the growing of the beet, as the hon. Minister of Finance showed in his Budget speech. But why would farmers not be protected? Don't we give premiums to fishermen? And is not iron also favoured with a premium? True, the latter is only intended to protect Sir Charles Tupper, but anyhow iron is protected. Well, I repeat it, why could not beet growing be protected? Why could not the farmer be protected, so that he might emerge from the perilous position in which he finds himself now? Here is the census, which shows that our farmers emigrate to the United States in large numbers. We must then look for the means of preventing this emigration. We must keep our people here; and to do that we must grant this premium to our farmers. I believe they certainly deserve it as much as the fishermen, if not more, owing to the sacrifices they make. I believe that the hon. member for Bagot, after having declared himself in favour of limited reciprocity, now attempts to argue that if we had reciprocity, even limited reciprocity, the cattle trade would suffer. He contends that if we had unrestricted reciprocity the Americans would be dangerous competitors to the farmers. Now, it seems to me that if we had reciprocity, limited to agricultural products, the Americans would make us the same competition, for they could export their cattle as well as we. Therefore, by pronouncing against the importation of American cattle the hon. member for Bagot pronounces against limited reciprocity, such as he has preached and still advocates, as well as his party. I would not like to enter into the discussion of the question of scandals, which was raised with so much acrimony by the hon. member for Bagot. I do not mean to follow him on that ground, nor to bring into this debate matters which should remain strange to it. This is not the place to discuss the doings of the Quebec Government. I believe that our own stock for discussion is large enough here. We have enough of a supply of boodlers here without importing any from the outside. And I believe that instead of speaking of Quebec boodlers the hon. member for Bagot might well have said a word regarding those we have here in Ottawa. He could have spoken of the Kingston graving dock, the Point Lévis graving dock, the Esquimalt graving dock; he could have spoken of Bancrofts, of Arnoldis, of Bronskills, of Senécals. It would certainly have been more in his province. Instead of speaking of Pacaud's voyage to Europe, he might have explained the flight of Bronskill, of Senécal and of McGreevy. He might have told us why it is that the latter does not dare declare here what he did with the money he received—whether he gave any to Ministers or not. He might have told us why it is Mr. Senécal does not want to come here and say whether he gave any money to the Secretary of State or not. It would be better to bring these people before the Committees of this House and make them unbosom themselves. I believe that the disappearance of these boodlers shows that behind them were guilty ones of higher ranks who probably ordered their flight to save their own heads from the steel of public reprobation. But let us examine this so-called Quebec scandal. What was the great crime committed? Was there any embezzlement? Has the Province of Quebec lost a single cent, Mr. Speaker? There was a vote of $280,000 to a responsible company which would undertake to build the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. A responsible company was formed, a company composed of friends of the Federal Government, and this company undertook to build and complete the road. What did the Quebec Government do? It turned over the $280,000 which had been voted into the hands of this company. And why was it that the Quebec Government had to demand the formation of a new company? It was because there were boodlers among the old shareholders, boodlers of whom some are to be found in the Senate and some had a seat in the House of Commons. There were Robitailles, Riopels, McGreevys, who had pocketed $700,000 of the Government money without proper consideration, and the Provincial Government wanted such robberies and such misappropriations to stop. That is what the Quebec Government did, Mr. Speaker. It handed over to this new company what it was obliged to give it, and the company used it as it chose. If the company gave money to Armstrong and to Pacaud it was money that belonged to it. If anybody lost anything it was that company. I regret to have to enter into those details. I know they are not the subject-matter of this debate, but we have been led to do so by the hon. Minister of Finance and his friends, who followed in his footsteps. Mr. Speaker, I do not know to whom the hon. member for Bagot referred when he said that former members of the Quebec Legislature came to launch charges at random in this House. Did he refer, perchance, to the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte), and to the charges brought out by this fearless member, who could be cowed neither by high personages nor by powerful political influence, and who pledged his seat to denounce the guilty, and reveal the robberies which for years have been committed to the detriment of the public chest? If he referred to that hon. member, he must know that the charges which this member brought, instead of being frivolous, and instead of being brought at random, were well founded. He must have been made aware of it by the disappearance from the political field of the two principal personages implicated in these scandals, namely, the Minister of Public Works and the former member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy). Mr. Speaker, I cannot conclude these few remarks without drawing the attention of the House to the fact that the county which I have the honour to represent is the one, I believe, in which the population has decreased the most during the last ten years. The County of Rouville is wholly composed of farmers; the population is exclusively agricultural; and if we now have to find, after ten years, a decrease of 2,500 people in the county, we owe it wholly to the fiscal policy of the present Government, who would not give our farmers the markets they needed for their hay and their other products. There is no doubt that this is the only cause of the evil, and that we can assign to no other reason this decrease of population which we find in almost all the agricultural counties of Quebec and Ontario. I think the hon. member for East Grey stated that the only counties which

have experienced a decrease of population are counties which are represented by Liberals. Well, he should remember that the County of Rouville was, for the last twelve years, represented by a Conservative—a rather uncertain kind of a Conservative at times, but a very decided one during the last few years. It is to be noted that although represented by a Conservative, the county was none the less reduced by 2,500 in its population. I do not know whether the presence of this Conservative member went for anything in the decrease of the population of his own parish, but I find that in that parish the population, which was 4,000, has been reduced by 1,700. When the hon. member for East Grey gets to looking for examples of decrease of population in counties represented by Conservative members during the last decade he can turn his eyes on Rouville. I do not want to uselessly occupy the time of the House. I think I have disposed of the charges brought against us by the member for Bagot. Much more might be said about the Quebec Government; but, as I said before, this is not the trial of the Quebec Government. We would not be afraid of such a trial, however, and we could stand it to advantage, as no other Government ever contributed so much as the Mercier Government to the prosperity of the Province of Quebec. No other Government ever developed to such a degree its mining, agricultural and lumber industries. And had it not been for the deplorable policy of the Federal Government the Province of Quebec would enjoy greater prosperity than it does now. I wish to mention but one example of the degree to which the Quebec Government favours the agricultural classes. While the Ottawa Government wanted the disappearance of the beet-root sugar manufactories; while they wanted that the farmers who realized anything out of this industry should get no protection, what was the position of the Government of Quebec on this question? They sent to France and Belgium practical farmers along with the Prime Minister, to enquire into the best means of implanting this industry into the country, in order to remedy the bad effects of the policy of the Federal Government. There, we see the Quebec Government trying to protect an industry which should be protected by the Ottawa Government. There, we see the Quebec Government trying to protect, in the interest of the farmers, an industry which the Ottawa Government wants to ruin. But there is an interesting detail to note in connection with what the Quebec Government did for agriculture, and it will show what degree of interest these Conservatives take in the farmers. When the Mercier Government appointed that commission to go to Europe and study the question of the beet growing, they asked the co-operation of the Conservatives. The Government asked among others the member for Bagot, in the Local Legislature, to go to Europe and study this question. But what did these people do who now wish to appear so devoted to the farmers' interests? What did Mr. McDonald do, the local member for Bagot, the political godson of the hon. member for Bagot in this House? He refused to co-operate with the Liberals, and that, no doubt, with the consent, if not under the direction of my hon. friend for Bagot. These are the gentlemen who claim to protect the farmers. These are the gentlemen who profess devotion to the interests of the farming community. There is only one Government that has worked for the agricultural classes, and it is the Mercier Government. On the other hand, there is a Government which has always worked for the ruin of the farmer, which has always refused and still refuses to do justice to him: it is the Ottawa Government, and it is that Government which is responsible for the decrease of population which we find to-day.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, at this early hour of the morning I would not inflict a speech upon the House, but that as the representative of the Agriculture Department here I thought I had better, perhaps, make for myself and partially for the department a statement in reference to the motion which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has moved in amendment to going into Supply. Especially I want to take the earliest opportunity of replying to some remarks which the hon. gentleman addressed to the House yesterday evening. In the first place, I wish to criticise the amendment which he moved, in which he states that the population of this country in 1881 was 4,324,810. Then he goes on to state that it further appears from the report of the Department of Agriculture for the year 1890 that the total number of immigrants stated by the department to have come into Canada was in the neighbourhood of 866,171. Later in my remarks I will deal with that. The next statement of the hon. gentleman is, that the total increase of the population of Canada in the ten years now past was 504,534. That part of his assertion was perfectly correct; but the next portion of it is that at the rate of 2¼ per cent. per annum the natural increase of the population of Canada during the last ten years would amount to 1,077,531. His figures are perfectly correct, but how he arrived at 2¼ per cent. per annum as the natural rate of increase in the population I do not know. The hon. gentleman had the means of ascertaining accurately what the natural increase of the population of this country was. If he had taken the deaths in the country in 1881, and the births, and deducted one from the other, by a simple calculation he could have ascertained the percentage of natural increment in the population of the country. According to the calculation which I have possessed myself of, I find that the total births of 1881 were 138,347, and the deaths, 63,413; deduct the deaths from the births, and the product is 74,934, which represents the natural increase; and the annual percentage of increase in the population of the country, according to that data, is 1·7 per cent. Mr. Taché, who took the census at that time, showed that the figures were incorrect, because he was not fully informed of the death rate of the country; and I am informed by the statistician of the Department of Agriculture that the natural increase of this country now is in the neighbourhood of 1·12 per cent., or very nearly the same as the natural increase of the population of the United States, as shown by the census taken last year. We all know that the increment of population decreases as the population increases, and the natural result would be that the increase of the population for the decade just past would be less than the increase of the decade of 1881. The census returns of the United States prove that; and the statistician, attached to the department, by a careful calculation shows that the only

natural increase of the country upon which we can depend is in the neighbourhood of 1·12 per cent. per annum. This is much higher than the natural increase of the European populations. Taking that, then, as the basis of calculation, the natural increase would give a population in Canada in 1891 of 4,836,849, or an increase in ten years of 512,039. So that you will see we have retained in this country the natural increase of population and no more. This brings us to consider what has become of the immigration into this country. According to the agricultural returns it amounted to 578,846. There is in addition to this number 307,331 entered in the Customs' returns. But we all know that there can be no reliance placed in the Customs' returns as indicating the increase of the population of the country. These may have been returned Canadians who had been in the country when the last decennial census was taken, and who had gone to the United States and returned. They may have been entered in the returns two or three times, and we may strike off altogether from the estimate the increase in the population of the country of the 307,331 which were supposed, according to the Customs' returns, to have come into this country. We have no means, as the hon. gentleman who interrupted said, of knowing what the actual exodus is from the country. The United States authorities in 1885 found that the statements of people going into that country were so incorrect that they stopped altogether taking any count of the people going from Canada into the United States. We have nothing to show what the exodus was from this country from 1881 to 1891. Then we have only to account for the immigration which is supposed to have come into this country, numbering 578,846. Every one who has lived for years in this country knows that a large portion of the increase in our population have been in the habit of going to the United States. I well remember those who departed from my section, in my boyhood, to settle in some portions of New York, and afterwards many of them went to Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Minnesota, Kansas, Dakota and many other portions of the United States. A great many also went and settled in our own section of country. The history of this country, ever since it has come under British rule, has shown that 30 per cent. of our increase of population by immigrants coming into the country have departed for the country to the south of us. Now, what showing have we? We have retained from 1881 to 1891 the natural increase of population. By what means have we retained that increase? We have retained it by the policy adopted by this Government, and the figures show it. I am astonished that any hon. gentleman on the other side would get up and deny the figures. Do they not show that our urban population has increased 33 per cent. ? There is where we retain the surplus, the increment of our population. Would not the exodus have been as great if the population of our cities had not increased? Do not statistics show that in nearly every state of the union there has been a decrease in the agricultural population, except in the newly settled states? The hon. member for North Norfolk, who is so fond of quoting statistics from the other side of the line, ought to study those of the statistician in charge of the census of the United States, and these figures will prove conclusively why it is that in settled provinces like Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island our population has not increased more. He will find that in the New England States, in Maine, there is no increase in the population, that Vermont has not increased in population, that the agricultural portions of Massachusetts have decreased in population, that the agricultural portions of every one of the New England States have decreased in population, and that any increment they have had since 1881 is caused by the increase of population in the cities. Let me show hon. gentlemen a map which was published by the census commissioners of the United States, showing in what portion of the population there has been an increase. If he looks over it, he will see that in the agricultural portions of New York there is a decrease in population. He will see that in Massachusetts, Connecticut, Michigan and Indiana there is a decrease in the agricultural portions, and he will see that only in the new states, such as Kansas, Minnesota, Dakota and other purely agricultural states, is there a large increase in the agricultural population. There is a decrease in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin and Iowa, in all the agricultural portions of those states; and if he will read this pamphlet, he will see the reason of the increase and decrease of population of these states. It says:

"Commencing with the pastoral stage, where the population is widely scattered, it passes through the agricultural stage, where the population though still scattered, is much denser, to communities engaged in manufacturing and commercial pursuits, in which the population is in the main congregated in towns and cities.

"The change from the first to the second of these stages of growth of this country has been accomplished quietly and without other symptoms than the accompanying increase in density of population. The change from the second to the third stage, on the contrary, is frequently a forced change, produced by the competition of other agricultural regions. The first symptom of approaching change, consists in a reduction of the rate of increase, or it may be an absolute decrease of population. This is followed or accompanied by an aggregation of the people in cities, and, finally, as manufactures and commerce become established, by an increase of population at an accelerating rate.

"Southern New England, together with most of New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey, have passed through these stages, and have now reached that stage in which commerce and manufactures are thoroughly established and constitute the leading industries. The people to a large extent have withdrawn from the country and are grouped in cities and towns. The population which two or three decades ago was almost at a stand-still, is now increasing rapidly under the stimulus of profitable occupations. The central parts of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and New York, however, are still in the transition stage, and are not gaining in population.

"In the upper Mississippi Valley and in Virginia, where the map shows great areas of losses, the community is in a transition stage from agricultural to manufacturing industries. The rich lands of the farther western states are drawing their farmers away to reap larger profits, while other industries have not yet attained such a footing as to attract or retain population in their place. The condition of things now prevailing in these states was suggested by the census of 1880, when Ohio was seen to be in this transition stage. Since then this transition wave has extended westward across Indiana, Illinois and well into Iowa."

In Canada, by the adoption of the National Policy, we have retained our manufactories. Does the hon. member mean to say that there would have been an increase of 33 per cent. in the cities if it were not for that policy, if the manufactured goods which we consume in this country came from the United States and Great

Britain, and would there not have been more of a decrease in the agricultural population of the country? It need only be stated to be understood. Yet the hon. gentlemen state that if they ruled the destinies of the country, they would make such a change as would keep the agricultural population at home, by making a commercial union or closer trade arrangements with the people to the south of us. The effect of that would be that our manufactures would altogether go to the south, and we would be left with no manufacturing people in the country. They say the system of protection is an old fad which has been exploded long ago, but the panacea which they propose is not to keep a 25 per cent. tariff, but to adopt the United States tariff, which is about double that. The United States have thrived and prospered under a protective tariff, and why should hon. gentlemen opposite use the argument against us that such a tariff is ruining this country? They saw the fallacy of that argument, but they say that there is no country in which protection would thrive better than in the United States because of the character of its population and climate. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that if the United States has adopted the policy now in vogue in Great Britain, they would have thrived better; but he says that the policy of protection is not applicable to the people living on the north of the St. Lawrence. Where is the distinction? Why cannot it apply equally well here as there? Why is it a panacea to keep the population in the country here to adopt a tariff double that from which we are now, according to those hon. gentlemen, suffering? The argument is an absurd one. If double the amount of protection is a benefit to the people to the south of us, why would not half the amount of protection prove to be half the benefit to us? As to the exodus from this country, every child knows that, from the day when the first Governor of British North America wrote his celebrated despatch in which he stated the reasons why the people went to the south, why they went to those fertile agricultural fields which they could cultivate with a smaller expenditure of capital, down to recent times, it was natural for people to go to those fields which they could make available with a smaller expenditure than they could in old Canada. You find the same thing existing in the States of Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and New York. From those states a larger proportion go west than from Ontario. The dividing line, the love for our country and the love for the flag under which we live, keeps 10 per cent. more of our people at home than of the people of those states. It is true, that the increase of our population is not as much as we would wish, but we have retained by our policy the manufactories of the country; we have increased the urban population by 33 per cent., and we have sent 173,000 of the young men of our country to the North-West. In the next ten years we hope to divert the population which for the last fifty years has been moving to the south; we expect by the policy of this Government, by the building of railways and the increased prosperity of this country, to divert that population to Canada. Any person has only to open his eyes in order to see the increase in wealth and prosperity in this country during the last decade. Look at the increase of the deposits in the banks, look at the amounts deposited in our savings banks, look at the new enterprises in which we are engaged, look at the increase in our manufacturing industries, look at the amount of tonnage which we move on our railways, look at the interprovincial trade which we have developed while keeping up our trade with foreign countries, and no man can make the people of Canada believe that, though the population has not increased to the extent we desire, the prosperity of the individuals of the country has not greatly increased. That is patent to everyone, and everyone knows that our country is prosperous and progressive, and that we are opening up a field for the surplus population of this country, and that the prospect is that in a few years we will see one of the finest and greatest nations in the world established here. Yet these hon. gentlemen offer us a panacea and a cure for the movement of our population, and that is to obtain reciprocity with the United States, to give up the manufactures of this country to the people to the south, and to fling us back into the position of being simply an agricultural country, which all over the world is known to be a poor country. We were forced to adopt the policy of the people to the south of us in order to retain our own people within our own borders.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But you have not done it.

Mr. HAGGART. We have kept within our own borders the natural increase of our population. We intend after this to increase the percentage year by year, and to see that not only the natural increment, but also the result of immigration, shall be kept in the country. Perhaps I have said enough on that subject, because the hour is late and I intended my remarks to be principally devoted to a speech of the hon, member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan). I might reply to an unjustifiable attack made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) on the Finance Minister. He almost accused him of making a contract with certain parties, and making an increase from $4,000 to $6,000 without any authority from Parliament or any authority from his colleagues.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). His colleagues could not give him authority.

Mr. HAGGART. The inference he desired us to draw was that this was for the Minister's own benefit. He said this in reply to an accusation made against him by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in reference to the boodling newspapers of the country, and he replied that there were other boodlers than the newspapers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt.

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to that charge and in his desire to defend his own colleague, he arose to defend Mr. Anglin, and why? Because a colleague of mine, the Minister of Customs, had a similar contract, is that a justification for boodling? If it is a justification for boodling, it is a justification for all the charges made against the hon. member.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That was not my argument. My argument was this: There was a certain interpretation put upon the Independence of Parliament Act in the case of Mr. Bell, of Russell, by a committee of which Sir John Rose was chairman, that was followed and recognized as law, and I referred to the case of the Minister of Customs, and

Mr. Beaty, who represented Toronto, and Mr. Stephenson, who represented Kent, to all of whom contracts for printing had been given before the contract was given to Mr. Anglin, and all sat in this House.

Mr. HAGGART. Because there was an improper decision given, as hon. gentlemen must admit it was, in certain cases, it justified Mr. Anglin. At least these parties took contracts in their own name, but Mr. Anglin farmed his out. The hon. gentleman should not have replied so warmly to the Minister of Finance, because the Minister was only instancing that if it was wrong in the case of parties who received money from the Government for the purpose of doing work which they honestly performed, and which we believe in every case they gave full value for, it was wrong for him to retort and say that the hon. gentleman had appointed a Speaker in the House who did the same things, and perhaps worse. But I intend to answer the accusations which have been levelled at this Government, in respect to the public debt, as being one of the causes which keep immigrants from coming to this country. Now, let me ask who is responsible for that debt? The debt of this country consists of about $237,000,000. The total provincial debts assumed were $109,000,000. Is not every hon. gentleman opposite as responsible for that as the Conservative party are? When we entered Confederation it was one of the conditions of the Union that the Dominion Government should assume all the provincial debts, amounting, as I say, to $109,000,000. Is not every man on this side of the House, is not every Reformer in the country, as responsible for that sum as any Conservative that stands in this House? Again, one of the conditions upon which Nova Scotia and New Brunswick entered Confederation was the building of the Intercolonial Railway. The expenditure upon that is somewhat over $40,000,000, which added to the provincial debts assumed, makes $149,000,000. Was not every member of the Reform party just as responsible for that expenditure, and did it not accept the responsibility as well as the Conservative party, for the building of that road? Then, there are $32,000,000 expended on the canals of this country. Was there ever a voice raised by those hon. gentlemen against that expenditure? Did they not build the canals themselves? Did they not make extensions to the canals? Add that $32,000,000 to the last total, and we have $181,000,000. Is not every hon. gentleman opposite responsible for that just as much as we are? Do they say that they are not responsible for the expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway? Sir, if they had an opportunity, would they not have expended the money for the purpose of completing that magnificent enterprise? Does any hon. gentleman opposite say that that money was ill-spent, or if they had an opportunity of building the road themselves, they would not have done so? Add $60,000,000 to the last total, and it makes more than the entire debt of the country. We will say nothing of the expenditure on capital account for the purpose of other improvements, for the building of the Prince Edward Island Railway, or what was expended on capital account for the acquisition of the North-West, that was expended on Dominion lands, expended on public works throughout the country, but confine ourselves simply to the canals, to the Intercolonial Railway, to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to the debts of the provinces, and you still have more than the entire net debt of the country at this time. Yet they get up on the stump throughout the country, as I have heard them again and again, and as they do in this House, and say that the Conservative Government are responsible for the increase in the debt of this country, and not one of them would dare to get up and say that the expenditure was not a proper one, that these different undertakings ought not to have been gone into. Have they shown, with the exception of two or three millions, how they could reduce the amount of money which we levy for the purpose of carrying on the business of the country? Not one of them. I have heard the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) endeavour to show how it could be reduced two or three million dollars, yet they say that the taxes imposed upon the people by an unscrupulous and incompetent Government are a reason why the population has not grown faster. They may talk in that line as long as they like, but the figures are too clear, too well known by the people, for the latter to be imposed upon by any such argument. Everyone in this country is responsible, the one as well as the other, for the debt of the country. I admit that the expenditure may possibly be decreased, and the Minister of Finance is doing his best to economize in the expenditure of the country, and I hope he will succeed; still, it can only be decreased by a small amount, and the expenditure of this country must continue to be in the neighbourhood of what it is at present. Now, last night the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) charged the Government with corruption. I think that hon. gentleman must have a fellow-feeling for everyone who is guilty of corruption, and he should not be so anxious to parade before the people the disgrace of his country, if the facts are as he stated. Now, what would they do in England under a similar condition of things? If there were corrupt contracts made, if there was peculation, if parties were receiving commissions, would the Opposition of that country get up and hound the Government as corrupt and incompetent? It has occurred again and again in England, but no such charges were made against the Administration. All the efforts made by the Opposition in the English House of Commons were not in the direction taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, they were in the other direction, for the purpose of assisting the Government; they deplored the crimes which brought mutual disgrace upon the people of the country. Every effort made by the Opposition in the British House of Commons was in that direction, and there was no charge made such as the hon. gentleman hurled across the floor of this House against the Ministry of the day. Let me quote some of the statements made by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) in his remarks the other evening. Some of his remarks were in regard to a question that is before a Committee of this House, and I will not transgress the rules by adverting to it this evening. I believe the whole of his remarks during that debate were not pertinent to the question, but I may be permitted, as the hon. gentleman was permitted the other evening, to refer to this subject. He said that events were transpiring in this country and were at present being brought to light, which caused immigration to shun the shores of this Dominion. In regard to the Kingston dock, he stated:

"I pointed out, in connection with the Kingston graving dock, that it was proved there was a clear steal in that matter from the public treasury of $190,000."

I remember the pleasure with which he rolled out "steal from the public treasury of $190,000." Where did he find his facts? Where can he adduce a single proof in support of his assertion? The statement is false. The amount of the contract is well known, and every hon. gentleman on the other side knows what the amount of the contract was. It was let to the lowest tenderer, although the hon. member for Bellechasse may say it was a forged tender or anything else. The amount of extras for increasing the capacity of the dock was only $30,000. Where does he find that the amount of the contract price has been exceeded beyond the extra amount which the Order in Council gave authority to expend—$30,000? Where does he get $190,000? Only out of his imagination. There is not a word of truth advanced in support of the charge. I have the figures here, and I read them the other evening. I will, however, give them again, and I should like to hear any hon. gentleman opposite deny the statement. The original contract price was $260,000, and the amount of the expenditure for enlarging it was $31,000. Let me give the amount expended up to date. The amount paid to Bancroft & Connolly on account of the work was $256,000. The total amount estimated was $401,844. The total expenditure was $450,000 or $456,000. The extra expenditure is made up as follows:—

Valves—paid at contract prices—so much per pound of iron, $3,000; caisson—under separate contract—Dominion Bridge Company, $18,000; hauling gear—paid contract prices, $2,000; pumping plant—separate contract, John Inglis & Sons, $23,300; engine and boiler house, &c., separate contract, P. Navin, $11,000; shop tools, $2,500; coal shed, $1,000; fencing and gates, $2,500; shores, wedges, bilge blocks, $2,500; blocks, storehouse, &c., $2,500; residence for dock master and engineer and dock office, $5,000; electric plant, $2,500; expenditure, 1888-89, for site, preliminary work, &c., $33,763.

Yet that hon. gentleman rises in this House and says there was a steal of $190,000. How long are charges like that to be made in this House and rung through the country? Is there not honour enough among hon. gentlemen opposite to lead some of them to rise and deplore that such statements as that are made by any hon. gentleman? Is he to vilify public men and to state in his own manner across the floor of the House that there was a steal of $190,000? Then he said in the next place:

"Am I out of order in drawing the attention of Parliament to the fact that, in the construction of the Tay Canal, constructed, as I believe it was, for the benefit of the Postmaster General, there was a steal of at least a quarter of a million? Is it any wonder that, in the face of these things, we cannot retain our population, and that any immigrants we do receive flee from our country as if it were a plague-stricken spot?"

What does he mean by a steal of $250,000? He almost insinuated that I had some interest in it. I may state, and I do not know what effect it will have on the hon. gentlemen opposite, that neither directly nor indirectly did I receive a copper for any political purpose or on any pretext whatever, nor did I have any dealings whatever with any contractor on the Tay Canal, nor in any manner or way did I ever use my influence for the purpose of getting any man work on the canal. Yet that party will rise and say there was a steal of $250,000. The estimate of the prices for the work completed may have been underestimated by the engineer; yet the hon. gentleman rises in his place and makes that statement; and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they will associate with a party who rises and declares without having a single tittle of evidence to support his statement, that there was a steal of $250,000. Then he said:

"Rumours were abroad in Canada, rumours were abroad across the international boundary line, rumours were abroad in the mother country. Is it any wonder that with these extraordinary facts published abroad the tide of immigration should be very narrow and should remain here but a very short time? Does everybody not know that the Department of the Postmaster General is notorious from one end of Canada to the other—so notorious that it has been the subject of discussion in the public press? So notorious has it become that it has been the object of denunciation from almost every pulpit in the land. The Postmaster-General, a Minister of the Crown, charged with these crimes, remains silent and dumb."

Who is my accuser in a case of this kind? Who is the gentleman who rises on the floor of this House and accuses me? I almost feel like Cicero who was accused by Clodius before his peers in Rome, and can say: *Clodius me accusat.* He was a man guilty of all the crimes in the calendar and who yet brought Cicero before his peers. This same gentleman with whom I have been in the House for a number of years must remember the celebrated Tuckersmith Bill. Did he not, after the decennial census, when a measure was introduced of gerrymandering the constituencies, come into this House and because he had a Liberal majority at his back, when his election was protested on his return for the riding he represented by a majority of only 81 when the riding was nearly equally divided as to population, there being very little difference between the divisions, seek to get Tuckersmith added with its Liberal majority of 206, when he was turned out by the courts? He did not present himself for election, Tuckersmith was not added, the Senate stood by us and struck out the Bill. Is that the gentleman who in the courts of this country had personal charges of bribery and corruption and debauching his constituency brought against him, and who had to admit that he spent from $14,000 to $16,000 in the election? Is that the gentleman of which the Court of Appeal of the country said, that if the judge in the first instance had only reported him for personal bribery, there was enough evidence to disqualify him, and that they would have disqualified him? That is the gentleman who gets up in this House and accuses me of crimes, on which I will say something hereafter, and on which I will say something now in so far as they affect this question. That is the party who gets up in this House of Commons of Canada with a clear record and accuses me of the atrocious crimes which have been heralded from one end of the country to the other. That is the same gentleman who speaks of the Liberal party of this country as the pure party of the country, who have an immense following in this House of nearly ninety members, and in their name, he tenders to the moral leader of the Opposition the support of the moral and well-behaving people of Canada. I have no innuendo to make against the leader of the Opposition in this House. I know nothing of his character, either moral or otherwise, but the idea of the member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) getting up in this House and tendering him the moral support of the country, is something

astonishing. What crime have I been guilty of? Of no crime that I know of have I ever been guilty. I know the innuendoes and the insinuations which have been spread broadcast from one end of the country to the other, and from my place in Parliament now I deny them. They are as false as the parties who make them; they are as false as the parties who give them circulation. Is there any manliness or honour left in the slanderers? Is there any manliness or sense of decency left in the individual who will charge a number of innocent ladies, many of them supporting perhaps a sister or a mother and who have no other means of support than working in my department? I do not know most of them, I never had any conversation with them, and with none of them have I ever passed an unchaste word. Are they to be charged for the purpose of making political capital against the Postmaster General of this country? I defy the men who make these vile charges. I have been accustomed to accusations of that kind from my boyhood upwards. I am able to take my own part in this House or anywhere else, but is it a satisfaction to those men that poor, innocent, guiltless ladies throughout the country, should have charges hurled against them, in which there is not a word of truth? Talk about honour; if these slanderers have no honour, at least humanity should be in the breasts of some of them. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say nothing more upon that question, further than to again give it a most indignant denial, and to all the statements which these men have made to that effect, here from my place in this House of Commons I state that they are utterly false and incapable of proof. I have trespassed on your time and on the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, but I have felt it necessary that I should make this reply. I have made no personal or private attack on the hon. gentleman who is opposed to me. I know him from his boyhood upwards. If I know anything about his character, privately, I am above making any accusation against him. I shall not take advantage of anything against him, nor shall I descend to any such tactics here. It would neither benefit me nor injure me. He may make those charges against me if it so suits him, and I shall suffer as well as I can, but I shall not revenge myself by making any charge against him or making any accusation against him, and he should remember that perhaps I feel these slanders as keenly as he would if the same statements were made about himself. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the patient hearing you have given me at this late, or rather early hour of the morning, and I am sorry that I should have been compelled to make such an explanation to the House.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Speaker, I do not trouble the House very frequently——

An hon. MEMBER. Do not apologize.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I do not apologize, but I merely say that I do not trouble the House very frequently, and this being a very important question I hope the hon. members will do—as they usually do when I speak—give me a patient hearing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question; call in the members.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am sure that you are all weary just as well as I am. I am sure you are anxious we should come to a vote just as well as I am, and I will not detain you very long, after the many speeches we have heard to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The more noise that will be made by these ungentlemanly men, for I cannot call them anything else, the longer I will be detained. I think that a member of Parliament when he comes to represent a constituency should have sense enough to behave himself when an hon. gentleman is addressing them in a respectful way upon the issues of the day, and any gentleman who has not sufficient respect for himself cannot expect that others will have respect for him. I want to draw the attention of the House to some very serious and untruthful remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat in reference to my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Cameron). He says that the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) acknowledged in a court of law that he expended from $14,000 to $15,000 in an election that was contested at that time.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That was a lie.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman saves me from telling the truth on that, for he has characterized that statement as a lie, and the hon. gentleman who made that statement, if he wished to confine himself to the truth, should have looked at the record of the court which I now hold in my hand, and from which he could obtain the real facts. That shows that he did not intend to express the truth on that particular question. I say that when an hon. gentleman stands up on the floor of this House and casts reflections upon hon. members in such a way as that, he should not be believed further in anything he says upon the question. The hon. gentleman knows just as well as any person in the country knows, that there have been irregularities in regard to his department. He knows very well that sums of money were paid to parties represented to be sick for several months in succession, when there was no guarantee that the party was sick.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Do not get uneasy, gentlemen. Every hon. gentleman in the House knows that nearly every department of the Government that we had the opportunity of investigating has been proven guilty of the charges brought against it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question; question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). And these gentlemen will get up and state that only a very few belonging to the various departments have been accused and found guilty. Certainly not; but had we the time and opportunity to go through the various departments from the first to the last, I believe we would find among them a very large percentage of irregularities; and, Sir, this country to-day blushes in shame when the scandals are carried on the wings of the journals throughout this country. Many Conservatives as well as Reformers say that there is a sink of corruption in Ottawa that should be removed, and those who preside over these departments, if they did not know what was going on, were unfit to fill the positions to which they were appointed. Will you tell me that a person at the head of a department should not be

close enough in contact with the business and the details of that department to prevent such irregularities, scandals, boodlings, and hookings of money as have been proven during the last two or three months? Hon. gentlemen know, as well as I know, and in their sober moments, talking among themselves, they admit that there has been great dishonesty in the different departments.

Mr. FOSTER. Question; question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. Minister of Finance, who calls "question," devoted nearly half his speech to matters that did not pertain to this House at all. He spoke in regard to the business of another Government, entirely apart from this Government, and now he is the first to call "question." The first speaker this afternoon, during his hour and a half speech, did not speak five minutes upon the question before the House.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the member for Ottawa? He is talking so fast that I cannot hear what he says.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I merely stated that the hon. member spoke an hour and a-half or two hours this afternoon, and that during that time he scarcely spoke ten minutes in reference to the question before the House; the hon. gentleman knows it to be true; and while he went from Dan to Bersheebah and around by Australia and returned by New Zealand, speaking on every question he had ever read upon, the Speaker never called him to order; but as soon as hon. gentlemen on this side diverge to the right or the left of the main question, they are frequently called to order.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Does the hon. gentleman say that I spoke beyond the limits of order to-day? I do not understand his English, if it is English.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I think the hon. gentleman spoke so much this afternoon that he got muddled, and he hardly knows what position he was in. Now, with regard to the exodus, it is a very serious matter for this country. Hon. gentlemen may talk about the want of increase in our population as lightly as they please; but I tell you that we have been fighting the battles of this country for so many years that every one of us, without a single exception, should feel sadly disappointed at the results shown by the census returns which have been placed on the Table. But we are told in language eloquent and emphatic, that the Liberal party have been the cause of this want of increase, that they have belied this country and decried it, that they have run this country down during the last ten years on public platforms and in their places on the floor of Parliament. Sir, every single speaker on the other side who spoke in this debate said that this party had decried the country; but not one single line from any member of the Liberal party has been quoted to show wherein they decried the country. I deny it *in toto*. There is no party in this country, there never was a party in this country, that stood so manfully for the interests of Canada as the grand Liberal party, which now stands just where it stood before. It is true we have pointed out the deficiencies of the Government and the flaws in their policy; we have argued from day to day against their large expenditures of money, and against the fiscal policy which they have established. But while we were pointing out their iniquitous effects and their influence for evil, never did we decry the noble country of which we are the inhabitants. This is one of the most glorious countries on the continent of America. It has grand natural resources, it has an intelligent, enterprising and pushing people, and it has large and increasing facilities for trade. But what we ask is, why in the face of that greatness, people will not come and live among us as they do among those adjoining us? I think it was the Finance Minister who said yesterday that the United States received a larger proportion of immigration during the last decade than we did. That is not so. They received 5,500,000, which is only 10 per cent. of their population of 1880, whereas we received 866,000, which is 20½ per cent. of our population of 1881.

Mr. FOSTER. It is all very well to make your argument.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman knows that on that basis all calculations are made in reference to the census. Suppose that in one place there was only one individual this year, and two in the following year, that would be an increase of 100 per cent. Do they not count the increase in the smaller provinces on that basis? The Postmaster General said that the highest natural increase is about 1·1 per cent. annually. Sir, in the last census of the United States, the natural increase is put at 1·04 per cent. per annum, or 14 per cent. in the ten years, which has been fully realized. Calculating our increase on that basis, we should have had an increase of 605,000, without any immigration. 886,000 immigrants came to Canada during the last decade, who expressed their intention of making Canada their permanent home. Now, the natural increase and the immigration would give us 1,491,000 of an increase instead of 504,000 as the census returns show. Our population on this basis should be 5,816,000 instead of 4,830,000 as the census returns make it, or 986,000 less than we had reason to expect under the usual increase. We were told to-day that the National Policy came from the people. The National Policy never came from the people, but was devised in one of the secret chambers of this House, and was brought before the people in 1878 under false pretenses, and the people were deluded by the promises then made. They were told at the end of the great depression which had passed, not only over Canada, but over every country in the world, that the Liberal party were responsible, that they were "flies on the wheel," and incapable of coping with the difficulties. They were told that the National Policy would bring higher prices to the farmer for his products, and these promises were held out by Government agents who went round as buyers of cattle and sheep.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). You tried that game last election.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). In 1882 they came before the country not upon the merits of the National Policy. No, but they gerrymandered this country almost beyond recognition, knowing that if they left the constituencies as they were in 1878, they would not have had a ghost of a chance to be returned to power. By manipulating the various constituencies to suit themselves, they succeeded in being re-elected, solely through their iniquitous system of gerrymander. In 1887, did the people vote upon the merits of the National

Policy? They did not. In 1885, the Government passed the most iniquitous Bill ever put on the statutes of Canada called the Franchise Act, for the purpose of placing in the hands of their own partizans, the revising barristers, the control of the lists. I know it to be a fact in my county that hundreds of names have been left out, and I have no doubt that partizan revising barristers acted in the same way in other counties. It was on these lists that the Government carried the country in 1887. What was done in 1891? Hon. gentlemen opposite were afraid of the National Policy that year. And the Finance Minister and the Minister of Justice, and one or two others were sent direct to Toronto to open the campaign by announcing the policy of the Government, and there upon the public platform, they declared in favour of negotiating a treaty of reciprocity along the lines of 1854. But Sir John Macdonald was soon made to know that such a policy, however acceptable to the people, would not suit the manufacturers, and what did he do to counteract the speeches made by his lieutenants at Toronto? He issued an open letter to the electorate of Canada, in which he said that the National Policy was still the policy of the Government, and not one word did he say with regard to trade relations between Canada and the United States. Ask those gentlemen who came from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to support the Government, on what ground they were elected? They went to the country, not purely upon the National Policy, but upon reciprocity with the United States in natural products. Had the National Policy acquired the strength they claimed for it, they would not have required to advocate reciprocity in any shape or form. But passing from that I will make a few comparisons between the increase of population in Canada and the northern fringe of states of the American union. The conditions and circumstances of the provinces and states are very similar, and therefore admit of a fair comparison. Take the four states, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont. We have heard a great deal about the infertility of Vermont and New Hampshire. We were told last year by the President of the Council in a very able speech that Vermont was one of the most depressed states in the American union, that you could buy a 100-acre farm there for $300 to $500, with fair buildings and the fences thereon, and that many farmers were leaving their farm which they could not sell. We were told that New Hampshire was in a very wretched state, and that the farms there were mortgaged to a great extent. Maine we were told was no better than New Brunswick in any particular. And yet we find that in those four states the population has increased 9 per cent. in the last decade, whereas in the Provinces of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Quebec, it only increased 3 per cent. What reason do hon. gentlemen give for this? Do they suppose that, if New Brunswick had free access to the states to the south for the articles it produces, manufactured and raw, it would only have increased by 61 individuals? Nova Scotia is comparatively a good province. Large portions of it are fine arable land. Its largest city is Halifax, which is one of the best ports on the Atlantic coast. Halifax is supplied very largely with railways built at the expense of the Government. It has a subsidized line of steamers running to Liverpool and another running to the West Indies. And yet with these advantages the population only increased in the decade 9,900, or 6·8 per cent. About 100 miles down the Atlantic coast is the City of Portland, having no special advantages, and yet it has increased in population from 1880 to 1890 nearly 8 per cent. I ask any hon. gentleman looking at the two cities and the advantages possessed by each, to give any reason for this difference, except that the one city is shut out from reciprocity with its neighbours, or is it because the Reformers have said something in reference to the policy of the Government? The City of St. John has 4,000 less of a population than it had twenty years ago. What do the members for St. John think of that? They have been putting forth their energies to establish a large import and export trade at that city, aided largely by Government subsidies. The reduction of 2,000 between 1871 and 1881 was in part owing to the great fire, but since that time St. John has had no backset, and yet has not the population which it had twenty years ago. The City of Montreal occupies the most commanding position of any city in America. It is at the head of deep-water navigation on the one hand and is the city to which converges the river and lake trade of the west, thus constituting a great distributing centre superior to any on the continent. Compare the increase of population in Montreal with that of Rochester on the other side, which has not the natural advantages or the central position that Montreal has, and you will find it has increased 10 per cent. more than the City of Montreal.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, it has not.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It has. Montreal has increased 40 per cent. and Rochester has increased 50 per cent.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. You said Rochester had increased 50 per cent. more than Montreal.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Rochester did increase 50 per cent. and Montreal 40 per cent., the difference is 10 per cent. in favour of Rochester. Everyone knows that a large portion of the trade which naturally belongs to Rochester, is cut off by the railways which centre in New York and Boston, and it has not the advantage of position such as Montreal possesses. Then, compare Toronto and Buffalo. Toronto has probably increased more than any other city on the continent of America, except two or three, but that has been owing to the withdrawals from the surrounding towns and rural sections of the country, and you will find that other towns both in the west and east have suffered by Toronto absorbing the population. Compare Hamilton with Cleveland. Hamilton has a central position, it receives the trade of the west, it has the advantages of the lake, and yet Cleveland has increased nearly twice as much as Hamilton. Hamilton has increased by 36 per cent. and Cleveland by 63 per cent., and Detroit by 77 per cent. To illustrate this more fully and show the falsity of some of the arguments which have been used this afternoon, I will take ten of the most prosperous inland cities of the Province of Ontario and compare them with ten cities taken at random from the adjoining states and see which has made the greatest increase in population. I take Ottawa which has a central position and is the seat of Government, where $500,000 of

the public money is spent every year. It possesses the largest lumbering interest in the country. This industry is of immense value to Ottawa. London is one of the most central cities of the west, surrounded by the best agricultural country of the Dominion. St. Thomas is another city which is a central distributing point. Guelph is another good distributing point. Stratford has very large railway repair shops, employing 300 or 400 men. It is a good distributing centre and surrounded by a magnificent country. Brantford is one of the manufacturing cities of Ontario, and so is Cornwall. Galt, the Sheffield of Ontario, is turning out some very fine work. Peterborough is a very prosperous city, and Owen Sound is a flourishing centre, the coming city of the north. In 1881 the population of these ten cities amounted to 114,540, and by the last census the population was 150,668 of the most prosperous cities and towns in Ontario, showing an increase of only 31½ per cent. I suppose the statement as to the increase by 40 per cent., as stated by the returns as being the increase of Canadian cities, include the larger cities as Toronto and Montreal, and some of the cities in the newer districts, as Victoria and Vancouver, which have greatly increased. Now, let me take another group of cities. I will take them in any state you please—take them in Michigan. The Province of Ontario is one generation older than Michigan: that province was partly settled when there was not a living soul in Michigan. Ontario has better lands than Michigan, has minerals of vast wealth, more than comparable to the minerals of Michigan. Take the following cities of Michigan:—Grand Rapids, Muskeegon, Lansing, Manistee, Saginaw, Alpena, Ann Arbor, Bay City, Marquette and Menomonee. Those cities increased 70 per cent. as compared with 31½ per cent. in the best Canadian cities, and those are taken at random from the cities of similar size in Michigan. Take another group of ten cities in Indiana, and the increase was 48 per cent. as compared with the increase of 31½ per cent. in Ontario. Take another group of cities in New York, which embraced a population of 153,000 in 1880, and in 1890 they had a population of 215,971, or an increase of 40 per cent. as compared with 31½ per cent. increase in Ontario. Take another group in Ohio, where ten cities had an average population in 1880 of 14,957, and they have increased to an average of 23,890, or an increase of 60 per cent. Now, I would ask: What is the reason that the cities on the other side increase so much more rapidly than the most progressive cities in Ontario? Can any hon. member recall any city in Canada more progressive than the ten I have mentioned? I first put in St. Catharines, but when I found that St. Catharines had gone back, I threw it out and took in Owen Sound, which has increased more than any other during the last decade, namely, 69 per cent., one of the smartest towns in the Province of Ontario, and I hope to live long enough to see it one of the best cities of the land. Now, I will compare some of the western provinces with the western states and territories of the republic. We have been accused of running down Manitoba. I say that Manitoba is one of the finest provinces of the Dominion, and I challenge any person to prove that I have ever said anything derogatory to that province. I say, that Manitoba is far more excellent in many ways than Dakota. First, it has better land than Dakota, it has a better climate, it is not so liable to frost, it has not so many blizzards in the winter time as Dakota. Now, while Manitoba has increased 148 per cent., Dakota has increased 277 per cent.; and remember that settlement in the two countries commenced about the same time. An hon. gentleman speaking yesterday said that that was owing to Dakota having a better market than Manitoba. Some years ago we were discussing the question here and we were showing that the people in Dakota were getting two or three cents a bushel more for their wheat than they were getting in Manitoba, and that very hon. gentleman said that nothing of the kind ever happened, that they were paying as high a price in Manitoba as in Dakota. The hon. member for the City of Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) who is not in his seat just now, stated that Manitoba had the best market, that it far exceeded the market of Dakota. So one hon. gentlemen says that Manitoba has a better market than Dakota and the other says it has a worse market; I will let them settle that between themselves. But if Dakota is incomparably poorer in many respects than Manitoba, will hon. gentlemen explain how it is, notwithstanding its poverty, both in soil and climate, that its population has increased 277 per cent. while the population of Manitoba has only increased 148 per cent.? Take the North-West Territories and compare them with Montana to the south; while they increased 141 per cent. Montana increased 236 per cent.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The mineral wealth of Montana has something to do with it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No: they have mineral wealth that Montana has not. We have coal in the North-West Territories, and they have none in Montana, and if we had free trade Montana would become a natural market for our coal for the purpose of smelting the minerals that they have in Montana, and thus a mutual benefit to both countries would accrue by the trade policy of the Liberals. Now, take British Columbia. British Columbia is one of the richest provinces in the whole Dominion. In its coal there is none that can be compared with it west of the Rockies. It has the finest coal on the Pacific coast. It exported last year to the United States no less than 500,000 tons, giving employment to a large number of men. It has gold, it has copper, it has lead and it has iron, all giving British Columbia a prominent position. Now, will the Minister of Finance say how it is that British Columbia only increased 88 per cent., while the adjoining State of Washington increased 366 per cent.? Seattle and Tacoma increased far beyond any city or town in British Columbia. Hon. gentlemen charge us with decrying our country and preventing people from coming into it, but according to their own evidence 886,000 immigrants came into this country during the last ten years, but we failed to retain them. We not only lost as many as came from foreign countries, at an expense to the country of nearly $3,000,000, but we lost in addition to that number at least 100,000. Now, Sir, I have a few things to place upon *Hansard*, some statements made by the leaders of the Tory party decrying their country, and I challenge any hon. gentleman to find a similar number of statements derogatory to the interests of Canada, made by any Liberal in the land.

It may have been their remarks that prevented the people from coming into the country.

"The Dominion is suffering from unexampled commercial depression."

Surely that was very disloyal. Who said that? A very loyal man, Sir David Macpherson.—

"We have no work people, they are to be found employed in the United States. Our people are adding strength to a foreign nation."

Who made that statement upon the public platforms of this country? The late leader of the Conservative party.—

"No less than 10,000 immigrants left in one year from the North-West for the United States. They passed through British Columbia to find work in the states and territories adjoining British Columbia, and they found employment in the various cities there, Seattle, Tacoma, and other places."

Who in the world uttered so disloyal a sentiment as to say that our people were leaving to go into the United States by the thousand? That disloyal man was a paid servant of the present Government, and that statement is to be found in his report; and hon. gentlemen opposite were so disloyal as to publish that statement in his report and spread it to the world, and yet if a Liberal makes a statement something similar it is considered disloyal on his part. "Loan societies and official assignees are the only prosperous classes in this country." Who said that? It might have been the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. FOSTER. It is too mild.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). But it was not the hon. member for South Oxford, neither was it the hon. member for North Norfolk, but it was an hon. gentleman on whom Her Majesty bestowed a high honour, Sir David Macpherson. "Farmers have to import corn for provender." That will be good immigration literature to send to the old country. "Farmers in some districts have had to import wheat for food.' The gentleman who made those statements was the same person. And here is another statement from a leader of their party:

"We have depreciated values. We have small dividends. We have limited markets. We have low prices."

The hon. gentleman who had been disloyal enough to make such utterances on a public platform and on the floor of Parliament was the Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, one of the late Finance Ministers of the Tory Government. Here is another precious sample of the literature of the Tory party:

"There is a loss of confidence. There is great distrust. There is a long string of insolvencies. Labourers are asking leave to work. Our workingmen are beggars. Our people are drifting to the United States."

Who was the man who would stand on public platforms and make those statements before this country? Surely neither the Minister of Finance, nor the Secretary of State, nor the Minister of Justice; no, it was none less than the leader of the Conservative party, who built up the party and stuck to it, and they to him, till he was taken away by a kind Providence at a time when it was a blessing for him to leave this world. He could not have lived through the disclosure of the last three or four months. No doubt, the scandals and corruptions brought on prematurely the disease from which he died. Had he lived, I am satisfied he would have felt deeply the disclosures that have been made, as he, no doubt, believed that the departments were under the supervision of men whom he thought capable of discharging the duties devolving upon them. I thank hon. members for the attention given me, and I hope we will consider the question more thoroughly as to how to increase the population of our country. We all admit that in the discussion of these subjects perhaps too much political feeling is introduced; but this is a question to which all intelligent men should apply themselves in order to ascertain if the small increase of population is not due to the National Policy, to which, I believe, it is largely due; and if such is not the case, we should ascertain to what cause it is due, and having ascertained the cause, let us then apply ourselves as men, be the cause the National Policy or anything else, to securing the establishment of a policy more in harmony and accord with the general interests and prosperity of our country.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan.	Hargraft.
Allison,	Harwood,
Amyot,	Hyman.
Armstrong,	Innes,
Bain,	King.
Barron,	Landerkin.
Beausoleil,	Langelier.
Béchard,	Laurier,
Beith,	Lavergne.
Bernier,	Leduc,
Borden,	Legris,
Bourassa,	Lister,
Bowman,	Livingston,
Brodeur,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brown (Monck),	McGregor,
Cameron (Huron),	McMillan,
Campbell,	McMullen,
Carroll,	Mignault,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mills (Bothwell).
Casey,	Monet,
Charlton,	Mousseau,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Christie,	Murray,
Colter,	Perry,
Davidson,	Proulx,
Davies,	Rider,
Dawson,	Rinfret,
Edwards,	Rowand.
Featherston,	Sanborn,
Flint,	Scriver,
Forbes,	Semple,
Fraser,	Simard,
Frémont,	Somerville,
Gauthier,	Spohn,
Geoffrion,	Sutherland,
German,	Trow,
Gibson,	Truax,
Gillmor,	Vaillancourt.
Godbout,	Watson. and
Grieve,	Yeo.—81.
Guay,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Baker,	Léger,
Bergeron,	Lippé,
Bergin,	Macdonald (King's),
Bowell,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Burnham,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Burns,	Mackintosh,
Cameron (Inverness),	McAllister,
Carignan,	McCarthy,
Carpenter,	McDonald (Victoria),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDougald (Pictou),
Chapleau,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cleveland,	McKay,
Coatsworth,	McLean,
Cochrane,	McLennan,
Cockburn,	McLeod,
Corby,	McNeill,

Costigan,	Madill,
Craig,	Mara,
Curran,	Marshall,
Daly,	Masson,
Daoust,	Miller,
Davin,	Mills (Annapolis),
Davis,	Moncrieff,
Denison,	Montague,
Desaulniers,	O'Brien,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Ouimet,
Dewdney,	Patterson (Colchester),
Dickey,	Pelletier,
Dugas,	Prior,
Dupont,	Putnam,
Dyer,	Reid,
Fairbairn,	Robillard,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Roome,
Foster,	Ross (Dundas),
Gillies,	Ryckman,
Girouard,	Skinner,
Gordon,	Sproule,
Grandbois,	Stairs,
Haggart,	Stevenson,
Hazen,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Temple,
Hodgins,	Thompson (Sir John),
Hutchins	Tisdale,
Ingram,	Tupper,
Ives,	Tyrwhitt,
Jamieson,	Wallace,
Joncas,	White (Cardwell),
Kaulbach,	White (Shelburne),
Kenny,	Wilmot,
Kirkpatrick,	Wood (Brockville), and
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wood (Westmoreland).—103.
LaRivière,	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Barnard,	Mr. Welsh,
Mr. Earle,	Mr. Fauvel,
Mr. McKeen,	Mr. Bowers,
Mr. Ross,	Mr. Paterson (Brant),
Sir D. Smith,	Mr. Mackenzie.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) has not voted.

Sir DONALD SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie).

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. Had we not better take another item ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not consent to that at half-past three in the morning.

Mr. FOSTER. Better take another one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman does not consent to that, I must tell him that we will be under the necessity of keeping him here a very long time.

Mr. FOSTER. We might as well stay here until six o'clock now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not consent to that. I object to any other item being taken. I move that the Committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. FOSTER. The Committee will not rise unless I make the motion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, do it then.

Mr. FOSTER. I move the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

Motion agreed to ; Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 3.30 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 4th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RATHBUN COMPANY.

Mr. TAYLOR presented the Thirteenth Report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a proposal, as I understand, to suspend all rules in favour of a private Bill. The thing has, no doubt, been done before and it is not my purpose to oppose this particular case, but I think no action of that kind should be taken without the concurrence of the Government in general and the Minister of Justice in particular, and that they should be held responsible by the House for any deviation from our rules of legislation such as this which is proposed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is not a motion, but I may state that I will object to the suspension of the rule which requires the Bill to proceed regularly by stages. I have not heard any reason given why this Bill should not have been introduced at an earlier stage of the session, which has lasted four months. However, the Bill may be allowed to be introduced, but it must proceed day by day, according to the rule.

Mr. O'BRIEN. As a member of that Committee, I may say that it was understood that there were no private rights affected.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think there is anything in itself objectionable in the Bill, but I am simply referring to the practice, and I think, if this is done at all, it must be after the Government have taken the responsibility of saying there is nothing objectionable in the proceeding.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved that Rules 49, 51 and 60 be suspended in relation to the Bill respecting the Rathbun Company, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, as contained in their thirteenth report. He said: I may state that the reason that this Bill is asked for in this unusual way is that a public Bill was introduced here this session by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) to amend the general Act so as to give this company and all other companies the powers herein mentioned. That Bill was before the House during the earlier part of the session, but, when it went before the Committee on Railways, it was stated that it would be more advisable to have a separate Bill for each company than that the general Act should be amended in that respect. That is the reason why this company now come to the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would suggest that there is no real necessity for the suspension of the 60th Rule as to the posting. There will be abundance of time.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I understood you were to prorogue within ten days.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Oh, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There will be no such good luck, I fear.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Make it that the posting be limited to three days, instead of following Rule 60.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 171) respecting the Rathbun Company. —(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE — PAYMENTS MADE TO W. I. BRADLEY.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland) moved:

That all accounts, cheques and vouchers, for payments to W. I. Bradley, clerk in the Department of Railways and Canals, from 1st July, 1884, to 31st December, 1885, as found on page 210, part II of the Reports of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts for the years ended 30th June, 1884-85 and 1885-86, and also the attendance books of the said department for the period specified, be forthwith produced for the use of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the Twenty-second Report of the said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE—PRINTING OF EVIDENCE.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland) moved:

That the evidence now being taken by the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts respecting certain payments made in the Audit Office, and also the evidence being taken in connection with certain accounts now before that Committee, for supplies furnished to the Department of Public Works in 1883-84, 1884-85 and 1885-86, be printed for the use of the members of the said Committee, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the Twenty-third Report of the said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE — CONTRACTS FOR TORONTO HARBOUR.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland) moved:

That all accounts and vouchers for payments made in connection with the contracts of Murray & Cleveland, contractors for work in Toronto Harbour; also all advertisements for tenders, plans, specifications, tenders elaborations, extensions and moneyings out of all such tenders; and all correspondence whether by letter, telegram or otherwise touching said works, tenders and contracts from any engineers, inspectors or other officers at any time connected with said works, together with any letters, papers or other documents from any persons whomsoever to the Department of Public Works or any member of the Government in regard to such works; also all reports from any engineer, inspector or other officer at any time employed on such work; also all orders, authorizations or instructions, from the Government or any officer thereof, touching the said works or any modifications thereof or additions thereto, and all receipts for all payments made on account of the said works, be forthwith produced for the use of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the Twenty-fourth Report of the said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland) moved, That leave be granted to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts to sit during the time that the House is in session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that mean the whole Committee, or a select Committee?

Mr. FOSTER. The whole Committee. That was chiefly to meet the difficulty which has arisen in this way: The Keewatin matter is to be taken up and the officials who ought to be away on duty at the present time, are here, and we do not wish to keep them any longer than we can possibly help.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to object, but in the case of the Public Accounts Committee the Minister will see that grave inconvenience might arise, as neither he nor I can very well be absent from the House while the House is in Supply, and we both ought to be on that Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not proposed to make these meetings stated meetings. It is merely for to-day, and for this special purpose.

Motion agreed to.

SEAT FOR QUEBEC WEST.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have issued a warrant of *Supersedeas* to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to stay all proceedings in relation to the issue of a new Writ of election, under a Warrant issued by me on the 18th of August last, for the Electoral District of Quebec West, until such time as a new Warrant may issue.

PUBLIC WORKS IN JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY.

Mr. BRODEUR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to remind the Minister of Justice that on Monday last I put a question to know whether the Government had received a petition from the corporation of the parish of Isle Bizard, concerning the erection of an iron bridge on the river separating the parish of Isle Bizard from the parish of St. Geneviève. I understood the Minister of Justice to say that he would give me the information in a few days. I would like to know if he is in a position to do so now?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was not able to answer the question fully. The petition has been received, and I was under the impression that the matter was about being finally disposed of. I will be able to answer that point by Monday, if the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to put the question then.

SUPPLY—COPYRIGHT.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House do again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I desire, before the House resolves itself into Committee of Supply, to briefly direct attention to the extraordinary position which the House, and I may say Parliament, and I should think the Government too, finds itself in connection with the copyright legislation which the Canadian Parliament passed in 1889. A very important and very fair Act was passed unanimously by this Parliament in that year to give a

fair measure of relief to the publishers and to the reading public of Canada. That Act, however, was not to come into force until a proclamation should issue from the Canadian Government to bring it into force. We have been waiting more than two years, and no proclamation has yet been issued. I think before this session terminates we ought to know why the proclamation is not yet issued. We have had explanations already from the Government on that point. We know quite well that the Minister of Justice, who introduced that legislation, is strongly in favour of its going into effect. We know that he has strongly pressed those views upon the Imperial Government, and I should like to learn from him what the final results are of all his efforts with the Imperial Government. The other day only we had a few papers brought down by the Government in return to an address which I moved for, showing the state of the correspondence with the Imperial Government on that subject; but it seems, so far as I can make out, still to leave the question very much where it was two years ago, only I consider in a rather worse position than it was then. So far as we can see by the correspondence that has been laid before the House this session, and formerly, this legislation is simply blocked by Downing Street; and how long we will allow that condition of affairs to continue without some very strong remonstrance being made, I should like to know. What obstacles are supposed to exist to this legislation? One which has been until perhaps very recently, the most serious obstacle was the action of the English Copyright Association. Then we had the Berne Convention, the International copyright treaty arranged at Berne some years ago between England, France, Germany and Italy, and three or four smaller powers. Then we had one other excuse for delay sent to us from the other side of the water, that the United States were going to introduce an international Copyright Act. More important than all was the objection raised by the Colonial Office that it was unconstitutional for this Parliament to pass such an Act. As regards the English Copyright Association, I think that merely the statement that they have been in the way of our legislation is a sufficient answer to that difficulty, because certainly, without reference to any Imperial or any other association, this Parliament must be allowed to know what is best in regard to legislation for this country. Then as to the Berne Convention, a matter of considerable importance. By that treaty it is provided that the British possessions should be subject to its provisions. I do not know whether the Canadian Government suggested that or assented to it, and I am not going to say that they did wrong, because coupled with that was a provision in the protocol affecting the subject that the British Government should have the right to give notice of the denunciation of that treaty as regards British possessions, Canada being specially named among them, just the same as if they were separate nations and parties to that treaty. So that the difficulty, if a difficulty did exist, could be removed by the machinery provided by that treaty. It has been said, the Minister of Justice has told us in a State paper dated August, 1889, that great difficulty existed in the way of getting our own legislation on account of the Berne Treaty, and he told us in that State paper that the Canadian Government had requested, early in August, 1889, the Imperial Government to give notice for the denunciation of that treaty on behalf of Canada, so that the difficulty might be removed. The public, and the members of this House also, only heard a few weeks ago that that notice which the Canadian Government gave to the Imperial Government had been ignored. The Minister of Justice, in answer to a question which I put in the House on this subject, told us that the treaty had not been denounced by the Imperial Government on behalf of Canada. There exists, therefore, a very extraordinary state of affairs. When a self-governing colony like ours has important legislation of its own delayed and thwarted by an Imperial treaty, and when in that Imperial treaty there is the right to leave Canada out of it, and when the Canadian Government two years ago made a request to the Imperial Government to do that thing and relieve us from the difficulty that arose out of that treaty, we find that now, after two years, the notice for the denunciation of that treaty has not been given, and it requires one year after notice of denunciation has been given by Great Britain before the treaty can come to an end. If that treaty is held to be such a serious objection, as it has hitherto been by the Imperial Government, there is no possibility of their assenting to our legislation going into force for more than one year, even if they give notice now to denounce the Berne Convention, because the notice would not have effect for a year. That is a very extraordinary position for Canada to be placed in. I do not know how the Government like treatment of that kind, I do not think Parliament will like it, and I do not think the country will like it, when the people understand it and know their position. Another objection that was raised from the other side of the water was, that we should wait to see what the United States Congress would do as to an international treaty. Well, they have acted. I do not think that their legislation does anything to help Canada, but I do think, on the contrary, that it works a practical injury to Canada, and in this way: It will allow British authors to copyright their books, on certain conditions as to printing, in the United States. When that is done Americans cannot reprint them there, and therefore the reading public in Canada will lose the advantage which they had of being able to purchase American reprints of British copyright works, and at the same time our Canadian publishers have no right to reprint them. The Canadian publishers are not benefited in consequence of that in any way that I can see, but the Canadian reading public is very much injured indeed. I know that the Minister of Justice himself in some of his papers has come to the conclusion that such legislation as they have passed at Washington does not in any way interfere with our own legislation, or should not be allowed to interfere at any rate. Then there comes the constitutional difficulty. The British North America Act, section 91, of course gives Canada the right to legislate upon the subject of copyright, just in as distinct terms as it has given Canada the right to legislate upon bills of exchange, promissory notes, or upon patents of invention. I shall not waste the time of the House in arguing in favour of the view that we have an absolute constitutional right to pass that legislation under the British North America Act. I would refer any one who is doubtful upon that point to the very able arguments which were presented by the Minister

of Justice in State papers which are before the House, and I will only quote the conclusion that the Minister drew from his own arguments. His conclusion was this :

"That the people of Canada would hold him culpable if he failed to assert, that was the only interpretation under which they received the constitution and under which they are willing to be content with that constitution."

That being the position of affairs, what remedy has the Canadian Government and the Parliament of Canada? Well, Sir, early in this session we were promised by the Minister of Justice across the House, in reply to some remarks that I had made on the subject, as I understood him, that unless the Imperial Government during the then present session passed some legislation which would remove any difficulties which they felt on the constitutional point, and would make the way free for our own legislation to go into effect; then, that this Government would this session assent to the proposal which I had suggested, namely, that this Parliament should pass a strong address to the Queen urging our rights in the premises. Now, Sir, I shall expect to hear from the Minister of Justice to-day that he will do that. The Imperial Parliament has been prorogued without any such legislation. No papers have been brought down to this House to show that anything else has transpired to improve our position, and, Sir, I would call upon the Minister of Justice to take this House, and to take Parliament entirely into his confidence on that matter; and ask us to back up the remonstrances which the Government have made, and especially in our address to remonstrate against the inaction of the Imperial Parliament in not denouncing the Berne Convention, when called upon by the Canadian Government formally to do so two years ago. That is one way of doing it, but I think the more straightforward and manly way for the Canadian Government to treat this matter would be to put in the *Canada Gazette* a proclamation bringing that Act into force. It cannot be disallowed; it will be allowed, and to make the Act law would, I think, be the more straightforward course. I think we have waited long enough to see what they will do in England, and I think we should now take our own line of conduct in the matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not quite agree with the hon. member, that the subject is not in a better position, but rather in a worse one than it was formerly. I think we have got it to such a point that it requires simply insistence and patience on the part of this Parliament to acquire the right, which it is absurd we should not possess. I confess that I am surprised and disappointed after what has transpired, and considering what is within my own knowledge as regards the negotiations of last summer, to find that the session of the Imperial Parliament closed without an enactment on this subject being brought forward. Her Majesty's Government, I may say, have declined so far to adopt the view, to its full extent, which we urged upon them, that the legislation of 1889 was entirely within our powers. They rather incline to doubt that, in view of previous opinions which had been given by law officers; although I thought that the decisions which have been arrived at in interpreting the British North America Act were amply sufficient to justify the conclusion that the statute was within our powers. However, entertaining some doubt upon that subject, obviously the best course was, that all doubt on the subject should be removed by the adoption of an Imperial statute, so that we should not simply proclaim the Act and have litigation afterwards as to its validity, when it would affect such very important interests in our own country. I do not want to say much about what transpired last summer beyond this: That I had every reason to expect that our statute would have received approval before this. Acquainted as we are with the many difficulties which attend the transaction of public business in the mother country, and especially public business which requires the action of the Imperial Parliament, one can easily understand that delay and disappointment will occasionally occur in the progress of a matter like that. I have this to say further on the subject: That we have not in the slightest degree receded from the position we have taken on this question. There is not a word in the strong language which the hon. gentleman has quoted from me which I am disposed to withdraw. I think it most unreasonable that the people of Canada should not enjoy the full right of legislating upon this question for themselves. I believe they do enjoy that right, but the denial of it, or the doubting of it by any authority in the mother country, is an ample reason why we have the right to expect prompt legislation there to remove any doubt of that kind. I have not the slightest doubt that that legislation will be given. It is simply a subject of regret that it has not been given before; but in a matter so clearly within our rights as a self-governing people, I cannot imagine the authorities in the mother country continuing to withhold it from us after the difficulties are removed which occur in connection with all legislation there, in relation to the press of very important Imperial business before the British Parliament. I do not see that the existence of the Berne Convention is a practical difficulty in the way of our measure of 1889 being either assented to now or being ratified by an Imperial statute. I think I am correct in saying that that has not of late been put forward by the Imperial Government as a reason why our Act of 1889 should not be put in force; and I am strongly inclined to think that others connected with the Berne Convention, who are entitled to speak as representing the contracting powers, do not now regard Canada as within the limits of the Berne Convention.

Mr. EDGAR. Canada is within the terms, though.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Quite so. But what I mean is this: That while Canada is included within the terms of the Berne Convention, it would be necessary, in order to give that convention effect in this country, that our copyright system should be changed in some important features, and our statute modified in relation to those particulars. That has not been done, and the Berne Office has taken the view that Canada has practically to adopt legislation in order to give the Berne Convention effect in this country. Of course, I do not wish to doubt for a moment the overmastering effect of the Imperial statute which includes us in that convention; but that has never been, and cannot be, worked out until legislation takes place here, and that is practically the reason why the existence of the Berne Convention has not been

put forward as a reason why our Act of 1889 should not be put in force. I fancy there would be no difficulty arising from any objection on the part of the contracting parties to our legislation. The question relating to the American copyright enactment is, to my mind, altogether removed from the discussion, and, indeed, was never anything more than a poor pretext for delay. That pretext, which was put forward from time to time as a reason why the Canadian legislation should not go into effect, pointed to the possibility that a measure of wider liberality in which we could concur, would be adopted by the United States, and that in the meantime legislation in favour of the production of works in our own country might tend to induce the United States Congress to pass a less liberal measure than they would otherwise adopt. That difficulty is already solved by the passage of an Act which contains provisions on this subject which the Canadian Copyright Act had; and it seems to me, therefore, that the existence of American legislation on the subject is quite irrelevant in the present state of the case. I just sum up all I have to say in these words: We stand upon the position we have taken; we intend to insist, in every possible way, upon that view being adopted; and, I think, there is not the slightest doubt that it will be adopted in a very short time. It may be that this House, and the Senate likewise, will be asked before the close of the present session to concur in an address to Her Majesty on this subject. I have thought it undesirable that that course should be adopted down to the present time, at any rate, down to the time when the Imperial Parliament was prorogued; because, it seemed to me, that the passage unanimously by both Houses of our Parliament, of the statute relating to this subject, was a sufficient address of both Houses to Her Majesty to give effect to that statute, by instructing that it be brought into operation. I had reason to suppose that would be quite sufficient in itself, until the prorogation took place. Now, I think it will be a matter for consideration whether we should adopt an address on the subject this session, or whether we should defer it until next session; but I certainly think that unless some prompt action is taken by the Imperial authorities next session, we should then ask Parliament to express its insistence on the measure we adopted in 1889 being brought into operation; and one can hardly suppose that a joint address of both Houses would fail to be effective in inducing the assent which is so much desired. There are reasons which it would not be expedient for me to communicate at this moment, why it would not be wise to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member as to proclaiming the Act—reasons which, I think, would commend themselves to his judgment, and which may be stated in due time. Possibly the adoption of an address on the subject by both Houses next session would be in time, considering that it will be late in the year before the Imperial Parliament begins another session, and considering that by the time we meet again there will be ample time to press the subject before the session of the Imperial Parliament reaches such a stage as to make it inconvenient to introduce new measures. But, on the other hand, some reasons may be presented why Parliament should, before it rises here, be asked this session to adopt an address on the subject, and I shall be in a position to make a statement in regard to that in the course of a day or two.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. LAURIER. The House, I think, will be sorry to hear that the hon. gentleman has somewhat receded from the position he took on a former occasion during the present session. When this subject was up before, as far back as the early part of the month of June, the hon. gentleman spoke with regard to the deferred action of the British Parliament on the subject as follows:—

"If I should be disappointed in that hope——"

That was the hope that Parliament would legislate during the pending session——

——"and should find reason to believe that we shall not have legislation in the Imperial Parliament during this session, I shall take steps to bring about an address from both Houses of this Parliament in favour of the ratification of that Act taking place, and its being brought into force by proclamation."

The hon. gentleman now, if I understand him aright, is not quite certain whether it would be advisable to pass an address during the present session or wait until another session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I quite agree that it would be advisable and proper. The only question is whether in view of the late stage of our business, it would not be in time next session.

Mr. LAURIER. If that be the only objection, I should say that in a matter of this kind, in which there is such a universal consensus of opinion that the address would be passed unanimously, the objection of the hon. gentleman would hardly apply; and, moreover, it seems to me that our remonstrance should be sent as soon as possible to the Imperial Government, so that they may have time to deal with the question, instead of receiving our remonstrance when perhaps they would be themselves in the midst of the session, which in England is always an arduous one, and when there would scarcely be time to prepare legislation for that session. It seems to me that all the reasons would be in favour of immediate action, because then the Government would be prepared at the very opening of next session to lay before the House the legislation which would be necessary. If that be the only objection the hon. gentleman has, I believe on all sides would be urged on him the advisability of his continuing in the mind in which he was some time ago and having the matter brought up before we separate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before you leave the Chair, Sir, I want to make a short statement with respect to certain facts having reference to the census of 1871 to 1881, to which I will call your attention, and also the attention specially of the Minister who represents the Department of Agriculture in this House. On examining the records of the census of 1871, I find that in the five old provinces of Canada there were reported to be at that date 2,980,000 people born in Canada, belonging to those provinces. In British Columbia, Manitoba and the Territories, no absolutely accurate statement is possible, but, according to the estimate submitted, something like 80,000 persons born in the Dominion appear to have resided in these sections. These I do not propose to include, as no accurate statement is possible, although to include them would make all the more evident the conclusion to which I have come. I find that in 1881, in the five older Pro-

vinces of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec, the census returns declare there were 3,605,000 persons born in those provinces then in the Dominion. In British Columbia, Manitoba and the Territories there were 110,000; but, as I have said, I do not propose to include these for the reason I have given. It follows from that statement that, in 1881, there were in the five older provinces alone, not including the Territories, British Columbia and Manitoba, no less than 625,000 native-born Canadians more than had been there in 1871. If you turn to the United States census of 1870, you will find it there stated that there were of native-born Canadians in the United States in 1870, 490,041. In their census for 1880, there were, I regret to say, said to be 712,368 native-born Canadians in the United States. That makes an addition of 222,327 native-born Canadians found in the United States in 1881, to whom you must add the number requisite to make up the death rate accruing in ten years on the 490,041 who were there in the year 1870, which I place at 97,510, showing this total result, that, according to the United States census returns, there were 319,837 native-born Canadians more in the United States in 1880 than were found there in 1870. Now, I would call the attention of the House to the fact that if you want to ascertain the net increase which took place in Canada from 1871 to 1881, you must add to the 625,000 whom our own census returns show to have been added to the roll of native-born Canadians the 318,837 whom the United States census returns show to have gone during that decade from Canada to the United States. That, I think, would be obvious to everybody. That gives, in all, a net increase in the decade of no less than 944,837 persons, and as our total population in 1871 is computed by the census authorities to have been 3,685,586, it is clear that the percentage of natural increase would have amounted in those ten years, if those figures be accurate, to no less than $25\frac{6}{10}$ per cent. That is taking the whole population, which is too large a divisor, but taking the population of the five older provinces, which amounted to 3,580,000, you will find those five provinces appear to have had a natural increase of $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. during the ten years from 1871 to 1881. Now, I have by no means taken the most favourable estimate for my position in making that estimate, because it is notorious that the emigration to the United States was heavier from Canada between April, 1880, and April, 1881, than between April, 1870, and April, 1871, as 1880-81 was not a prosperous year for us while 1870-71 was.

Mr. HAGGART. Will you allow me to show how your figures are incorrect? The whole increase of immigration that comes into the country is included in that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is wholly in error and has not listened to what I said, or has failed to comprehend it. I referred simply to the native-born population in each decade.

Mr. HAGGART. Would not the hon. gentleman consider a native-born person to mean one born in the country of immigrants?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. HAGGART. Would that be a natural increase?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman had examined the matter with a little care he would have known that there is a very considerable reduction in the number of immigrants who came into Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. But all those enter into your calculation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not a bit of it. The immigrants who came to the older provinces show a total by many thousands less in 1881 as against the number who were there in 1871. Now, all that could by any possibility be credited would be the percentage of natural increase upon the small proportion of immigrants that were shown to have settled in Canada between 1871 and 1881. Does the hon. gentleman know what that would have been? It would have amounted perhaps to 10,000 or 15,000, and, as against that, I have deliberately omitted our loss of the natural increase from the huge number of emigrants who have settled in the United States from Canada. I say this: If in 1871 there were in our five old provinces 2,980,000 souls born in Canada, if in 1881 there were 3,605,000 natives of those same older provinces in Canada, the difference between these two figures shows that portion of the natural increase which stayed in Canada, and to that you must add the 319,000 emigrants whom the United States statistics show to have gone from Canada in that decade and settled in the United States. I say, Sir, if you want to get the percentage you get it by adding those two figures together, and if you add them together you get precisely the result I have intimated, only that I rather underestimated the natural increase.

Mr. HAGGART. The figures I took last night and the statements I made to the House were made upon as accurate a basis as could possibly be obtained. I took the number of deaths during the year 1881 and the number of births during that year, I separated the deaths from the births and took the year 1881 as an average. Upon that it showed that the natural increase was 1·07 per cent. I made the statement that Dr. Taché, the person who took the census that year, showed it was impossible, showed how it was that the death rate did not show up as much as it would be, and I made the comparison with the United States. There has been an accurate estimate of the natural increase of population in the United States. It is made by the statistician in the census returns of 1890, and it is less than 14 per cent. I made the calculation of what I thought the increase would be from statistics furnished me by Mr. Lowe, and I arrived at the conclusion that the increase would be 1·12 per annum. Taking a logarithmic proportion, that would show about 13 or 14 per cent., an average percentage of natural increase about the same as that in the United States. I do not know whether I am correct or not, or whether my information is correct or not, but the information I gave to the House was the information furnished to me by the department on the subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman gave an accurate statement to the House of the information he had got. It is not my object to prolong or provoke a discussion. I give these facts for the express information of the House and the country. It will be easy for the hon. gentleman, when he has got them, to see

if they are inaccurate. They refer to the period between 1871 and 1881. We cannot as yet test the accuracy of my statements as to the last decade, because, at the ordinary rate of progress, some time must elapse before you will get a return of the native-born population of Canada in 1891, and it may be some time before you will get the returns of the Canadian population in the United States. When you get those returns, we will be in a position, without controversy on either side, to gauge by actually ascertained facts whether or not I have been correct, not as to what the natural increase ought to be, but as to what it actually is. I have never contended, looking at the enormous loss of our youthful population, that our natural increase would be maintained. My contention was that, if we kept our people here, the natural increase would amount to 2¼ per cent. Until the facts I have given are refuted, it seems to me that there is no reply to the deductions I have drawn from the returns of the census of 1871 and 1881.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Collection of Revenues — Customs, Nova Scotia..... $117,675

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is some small increase here which you might explain.

Mr. BOWELL. There is an increase in Digby of $470, necessitated by the appointment of an additional officer and boat man. This arises from the extra work in connection with the steamers running from Digby to Annapolis. In Halifax three officers have been removed from the temporary staff to the permanent staff, and the other increases arise from the extra work in the ordinary service when the steamers arrive from Europe. In Kentville there is an increase of $50. In Lunenburg an additional clerk had to be appointed in consequence of the additional work there; and in Port Hawkesbury there is an additional $60 for extra work. In Pictou it is proposed to increase the salary of the collector of the outport of New Glasgow, in consequence of the extra work constantly occurring at that outport. New Glasgow now collects about one and a-half more revenue than the port of Pictou itself, and it is conducted by a sub-collector and a landing waiter. At Weymouth there is an additional expenditure of $200 caused by the fact that an old man 80 years of age has been retired, and in appointing the new officer we had to pay $300 instead of $100. There has been a decrease at Annapolis of $85, and at Windsor of $150, owing to the death of one of the preventive officers, which has not been filled. The net increase in the Province of Nova Scotia is $2,515.

Collection of Revenues—Customs, New Brunswick..... $90,060

Mr. BOWELL. There is a decrease in this province. The expenditure at Chatham has apparently increased by $2,260, but that is because we have abolished the port of Richibucto, making it an outport of Chatham. In Dalhousie there is an increase of $60 on contingencies. There is an increase in the payment to one of the collectors amounting to $100. The total increase apparently in New Brunswick is $2,635. The decreases are $150 at Bathurst, where Haley's place has not been filled, and $100 at Dorchester, where the place of Bilodeau, the preventive officer, has not been filled. There is a reduction of $2,260 at Richibucto to which I have already referred, and at St. John there is a decrease of $1,200 owing to the death, dismissal or superannuation of some of the higher class officers and the appointment of officers of a lower class at salaries of $500 or $600 each. The total decrease in New Brunswick is $1,075.

Collection of Revenues—Customs, Prince Edward Island..... $19,885

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to bring to the attention of the Minister of Customs representations which have been made to me respecting the payment of the Customs officials in Charlottetown. The general belief exists among them—a belief which I suppose is apt to prevail among all officials—that they are not fairly treated in regard to their pay. They have called my attention to this fact, that the same rules which apply to the increase of salaries in the Inland Revenue Department and the Post Office Department do not apply to the officials of the Customs Department, and therein they think a serious grievance lies. They stated—and I must say that when the fact was stated to me it did appear to commend itself as not unreasonable—that in the Post Office Department a third class clerk is appointed at a salary of $400 a year, and he has a yearly increase of $40 until his salary reaches $800; a second class clerk is appointed at $900, and his salary is increased at the rate of $50 a year until it reaches $1,200, and a first class clerk in a similar proportion. Now, I am not in a position to say whether that rule is just or unjust, but assuming it to be based upon justice, and to continue in practice in the two departments I have referred to, it does appear to me to be unjust that another department, officered and paid from the same exchequer, should be placed in a different position. I understand that in the outside service of the Customs Department, the chief clerks and the appraisers, the cashiers and other officers have a salary which is fixed at a certain sum and does not increase from year to year as do the officials I have referred to in the other departments. Now, in the City of Charlottetown the collector gets $1,800. I have never heard him complain about his salary, although he may have done so. The other officials are a chief clerk at $1,200, and appraiser at $1,000, the other clerks get $600, and the cashier $700. It is difficult to determine with relation to other Customs ports, whether the salaries are above or below the average, because I suppose, to some extent, the amount of the salary is regulated by the work at the port, and there is no doubt that should be an element in determining the amount of salaries to be paid—nobody will doubt that. But it should not be the sole element, and I am not quite sure that it should be the controlling element. It has been pointed out, and there seems to be something in it, that the officials in Charlottetown —and the same argument, of course, applies to other ports similarly situated—although in the winter time they have very little work to do from the nature of the case, the port being frozen up, are obliged to attend from 9 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock, or whatever hour the office is closed, ready to do the work if the work is there for them; and they are not permitted by the rules of the department, which, no doubt, are based upon justice

and necessity, to engage in any kind of commercial business whatever. That, I suppose, is an absolute necessity in the Customs Department. Therefore these men, nearly all of whom, I may say, are married men, receive a fixed salary, with no hope of increase such as exists in the other departments, and a salary placed at a sum upon which I do not see myself very well how they manage to maintain their families. As I say, they are prevented from engaging in any commercial enterprise outside, and of that I make no complaint; they are bound to be in their place all the year round; and although it may be urged that for a portion of the year they have not got much work to do, still that is not their fault, nor are they to be blamed. Then the salaries, of course, are very much smaller than the salaries paid to the officials in St. John and Halifax; and while I would be the last one to contend that the salaries should be placed upon the same footing, still I think the discrepancies are so very great that the matter should receive the attention of the Minister. I know that an impression prevailed—and perhaps that existed in the mind of the Minister when he fixed their salaries—that the cost of living in Charlottetown is very much less than in these other cities. There was a period in the history of Charlottetown when that was true, but that period has gone by, because the cost of living is just as great there now as it is in Halifax, or in St. John, or in any other port of the Maritime Provinces. The taxes are high, and the cost of living in every respect is just as high as elsewhere. Looking, therefore, at the several facts I have mentioned—that these officials do not occupy as good a position as the officers in the Inland Revenue and the Post Office Departments, in that they do not receive any increase as the other officials do; looking at the fact that they are not permitted, for good reason, to engage in any business outside their official business, and therefore cannot augment their salaries from any private source; looking at the fact that they are married men with families, I think that the amount paid to them is so small as to deserve the favourable consideration of the Minister to receive a small increase. Now, the hon. gentleman is aware of the character of these officials. Mr. Bremner, the chief clerk, has been in that office, I think, a quarter of a century, at least. He is a man of very high character, and I know discharges his duties well. Mr. Hogg, the appraiser, has filled the position, I think, for the last ten or twelve years. I never heard any complaint about the manner in which he discharges his duties. He seems to be faithful and efficient, so far as one can judge from seeing him at his post all the time. I have never heard anything said of him except in commendation. The clerks all bear excellent characters. I thought, after looking the matter over, and thinking it over to see whether I would be justified in bringing it before the House, that a fairly good case was made out for the consideration of the Minister, I would therefore present it to him for consideration, trusting that if he sees the public interests will permit it, these gentlemen may receive a reasonable and fair increase for their services.

Mr. BOWELL. The question brought before the Committee by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is not a new one. It has been brought under my notice a number of times, and I came to the conclusion that to adopt the system which prevails in the Inland Revenue and Post Office Departments would entail an enormous increase in the expenditure for the collection of the revenues of the country. When you consider that there are nearly a thousand officials in the whole Dominion, you, by adding only $10 to the salaries of each one of them, increase the demand upon the revenue by $10,000 a year. Many persons urge that the increase of $50 a year in the salaries, as in other departments, is a mere bagatelle, still that entails a charge of $50,000 a year, and so in proportion to the increase made, until they reach the maximum. It has not been deemed advisable to adopt that principle in connection with this department. When the Civil Service Act was passed a scale of salaries was adopted which was believed to be commensurate with the work to be performed by the gentlemen appointed to fill the different positions. If the hon. gentleman will look at the schedule of the Customs in the Civil Service Act, he will find that the salaries of inspectors range from $1,600 to $2,500 per annum. Collectors' salaries range from $400 to $4,000; there are only two ports in the Dominion at which a salary of $4,000 is paid, Toronto and Montreal. I am not prepared to say that the salary at Montreal, considering the amount of responsibility connected with the collection of the revenue, which amounted for the last two or three years to about $9,000,000 annually, should not range higher than the salary at Toronto, which, I may remark, has increased during the last ten years from between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000 to nearly $5,000,000 annually. Gradually the trade is going westward. That arises from the facilities which are given to carry goods direct to the merchants who import them. Then we come to the surveyors, whose salaries range from $1,200 to $2,500. I have adopted the principle of having as few surveyors as possible except in large ports, where some one is required to supervise the officers. Chief clerks range from $1,200 to $2,000, and other officers in proportion downwards. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to compare the salaries paid at St. John, which, of course, is admittedly a much more important port than Charlottetown, he will find that as fair salaries are paid at the latter port. Both Halifax and St. John are open ports the year round; hence there is really more work in the Customs Department there at certain periods of the year than there is at Montreal or Quebec. If the hon. member for Queen's will take the trouble to compare the salaries of the officials at Charlottetown with those at St. John, he will find there is very little difference, except in the higher positions, where the work is more onerous and the responsibilities greater. The chief clerk at Charlottetown receives $1,200 a year. The hon. gentleman did not speak too highly of that officer, so far as I have known that port for the last 12 years. At St. John, the chief clerk is paid $1,500. At Montreal he is paid $2,000, and the officers are paid, as far as possible, on the principle of equity in proportion to the labour and responsibility devolving upon them. In the lower grades, tide waiters and landing waiters, there is very little difference. They enter at $500 at St. John and Halifax, and they advance as the department thinks they merit advancement until they reach the maximum. That, I admit, rests solely with the

department and the Minister, and when applications for increases are made, and they occur very frequently, application is made to the collector for a report as to the character of the officer making the application. Unless the House desires to establish a principle which will add to the expenditure for the collection of revenue from $10,000 to $50,000 annually, the present system is the best one to pursue. Another point that must be remembered in connection with this subject is this, as to how many of the men occupying positions as tide waiters and landing waiters would earn elsewhere more than they receive in the Customs Department. Take mechanics and artizans. They earn $1.50, $2 or $2.50 per day, and $3 is high wages the year round. If a mechanic, in consequence of a rain storm or from sickness, is absent from work he receives no pay. In the Civil Service, as has been brought very prominently before the notice of members during recent examinations before the Public Accounts Committee, an officer may be absent one, two or even twelve months, and his salary continues, and at the same time provision is made for those officers if they become unfit for duty and reach a certain age, being superannuated. I know there is much force in the suggestion made by the hon. member for Queen's, but when we consider the classes of men who obtain these positions, and the positions they occupied before they entered the Civil Service, the advantages that arise to them from the positions being permanent and from receiving pay under all circumstances, we must come to the conclusion that, as a whole, more particularly remembering the number of hours they have to labour, they are as well paid as are the same classes of men occupying other positions. There may be and are individual cases deserving consideration: such probably is the case of Mr. Bremner. With the ability he possesses and the aptitude for the work he performs, he would be worth $1,500, $1,600, or $2,000, if he were in Montreal, and no doubt he would get it. But considering the revenue of the port of Charlottetown, and that his work continues only six or seven months of the year, in receiving $1,200 per annum he is tolerably well paid. Still that is a question, particularly with respect to that officer, which deserves the consideration of the department. The same observations apply to the appraisers. Take the port of Montreal. The work of the appraisers there is enormous; they are constantly busy and are brought into contact with hundreds of merchants and thousands of different classes of importations, and from the enormous responsibility devolving upon them, we have to pay them higher salaries, especially as their duties continue from 1st January to 31st December. I shall be very glad in the administration of the department to accept any suggestion I think equitable, affecting any individual case, or as a general principle. I may say that I proposed at one time to adopt the system suggested by the hon. member for Queen's; but when I considered the whole question, the work to perform, and the enormous increase that the adoption of such a system would make to the expenditure of the department every year, I thought the better way was to adopt the principle which is laid down in the Civil Service Act, of establishing a minimum and maximum salary and treating each case on its merits as it was brought before the head of the department.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has stated the case very well, very fairly and very strongly. He misunderstood me if he thought I desired the system to be changed, and the Inland Revenue and Post Office systems to be applied to Customs. I did not so desire. I have not a sufficient knowledge of the facts to enable me to arrive at a judgment in the matter.

Mr. BOWELL. That is what I understood was your contention.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was prepared to accept the hon. gentleman's judgment in the matter, and to assume that the system which he has adopted is the better one. I merely referred to the system which is in vogue in the other departments, by reason of which employés get increases from time to time, as an incident in the argument I was advancing. The argument I was advancing was this: Granted that the system is a good one with a minimum or maximum rate, and with a discretion in the Minister to increase the salary in those cases where he thought the service was meritorious, my desire was to appeal to that discretion and I submitted certain individual cases for his judgment. Take the case of Mr. Bremner. He is a gentleman of very superior abilities as an accountant; he has been twenty-five years in the department discharging duties responsible and heavy at certain seasons of the year, and he is at the lowest grade of $1,200. It struck me that considering his length of service, his abilities and his excellent character, his was a case that might be considered by the Minister with respect to an increase of salary. I did not bring this matter hurriedly before the hon. gentleman, for it has been pressed upon me for some years. I am the last man in the House to advocate extravagance, and I can see a good deal of force in what the hon. gentleman says, that it would be absurd for officials of the smaller ports to expect to have their pay fixed at a sum at all in relation to the pay of officers in very large ports like Montreal and Toronto where there are enormous responsibilities and very heavy work. But I was presenting the individual cases on their merits. Take the appraiser's case. He has been there since 1879, I think, and, live economically as he will, I fancy a man with a large family will find it hard work to make both ends meet. Of course this is not a conclusive argument that the pay should be increased, but I think it is a case that deserves the favourable consideration of the Minister. Then the clerks of the department are at a minimum of $600. One of them, Mr. Edwin White, has been there fourteen or fifteen years, and the other two, Mr. McNeil and Mr. Moran, have been there, I think, for ten years. They are very good accountants, and, with one exception, I believe, married men with families. They are not drawn from the class the hon. gentleman represents that tide waiters and preventive officers are largely drawn, and who cannot complain if in their official position they get as large a salary as they could hope to have made if they continued in private life. These gentlemen are not receiving anything like the sum which men of similar qualifications receive in banks and other institutions of that kind, who discharge somewhat analogous duties. I may say that the cashier, Mr. McLeod, stands in the same position. I thought,

therefore, that comparing their pay with the pay received by similar officers in other ports, they had fair grounds for submitting with some confidence their case to the Minister and asking that a reasonable increase would be made. I do not press for anything large or excessive or extravagant. I would be the first man to oppose it if anything of the kind were proposed, but I think their cases are fairly well justified to the favourable consideration of the Minister. I know that the hon. gentleman has had reports from his inspector on the capacity and qualifications of these men, and he is in an excellent position to judge of their claim, and in judging that he has to consider the claim of officers in other ports than the one I am bringing to his immediate attention. But taking it all in all, I do think there are special circumstances here which would justify the Minister in increasing the pay of these gentlemen to a reasonable sum.

Mr. INNES. In connection with this matter which the hon. gentleman has just referred to, I would ask the Minister if in all cases the salaries of officers are graded in accordance with the receipts of fees as well as the length of service? Take the case of the collector at Guelph, for instance. The Minister knows perfectly well that Mr. Heffernan has served for quite a number of years, and has discharged his duties faithfully and efficiently. I do not think, from the first day of his appointment until now, any increase has been made in his salary.

Mr. BOWELL. We cannot adopt the principle suggested by the member for South Wellington (Mr. Innes) and do justice to the ports, because there are some outports which collect a much larger sum of money than the ports, but the only responsibility they have is the amount of money collected: while the collector has the management of not only the port over which he presides, but of all the outports. Take the instance to which I referred a few moments ago: New Glasgow, an outport of Pictou, in Nova Scotia. In New Glasgow, the sub-collector receives $1,000 per annum, and he has one landing waiter under him. He collects $51,282.24, while the port of Pictou itself, which has four or five officers, collects only $21,967.76. The disparity in the collection of revenue is no indication of the amount of work which the collector or officer in charge of a port has to perform. There are many ports and outports where the officer is engaged nearly the whole year round, and the collections very small, but they are more preventive stations than collecting stations. There are other stations which are inland that collect a very large amount of revenue, but where the officers have nothing to do further than to receive entries, examine the goods and enter them upon the books. I think the hon. gentleman is in error about what he said in reference to Mr. Heffernan: that he did not receive an increase of salary since he was appointed. My impression is that he received $50 last year. I know he is asking for more, but the principle of Oliver Twist governs every official in the department. The first principle is, get in, and then never cease asking for more salary.

Mr. INNES. As the Minister says, there may be a slight increase in Mr. Heffernan's salary, but he is also aware that there are several outports which report to Guelph.

Mr. BOWELL. Quite right.

Mr. INNES. Not only is there a large amount of money collected at the port of Guelph, but the collector has charge of several outports, and additional responsibility in that respect.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The House seems to be under the impression that in some of the departments, especially the Department of Inland Revenue, the system of regulating salaries involves an unnecessarily large expenditure to the country. I would not like the House to remain under that impression, and I wish to say a few words to explain that the system of the Inland Revenue Department in fixing salaries is one in the interest of economy. The Civil Service Act provides that the first, second and third class of excisemen shall be paid from $500 to $1,000 salary, leaving it optional to pay any of these officers any amount within these two sums named. My impression was, seeing that this was the state of the law, that the tendency would be for the Excise officers to get as nearly the maximum salary as possible and as speedily as possible, and a regulation was adopted in the department over which I preside, by which the maximum salary of a third class exciseman is $750, beyond which he cannot reach if he was to serve twenty years in the department. He would remain at $750 unless he passed such a promotion examination as no other officer in any other department has to pass, and then he would increase by $30 a year until he reached the salary of $850, after that he would remain at $850 until he died in the service, if he could not pass the other promotion examination which would make him eligible for the first class. During the whole of this progress he would only increase at the rate of $30 per year after passing the examinations necessary. I hold that this increase of $30 a year to these men, who must come in at the minimum salary of $500, is more in the direction of economy than if I were to appoint one at $800; and I can take the Civil Service list and show that excisemen used to be brought in at a maximum of $1,000 at their first appointment. The system adopted in the Inland Revenue Department is one which tends to great economy, and I wish the House to understand it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not make a complaint of either system, as I have not the knowledge to enable me to judge which is the better. Perhaps they would both be good as applied to the respective departments to which they belong. My remarks were only addressed to the discretion which the Minister has under the system which exists in his department, and to the application of that discretion to particular cases. Whether my case is a good one or not, it will be for him to determine, after consideration, which I have no doubt will be fairly given to it.

Customs—Province of Quebec..... $227,370

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that there is quite a large increase. Will the Minister explain what is the reason for that?

Mr. BOWELL. It arises from various causes, which I will point out to the hon. gentleman. The completion and opening of the railway running through the Eastern Townships connecting with the Short Line at Cookshire, in the County of Compton, made it necessary to establish a new port at that place, and Mr. Bean, formerly sub-

collector under Coaticook, is attached to that new port. The contingencies of that port are $100, and the officer appointed receives $600, which makes that port cost to the country $1,150, a portion of which, however, will be deducted from the expenses of Coaticook because of the transfer. The apparent increase in the City of Montreal is in consequence of adding to the permanent staff, and in consequence of a number of increases which have occurred much in the line of the suggestions made by the hon. member for Queen's, amounting to $3,350. But from the investigation which has taken place, and to which I have alluded before, I am quite satisfied that the increase will not be required during this year, but that on the contrary there will be a large reduction. These estimates were based on the expenditure of last year, and before the investigation to which I have alluded took place. I propose to make an equally searching investigation into other ports to see whether the expenditure cannot be reduced without interfering with the efficiency of the service. The port of Magdalen Islands, which cost some $1,300, has been abolished, and it has been made an outport of the City of Quebec, causing an apparent increase in that port of $1,250. Of course, the receipts at the Magdalen Islands do not amount to more than a few hundred dollars; but still it is necessary to have officials there to prevent those islands being made a rendezvous for smugglers from which they could distribute liquor and other dutiable goods throughout the country. In St. John's there is an increase of $550 by the appointment of a new man, owing to increase of work arising from its being a railway centre. In Stanstead there is an increase of $420 arising from extra services, and an increase of $50 to one of the officers. Magog has been made an outport of Coaticook for the accommodation of importers in that section, which adds $500 to the expenditure of that port. In Three Rivers it is proposed to give the collector a small increase in his salary. That makes a total increase of $7,775, including, of course, that large increase in Montreal, which I hope to have reduced. With regard to the decreases, Mr. Bean is transferred from Coaticook to Cookshire, making an apparent decrease of $550. There is a decrease of $1,300 at the Magdalen Islands, owing to the transfer to the port of Quebec. In Sherbrooke, Mr. Barry, formerly subcollector at Richmond, was transferred from Montreal to that port by my predecessor. He had a salary of $1,200, much larger than the port justified; but the hon. gentleman knows that, when a man is once in the service, it is very difficult to reduce his salary, no matter where you send him. He is since deceased, and his successor has been appointed at $600. At Sutton there is a decrease of $200, owing to the death of Mr. Langlois. The total decrease is $2,650, and the total increase $7,775, making the net increase, $5,125.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am very glad to have this explanation from the hon. gentleman. I was very glad to hear him announce the other evening that he had without any inconvenience superannuated no less than four officers in the Montreal office, and that he did not think it would be necessary to replace them by new appointments.

Mr. BOWELL. None of those positions have been filled, nor is it the intention to fill them.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understood that he expected to be able to get along without making new appointments. That statement surprised me, because if the staff was reduced by four without any inconvenience——

Mr. BOWELL. There are two others, making six.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me that there must be a good deal of looseness in connection with the management of our officials in the different ports. The hon. gentleman also stated in reply to a question that there were 150 officials at the port of Montreal. That is a very large staff. I know that a large amount of revenue is collected at that port and a large staff is necessary. At the same time I think that with a thorough and careful revision of the whole staff there, as well as at other points, we ought to be able to reduce the amount of expenditure in connection with the Customs offices throughout the Dominion, seeing that the revenue collected from imports is not running up, but is rather lower than it was some years ago. If the amount we pay is to be proportionate to the amount of revenue we collect, we should be reducing rather than increasing. That was the reason I asked the hon. Minister to explain the proposed increase in connection with the Province of Quebec. There have been some new appointments made in Montreal within the last year. Could the hon. gentleman give me the names?

Mr. BOWELL. I have no recollection of any new appointments being made in Montreal, other than placing some temporary men, who are termed, in Customs parlance, "temporary-permanent," on the permanent staff. They are those who were there before 1882, who may be put on the permanent list without examination, if the collector reports that they are efficient. There may have been some new appointments, but I have no recollection of any at present. I desire to say, however, that I am not prepared to admit that there is, as the hon. gentleman says, a great deal of looseness in the department because certain men were on the staff who were found not to be required. I explained to the leader of the Opposition, when this question was up before, that there are men who have grown grey in the service and have become comparatively useless, and that as they grow old and unable to perform their full duties, younger men are appointed to aid them in doing their work. It is always a painful duty and a difficult duty to turn these men out, and even to put them on the superannuation list. I have a case in my mind as an illustration—that of a very respectable man who had been fourteen or fifteen years in the service, and had been receiving a salary of $1,800 per year. He was compelled to retire on an allowance of $500 or $600, and I have received from him a most pitiful letter saying that he cannot support his family on that allowance. I assure the hon. gentleman that if he has ever the misfortune to occupy the position I do, with a thousand men under his charge, he will find it exceedingly difficult to manage, because, as soon as he attempts to superannuate a man who has become unfit from age to do the work properly, he will be assailed by importunities from all that man's friends and from his own supporters to keep him on in the service; and if the appointment had been made by the opposite party he will be charged

with having superannuated the officer because he owed his appointment to an opponent.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman understood me to mean that I charged his administration with looseness, I beg to assure him that I did not intend to convey anything of the kind. I only rose because, in my humble opinion, since there have been four superannuations in a very short time, we seem to be overloaded at some points with officials who could very well be dispensed with.

Mr. BOWELL. Quite right.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can quite understand it is hard, when a man has been a long time in the public service, to dismiss him or treat him harshly, but I think that greater care should be exercised in making new appointments, and that no new appointment should be made except when absolutely necessary. In this way we would prevent considerable increases in the staff. I can well understand that members of Parliament bring strong pressure to bear on Ministers to secure appointments, and no doubt the hon. gentleman has had considerable difficulty in trying to relieve himself of such pressure. I honestly believe, however, that he makes the best efforts he can to administer the affairs of his department, and that his department is as well, perhaps better administered than that of any other member of the Government: but I believe that, through pressure brought to bear on him, appointments are made which otherwise would not have been made. I would ask if it has been the custom in the past to collect and levy on fresh fruit coming into port?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is that changed now?

Mr. BOWELL. There has been no change in the law, but in the manner of collecting. For some time past, in the port of Montreal, the custom has been for one of the appraisers to go to the station and make entries before and after official hours, charging the merchant a fee of 25 cents or 50 cents. The inspectors have suggested a mode by which the entries can be made and the importers relieved of this extra tax, but the law has not been changed with reference to the collection of duties. When fruits arrive in the morning before hours, or in the evening after hours, it is necessary that delivery should be made at once as they are perishable articles, and the merchants were willing to pay the extra fees rather than have delivery delayed until the official hours.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do the officers appropriate these fees for their own benefit?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; the fees go to the officers who perform the work, in the same way as do the extra fees paid annually by the steamboat owners and railway officials for certain work performed by the Customs officials after hours. That, of course, goes to the officers. Some get $10 a month and some $15 a month extra.

Mr. LANGELIER. The Minister stated a few moments ago that he intended to keep the Customs officer on in order to prevent smuggling, and not on account of the receipts from that office. I think that is a very proper thing to do; but I take this opportunity to ask what steps the Minister intends to take to put an end to the immense amount of smuggling which has been going on? As a matter of fact, it has become a regular pest all over the south coast of the St. Lawrence down to Gaspé.

Mr. BOWELL. And on the north coast as well.

Mr. LANGELIER. And also on the islands. Smuggling is going on notwithstanding all the efforts of the officers. I do not complain of the efforts of the officers; and, with their present appliances, I think it is impossible for them to put an end to the smuggling. It has been stated to me by some of our merchants that the Department of Customs has been losing half a million a year by this smuggling. That may be exaggerated. I am not able to say whether it is or not; but it is admitted that smuggling is going on and is increasing every year, and especially the smuggling of liquors, on which the duties are very high. It is not only in regard to whiskey as it was formerly, but the methods have been improved. Even champagne is smuggled into the country. Last winter, during the elections, I had several opportunities of going through that country on the south coast of the St. Lawrence, and in almost every house you could have champagne, brandy, whiskey, port wine, almost every sort of intoxicating liquor.

Mr. BOWELL. Did they treat you kindly?

Mr. LANGELIER. I do not say that, but I was told that you could get liquors of that kind in almost every parish on the south coast of the St. Lawrence, upon which no duties had been paid, and all the clergy and those who have at heart the morality of the people complain very bitterly of that state of things. Demoralization is going on in consequence of the drunkenness which is brought about by that immense amount of smuggling, not to speak of the loss of revenue. The general opinion at Quebec seems to be that, unless a very swift steamer is put at the disposal of the officers of Customs, it will be almost impossible for them to struggle with the smugglers. They have swift schooners and small steam yachts, and, when they know the officers of the Customs are at one place they hasten to another place, and land large quantities of whiskey. Last year the Minister may remember that I told him privately of an occurrence which had been reported to me showing the exceedingly perfect system of smuggling which is in existence. Some people got an old rotten schooner for which they paid $50. Then they would put a few barrels of whiskey on board that schooner with three-quarters of water in the whiskey, and would show themselves in that place and commit some calculated indiscretion in order to bring the attention of the officers of Customs to them. The officers pounced on the little schooner and confiscated the whiskey for a few dollars of duty, and during the time these men were apparently fighting with the officers another schooner loaded with hundreds of barrels of whiskey was unloading at a spot not far away. It is impossible for the officers of Customs to put an end to this smuggling unless they have swift steamers to catch those who are smuggling all the time. I should like to know if the department intend to adopt some means of that kind to put an end to that smuggling, which has assumed such large proportions that it is a real pest in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. BOWELL. I am sorry to say there is too much truth in what has been said by the hon.

member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier). This has been brought to the attention of the department by many of the clergy of that section of the country. My hon. friend seems to understand pretty well how the smuggling is done, but we have failed in the past to find any of the kind of whiskey referred to. What we have seized has not been half water. The whiskey which we have tested has ranged from 30 to 40 and even 60 above proof. The way in which it is done, as a rule, is by the schooners to which he refers sailing from St. Pierre-Miquelon, which, as he knows, are French islands, where the liquor is almost free, the duty being only 3 or 4 per cent. They get behind some island in the St. Lawrence and transfer their liquors into the poor class of vessels to which he has referred, and when they are seized, many of these vessels, when put up at auction, would bring $50 or $75, so that rather than sell them we have often allowed them to rot on the shores. It is the intention of the Government to take energetic steps in this matter. We have invested the officers in command of the vessels belonging to the Marine Department with the powers of preventive officers, so as to enable them to capture, if possible, just such vessels as the hon. gentleman has spoken of.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How would the *Joe* do?

Mr. BOWELL. It would do very well if my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) will agree to go in her to the lower ports as mate or captain. In such an event it would be a relief to the Public Accounts Committee after the first storm, but I would not like to dispose of my hon. friend in that way, and so I would not like to ask him to take the *Joe* down to the Lower St. Lawrence. We will have to procure a vessel costing from $30,000 to $50,000 for this purpose. In the meantime we have adopted the principle of making every captain on a fishing cruiser a preventive officer, with full power to act in case he comes in contact with these smuggling vessels, and I hope we may be able to put a vessel on those waters exclusively for that purpose during this fall. It will cost money, but I am sure the revenue will be more than recouped by preventing the illicit traffic which is going on. The most important point is to put an end, if possible, to the demoralization which this illicit traffic is creating both on the north shore and on the south shore by the people drinking a poisonous stuff 50 and 60 over proof—in fact, high wines—instead of the matured whiskey which they would get under the regulations of the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr. McMULLEN. Coming back to the question which was under discussion, as to the fees collected on fresh fruit, I wanted to find out definitely from the Minister, if possible, what were the arrangements at the present moment. In the past I understand the arrangements were that the officer of the port—I do not know whether more than one officer or not—who performed those duties collected the fees and appropriated them to his own use, but the duty of course was properly returned. Can the Minister give us any idea of what these fees amount to per day or per week?

Mr. BOWELL. No, I could not. I have heard that they run up to hundreds of dollars through the season. I made enquiry once, and if my recollection serves me aright, I found that one officer had collected, in addition to his salary, fees running from $400 to $600, but I would not say positively. I know that in one case it was a very large addition to his salary. There has been more than one officer to perform this work, but there was one of the appraisers particularly who did a very large amount of this work, and received a large remuneration for it. That officer, instead of being assistant appraiser, has now taken the place of the appraiser, who has been superannuated, and he has been deprived of any of the fees to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. I will be better able at another stage to inform the Committee of the exact system which prevails now.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand there has been an Order in Council passed doing away with the collection of those fees.

Mr. BOWELL. I have told the hon. gentleman three times already that the inspectors had reported that they had adopted a system by which the importers could be relieved of these fees. It is purely a departmental regulation. There is no Order in Council at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it was Mr. Hatchett who collected these fees: I understand he collected a considerable amount annually in this way. Now, has there been an addition made to the staff recently for the purpose of attending to this particular duty?

Mr. BOWELL. No; there may have been a clerk or landing waiter on the staff relegated to that duty, but there has been no new appointment.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there such a person as William Patterson upon this staff?

Mr. BOWELL. Not that I am aware of. A Mr. Patterson has been for years a constant applicant for the position, who, I should judge, from his own opinion of himself, is fit for any position from that of Archbishop of Canterbury down to collector of the duties upon fruit. But he has never been appointed, unless temporarily for unloading fruit.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have been looking over the list of the staff published in the Auditor General's Report, page C—25, and as I stated to the House some time ago, there were about 150 altogether. I see there are only about 115 names enumerated.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the permanent staff. Then there are 30 or 40, and sometimes as high as 50, temporary men who are employed during summer, and some of them during the winter, but they are not upon the staff, consequently they do not appear here except as being paid extra.

Mr. McMULLEN. Could the Minister say whether he has on the temporary staff a person named Michael Costello?

Mr. BOWELL. I could not say.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) has a son who is in the Custom house at Montreal. What position does he occupy?

Mr. BOWELL. Either a landing waitership, or clerkship. He receives $600 a year.

Mr. McMULLEN. When was the appointment made?

Mr. BOWELL. I could not say. It may have been made this year, but he has been on the temporary staff for some time, and then put upon the permanent staff, being qualified under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not notice his name on the list. Under the report that has been made to the Minister of the investigation that was recently held, have there been any dismissals made from the staff in Montreal?

Mr. BOWELL. There was a dismissal made of a man named Campbell, whose name I have mentioned to the House two or three times before. Some others have been removed, or will be. We now have under consideration a report providing for the removal—I do not know whether I can say dismissals—of a number of temporary men who are upon the staff. We think they are not necessary, and there may be some others whose services it may be necessary to dispense with, either by way of gratuity for those who are not eligible for superannuation, or by superannuation. I cannot give the Committee full information on that point just now, as it is only within a week or ten days that I have received the report. It is very voluminous, and I have not had time to give it full attention.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no doubt the Minister will do his best, under the report of this investigation, thoroughly to purge the department of any irregularities that may have passed. Now, with regard to this enormous amount for cartage done at the Montreal Customs house, for which $5,900 is paid, can the Minister say whether there is a standing contract for this work being done, and who has it?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot remember the names. The same contractors have had the work for a number of years; it was given to them by tender some years ago, and they receive so much for each parcel they bring from the station to the examining warehouse. I may inform the hon. gentleman that this custom was imposed upon the department by his friend, and my predecessor. Formerly the merchants were compelled to pay for the cartage. I may inform him, also, that the fact of this system having been inaugurated in Montreal has compelled me to extend it to other cities. The Cities of Toronto, Hamilton and others claim very properly that they should not be taxed for cartage while the department pays it in Montreal. The cartage is a necessary expense, and from what I have learned, and I have made a number of enquiries within the last six months, I believe the contractors have performed their work very well, and they are not overpaid for what they are doing. I think it is 10 cents, but I am not certain. These are little items that I cannot remember.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understood it was 20.

Mr. BOWELL. No; I am quite satisfied it is not.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the name of the contractor, Kennedy?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know; I will make enquiry.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must say, whoever inaugurated the system, that I think it was a mistake, because I think the owners of goods should be willing to comply with the Customs regulations of any port in the matter of removing their goods to the examining warehouse, without the country being put to the expense of paying such an enormous amount for cartage. I think the merchants should be required to pay for their own carting. Besides, there are a great many people in the cities who would be glad to have an opportunity of doing it. However, if it is necessary to continue that expenditure in Montreal, I should fancy it would be cheaper to secure one or two Government drays to do the entire work, or even three or four. Certainly, it would not cost $6,000 a year to keep them up. My attention was directed to this by a person in the Customs business, and he was inclined to think that the fees paid to this individual were pretty large for the work done. In a large city like Montreal, where it is difficult to keep a keen eye on the work performed, it is impossible to judge of the actual value of the work done. I desire to know whether the sum paid is increasing or is about stationary? I suppose the work depends on the imports; the larger the imports the greater the amount of cartage required. What are the provisions of the contract, and how is payment made?

Mr. BOWELL. I have told the hon. gentleman that he is paid by the parcel, whether large or small. It never would do to trust the carrying of goods to every carter a merchant might think to employ. The carters must be responsible to the Customs directly, and be not only qualified to do the work but be responsible men, because they are held responsible for any parcel, should any be lost, and they carry very valuable goods occasionally. The amount received by the carters depends on the imports, as the amount of work depends on the imports. I made a note of what the hon. gentleman wishes, and I will endeavour to obtain the information.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do they take goods from the wharf to the bonded warehouse?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do they remove them from the bonded warehouse?

Mr. BOWELL. They may remove them to the examining warehouse. The merchants constantly urge that the goods should be taken to their stores, but I have steadily refused to do so in all parts of the Dominion. In Winnipeg we have to pay nearly double the rate we pay in Montreal from the railway station to the examining warehouse.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did the Customs Department remove all the sugar in bond to the bonding warehouses or refineries?

Mr. BOWELL. The importations of sugar were landed from the canal bank and placed in the bonding warehouses at the sugar refineries.

Mr. McMULLEN. With respect to the question raised by the hon. member for Quebec Centre, I fail to understand how the Minister is going to stop all the smuggling that is being done. This smuggling is also carried on in Ontario. The Minister will find very great difficulty in preventing goods being brought in from the United States, and this smuggling I am afraid is growing. It occurs also in Quebec and in the Lower Provinces, and especially prevails near the railway border. If the Minister desires a sufficient staff to watch our frontier against smuggling, an enormous increase must be made to the staff. I am aware from knowledge received by a person employed in Buffalo, that the smuggling of articles in every day use is something enormous. People go there and make purchases and have means of hiding the fact, and

of getting them across into Canada, avoiding the duty. No doubt the Minister will do everything possible to stop the smuggling in the interests of the revenue, but in view of our present relations with the United States, this becomes a very serious problem. Some years ago, the United States had to face this difficulty themselves. We remained quiet, and had not to pay any expenses, because goods were cheaper in Canada than on the other side of the line: but the tide has turned, and the difficulty now presents itself to us.

Mr. BOWELL. It is on account of their high protective tariff.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman will not deny that such is the fact. Many commodities are cheaper there than in Canada, and as a result a system of smuggling has been inaugurated and is being carried on to a very large extent along our entire boundary. If the condition of trade continues as at present, and if our goods should continue to increase in price here while they fall in price across the line, I cannot see how he will be able to support the enormous staff of preventive officers necessary to suppress smuggling. The hon. member for Quebec Centre has pointed to the system in his province. With respect to Ontario, I can give the Minister some hints as to how it is carried on in our province. I wish to know what steps the Minister has taken to stop this system, which is growing?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Another small matter to which I wish to ask the attention of the Minister is with respect to entering goods. Is it the duty of the collector to make out entry papers?

Mr. BOWELL. No; there is a positive order that he shall not do it. The reason for that order is, that if any blunder is made designedly or otherwise by the importer it would be attributed to the collector or other official. I know that this work has been done by collectors in some small places, and a quarter charged for each entry. When the department's attention has been called to it, they have been instructed to stop the practice, because the entries must be made by brokers or the importers.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I know a certain collector who has been for a number of years making out the entry papers and charging 25 cents which went directly into his own pocket. The inspector some few months ago found it out and he put a stop to it, but now the way they work it is, that the collector simply has an outside person to make out the entry papers and he charges 25 cents for it.

Mr. WELSH. That is quite right.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think it is right. I think that the collector of Customs should be able to furnish the importers with the necessary blanks. There are a great many importers in my part of the country who import articles of very small value, and yet they have to pay 25 cents for each entry, which is a heavy tax on them. If the collector of Customs was in a position to furnish them with the necessary blanks so that they could make out the entries themselves, this expense would be saved. I am informed that every obstacle is put in the way of importers against making out their own papers so that they will be forced to go to the broker and pay him 25 cents. That is quite a serious matter for some of these people. If the collector of Customs was obliged to keep a stock of the blanks so that importers could get them, it would be quite a saving to business people who have every day to import articles of small value in their business. In my opinion the department ought to furnish the collector of Customs with these blanks and ought to oblige him to furnish them free of charge if he is asked for them.

Mr. WELSH. I do not think there can be any improvement suggested in the mode of conducting the business of the Custom houses of this country. I know that in England, Ireland and Scotland and every country I have visited, or had ships to go to, we have always had to employ a broker to enter that ship at Customs. My experience is that if you go to the Customs officers and ask them for a blank entry they will always be happy to give it to you. But if you are not able to make the entry yourself, or have not a clerk in your office that is able to make the entry, you go to a broker and get him to make it for you, I think that system is as fair as it can be and that it does not require any improvement. I have been in a good many ports in the world and have had a good deal to do with Customs, and I cannot suggest any improvement in the mode of entering goods as far as Custom house brokers ars concerned. However, I would certainly object to the collector making the entry himself, as my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) has said. I do not think it is justice to the Customs Department for the collector to do so, but the Minister of Customs has already said that there are decided orders that the collector shall not make these entries. Whenever I went to a Customs house in Canada I have always been accommodated with that blank form whether for an entry or anything else. It may be that some persons may have been refused them, but I never heard anything about it.

Mr. BOWELL. I may say that what the member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) suggested is now the practice. No man need pay a single cent for making an entry unless he chooses. All he has to do is to go to Mr. Pennefather, if that is the officer he refers to, and say he wants a blank and he will get it. The Customs Department furnishes every Customs officers in the country with the blanks. I think they charge 5 cents for a duplicate, to cover the amount of printing, and then the importer can make out the entry for himself. The hon. gentleman says obstacles and difficulties are thrown in the way of the importers in order to compel them to go to a broker; if that were brought to the notice of the department, the officer would be reprimanded at once. My hon. friend can go to the Customs house and he can get a duplicate entry paper for 5 cents and make the entry out himself.

Mr. FLINT. When the value of the article is $1 should there be some regulation by which the importer can get assistance from the Customs officer to make out his entry without being obliged to go to a broker.

Mr. WELSH. If it is under $1 let him smuggle it.

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, no; if you do that you open the door too wide for illicit traffic.

Mr. McGREGOR. I live in a frontier town and the order is there, that anything under $5 is allowed to go without making out a regular bill. The duplicates are always on hand in the Customs

office for 5 cents, and you do not require to use a broker unless you feel so disposed. As to the remarks of my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) I simply say this: that I am persuaded that there are as many goods smuggled from Canada over to the United States as there are from the United States to Canada. Imported goods from England and Germany and other countries come into our country at a lower rate than they do into the United States, and so they buy the goods here and smuggle them back to the United States. There are a few articles made over there in the way of cotton and light goods that are smuggled from the United States to Canada, but the amount is not large. In former days, when there was a considerable difference between our sugar tariffs, they used to smuggle sugar and sometimes tea into Canada. I think the smuggling now would be about even between the two countries; in fact, I am inclined to think that we get a little the best of it, and that there are more goods smuggled from Canada into the United States than the other way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you speak from experience?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is my experience. I believe there is some smuggling from the United States into Canada in alcohol, and I have no doubt that the distillers in this country feel the effects of it to some extent. The smuggling of this article is for the reason that alcohol imported into Canada is fresh and sold cheap, and when received into this country it is put on the market to compete against the old liquor which has to be kept for two years in Canada, which no doubt affects the distillers in this country to some extent. As to smuggling generally, I think we are on a par.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman comes from a border county and is no doubt able to speak with experience of his locality. From the information I have received I understood that smuggling was practised to a considerable extent, although it may not be in the place whence my hon. friend comes. I know from a young man who was a clerk with me for many years, and who now lives in the City of Buffalo—if the statements made by him are true, and I believe they are—that there is very considerable smuggling carried on across the border. Might I ask the hon. Minister—and I may say I have had a letter recently asking me for this information—what percentage is allowed to a person who gives information with regard to a cargo or quantity of goods having been smuggled in, the person giving such information having secured the discovery of the smuggler? What percentage is he paid?

Mr. BOWELL. Under an Order in Council passed in the year 1876, under authority of the Customs Act, the informer is entitled to one-third of the proceeds of all seizures. The other one-third goes to the officer, and the remaining one-third goes to the revenue.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not necessary that the informer should be an employé of the Government?

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, no; quite the contrary. Nineteen times out of twenty they are men who are not engaged by the Customs Department. By way of illustration, I may say that one of the steamships coming from Germany to Montreal smuggled some brandy. They got it off the vessel; the saloon keeper who purchased it tried to cheat the carter by giving him a counterfeit half-dollar to pay for it, at which the carter got angry, and went and complained against him; the liquor was seized, and the steamship was fined in addition to the confiscation of the liquor. The carter should perhaps have been punished as a smuggler too, yet he would be entitled under the Order in Council to the fees, whatever they might be.

Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Customs—Ontario..... $293,905

Mr. CHARLTON. I see that there is a considerable increase in this item.

Mr. BOWELL. The total increase is $7,975. It is made up in this way: There is an increase at Amherstburg of $250 in salaries, an additional preventive officer, and $80 in contingencies. In Brantford it is proposed to give the collector an increase of $100 on account of increased work, and the contingencies are increased by $25. In Brockville there is an increase of $100 to Stewart, a man who was appointed at a lower salary than the previous officer who died, and who has proved to be a good officer; and the contingencies will be $40 additional. Cobourg has an apparent increase of $600 in contingencies, but that is really not an increase, because the port of Brighton is reduced to an outport of Cobourg. I may mention to the Committee that I am, as far as practicable, reducing ports and making them outports attached to larger ports. By doing that the aggregation of statistics for these places is done at the port by the officers without any additional help, and this relieves the head office of that work, besides decreasing the expenditure to the extent of a full set of books, which would otherwise have to be sent to the port. The outport simply takes the entry, makes a statement and sends it to the port, where the aggregation of statistics takes place. I know that it is an unpopular thing to do, because people think that it is degrading their port, when, in fact, they are not deprived of a single privilege that is enjoyed by any large port. Port Colborne is also reduced to an outport and attached to St. Catharines, causing an apparent increase of $780 in St. Catharines. In Collingwood there is an increase of salaries of $100. In Dover I propose to increase the salary of the subcollector by $100; he receives now only $200. His name is Mr. Backhouse; he takes the place of Mr. Dunham, who was removed to St. Thomas. Dundas has been made an outport and attached to Hamilton, which adds apparently to the Hamilton expenditure of $1,275. At Fort Erie there is an additional officer, named Schofield, put on the permanent list; he is to receive $600. He has been employed there for some time as a preventive officer, has passed the necessary examination, and was put on the permanent list last year; and the extra pay there is increased $50, arising from the fact that there is a continued

increase in the trade between Buffalo and Port Erie. In Galt there is an extra charge of $250. The outport of Clinton has been taken from London and attached to Goderich, where, consequently, there is an apparent increase of $600. Oakville, with the expenditure of $1,250, has been reduced to an outport and attached to Hamilton; there is an additional officer at Hamilton at $600, and a proposed increase to some officers' salaries amounting to $200. In Kingston there is an increase by a new appointment. In Peterborough the collector died and another was appointed at the same salary. No additional officer has yet been appointed, but a temporary man has been put on at $1.50 per day. At Port Arthur there is a reduction of $200. At St. Catharines and Colborne there is an addition of $550, as I have already explained, with an additional officer, Mr. Ramsdell, at $300, who attends to the Customs duties in connection with the duties he has to perform on the canal. In Sarnia, by the transfer of an officer, Mr. Heath, to Brantford, and Mr. Ostrom to Sarnia, there is an addition of $100. At Sault Ste. Marie there is an increase to the collector of $100, and contingencies $150. Stratford, contingencies, $50; the same as before. At Toronto there is a general increase. In all these larger ports, as the business increases, we have to add to the staff either temporarily or permanently, and to carry out the principle advocated by the hon. member for Queen's, we increase their salaries $50 and sometimes $100, but usually only $50 per annum, that is, those of the better class. The extra pay at Windsor arises from the extra railway work continually growing there, more particularly since the Canadian Pacific Railway has been opened. At Woodstock, which is one of the most thriving places, where the collections are very large, and where, until this year, the work has been done by one officer, there is an additional officer at $500. The net increase is about $7,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not suppose that the charge could be brought against the Customs Department that the increase of expenditure is at all extravagant. The management of that department, so far as my judgment goes, is, I must say, characterized by economy in the matter of increases. Of course, as business increases, certain classes of officials are entitled to increased pay. It occurs to me, however, that it might be possible to effect a saving by reducing the number of small outports along the lines of railways, many of which might be dispensed with. Upon the line of the Canada Southern and Air Line Railways, there are Hagarsville, Tilsonburg, Simcoe, Dunnville, and three miles from Dunnville, Maitland, at which small points the business, in many instances, is not sufficient to pay the expenses of the officers in charge, and the entries might be made at the frontier or at stations comparatively near, such as St. Thomas, and the Government might, without detriment to the service, effect quite a saving by closing some of these little outports. I may be mistaken as to the position I take in the matter, but I certainly think the number of these small outports is in excess of our requirements.

Mr. BOWELL. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman has not escaped the notice of the Government; and if I had my own way, to speak frankly, I would close a very large number of these small ports. But once they are established and the people have the advantage of them, it is very difficult to carry out the hon. gentleman's suggestion, more especially as there are continual demands for others. Tilsonburg, however, is one of those places to which I think perhaps the hon. gentleman's remarks do not apply with any great force, because that is increasing rapidly. The collections at Tilsonburg exceed those of Simcoe, and Simcoe really should be, I suppose, the port, being the county town, but it is only an outport of Dover, which, having been one of the lake ports in the older days, was the important importing point of entry for that whole section; but Dover has gone down and Simcoe has grown up, and Tilsonburg has taken the lead of even Simcoe, the county town. With reference to the other places there is a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the amount of business at these places?

Mr. BOWELL. At Hagarsville the amount collected was $1,413; at Dunnville, $3,002; at Port Rowan, $361; at Simcoe, $4,879; at Tilsonburg, $7,837.

Mr. CHARLTON. At Port Rowan, which used to be a point of some consequence, the officer might be dispensed with, judging by the receipts.

Mr. BOWELL. These are preventive stations where they make small collections, but where it is absolutely necessary to have an officer.

Mr. TRUAX. What is the amount collected at Walkerton, and the salary paid the collector?

Mr. BOWELL. Last year we collected $2,657.62, and the amount paid to Mr. McNamara is $600 per annum.

Mr. TRUAX. I notice, in the Auditor General's Report, that Mr. McNamara, a sub-collector, was paid $590.56; fuel, $15.61; stove, &c., $16.10; cleaning, $48.25; telegrams, $56.25. I was not aware that Mr. McNamara had to keep an office open to the public, and cannot understand how it is he is paid $48.25 for cleaning office.

Mr. BOWELL. Is there not a public building in Walkerton?

Mr. TRUAX. That building is not yet completed, and Mr. McNamara simply occupies the telegraph office.

Mr. BOWELL. Does he not keep an office?

Mr. TRUAX. He does, at the Montreal Telegraph Office.

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot give you any other explanation. If he put in a bill for cleaning, it was paid. Where there is an office, we allow a certain sum for cleaning during the year, sometimes $25, sometimes $30 and $40. I will make enquiry and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. TRUAX. I do not think the amount paid him is too much, unless he received it as salary.

Mr. BOWELL. We pay a salary, and if any officer has to rent a building we pay the rent and the cleaning, and pay for the furniture, if he requires to furnish it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I wish to bring to the attention of the House the case of a seizure in the town of Durham, in the riding I have the honour to represent. It appears Mr. Cliff and his sons

were engaged in woollen manufactures, and in 1886 they purchased a carding mill in the United States. I am informed it was a second-hand carding mill, old-fashioned, out of use and idle, and they got it at a very low rate. I am also informed that they paid duty on the price for which they purchased that machine. In 1887 Mr. Cliff failed in business and made an assignment to Mr. Harris. The building was sold by the assignee at public auction to Mr. Grant of Durham and the machinery to Mr. Hunter. In 1888, I am informed, the Custom house officers came up and were about to seize the machine, stating that it was entered at an under-valuation, and as it was being used by Mr. Hunter in the carding mill and he did not desire to have it sold, he deposited $1,000. I understand that this has not been returned to him. Mr. Hunter had nothing to do with the importation at all. He went to the public auction and bought the machine and paid for it, and was in no way connected with the original purchase of the machinery. It is difficult to understand how it happens that three years afterwards, when it has passed from the possession of the Messrs. Cliff, the officers should attempt to seize the machine. I would ask the Minister if he thinks Mr. Hunter should lose any portion of this money which he deposited in order to prevent the mill from standing still? It looks very peculiar.

Mr. BOWELL. The only explanation I can give the hon. gentleman is that the machinery was originally entered at an under-valuation. An information was lodged, I presume, in regard to the under-valuation and the machinery was seized, and the result was, I have no doubt, as the member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has represented it. Very likely the penalty imposed was the confiscation of an amount equal to the under-valuation. I know that at that time there were a large number of these machines coming from a particular house in the United States, and in many cases they were seized and all were dealt with alike. It is the practice of some American manufacturers, of late years, to give the appearance of second-hand machinery to what are really new machines. They make the machine and they put it up and test it in their own factory, get it dirty and ship it in that shape so that it has the appearance of machinery which has been in use for years, when in fact it is absolutely new, has only been tested, and instead of being re-cleaned is sent here as a second-hand machine. There are many cases of this kind, though I do not know that this was one of them. There are scores of other means by which attempts are made to enter goods at an under-valuation, and when they are seized the party who holds them has to suffer the consequence. The Customs law does not consider, except from an equitable standpoint, the party who owns the article at the time the seizure is made. If anyone stole a horse from the hon. gentleman, he might sell it to some one who would buy it innocently, and he might innocently sell it to me, but the hon. gentleman, if he found it in my possession, would come and take it. There are many cases on the frontier where horses and various articles are smuggled and sold to third parties. In these cases we exercise an equitable jurisdiction as far as the law permits by insisting on the payment of the duty and expenses, where there is no evidence of collusion between the party in whose possession the article is found and the one who smuggled it. The fact of two years having elapsed before seizure does not imply any lack of vigilance on the part of the officers or that the seizure was improper, because it often happens that the facts do not come to the knowledge of the officials until some time after the smuggling has taken place. Often a man will import an article and enter it at a certain value, and a year afterwards another importer may enter a similar article honestly at its market value in the United States. The officer seeing that, and he remembering that another man imported a similar article and entered it at a much lower price, and finding the first entry a fraudulent one, he seizes the article. I give this as an illustration of what may have occurred in this case. I do not remember all the circumstances now, but very many cases of that character occur, where a seizure does not take place till two or three years after the importation, when the fraud is discovered.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Has any portion of that amount been refunded?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot say; but from what the hon. gentleman has stated I should judge that nothing was refunded. Probably, after an investigation, the officers found their supposition was correct, and that that would be the penalty which would have to be paid.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will read the statement which I received from Mr. Harris, the assignee:

"Some time in the year 1886, C. F. Cliff & Sons, woollen mill men, purchased in the United States and imported into Canada a quantity of second-hand woollen machinery, which was entered for importation and the duty paid thereon at the actual cost or the price paid therefor. In the latter part of the year 1887 the Messrs. Cliff assigned their estate to me. The equity of redemption in the real estate was purchased by C. F. Grant and the machinery and stock by the late J. H. Hunter. Among the machinery purchased by Mr. Hunter was the second-hand lot imported by the Messrs. Cliff. This purchase was made by Mr. Hunter at public auction in January, 1888. Customs Officers J. Hamilton, of Stratford, and Hutton, of Guelph, called upon Mr. Hunter and claimed one thousand dollars ($1,000) for fraudulent entry of machinery, claiming that the goods had been undervalued. Rather than allow a seizure the money was paid. If there was any fraud upon the Customs, Mr. Hunter was most certainly not a party thereto. But the duty was paid on the actual amount paid for the machinery. No doubt the goods were purchased at a very low price, but the machinery was old-fashioned, out of repair, dirty and idle, and the terms of the purchase were that the lot was to cost so much. In addition to the goods, the seller was to clean, repaint and furnish all necessary repairs; this was done, but at no additional cost to Cliff. If there is any further information required I will be happy to furnish you with it.

"Yours faithfully,

"THOMAS A. HARRIS."

Now, if it were in the public interest to make the seizure, why should Mr. Hunter suffer all the penalty? Mr. Hunter is now dead, but I certainly think his heirs have a claim, and if it were in the public interest to make this seizure, they should not suffer all the loss that is required by the Government. In the Agriculture Department, for instance, when it is necessary to slaughter diseased cattle in the public interest, the owner of the cattle does not sustain all the loss, but the Government sustain a part of it. In a matter of this kind, I think the department would scarcely be justified unless they saw that this claim of Mr. Hunter was paid back in full. I think the people of this country would demand that Mr. Hunter should not be made the victim in the public interest. He did it purely as a matter of business, he did it honestly,

as an honest man, he acted as a straightforward man without any collusion. And I would say the same of the Messrs. Cliff: so far as I know them they have a very good reputation, and I do not believe they would be guilty of doing wrong either. I believe that what they say in this matter is correct, and I hope the Minister will consider this case, because it seems to me too much to ask that one person who was entirely innocent should suffer all the loss. I hope he will look into it, because I think it would be terrible to allow the heirs of Mr. Hunter to suffer this loss. I am asking for nothing but what is fair and just, and I think every member of this House will agree with me.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the Minister of Customs say under what section of the Act he claims the right to confiscate the goods?

Mr. BOWELL. According to the Act the moment a violation of the law takes place, the goods become *de facto* the property of the Crown, and you can take them when and where you please. It does not require an action at law, but the moment the Customs Act is violated by the improper importation of an article, it becomes *de facto* confiscated.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the hon. gentleman will see that if the article has been entered at the price that was actually and *bonâ fide* paid, he could hardly say that the appraiser's value, which might differ from the price which was actually paid, and which is not given for two years afterwards, will have a retroactive effect and relate back to the time the importation took place, to make the goods the property of the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. It is, I say most distinctly, because the law provides that the article must be entered at the marketable value in the country in which it is purchased, not the price that is actually paid for it. Consequently, if a man sold this machinery, to which the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has called attention, at an under-valuation, say $500 below the price at which it would be sold in the market in which it was produced, and was so entered, though he only paid the amount at which he entered it, it is absolutely forfeited under the Customs Act. No one enforced that view of the law stronger than my predecessor in the hon. gentleman's Government; he will remember I produced to this House some years ago a volume to show the number of circulars which had been issued by the Liberal Government in order to enforce strictly that provision of the Act, to prevent what is termed under-valuation and slaughtering in the market.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Supposing this machinery was bought at sheriff's sale; would not that be conclusive as to its market value?

Mr. BOWELL. No, that is not conclusive, and the law makes special provisions upon that point; an article might be bought at a bankrupt sale, but that might not be its fair market value. The law says the value of an article for duty shall be the fair market value of that article in the principal markets of the country in which it is produced. Now, it is not the fair market value of the article if it is sold at a sacrifice at auction sale.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You have no better way of ascertaining the price, than where men are bidding with each other and putting up the price until it is knocked down to the highest bidder.

Mr. BOWELL. No. If you refer to another clause of the Customs Act in the tariff, you will find it is distinctly stated that sales by auction, or sacrifice sales, shall not be accepted as the fair market value for duty.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Can the Minister tell me how it was discovered that the machine was entered at an under-valuation?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman thinks that I am an encyclopædia, or that it is possible for me to carry in my head the reasons for the thousands of seizures that have been made. When he calls my attention to a seizure that took place two or three years ago, he must not be surprised if I am not in a position to give him full information. But if he had told me that he intended to bring this case before the House, I would have furnished the whole information. I have spoken to the officials of the department and have asked for full explanations to give to the hon. gentleman, so far as the reasons for the seizure are concerned, and the action of the Government thereon. I submit to the Committee whether it is fair for hon. gentlemen, in criticising the Estimates, to rise and ask for all the minutiæ in a particular seizure, when hundreds of them come under the notice of the Minister annually. I will give all the information I possibly can.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would be very sorry to think here were hundreds of seizures made under circumstances similar to this one, because it is a great hardship indeed.

Mr. BOWELL. You do not know the facts.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the facts of the case have been brought clearly before the Minister. Mr. Harris, who gives me this information, is a reputable man, and has an intimate knowledge of the business of the firm, and these statements that he makes over his own signature, are something that the Minister cannot ignore. I have an idea that the Minister would want to do what is right in this matter, and if he lets his officers seize that, I would like to know where the money has gone?

Mr. BOWELL. Gone into the treasury, I fancy, some portion of it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did the informer receive it?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot tell you what became of it. I will tell you that to-morrow, if you will give me time.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think it is necessary I should know. I suppose that to a certain extent I am responsible for the expenditure of public money, and if any money has been taken away wrongfully from any of my constituents, I will make it as hot as I can for the Ministers and everybody else concerned.

Mr. BOWELL. All right, I will try and get a cake of ice to sit on while you are making it hot.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not want to see money taken from my constituents improperly. I want to see them act squarely and fairly with the department, and I want to see the department act fairly with them. I think the Minister of Justice should look into this case, for I do not think he would desire to see the heirs of this estate wronged

out of this money. The Minister, I am very glad to learn, promised to lay the matter before the House.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say so; I said I would furnish the facts.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am rather surprised to learn that such an incident should have occurred. I knew Mr. Hunter, who was a highly respectable man. His health became very poor, and I suppose he was not disposed to carry through litigation with the Dominion Government in order to recover what he felt was his own. Since the matter occurred, he has died. Notwithstanding that fact, and more so under the present circumstances, if an injustice has taken place, the heirs of the deceased should be recouped. I do not say the action may not have been proper on the part of the officer in taking the machinery, for there must have been reasonable grounds on which to have proceeded. But, after careful investigation of the whole circumstances, I earnestly hope the heirs of the deceased will be granted a refund of the money if there are reasonable grounds on which it can be made. No doubt the Minister of Justice will give it his careful and impartial consideration. The member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) was quite right in bringing the matter forward, seeing he was not aware of the facts until a few days ago when he received the letter. It is a very important matter, and I am sure the Minister of Customs will give it his consideration, and if there is any ground on which the Government can refund the money, I am satisfied he is disposed to do what is right. All we want is a full investigation.

Mr. FRASER. I agree with the Minister of Customs that not having all the facts we cannot discuss this special case. In regard to the general principle laid down, I do not think it is as broad as he stated it. The best criterion of the value of an article is the amount for which it sells. You are not to suppose that a man who is selling an article is selling it under price. No valuator can give the value of an article as well as the business man who sells it. He is not going to sell it here for less than he can sell it elsewhere. So far as this article is concerned, it having passed from hand to hand is in the position of an article sold on the market. If the bill was attached to the affidavit made by the importer showing its price, and there was no collusion, you could scarcely obtain evidence strong enough to show there should be another trial. The second sale should regulate the matter, the amount for which it was sold by the assignee.

Mr. BOWELL. You would not fix the price of an article sold in Canada as value for duty.

Mr. FRASER. It would be an indication of the value of the article when an article was sold by an assignee after being imported. But it is the general principle to which I wish to address myself. A wrong would be done to very many purchasers if a criterion of the value was laid down by an officer, who cannot have all the facts. If it was a regular business transaction, if the goods were purchased in England or in the United States, even at very low prices, it would be a dangerous principle to lay down that you must put the value up to what this man or the other man may place it, except the seller. The seller carries on business to make money and he is the best judge of the value. There was a case to which I called the attention of the Minister a short time ago of a similar character. An ex-member of this House, some time ago, I think previous to Confederation, made a certain importation.

Mr. BOWELL. The duty never was paid on it.

Mr. FRASER. I understand the duty was paid on it. If the importation of the article was regular, if the purchase was made in trade, it was a dangerous principle to apply that an official authorized by the Customs shall say what the value is, from whose decision there is no appeal, for he may place that value higher than that given in open market in a fair business transaction. I think the principle as stated by the Minister of Customs is too broad and must lead to great wrongs being committed towards many importers.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think this is a time to discuss this question. I am quite satisfied that if the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who is a lawyer, will read the Customs Act from the 58th to the 66th or 69th section he will find I place no strained construction on the law. I am not going to discuss the reasons why Parliament, in its wisdom, thought proper to pass an Act which in its character is materially different from the general principles laid down in the administration of law. There are reasons with which I could convince the hon. gentleman why the law is strictly correct, and why it is absolutely necessary to have unusual powers in order to enforce the Customs Act and prevent frauds on the revenue.

Mr. FRASER. I am not complaining of the law.

Mr. BOWELL. The statement made by the hon. gentleman has been made by a great many others, who have declared that the Customs Act provides no appeal. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong. If the appraiser, whose sworn duty it is to ascertain as near as possible the value of an article, places that value too high, the importer has a right to appeal to merchant appraisers in order to have a thorough investigation on that point, and to prove before those arbitrators, his own peers, the inaccuracy of the appraiser's valuation. If he does not desire to take that course, he can appeal from the decision of the department and take the matter to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. CHARLTON. Might I ask the Minister whether a Customs office has been established at Little Current, which is now the principal business centre in Manitoulin Island?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, one has been established.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has it been removed from Manitoulin?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. At the hon. gentleman's suggestion that the business of that section of the Island was done at Little Current and not at Manitoulin, I ordered the removal of the officer to that point.

Mr. CHARLTON. That puts the matter in proper shape.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that the Customs house in Montreal costs $147,300 while the Customs house at Toronto costs only $60,000. If the cost is generally in proportion to the amount collected might I ask what is collected at these ports?

Mr. BOWELL. For the year ending 30th June, 1890, at Toronto $4,322,318.28, and at Montreal $8,801,117.95.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a very serious difference between the cost of the two offices, and I presume the Minister will be able to explain why it is.

Mr. BOWELL. The cost at a port arises not only from the amount of duty collected but from various reasons. In Montreal the constant arrival of steamers necessitates the employment of a much larger number of men than in Toronto, and in proportion as these cities become railway centres so do the expenses increase. A new railway entering a city requires three or four additional men to receive the goods when they arrive. In Montreal, as the hon. gentleman knows, there has been three or four new roads constructed, and a certain number of men have to be at the depots to examine goods or baggage in bond. It is the same way in Toronto. The hon. gentleman knows that city has grown very rapidly and that new railways constantly find an entrance there. As I explained before, the amount of collections do not in any way indicate the total amount of work there is to perform. No one knows better than the gentleman who asked the question that it is no more trouble to make an entry in which you give a cheque for $10,000 duty than it is for $10. The only difference is that there is a larger amount of work in the appraisers' and warehouse departments in examining the goods.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then we are to understand that the goods which arrive in Montreal by the Allan or Dominion line of steamers, and that are going through to Toronto or other places in bond, have to pass through the hands of the Customs at Montreal?

Mr. BOWELL. Every package that arrives by an ocean steamer has to be landed under the supervision of a Customs officer, transferred to the bonded car, sealed by him, and the manifest sent wherever the car is going. When that manifest arrives at its destination, it is compared with the goods in the car, and if the goods do not agree with the manifest, then the railway is held responsible for anything that is missed.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can understand now, from the explanation given by the Minister, why it is that the port of Montreal is more expensive than Toronto, because of course Montreal is the distributing point for the whole Dominion.

Customs—British Columbia.. ..... $48,845

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there is an increase here.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; and necessarily so. In New Westminster alone there is an increase of $2,000 for additional salaries and extra pay. There are two railways now crossing the border, one at a place called Blaine and another at Huntingdon, and it is necessary to have officers there. There is an addition in Nanaimo of $50. I may say in reference to New Westminster that within the last few years the population has more than doubled, and the collections of revenue have more than doubled also. Last year the revenue was $61,000; ten years ago it was about $4,000. In Nanaimo $51,000 was collected. In Vancouver, which is a new port, comparatively, $210,515.97 was collected; and the fact of this port being the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers from Japan, as well as other vessels, necessitates the employment of a larger number of extra men to supervise the landing of all the goods. In Victoria there is an increase of $930, but the revenue of Victoria has also increased to no less a sum than $820,930. On the frontier service of the province there is a reduction of some $1,500.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the salary of the collector at Victoria?

Mr. BOWELL. $3,000. The old salary was higher than that, because when British Columbia came into the Union one of the agreements with the British Government was that the salaries paid to the old Imperial officials should not be interfered with, and that they should be superannuated on the full amount of their salaries.

Salaries and Travelling Expenses of Inspectors of Ports..... ..... $18,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How many inspectors are there altogether?

Mr. BOWELL. There are five divisions—one for Nova Scotia; one for New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island; one for Quebec; one for Ontario; one in Winnipeg; and one in British Columbia. But in British Columbia, I have combined the inspectorship at present with the collectorship of New Westminster. Mr. Clute, who is a very efficient officer, I made inspector of the province with a slight increase of salary, and he performs both duties now.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that there is a good deal charged for boarding and travelling expenses and board allowance. For instance, W. H. Hill, inspector, has received $288 for travelling expenses and $472.50 for board allowance for 135 days. H. Kavanaugh, inspector, has received $532.16 for travelling expenses. Mr. Mewburn has a salary of $2,000, and receives $326 for travelling expenses and $998 for board allowance for 281 days. J. McLean, inspector, has a salary of $2,000, besides $686 for 196 days. S. W. McMichael has a salary of $1,600 and a board allowance of $437. In what way are these allowances regulated? Do the officers produce vouchers?

Mr. BOWELL. I am surprised at the sums which the hon. gentleman has named being so small as they are. An inspector is supposed to be on the road all the time. He goes from port to port constantly, and he is allowed by Order in Council $3.50 per diem for board allowance, in addition to travelling expenses. Mr. Mewburn has a very large territory, including nearly the whole of Ontario as far as the Manitoulin Islands, and until lately as far as Port Arthur, which recently I have added to the Winnipeg inspection district. The inspectors have to give a detailed account to us, and through us to the Auditor General, of the amounts paid for travelling. I know that the inspectors apparently cost a good deal of money; but, if they did not travel, there would be no use in having them appointed. Mr. McMichael is what we term a financial inspector. If there are any financial difficulties, and we desire the books and accounts of any port examined, we send him. Mr. O'Meara, the new inspector of the Province of Quebec, in place of Mr. Kavanaugh, who has been superannuated, being over 70 years of age, has been associated with Mr. Mc

Michael for some time. He spent over two months in the port of Montreal, during the whole of which time he received $3.50 per diem for board allowance, in addition to travelling expenses going to and from that port. The same statement would apply to all the ports which the inspectors visit. Mr. Clute, for instance, has an immense territory over which to travel in order to reach a single port. It costs a great deal of money for travelling expenses in British Columbia, because the inspector has to travel long distances on horseback; yet many places there are growing so rapidly that it is necessary for him to visit them in order to see that the work is properly done. The expenses in a country like ours will always necessarily be very large.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that some officers received more for travelling expenses than others. Are there any vouchers produced by any of these men setting forth clearly and distinctly the number of days and the actual outlays? I do not wish to make the slightest insinuation with regard to the inspectors, who no doubt are all honest, honourable men, but I would like to know whether there is any way by which the expenses claimed as travelling expenses are checked or certified to.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course, just as long as human nature is inclined to be dishonest, those who are dishonest will find means to evade the law. When an inspector goes away for a week, he is the only person who can vouch for the expenses he made during that time. He is entitled to $3.50 per day all the time he is away. He shows what places he has visited and charges his railway fare. I am not sure, but I think he makes an affidavit. Then the account is sent to the Auditor General, who checks it. Every precaution is taken, and I am glad to know that the inspectors of Customs are men who are, I believe, above committing anything of that kind.

Board of Customs and Outside Detective Service—To meet expenditure in connection therewith, including $800, salary of Commissioner of Customs as Chairman of the Board $17,550

Mr. BOWELL. There is an increase of $1,600. In the first place, we had to employ an additional clerk at $450, and he is now receiving $500. Then there is an amount for travelling expenses, and there are various other items which bring the increase up to the figure I have mentioned. If we send one of the Dominion appraisers, or anyone connected with the Board, to investigate or to supervise the appraiser's department at any port, we have to pay his expenses. There is a decrease in the inspection staff of $3,200, which more than offsets the increase. The decrease arises from the fact that Mr. Wolff, who died a year ago, has not been replaced. His duties are being performed by Mr. McMichael without any increase of pay.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand that in the North-West, along the boundary, the Mounted Police render good service in the prevention of smuggling. I suppose the hon. gentleman depends almost entirely on them.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; with the exception of a few outports at some places along the border of Manitoba, such as Deloraine, Killarney and Gretna, and coming down to Emerson these are outports. The Mounted Police are utilized along the whole border from the Rocky Mountains to Winnipeg, and they cost very little more than if they were located in barracks. There is a patrol from the Rocky Mountains to Emerson twice a week, on that whole length, from 1,000 to 1,200 miles. This preventive service, which is admirably performed by the force without additional cost, would otherwise probably cost the Government $10,000 to $20,000 a year.

Customs Laboratory—To meet expenditure in connection with the testing of sugars, &c., including pay of officers appointed or employed for that purpose $6,000

Mr. BOWELL. I shall probably not require the whole of this item, as I may be able to dispense with one or two of those formerly employed. We have, however, to keep the laboratory in existence, because we have to test vinegars, liquors and molasses still. I may retain one of the young ladies in the department for the purpose of taking charge of the Chinese work which is rapidly increasing.

Mr. KENNY. I desire to call the attention of the Committee to the very satisfactory manner in which the work is performed by the laboratory, and I hope that now, when we collect revenue on sugars by the Dutch standard, instead of the polariscope, the Minister may see his way clear, if he cannot continue the polariscopic test, to have all sugars graded uniformly at Ottawa as they have been formerly tested uniformly at Ottawa, by the polariscope. He will recognize that at the many outports it is impossible all the collectors can be accurate judges of sugars, or tell the difference of one point in the different grades of sugar. It seems to me that it is in the public interest that the greatest possible uniformity should exist in the collection of revenue, and I would suggest it would be advisable that all the sugars imported into Canada, if we abandon entirely the polariscopic test, should be graded here. It would be more satisfactory to the trade, and more beneficial to the revenue if that were done here by the same officers who have performed the work of testing sugar so satisfactorily during the past few years. I think this matter is of so much consequence that I desire formally to call the attention of the Minister to it, and hope he will give it his favourable consideration.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not know that it would be wise to go to that expense, and it appears to me it would be injurious rather than beneficial to the consumers. It might possibly be an advantage to the refiners, but I do not think it would be to the consumers that such an inspection should take place.

Mr. BOWELL. It certainly would not be an advantage to the refiners, but the contrary. Sugar now is judged by the colour, or what we call the Dutch standard. If the refiners could get in sugar over sixteen free, they might sell it in competition with the merchants who import the same article and pay the duty. The great objection the trade would have to the adoption of that policy would be the delay that would arise from sending the sugars from the extreme parts of this country to the laboratory in Ottawa to be tested as to whether it was fourteen, fifteen or sixteen. Formerly the test as to the strength of sugar was confined to that which was imported for refining purposes,

and not to sugars which were over 14 Dutch standard. It is a matter of gratification to me, however, and I frankly confess it, to know that the merchants have come to the conclusion that the policy was correct which was adopted by the department of compelling all sugars that were imported for refining to be sent to Ottawa for the purpose of being tested as to their strength. My hon. friend knows how the Boards of Trade protested against that plan being adopted, and that it was with no little difficulty that, as head of the department, I had to insist upon a year's trial being given to it. No one objected to it more strongly than my hon. friend's late colleague, and I am pleased to know that he subsequently was not only satisfied with the system which was adopted, but I received a letter from him recently strongly urging the adoption of the system which has been suggested by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) to-day. The importers have urged a continuance of the test of these sugars in Ottawa, and say they will pay the expenses of the officers at headquarters, and further they say they will pay at Halifax, and other important centres, the expenses of Customs officials to test sugars and weigh them at those ports. The objection I have to that is that the Government would put themselves in the position of being responsible for all difficulties and errors arising in connection with the weights and qualities of sugars between the exporter and the importer. I think the department of the Government should hold itself, as far as possible, free from all complications that might arise between business men, and that is one of the reasons why I have not given my consent to the proposition suggested by the member for Halifax, and by the Board of Trade of Halifax, and which has been indicated by my hon. friend who has spoken. I think those who have had experience in the management of public affairs of that kind will conclude that the best course to pursue is for the Government to assume the smallest responsibility they possibly can so far as any interference with the trade of the country is concerned beyond the absolute requirements of the tariff.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs has stated that one of his objections to acceding to the wishes of the importers of sugars in Halifax is that the distance is so great. The distance is no greater now than it was when we used the polariscope, and the Minister knows that in every cargo of West India sugar there will be in all probability a certain percentage which will grade higher than the 14 Dutch standard. I am quite sure my hon. friend the Minister of Customs need not be afraid that his revenue will suffer at the port of Halifax because there he has efficient officers and experts, but he knows that at many of the outports in the Maritime Provinces and other parts of the Dominion, the officers of the Customs Department are not experts in the matter of sugar, and that it requires an expert to decide accurately whether the sugar is the Dutch 14 or whether it slightly exceeds it, and there might be on the part of the importers at the port of Montreal or the port of Halifax, an impression that the duty had not been fairly collected at the other ports. All that might be prevented and perhaps better protection might be secured to the revenue, if the Minister would have this sugar graded, if it is not tested by the polariscope. My only object is to have the greatest uniformity adopted in the collection of revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will have to provide that your Customs officials are not colour-blind.

Mr. BOWELL. I think so. Of course, we would have to furnish samples, such as I produced in the House, to all the officers, and we would also have to see that they were not colour-blind.

Administration of the Chinese Immigration Act, including remuneration to Customs officers..... $2,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What was spent in connection with this service last year?

Mr. BOWELL. I think I can satisfy the hon. gentleman that this is the most economically administered part of the whole Government service. The amount voted last year was $2,000. The expenditure for the year 1889-90, which is the year we are now considering, was $1,634.99.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What were the receipts for Chinese immigrants?

Mr. BOWELL. The expenditure for the present year will probably be $1,700. We have been in the habit of taking a vote of $2,000 because the expenditure varies. The reason for the small expenditure is that I have utilized the Customs collectors in the different ports to perform the duties of controllers of Chinese immigration without extra pay, except where we have had to add an additional officer. The revenue was increased over that of the former year, and this year it will exceed $80,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. From Chinese immigration?

Mr. BOWELL. From Chinese immigration. This is for the year ending the 30th June. It will be more this year. Yet, strange to say, as far as we can learn, we have no more Chinese in this country now than we had before. I do not say where they go, but I know the American Government has been communicating with the Imperial Government and requesting them to ask Canada to assist in enforcing the American laws of prohibition against the Chinese.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is their present law?

Mr. BOWELL. Total prohibition.

Mr. INNES. Is it not true that many Chinese come into Canada from Washington and Oregon without paying duty?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not aware of it. I think it is rather the other way, though, no doubt, some do come in.

Mr. FRASER. Does not the Minister think it would be well to repeal that Act? As we cannot get population to come into this country, why should we not allow the Chinese to come in as well as anybody else?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think it would be profitable for the Committee to enter into a discussion of that question now.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is the officer at Victoria that the Minister says he is utilizing for this work?

Mr. BOWELL. The collector, Mr. Milne. I will give the hon. gentleman the details. The chief controller is Mr. Parmalee here at headquarters, who supervises the whole work and receives $400. Yip Yun, interpreter at Vancouver, $360 a year; Mongkow, of Victoria, also an interpreter, receives $177.50; J. Saunders, who is also an interpreter although of English name, received $2.50; Ah Wing, $2.50 as interpreter of Chinese invoices. The salary of G. L. Webster, at Vancouver, who attends to this business in connection with the Customs, was $281.72. He was appointed in the double capacity of landing waiter and in connection with the Chinese Act, half the salary being charged to the Chinese fund, and half to the Customs. Mr. Brooks, for services rendered, received $28.50; W. Dunstan, $2.50; G. Winne, caretaker at Victoria, $60; legal services, Drake, Jackson & Co,, $86.37; travelling expenses of inspector, G. H. Young, $159.85; postages and telegram, $105; Queen's Printer, for printing certificates and other things, $72.50, making a total of $1,634.99. The collectors at Vancouver, Victoria and New Westminster, in addition to being collectors of Customs, are controllers of the Chinese Immigration Act, without extra pay.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would the Minister say what the feeling of the public is in British Columbia regarding Chinese immigration, whether the prejudice that existed with regard to the Mongolians some time ago, has to any extent diminished, or whether it still continues on the part of the Anglo-Saxon population of the province?

Mr. BOWELL. I think in some respects it has increased, in others it has decreased. The prejudice against the introduction of the Mongolian race into that province has decreased among that class of people who desire to have greater facilities for obtaining servants. Among the labouring classes, the workingmen, and the artizan, I suppose the feeling against the Chinese has increased. So far has that feeling manifested itself that the Executive Council of British Columbia have passed an Order in Council asking the Dominion Government to make the law still more rigid, which fact would indicate that the feeling had increased against the introduction of the Mongolian race into British Columbia.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have noticed in California on two or three occasions, and also in British Columbia, that the popular feeling with regard to Mongolian immigration was very strongly opposed to it. Although it is customary to indulge in criticisms upon the policy of the Government in throwing impediments in the way of that immigration by a tax of $50 per head, yet I am unable, in view of all the circumstances, to say that the policy is an unwise one. I think the Government have acted wisely in the matter. There certainly must be good reasons for the prejudice that exists against this class of the population, among the white people. That prejudice is universal in Washington, in Oregon and California, as well as in British Columbia so far as my observation and enquiries have gone. The employer of labour, no doubt, who wants cheap labour, would naturally look with favour upon the introduction of that race, but we must remember that the Pacific coast lies very convenient to China, and that if no impediments were placed in the way of immigration, we would have a swarm of Mongolians coming to our shores. I must express my opinion that the policy of the Government on this matter is justified by the circumstances, and that to admit the Chinese without let or hindrance—to invite them, in fact, as we would do by placing no impediments in the way of their immigration—would probably be an unwise policy.

Mr. TROW. During the trip that I took a few years ago to British Columbia, I had conversation with a good many of the leading citizens of Victoria in regard to the Chinese. I remember that the landlord of the largest hotel in the city, the "Driard," where they employ some 20 of these Mongolian servants, all males, informed me that there was no possibility of getting white labour, or labour of any kind, other than Chinese, who were honest and industrious. He said they made the very best of servants, and it was almost impossible to get along without their assistance. He was surprised that the Dominion Government should adopt such a rigid law to prevent them from coming into this country. In fact he said that the Canadian Pacific Railway would not be the accomplished fact that it was at that day, that it could not have been constructed in the brief time that it was constructed, had it not been for Chinese labour.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think it is easy to see that if you allow Chinamen to come in at all, you necessarily make white labour very scarce, because no white labourers can exist where there are any Chinamen. Now, if there were no Mongolians in British Columbia at all, there would be no doubt an abundant supply of white labour, because then white men would get better wages and they would go there to live. But as soon as you allow the Chinamen to come in, they cut down wages so that no white man can live at all. Then they are no good to the country, they do not become naturalized, they simply remain and make a little money and then they go back home and carry it with them. In the Western States and California, especially, where I have had some knowledge of them, they have their Chinese stores, and they bring all their goods, and wearing apparel and everything that they use, from China; they do not patronize European houses at all. I think they are of no use at all in the country. They do not develop the resources of this country, they do not build up the country, and I believe that we should put all the impediments we can in the way of their coming here.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have had a little experience with this question myself in the western countries, and I can confirm the statement made by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), with regard to the usefulness of the Chinese as labourers. At the time the Union Pacific was being built, I was crossing upon that line, and after making enquiries into the question of Chinese labour, I was informed that the men who worked in the machine shops, under a white foreman, were all Chinamen. In conversation with railway men they told me that if it had not been for Chinese labour they could not have built the road at all. In the western country where there are mining settlements, they cannot keep white men at all, they rush off like sheep, one after another; but when they have Chinamen they can depend upon them to carry out the work. There is also a strong feeling amongst the people who employ servants in the western country, that they cannot get along without Chinese labour. A few years ago,

owing to same difficulty with the leading Chinese in the City of Victoria, the Chinese believing they were harshly treated, all struck work, and every Chinese servant in the City of Victoria left. They remained out for some months, and the people endeavoured to get white labour by sending to California, but they were finally obliged to throw up the sponge and give in to the Chinese. They took back their Chinese servants, who have remained ever since. In fact, 99 out of every 100 servants in the western country are Chinese, and the people are able to get no others. On the other hand, there is no doubt that the Chinese tend to bring down the wages of white labour, and that is a difficulty we shall always have to face. At the same time, if the Chinese were excluded to-day in that western country, there would be a great deal of suffering and inconvenience among the employers of labour.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not doubt that is true. I do not doubt also that this is a very thorny question with rather more than two sides to it. Still, for all that, it appears to me although it may be that this practice of taxing Chinamen is opposed to British practice, I take it that to a very considerable extent that instinctive feeling which prevails in California and also in British Columbia has its origin in a wholesome feeling of self-preservation.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No doubt of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Looking at the enormous mass of people in China, who might at a very short notice be poured upon the shores of North America, and looking at the fact that they most assuredly will not alter their own civilization for ours, and as we perfectly well know it is an immigration of men pure and simple, they never bringing any respectable Chinese women over——

Mr. DEWDNEY. Very few.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,—we are not in a position to depart from the regulation which the Government has laid down. I cannot say I like it, but I am afraid, as I have said, it is absolutely necessary for the preservation of our white civilization that some considerable restriction should be placed upon this immigration.

Indians, New Brunswick..... $6,200

Mr. DEWDNEY. This item was allowed to stand in order that I might make some enquiry into the question of missionaries. I referred to my deputy, who writes as follows :—

"The missionaries referred to on page 13 part 2 of the departmental report are the successors to similar appointees of the Imperial Government. When Indian affairs came under our management we still continue the salaries of the missionaries at those points."

So the practice has been going on for many years, as I suspect.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be ; but it does not meet the question to which I called the attention of the Government, and which I must repeat. The payment by the people of Canada of salaries to missionaries is, as I stated, a thing to be very seriously considered. I think we have a right to know whether the Government have any policy on this subject. If we are going to pay missionaries in New Brunswick for their services as missionaries to the Indians, I do not see how the Government can refuse to pay other clerical gentlemen in other parts of the Dominion who may be rendering similar services to Indian bands. That is a question which requires to be seriously considered before we engage in it. I am perfectly well aware that a great many of the clerical bodies, a great many of the clergy in various parts of the Dominion who have been brought into contact with the Indians have sacrificed a great deal for them, and have devoted themselves to the Indians, and may be have rendered them much better services than a considerable number of the persons whom we may pay nominally to look after the welfare of the Indians. But, all the same, this question of paying salaries to the clergy for their clerical service, is wholly and entirely apart from our custom, and wholly and entirely apart from our previous habit in dealing with Indian tribes or anyone else. I do not myself see that the mere fact that this is a legacy handed down from the British Government at all affects the question as to how we shall deal with it in the future. It is quite obvious that this item has heretofore escaped discussion because the House did not know anything about it. Now, the Government, in my judgment, will find it impossible to continue to pay the missionaries to Indians in one province. I take it that in the North-West and British Columbia and in other provinces you will be exceedingly likely, this item now having attracted attention, to have demands made on you to pay missionaries who allege, rightly, I dare say, that they are occupying themselves for the welfare of the Indians. The item, though small in itself, may come to involve serious consequences, and it certainly does involve the policy I have stated. I, therefore, wish to know what the Government propose to do, and if they intend to continue this payment ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In looking into this matter I found that there are eight missionaries paid in the same way in the Province of Quebec, four Protestant and four Roman Catholic.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As missionaries ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, as missionaries. They have been paid for some years.

Mr. CHARLTON. How many missionaries are paid in the Province of Quebec ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Eight.

Mr. CHARLTON. And how many in New Brunswick ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Eight.

Mr. CHARLTON. To which denomination do these sixteen missionaries belong ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In Quebec there are four Protestant and four Roman Catholic, and in New Brunswick all Roman Catholic, and all Roman Catholic Indians.

Mr. CHARLTON. The system will lead to wrangling, bad feeling and difficulty. If the Government are to adopt the system of making grants to missionaries belonging to the different religious bodies for the purpose of enabling them to prosecute their work of teaching the Indians, the various religious bodies will naturally begin to enquire as to which has received an undue proportion for this end. The position of the matter is that the Roman Catholics are receiving three-

fourths and the Protestants one-fourth. It is a matter of no very great consequence at present. But if the amount paid to the missionaries becomes larger, public attention will be drawn to the matter and the Government will find on its hands a question which will be a source of trouble and irritation. I do not believe, on thinking the matter over, that it is a prudent policy for the Government to pursue to make appropriations for the purpose of furnishing religious instruction to any class of people in this Dominion. They had better refrain from it. If they wish to use public money for the instruction of the Indians let it be used and appropriated by the Government themselves; let the work be done under their supervision and let them take the matter into their own hands. I am quite sure that while there is nothing serious involved, yet we have here the germs of serious difficulties. We are not going to satisfy all the denominations in regard to the appropriations made; some one of them will be very likely to claim that others receive more than their proper share. I repeat I do not believe the principle is a correct one anyway. I do not believe it is the business of this Government, or any other Government, to enter into the field and subvent religious institutions in any way in the prosecution of their religious work. Let them carry on that work by their own methods voluntarily.

Mr. FRASER. How many Indians in New Brunswick and how many in Nova Scotia?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are 1,574 in New Brunswick and 2,059 in Nova Scotia.

Mr. FRASER. Therefore, in Nova Scotia we have more Indians than in New Brunswick, and there are no payments made to missionaries in Nova Scotia. In the counties of Pictou and Antigonish, the Indians all belong to the Roman Catholic church, and the denomination has built them a church in each county, and that religious body looks after the Indians and gets nothing from the Government. In the Province of New Brunswick, where they only have 1,500 Indians there are eight agents paid by the Government, whereas the Indians in Nova Scotia have to be looked after by the religious denominations themselves. It is a piece of unfairness that should be ended at once by the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are agents in Nova Scotia.

Mr. FRASER. But there are no paid missionaries.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, there are eight, but they act as agents; and in New Brunswick there are only two agents and eight missionaries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You do appear to be mixing up State and Church in a remarkable fashion.

Mr. FRASER. In New Brunswick they are simply missionaries and do no agent's work, but in Nova Scotia they are agents.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They do a certain amount of missionary work as well.

Mr. FRASER. I am opposed to this system because it is no part of the functions of Government to pay anything to any clergyman of any denomination. It is not the business of this Government to enter the field as an educator in matters of religion. That is a matter for the people themselves, and the Government have no more business to interfere in it than in a matter outside their jurisdiction altogether. I do not care what denomination the man belongs to who receives public funds, this Government have no right to give him any money in order to educate people in any particular precepts. That is a matter that should be left to the religious zeal and enthusiasm of the religious bodies. Look at what the various Christian denominations of this Dominion are doing for the Indians in the North-West. There, the various churches are paying towards the education of the Indians. What right have the Government to pay money out of the public funds to any religious denomination, no matter what it be, to educate the Indians or any other class of the population? I think the Government should at once stop this, because it is wrong in principle, and unfair to the province which does not receive any money for purposes of this kind. The Government is laying the foundation of what will be a troublesome matter, and the sooner they cut off these excrescences of a by-gone age by which the State gives money to the Church the better for the future of this Dominion. I believe that good work is done by these men. I believe there is not a dollar expended by the Government on these missionaries that is not well repaid in the civilization of the Indians. I know that by the work of these men the Indians have been raised to a better condition than they were before; but that is not the point I am raising. I say that the Government is wrong in carrying out this principle and the sooner they stop it the better. There is no justification for the Government doing this and it will only lead to continual trouble.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know what the Government proposes to do with respect to this?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I would not like, on my own responsibility, to express any opinion about it, but I think it is a matter worthy of consideration and I shall bring it before my colleagues at an early day, and endeavour to get an expression of opinion as to whether a change should be made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How long has that been going on?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It has been going on since the Imperial Government had the handling of the Indians.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is prior to Confederation?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. I think the Government might apply the same principle here as they do to postmasters and other officials appointed prior to Confederation. They might, in case of vacancy in an office, not make a new appointment.

Mr. KENNY. In the Province of Nova Scotia I think these are not considered as salaries, but the small amount allowed is used in travelling expenses incidental to the discharge of the duties of these gentlemen as agents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As regards Nova Scotia, I understand that no payment is made to the men as missionaries, but that the payment is made to them as Indian agents. I am not disposed to be too rigorous, although it might look

like evading the principle; but here you have got, in the Auditor General's Report, a distinct statement that we are paying the salaries of eight or nine gentlemen as missionaries, and upon that point I say that some decision will have to be come to by the Government. The thing was never known to me, and I do not think it was ever known to my hon. friend.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood that these sums were paid to the missionaries, not so much to themselves as in trust for the relief of the poor and the distressed amongst the Indian population. That is my recollection of the former condition in these particular cases.

Mr. GILLMOR. That is my recollection of the matter. I have been a long time in public life, and I never understood that clergymen were getting public money as missionaries. So far as I have known, they have looked after the poor and provided medical attendance. I have never known of money being paid to them for religious purposes; but I have known for many years both before and since Confederation that clergymen have been employed as agents to look after the poor among the Indians.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is just about what they are now. In the Province of Nova Scotia the agents are organized, and there are sixteen of them, with regular agents. These clergymen look after the wants of the Indians, providing them with the attendance of physicians and medicines, and distributing the bounty given to the Indians; and they do all this work under the organization of agencies. In the Province of New Brunswick these agents are called missionaries; but it is quite evident that they do the kind of work the hon. member for Charlotte describes, though the work of looking after the Indians there is not organized into agencies, because there are only two in the entire province, and it would be out of the question to consider two agencies as a sufficient organization. It would be better, of course, for appearance sake, that there should be organized the same kind of agencies that exists in the other provinces; but there is no difference in reality, it amounts to the same thing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It may amount to the same thing, but nobody will see more clearly than the Minister of Justice that it makes a great difference whether we are placing in the hands of these gentlemen—who I dare say probably devote all they receive to relieving the temporary wants of the Indians—money to be used by them as almoners of this Dominion, or whether we are paying them salaries as clergymen, as stated here. I do not think we can consent to pay sums of money to any body of clergymen in their capacity as clergymen.

Mr. FORBES. Will the hon. Minister inform me whether there are regularly appointed physicians to attend upon the Indians, or whether various medical men are subject to the call of the agent?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I gave that information the other night. I have not my memorandum here; but the agent employs the doctor, and I think there are one or two in New Brunswick regularly appointed and paid $200 a year.

Mr. FORBES. Has the agent authority to employ physicians and obtain provisions for other Indians than those especially on the reserve?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No, he has not, without special authority from the department. We have before us now some applications for payment from physicians for attending Indians who were off their reserve. I think there are one or two now under the consideration of the department, which have been refused payment because the services were given without the authorization of the agent, and because the Indians were off their reserve.

Mr. FORBES. Do I understand the Minister to say that they are still under consideration, although they have been refused payment?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; one or two are still under consideration.

Mr. FORBES. Does the Minister know the case I refer to, that of Doctor Calder, of Bridgewater, from the agent T. J. Butler?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think I wrote to the hon. gentleman in relation to that. It may, perhaps, be decided.

Mr. FORBES. I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to that case. It seems strange that the agent should give orders to wholesale or retail dealers to supply these Indians when they are not on the reserve, and that the department should pay the bills for those supplies, and yet should refuse to pay the bill of Dr. Calder. The agent, the Rev. Father Butler, lives 30 miles from the Indians, and the doctor whom he claims to have appointed to wait upon the Indians, lives 11 miles from the reserve in the other direction, so that the distance between the agent and the doctor is 41 miles. The doctor appointed by the agent is Dr. Gray of Mahone Bay. Dr. Calder, feeling it his duty as a medical man to wait upon the poor when they require his services, has for the past 12 years waited on the Indians who live in his vicinity, and he has rendered to the department a moderate bill in detail, amounting to $64.85. For three years he has been unable to get any satisfaction from the department, and it is only within a short time that he has been informed that because the Indians were not on the reserve, the bill was refused payment. I am simply desirous of informing the department of the irregularity of the proceedings of the Rev. Mr. Butler, as regards this particular transaction. I will not attribute to the agent the fact that he reported adversely to the bill because Dr. Calder is a Liberal in politics, but he may have so reported to the department, and it does seem curious that the department should pay the bills for supplies to these Indians, although they are not on their reserves, when the supplies are ordered by the agent. The sole objection given by the department, is the letter to which the Minister has referred, in which he says:

"It has always been the rule of the department to refuse the payment of doctors' accounts for services to the Indians not on their reserves, and it will be impossible, under the circumstances, to pay Dr. Calder for the services he has rendered the Indians. I regret this very much in view of your strong opinions on the matter, but similar applications have invariably been refused."

This letter was addressed to me, and I would call the attention of the Minister to the fact that he should make better provisions for the Indians, as

otherwise this doctor and others would be perfectly justified in refusing these poor wards of the Government their attendance. In that neighbourhood Dr. Calder has the reputation of being one of the very best physicians. He has given his time to the Indians and has spent his money for medicines for them, and he is certainly entitled to be repaid by the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I know nothing of the politics of a single doctor attending the Indians in the Maritime Provinces, and I do not believe their politics would make the slightest difference, so far as my deputy is concerned. If we were to pay the bills of every doctor who attends Indians who are not on the reserves, we would have to ask Parliament for three times the amount we now require for medical services.

Mr. KAULBACH. I may relieve my hon. friend of a little of the dissatisfaction he appears to feel with regard to the position the Government have assumed when bills in this connection were presented, of which I have a knowledge, by stating that they have not shown any discrimination between Conservatives and Liberals in their refusal to pay for medical attendance on the Indians who are off the reserves. I had occasion to make the other day application to the Indian Department for the payment of a bill sent me by a political friend for medical services to the Indians.

Mr. FORBES. Who was he?

Mr. KAULBACH. Dr. Mack of the firm o Mack & Foster. And although I urged the claim as strongly as I could, I was told that the bill, not having been authorized by the agent (the Rev. Mr. Butler) and the doctor for the county, which was Grey, not having been called in to render his services, the department could not favourably entertain the request for the payment of the bill.

Mr. FORBES. Of what politics is Dr. Mack?

Mr. KAULBACH. He is a Conservative, I believe, as he supported me.

Mr. FORBES. That does not follow. I know he is a warm and good Liberal in principle, and an absolute free trader.

Mr. FRASER. There are methods and methods. I will not say that the agent acted at the bidding of the department, but he finds it very convenient just to employ the doctor who happens to suit, from a political point of view, at the particular time. In the county I represent and the adjoining county there were two doctors who did all the work required, Dr. Caddigan and Dr. McKinnon, and the whole amount paid during the year was about $90; but the services of these gentlemen have been dispensed with and the bill has gone up to over $200, I do not say the expense increased because a new doctor was employed as there may have been some other reason, but I mention this as showing that a doctor may be employed just to suit the political complexion of the party in power. If a doctor has been in attendance on the Indians for twelve years, he ought not to be removed without good reasons, for these people have their preferences as well as white, and to remove one in whom they have confidence in order to replace him by another who is in political sympathy with the Government, is not the best way of treating the Indians.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Indians only asserted the preference of the greater portion of the white people in the place of preferring the services of the gentlemen who now do the work.

Mr. FRASER. I would not draw a comparison, but I am bound to say that where they are both known, Dr. McKinnon is considered just as good a medical man as the other.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have not heard that opinion pronounced by others in the county, and I have not been so unfortunate as to have required the treatment of either, but if both be of equal standing that is sufficient to show the preference is not on account of politics.

Mr. FRASER. In the country parts party politics are apt to decide the respective merits of doctors as they do of lawyers, and no doubt the hon. gentleman has not had the opportunity of coming into contact with the friends of Dr. McKinnon or he would have learnt in what high reputation he is held.

Government of the North-West Territories..... $217,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think it will be possible to sit very late to-night, and I suppose, if the hon. gentleman gets through this item, he will seek his virtuous couch?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Probable cost of elections, North-West Territories..... $10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not $10,000 for elections a heavy figure?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think it cost that last year.

Clerical assistance, North-West Territories..... $9,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does not $9,000 for clerical assistance seem to be an extremely large sum? It appears to be all frill and no shirt in this expenditure. There is an extremely large expenditure for the Government, and very little money is expended for the benefit of the community except in the matter of schools. Why should we pay $9,000 for clerical assistance to administer an expenditure of $217,000 of the public money? I had a good deal to do in past days with the reorganization of the Government of Manitoba, and I found that they were spending more than half the money they got from us in printers' bills and on the Legislative Assembly. It appears that very much of the same kind of thing is going on here.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Last year the expenditure was $8,328.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; but why did they spend that amount?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is an accountant and an assistant accountant who attends to the issue of the permits, seven clerks at salaries varying from $600 to $900, the private secretary of the Governor, the secretary of the Board of Education, a clerk in charge of public works, and three messengers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You have a special bill for messengers besides.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Including the messengers and these officers, the expenditure amounts to $13,470. These were all appointed by Order in Council here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So I have heard; but it appears to me that an immense amount of the money which is voted to the North-West goes to pay salaries, and these appear to be multiplied without rhyme or reason.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We have to vote these Estimates in this manner this time, but I think it will be the last time. There is no Legislature there now. The elections will be held in a month or six weeks, and the Assembly will not meet probably until November, so that the money has to be voted now; but when the Legislature meets, they will have power to cut down the clerical force if they think it necessary. Heretofore it has been in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. FLINT. Is it contemplated, under the new Bill in regard to the North-West Territories, that the Assembly itself shall regulate its clerkships and incidental expenses?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. FLINT. And this Parliament will be relieved of that expenditure?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. FLINT. That is a very good idea.

Subscriptions to Newspapers..... $500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see you have cut down the fourth estate from $2,000 to $500.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We have been doing that in every department.

Caretakers and messengers, Legislative Hall and Government House..... $3,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here again there seems to be more spent for messengers and for keeping up the pomp and dignity of the Governor than is desirable.

Mr. FLINT. I presume that this item also will disappear under the new regime, and that they will regulate this matter themselves in the North-West Assembly?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does this include the cost of the Governor's personal attendants, his man-servants and his maid-servants, because I find some very extraordinary charges in the Auditor General's Report respecting some of the employés of the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a gardener——

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am not referring to the gardener. There is a much more important employé, a much more dignified employé than the gardener. I see the Lieutenant Governor finds it necessary to employ a page who attends the Lieutenant Governor at Government house.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Yes.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He does not. I think I know more about it than the hon. gentleman. He does not go to Government house at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Where is he?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He stays down town with his family, and during the session he is in the hall of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Is he employed for the session as we employ our pages here?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He is employed all the year round. He is in the Legislative Hall.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Why should we require to vote for cuffs for a page?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot prevent the Lieutenant Governor putting on frill if he is inclined to do so.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). But you might prevent our paying money to enable him to do it. I find we are charged for six pairs of cuffs for a page, two pairs of hose for a page, a pair of knee-breeches for a page. I think this is one of the most scandalous expenditures I have heard of. Kid slippers for the page, ties for the page—all this is in the Auditor General's Report. Now, the Minister is clearly mistaken. It is not at all likely that the members of the North West Assembly would require a page with all this paraphernalia, knee-breeches and slippers. Did the hon. gentleman have a page like that when he was Lieutenant Governor of the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No, I did not; but my messengers used to wear breeches.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is out of all character and all reason. I think these accounts should be certified to as correct by the Minister. Has the Minister seen them?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; I have seen them.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then the Minister ought not to sanction anything of that kind. Governor Royal was not accustomed to that sort of luxury in the province from which he came, and there is no reason why the Governors of the North-West Territories should start out with pages.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can assure the hon. gentleman that he is mistaken. That boy goes to the office, he is the only messenger they have got in the legislative offices. He goes there at nine or ten o'clock in the morning and remains there all day. I do not believe that boy has been in the Governor's house half a dozen times in his lifetime. He is a little boy about the size of the pages in this House. I left him there when I left the office, and he is doing the same work now that he was doing when I left.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If that is what he is doing, why does he require knee-breeches and kid slippers?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I presume they wanted to put him in a little livery during the session.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). We do not put our boys in knee-breeches and kid slippers.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He is dressed like our boys.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Our boys are not dressed in knee-beeches and kid slippers.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Oh, yes, they are. Stand up here, boy.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have not examined their shoes, but I think they wear neither kid slippers, knee-breeches nor ties. There are other items

here of an equally absurd character, charges which are scandalous, so much so that the Auditor General has drawn the attention of the Lieutenant Governor to them. Calendars, cards for programmes, menu cards, pencils. Now, if the Lieutenant Governor sees fit to give an entertainment why should the people of this country have to pay for his menu cards? Then I find an item of $63 for portraits of all the distinguished men in Canada, except the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Oh, I am there; at least I was told so the other day.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is a charge for framing portraits of the distinguished men of Canada, except the Minister of the Interior. He should strike that out.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I thought I was there.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is an insult to the late Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories that he should be left out. We find Speaker Allan, Mr. Blake, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Bowell, the Hon. John Carling, Sir Adolphe Caron, Sir George Cartier, Mr. Chapleau, the Hon. John Costigan, G. E. Foster. Now, when the Minister of Finance is there, surely the Minister of the Interior ought to be there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another item here: portraits from Topley's Studio, among which is the Hon. E. Dewdney, $15.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman ought to have his name amongst the other distinguished gentlemen whose names are mentioned here. Now, I would like to have some explanation why we should be called upon to pay such charges as these. They are not charges that we pay for any other Lieutenant Governor in any other portion of the Dominion. Now, here is a sewing machine. Are the tax-payers of this country expected to pay for the Lieutenant Governor's sewing machine? Who uses the sewing machine? Does the Lieutenant Governor use it to while away a weary hour? We have got to pay $60 for a sewing machine. Did the hon. gentleman get a sewing machine at the public expense when he was Lieutenant Governor?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then there are China ornaments, a claret bowl. Is the hon. gentleman to sanction the payment of a claret bowl for the Lieutenant Governor? Cream jug, cup and saucer, decanters, champagne glasses, claret glasses, flint glasses, port glasses, sherry glasses, wine glasses, a two-gallon jug — I suppose that is for the whiskey——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is for the permits.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Now, it is no laughing matter. Although the items are not large, it is the principle that is involved. Why should we pay for the wine glasses, or glasses of any description, for the Lieutenant Governor? Are they left there when he leaves the office? Or are they carried off with him as part of his perquisites? If we select a temperance Lieutenant Governor what use will he have for wine glasses, claret glasses, champagne glasses, and two-gallon jugs? The hon. gentleman must see that such a thing cannot be justified in this country.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; I will justify it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then you will do a great deal more than I expected you would. Surely, that the people of this country should be called upon to pay for these things, is out of all reason. I suppose we have to furnish the Lieutenant Governor's house there, but we are not bound to furnish sewing machines and wine glasses; we are not bound to furnish piano scarfs and cords; we are under no obligation to furnish things of that kind. There are things there for which no justification can be urged.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There may be two or three items. You must recollect that when Mr. Laird was appointed Lieutenant Governor his house was built and furnished for him.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not object to the furniture of the house.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The furniture was bought at St. Louis and taken up to Red River, and from there to Battleford. It was excellent furniture, better than that used by the late Lieutenant Governor. When Mr. Laird left, the furniture was brought and put into the Government house at Regina. I happened to have many articles of furniture which I brought from British Columbia, such as dinner-services, knives, forks and spoons, plates, &c., so there was no occasion to expend money on that account, and I did not expend money for more than some small necessary items. When I left I took away those things which belonged to me, and the house was very bare when Governor Royal came there. I hope the hon. gentleman did not mean to insinuate anything when he remarked just now: Does the Governor take them away?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No; I had no reference to you.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Because I can assure the hon. gentleman there was a strict inventory of the goods taken from Mr. Laird, and as strict an inventory of the goods left for Mr. Royal. But the house was left very bare. I had my own pictures, which I took away. Governor Royal, in order to decorate the walls, appears to have chosen pictures of the public men of Canada, rather than other subjects. There are some items which are peculiar. I do not think I would have purchased the articles, and I would not have seen the necessity for them; but we have not all the same ideas and the same views with respect to those matters. With respect to the sewing machine, that is a most necessary article in a house. There is a certain quantity of household sewing to be done, and in the end probably money will be saved by having bought it for the house.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Looking at the Auditor General's Report I find a letter protesting against these items being paid out of the public money. And yet the Minister of the Interior I fear justifies them and intends to certify to them and have them paid. A letter from the Auditor General dated 13th June, 1890, requires the attention of the Minister of the Interior. The Lieutenant Governor appears to have been absent 100 days in one year. I understand that the practice is that cheques must be signed by the Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; by the Lieutenant Governor, and counter-signed by some other official.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The attention of the Minister of the Interior is directed to the fact that while absent cheques were signed in the Lieutenant Governor's name. He must have left blank cheques to be filled out.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That was explained.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The explanation was not given by the Lieutenant Governor but by some one else. The Lieutenant Governor does not explain it in any way. He was apparently absent 100 days in one year. Do we have to furnish the Lieutenant Governor with horses and sleighs, and everything of that kind?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think the Governor has a Government horse.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not care whether he has a Government horse or not. If he has, he has no business to have a horse for which the country pays. There are charges for repairs to a sleigh, and exchange on pony, $35. Why should we be charged for that item? Exchange on sleigh, $17; express sleigh, $35, and so on. These are all items for which there is no justification. If the Lieutenant Governor must have these articles, he must pay for them out of the salary given him by the Dominion Government. As to the house, I observed before and I repeat that I have no objection that a suitable residence should be provided for the Lieutenant Governor and that it should be suitably furnished, but I object that any absurd trappings should be paid for by the people of the country. If the hon. gentleman left the furniture, as no doubt he did from what he says, then Lieutenant Governor Royal's notions of the dignified position he occupies there are much greater than those of the hon. gentleman, for I find there are no less than three columns of the Auditor General's Report filled with items of articles procured for the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories. Almost every conceivable thing that a gentleman could want is there, and some things which it is inconceivable he should require are there, articles which no man, be he Lieutenant Governor or otherwise, would require in his house. The sooner this sort of thing is put a stop to the better, and the sooner the Lieutenant Governor is told that the tax-payers of this country will not submit to pay for such items the better. I trust before very long the North-West Territories will be constituted into a responsible government, where payments of this kind will be properly checked.

Mr. DEWDNEY. After this.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). After this, according to a Bill which has been brought in. I have always been in favour of the Government going a step further and giving the people of the North-West Territories not only representative but responsible government, when items of the kind spoken of here would receive the strictest scrutiny from the representatives of the people of the territories. Down here, a thousand miles from the scene where these things occur, one is not in such a good position to criticise and discuss them as are the people who live in the locality. Here items go before the Minister and he passes them, and that is the end. But I trust hereafter the Minister will be more careful in seeing that items of this kind are not paid by the Canadian tax-payers.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

Manitoba Insane Asylum.....$8,400

Mr. WATSON. How many patients have been transferred to Manitoba?

Mr. DEWDNEY. From 35 to 40.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I draw the attention of the leader of the Government to the fact that there is not a quorum of members present.

North-West Territories Government House—Light and fuel..... $1,400

Mr. WATSON. I notice there are 217 gallons of coal oil, at 50 cents a gallon. Is that not a high price at Regina?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; about the usual price.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I draw the attention of the Minister, in connection with items under the head of Indians in the North-West, to these extraordinary charges for coal oil. When was the contract made, and how long did it continue? We are paying on Indian reserves, within a very short distance of the railway, even only 20 miles from Regina, 66 and 67 cents for coal oil. Is the hon. gentleman sure that tenders are called for?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; you will see it in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Are they called for every year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; every year.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I may tell the hon. gentleman that coal oil can be bought in Ontario for 12 cents per gallon. Taking the average price of coal oil charged at 62 cents, that allows 50 cents per gallon for carrying from, say Toronto to Regina or Calgary, or some other western town. There are about 42 gallons in a barrel, and this would give about $20 a barrel for carrying it. There is something radically wrong about the matter, and it requires investigation.

Mr. FLINT. What kind of coal is that for which $15.50 per ton is charged?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; that is the price of anthracite coal there. When the question was asked before during the session I enquired into the reason of the difference between the prices paid by the North-West Mounted Police and the North-West Governmnet, and the Comptroller of the Mounted Police told me that the coal was contracted for by the North-West Government to be delivered into their bins, and that the Indian Department and Mounted Police took their coal from the cars. The coal was purchased by contract, and as they considered the price too high they endeavoured to get it from Winnipeg direct, but they were told that they would have to purchase their coal through the agents.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Has the hon. gentleman got any information as to why the price of coal oil is so enormously high?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The coal oil is bought by contract, and they put it up in tin boxes enclosed in wood, so that I suppose that makes a difference.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It would be better for the Government to buy it at Ottawa and send it up.

Mr. WATSON. I see that some coal is bought here at $15.49 a ton, and soft coal at $8.50. I sup-

pose that is Galt coal. Has the hon. gentleman ever entered into a calculation as to whether it would be better to burn the Galt coal at $8.50 than the other coal at $15 per ton?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think one ton of anthracite will go about as far as two tons of soft coal. The stoves in the old buildings are base-burners, and hard coal has to be used. There is no doubt that the combinations keep up the price of anthracite coal.

Mr. WATSON. I have no doubt of that, and I have no doubt that the combination keeps up the price of the soft coal as well, because soft coal is sold at $8.50 a ton at Regina, and you can buy that same coal in Winnipeg for $7 a ton, although it is carried 365 miles further from the mines. Of course, that is simply because the freight has to be paid on the hard coal going west to Regina, and it meets with competition there. The hon. gentleman should remember that it is these combinations that keep up the price of coal, and he ought do all in his power to provide that combinations should not be formed. I state this as another argument why he should accept the motion I made the other night when he brings this Bill before the House again.

Management of well-boring machines.. $3,000

Mr. WATSON. Can any of these machines be got in Manitoba?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think so.

Mr. WATSON. Why make a difference between Manitoba and the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Local Government can look after that in Manitoba.

Mr. WATSON. There are certain sections of Manitoba where the Dominion Government owns the land, and where it is necessary to get water. The Dominion Government ought to have the same interest in Manitoba as in the North-West, so far as work of that kind is concerned.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is not the same difficulty in getting water in Manitoba as in the North-West. These machines have been sent to the North-West as an experiment, so that in a dry district it can be seen how far a farmer has to go for water. Southern Manitoba has no reason to complain, because we have spent a good deal of money in one well there.

Mr. WATSON. How are they succeeding with that well?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They have gone 1,800 feet, and they expect every day to get water, as soon as they bore through the layer where the experts agree in saying that the water is underneath.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 7th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE EX-MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Before the Orders of the Day are entered upon, I want to make a short statement to the House as to the position of the late Minister of Public Works. I might remind the House of the time and of the occurrence when the resignation of the Minister of Public Works was announced to the House, and when the House was informed that another Minister had taken charge of the Department of Public Works in consequence of the resignation of our late colleague. I was somewhat surprised, two or three weeks afterwards, at a question being put across the House as to the position occupied by the late Minister, because it indicated that a misapprehension existed as to the position of the hon. member for Three Rivers, which was not anticipated at the time the resignation was announced. I made the statement then to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), that the resignation did not require to be accepted, because my view was entertained by the Minister himself and our colleagues, that he had renounced his office in placing his resignation in the hands of the person qualified to receive it, and that unless his resignation was declined, it took effect as a matter of course. But I judge from the fact of the question being put in that way, that the hon. gentleman who put it was under the impression, and that, perhaps, some other members of the House were under the impression, that while resigning his position as Minister of Public Works he continued to take part in the deliberations of the Council and to act otherwise as a member of the Government. It would have been obviously unfair to leave the House under the impression that the hon. member for Three Rivers, our late colleague, was sharing the responsibilities of advice at a time when he was not so sharing them, and I presumed that my answer to the question removed any ambiguity that remained on the subject. But a day or two ago the question was repeated in the Senate, and the hon. gentleman himself feels that it is due to himself that any ambiguity on the subject which may exist in the public mind, or in the minds of members of Parliament, should no longer exist; and he, therefore, addressed the Prime Minister in the following letter:—

"OTTAWA, 7th September, 1891.

"MY DEAR PRIME MINISTER,—I see that, at the last meeting of the Senate, a question was put to you by one of the Senators to know whether my resignation as Minister of Public Works has been accepted. This question, coming after a similar one in the House of Commons, makes me perceive that there is some misunderstanding about my position; and, in order to put an end to it, I wish, as intended by me, to ask you that my resignation may be accepted without further delay.

"I remain, my dear Prime Minister,

"Yours very truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"Hon. J. J. C. ABBOTT,
"Prime Minister,
"Ottawa."

The Prime Minister has written as follows:—

"PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE,
"OTTAWA, 7th September, 1891.

"DEAR SIR HECTOR LANGEVIN,—I have to acknowledge your letter of this morning, requesting that your resignation may be accepted without further delay, and to say that in accordance with your request I shall regard your resignation as final, and shall lay it before His Excellency immediately.

"I remain, dear Sir Hector,
"Yours very truly,
"J. J. C. ABBOTT."

Mr. LAURIER. The statement just made by the Minister of Justice shows that, after all, there was some reason for the anxiety that existed in the public mind as to the position occupied by the present member for Three Rivers. Some time ago the Minister stated, in answer to a question put by myself, that the resignation of the hon. gentleman did not need to be accepted. In point of law, perhaps it might be so, because no one can be compelled to serve unless he is willing to do so, and the moment the hon. gentleman tendered his resignation, if the Prime Minister did not decline to accept it, of course from that moment we had a right to understand that it was accepted. Now, however, the position has been cleared up, and we understand that from the time the hon. gentleman placed his resignation in the hands of the Prime Minister, he ceased to be an adviser of His Excellency.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 171) respecting the Rathbun Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

IMMIGRATION INTO CANADA.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. AMYOT) asked, 1. What is the total number of immigrants who arrived in Canada, during the decade which ended at the taking of the census of 1891? 2. In the case of how many of these immigrants has the Government of Canada contributed towards the cost of transport? 3. How many of these immigrants have taken up their residence in Canada? 4. What is the total amount expended by Canada for immigration purposes; in direct subsidies to the steamship companies, to the railway companies, or to the immigrants themselves, or to agencies or otherwise during the said decade?

Mr. HAGGART. The returns of the census are not yet sufficiently advanced to enable us to give the information the hon. gentleman asks for. In the case of the other question, it involves a good deal of work in getting up the information, and perhaps the question had better stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. LANGELIER. Till next session.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think the information will be ready during this session.

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. AMYOT) asked, What is the total amount of the subsidies paid to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, up to the present date?

Mr. FOSTER. $524,175.
Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

JUDGES IN THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. DELISLE) asked, Whether the position of judge is conferred on members of the legal profession as a reward for political services, or as the crowning of their success in their professional career? How does it happen that, since 1878, no judge has been selected, in the Province of Quebec, from amongst the advocates belonging to the Liberal party? Are the Government not convinced that it would be better, for the public interest, that the administration of justice should be entrusted to men selected from both political parties?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The reasons which justify the appointment of a judge are not satisfactorily expressed by either of the propositions contained in the first question. The second question, I think, is not according to the rules of the House, inasmuch as it assumes a fact of which I have no knowledge whatever. As to the third question, the administration of justice is entrusted to men selected from both political parties.

GEORGE M. ELLIOTT, GAS INSPECTOR.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. ALLISON) asked, Is George M. Elliott Government gas inspector for the town of Napanee? When was he appointed? What amount has he been paid since his appointment to this date? Is he also collector of Customs for the same place, and what salary has he received as such collector a year? When was he appointed such collector, and how much has he been paid to date?

Mr. FOSTER. George M. Elliott was appointed gas inspector at Napanee, at a salary of $100 per year, on the 24th April, 1890. He was paid $131.99 up to 31st August. He was appointed collector of Customs at Napanee on the 1st of February, 1884. His present salary is $900 a year. Total amount paid him up to 1st of September, $6,825.

JOHN CONNELL.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. BEAUSOLEIL) asked, Is there a person named John Connell employed by the Sorel Harbour Board? If so, what is the date of his appointment? What pay does he receive, and what duties is he supposed to perform? Is the Government informed as to the manner in which the said Connell discharges his duties?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. 1. There is a person named John Connell employed at the ship channel works at Sorel, 2. 1st January, 1889. 3. $60 per month as checking clerk, and to attend to French and English correspondence in the superintendent's office at Sorel. 4. Connell has always discharged his duties to the entire satisfaction of Mr. Howden, the superintendent.

THOMAS JOCKES AND JOHN B. DELORIMIER.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. BEAUSOLEIL) asked, Have Messrs. Thomas Jockes and John B. Delorimier, the Caughnawaga stone contractors, paid the arrears of royalty owing by them to the Government, in 1890, amounting to $3,909.01? If so, have they paid in full, or only in part? Were they prosecuted? Did the Government accept a

sum less than the debt, and if so, what sum? At what date was the settlement made? Through whose intervention was the compromise effected? Are Messrs. Jockes and Delorimier still the Caughnawaga stone contractors? If so, what are the terms of their contract? Are they still indebted to the Government, and if so, to what amount?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Department of Indian Affairs claimed a balance to be due by Messrs. Jockes and Delorimier of $3,918.48, exclusive of interest. Upon consideration of all the facts the solicitors of the Government advised that $3,007 should be accepted in settlement of this claim, and that Messrs. Jockes and Delorimier should pay all costs of prosecution. Part of the above sum has been paid. There is a balance of $1,225 still outstanding. The date on which the settlement was made on the above basis was May 13, 1891. The solicitors of the Government advised such settlement. Messrs. Jockes and Delorimier are still the Caughnawaga stone contractors. The terms of their contracts are $1.50 per toise for large stone, and $1 per toise for rubble. Besides the amount shown above to be still due on their old account, Messrs. Jockes and Delorimier owe $23.28 for stone quarried in July last.

SOREL HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. BEAUSOLEIL) asked, What was the number of men employed on the 1st June last, at the Sorel Harbour works? What was the number so employed on the 1st September instant? How many officials were employed at the office of the Sorel Harbour Board on the 1st June last, and on the 1st September instant?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The number of men employed on 1st June last at the Sorel Harbour works was 50, as follows: Shipyard, 20; machine, boiler and blacksmith shops, 22; office and stores, 8. The number employed on 1st September last was 55, as follows: Shipyard, 21; machine, boiler and blacksmith shops, 27; office and stores, 7. Four officials were employed at the office of the ship channel works on 1st June last and on 1st September, namely, superintendent, storekeeper, engineer, clerk. In addition to the officials and men employed at the Sorel works proper, there were employed on 1st June last on dredges, stonelifters, tugs, and barges, 79 men, and on 1st September instant, 57 men.

POST OFFICE SERVICE.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. BEAUSOLEIL) asked, What are the names and places of residence of the parties holding contracts for carrying the mail between Montreal and Mile End, Côteau St. Louis, Côte Visitation and Villeneuve? For what period were the said contracts made? What are the prices paid? Were tenders asked for? If so, were the contracts awarded to the lowest tenderers? If not, why not?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. The offices mentioned are served with mails by the routes between Montreal and Côte St. Louis, and Montreal and St. Léonard de Port Maurice. The contractors are, for the former service, Napoléon Lachance, of Montreal; for the latter, Joseph Gervais, of St. Léonard de Port Maurice. 2. In each case three years and eleven months. For the former service $420 per annum. For the latter service $306 per annum. 4. Yes, tenders were asked. 5. The contracts were in each case awarded to the lowest bidders.

EXCISE COLLECTOR AT STRATFORD.

Mr. TRUAX asked, Is A. Caven Excise collector at Stratford? What is his salary? Did he receive any allowance for seizures during the years 1886-87-88-89-90 and 1891? If so, what amount was paid to him on this account and for what services during those years respectively? Is it his duty to take active steps to prosecute those engaged in illicit distilling, on receiving representations from responsible parties?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. A. Caven is Excise collector at Stratford. 2. His salary is $1,600. 3. He was paid no allowance for making seizures during the years 1886-87-88-89-90 and 1891. 4. He was paid an additional $100 for one or two of the years named for extra work. 5. It is his duty to take steps to prosecute those engaged in illicit distilling on receiving information from responsible persons, and he has discharged his duty in this respect most energetically and successfully within his division.

MR. J. G. HEARN.

Mr. MOUSSEAU (Translation), asked, 1st. Is Mr. J. G. Hearn an employé of the Militia Department, attached to the staff of the Cartridge Factory in Quebec? 2nd. How long has he been so employed, and what salary is he in receipt of? 3rd. Is the department aware of the fact that he absented himself without permission for a period of one year or thereabouts, between the dates of 15th August, 1889, and 15th September, 1890? 4th. When and by whom was he reinstated? 5th. Was not the said John G. Hearn paid in full the amount of his salary for the year in question? If not paid to himself personally, to whom was the amount paid?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I have the honour to state: That Mr. John Hearn is employed as Government assistant superintendent at the Cartridge Factory in Quebec. He has been so employed since 31st March, 1885. His salary was at first $700, but was, by an Order in Council of the 29th of January, 1887, raised to the sum of $1,200. The department is aware of the fact that Mr. Hearn absented himself without permission for a period of one year or thereabouts, from 15th August, 1889, but during that period Mr. Hearn received no part of his salary. Mr. Hearn was reinstated by authority of the Minister of Militia on 20th August, 1890. Mr. John Hearn was neither in full nor partly paid during the time of his absence. No amount was paid to him personally or to anyone else.

INSTRUCTIONS TO REVISING OFFICERS.

Mr. EDGAR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the Minister of Justice whether the Government took occasion to notify the revising officers throughout the country of the extension in the time for putting in declarations? I ask that because I am informed that in the County of Muskoka the revision officer closed the preliminary lists and

had them printed on the 1st August, and has gone on to hold his final courts. I suppose that the revising officers are understood to know what the law is, but I should think that in a case like this when an Act is passed just before it comes into force in the middle of a session the Government should have taken every possible step to inform the revising officers. I cannot believe that Mr. Mahaffey, the revising officer, would have done this had he been aware.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The revising officers have always been communicated with by the Department of the Secretary of State. The Minister told me that they were all notified by telegraph on the day that the Bill was assented to, and that was before the 15th August.

SUPREME COURT AMENDMENT ACT.

House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 138) to amend Chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Supreme and Exchequer Courts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The House will remember that one clause of the Bill fixed the term of the Supreme Court to commence on the first Tuesday of October, instead of the fourth Tuesday. As the session of Parliament is continued so late, and as there is not an opportunity to get the Bill assented to at an earlier time, on the representations of the bar of Ontario this change is made applicable, not to the present year, but only to future years. The next amendment is one of more substantial importance. It is an amendment to that portion of the Supreme Court Act which provides for appellate jurisdiction being exercised with regard to matters in the Province of Quebec. The section reads:

"Where the matter in controversy involves any such question, or relates to any such fee of office, duty, rent, revenue or sum of money payable to Her Majesty, or to any such title to lands or tenements, annual rents or such like matters or things where the rights in future might be bound, or amounts to or exceeds the sum or value of two thousand dollars, there shall be an appeal from judgments rendered in the said province, although such action, suit, cause, matter or judicial proceeding may not have been originally instituted in the Superior Court:

"Provided that such appeals shall lie only from the Court of Queen's Bench."

It is proposed by the Senate to add:

"Or from the Superior Court in review, in cases where and so long as no appeal lies from the judgment of that court, when it confirms the judgment rendered in the court appealed from. Whenever the right to appeal is dependent upon the amount in dispute, such amount shall be understood to be that demanded, and not that recovered, if they are different."

Mr. LAURIER. This is a very serious amendment, it is one which is at total variance with the law of the Province of Quebec, and one which I hope will not commend itself to the Minister of Justice. The law of the Province of Quebec is this: Cases are instituted at first in the Superior Court, and then after the trial judgment has been rendered by the Superior Court, which is presided over by one judge and is a judgment on the law and facts as well, the case can be inscribed in review before three judges. That is simply a re-hearing of the case upon the evidence as it appears in the record. If the judgment is confirmed, there is no appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench, which is the court of final resort in the province; but if the judgment is reversed, then there is an appeal, from the Court of Review to the Court of Appeals. That is to say, that if there is such variance of opinion between the judge who hears the case in the first instance, and the three judges who hear the case in the second instance, then the law allows an appeal to the final tribunal, the Court of Queen's Bench in Appeal. But if the judgment of the first instance is confirmed by the Court of Review, then, in such case, the unanimous judgment of four judges being had upon the question, the law of the province is, that there can be no further appeal, and that the judgment of the Court of Review is to be conclusive. After the judgment has been rendered in the Superior Court, it is optional to the party who is dissatisfied with the judgment, either to appeal it to the Court of Review or to go to the Court of Appeal direct. If he chooses to go to the Court of Review, and that court confirms the judgment of the court below, according to the law of the province, the preponderance of judicial opinion is against him, and he is denied another appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench. The hon. gentleman will see that the provision now introduced is tantamount to superseding altogether the law of the province, and ignoring the jurisdiction of the Court of Queen's Bench, by giving a jurisdiction to the Supreme Court which is denied to the Court of Queen's Bench. It seems to me that this is a serious step, which ought not to be taken at this stage of the session, at all events without the question being debated more than it has been debated already. I have received from one or two members of the Montreal bar some complaint that the amendment which was introduced a few weeks ago by the hon. gentleman, had taken the bar by surprise; but I believe that on the whole it is in line with the general law of the province, which affirms that any matter of litigation, though for an insignificant amount, may, if it involves future rights, be a matter of appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench; and by parity of reasoning it may be right and proper to give the supreme jurisdiction to the Supreme Court. But in this matter I hope he will agree with me that to ignore altogether the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal, and to give an appeal to the Supreme Court which is denied to the Court of Queen's Bench, is not sound doctrine. Therefore, I hope the hon. gentleman will not confirm that provision. If it should be my misfortune to fail in impressing him with my views upon the subject, I think I should have to test the sense of the House upon it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think what the hon. gentleman says requires to be very carefully considered before I press the amendments, and with your permission I will move that the further consideration of these amendments be postponed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the motion is carried, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice and your attention, Sir, to the very great inconvenience under which the members of this House labour when these amendments come from the Senate to any Bill that has passed through this end of the Legislature. An important Bill like this, affecting the constitution of the Supreme Court, is generally very carefully considered by this House; then the Bill leaves this House and goes to the Senate, where amendments of a more or

less important character are made ; and when it returns here, there is not a member of this House who knows what those amendments are, or is capable of grasping their full effect. Some plan should be devised for reprinting the amended clauses with the amendments put in italics, so that the members of this House may have some idea of what we are doing. Of course the hon. Minister of Justice has an idea ; but I doubt if any other member of the House understands the import and purport of these amendments. Some improvement has been made by publishing the amendments in the Votes and Proceedings, but in that form they are quite unintelligible. I have tried to compare them with the Bill, and I have been unable to make them out. The only copy of the Bill which I have on fyle, is the copy as it was originally introduced. True, I may get the Bill from the Senate, but I have not got it. I am speaking of matters as they are, not as they should be. I would suggest that some such mode be adopted, of meeting these objections, which are of a serious character.

Motion agreed to, and further consideration of amendments postponed.

NORTH SHORE RAILWAY BONDS--CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Bill (No. 170) respecting the North Shore section of the Canadian Pacific Railway was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. I complained the other day that this measure was of a very grave character, leaving everything to the decision of the Governor in Council. It seems to me that before the next stage an amendment should be prepared setting a limit of time and conditions which the Government ought to exact as to what shall guide them in their relations with the company in carrying out this Bill.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Expenses in connection with the distribution of parliamentary documents.....$600

Mr. McMULLEN. I think some steps should be taken in the direction of cutting down the expense of printing and distributing the enormous amount of blue-books, the greater portion of which is virtually wasted. I have seen these books corded away in different offices and never used. Some members may make some little use of the large amount of parliamentary documents they get ; but judging by the amount I have received, and I presume other members received similar amounts, if a man had nothing else to do but study these different documents, that would occupy his time the whole year round. No doubt a good many of the papers distributed are valuable and necessary, but a great many are really worthless, and the cost of printing them is something enormous. I fancy these documents are distributed to the different papers, mechanics' institutes, &c., throughout the Dominion, and wherever they serve a good purpose they should be sent, but there is a large anount of trash published and distributed which only finds its way to the waste paper basket. I was in one member's office, and I believe I saw there a cord of this material piled away, not even the strings having been touched. It seems to me that either the Government or the Printing Committee ought to carefully examine into the whole business and suggest some means of reducing this enormous expense.

Mr. TROW. I rather disagree with the hon. gentleman. I know that I have not sufficient for my own constituents, and I only wish the department would publish more, especially if they would only publish a better collection of pamphlets. The documents the hon. gentleman referred to in my office are books that came during recess, and which I had not time to send to my constituents. Any books I get here I send direct, but those I get during recess it is a little inconvenient for me to get them ready and addressed to my constituents. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman says he has a ton of these documents in his office. It seems to me either that his constituents do not read, or that he is very negligent in his duties in regard to his constituents.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not refer to pamphlets which are sent out for circulation, but to parliamentary papers which are brought down for the use of members themselves. I generally circulate all the papers I receive. I do not care of what particular political complexion they are, but many of the other documents which are printed are worthless.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) would find it very difficult to tell what documents would be useful and what would not be useful. Some parliamentary reports would be useful to one set of members to whom the others would not be of any use. For instance, I suppose my hon. friend does not care much about reports affecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but he is interested in the report of the Department of Agriculture and in the Trade and Navigation Returns.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). And the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, as my hon. friend suggests, and the Auditor General's Report. Just in the same way, in the Maritime Provinces, they would be interested in the report of the Marine and Fisheries Department. In regard to these returns to which the hon. gentleman has referred, the Printing Committee are charged with the duty of determining which of the returns brought down shall be printed and which shall not, and I have no doubt, from the record for economy which characterizes the leading members of that Committee, that they determine to print only such returns as will be interesting to the general public and to the members themselves. Although there is a great deal of truth in what the hon. gentleman has said in regard to some of these reports lying around our offices, still I think he will agree with me that in many cases where information is necessary in regard to political matters, some of these reports which may be disregarded for years will be found very useful on some occasions. I remember

during the general elections of 1887, in my own case, where an allegation was made charging the political party with which I was then connected.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course my hon. friends will understand that I do not belong to any political party now. At that time I found it necessary to go back some years in order to find how the expenditure of the then Government compared with that of their predecessors, and I think my hon. friend will find it useful to have these reports kept in his library.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think it would be false economy to limit this expenditure on reports. The only question is whether it is well to publish these returns in this way and so to allow every member to obtain these expensive returns, in regard to which I think the hon. member for North Wellington puts the Government and the country to as much expense as any one. If the hon. gentleman would do what members on this side of the House do, and would hunt up the information for himself from the printed reports, then the information could be more cheaply obtained than it is by the production of these returns which he so often calls for.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am only referring to what is printed. All these matters go before the Printing Committee, and they are not printed unless that Committee thinks them of sufficient importance to print them. It is a matter of choice with the Printing Committee whether these returns should be printed or not, and if they are printed it is because the Committee considers them sufficiently important, and the member who moves for them is not responsible. The member may want the return for his own personal convenience and information, but the printing is in the hands of the Committee, and if the hon. gentleman thinks that when returns are ordered to be printed, the member who moves for them is responsible, the hon. gentleman is mistaken and he should apply himself to study and ascertain the rules of Parliament before he makes such a statement.

Mr. BAIN. I have discussed this question before. I have always felt that we were expending large sums of money in this way. Perhaps formerly we were more derelict in that matter than we are now, especially as to the documents which were printed for circulation. We have improved a little, but sometimes I look aghast at the expenditure we have made for printing reports. I confess that there is this difficulty to be considered. It is desirable to have the utmost publicity given in regard to every department of the public service, and if we drop printing these reports, we will inevitably tend to facilitate a condition of affairs in these departments which we will all regret. What would my hon. friend do without the Public Accounts Committee, or what would they do without him? I, therefore, say that my hon. friend deserves credit for the way in which he has brought to our attention many items in the Public Accounts, many of which we never would have had brought to our attention but for him, and, considering the expenditure of the various departments, I do not know but that on the whole we had better go on and submit to the large bills for printing and make the best we can in regard to it.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think there is a loss to the country in the distribution of immigration pamphlets throughout Ontario. I notice that pamphlets intended for immigrants from the old country are distributed throughout Ontario. That is one branch of expenditure that we might stop. There is another matter which I think it might be useful to consider. We ought to have more copies of the Auditor General's Report, and the Public Accounts Report, and the Trade and Navigation Returns. We might be able to increase the circulation of these reports which are useful to all classes of the people, and, if you put the Auditor General's Report in the hands of the people, they will be able to discuss these matters properly.

Classification of Old Records..... $1,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that last year $9,783 was spent in the collection of Orders in Council. How was that necessary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has no connection with this. It was the printing and binding of the volume containing the consolidated accounts relating to all the departments, which was issued as a completion of the series of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a decrease in this vote, because the expenditure has been less than the vote taken; so we reduce it by $5,000.

Commutation in lieu of remission of duties on articles Imported for the use of the army and navy..... $2,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What kind of articles are these? In the investigation that took place some time ago in regard to clothing, I think it was then understood that there was no rebate or commutation of duties charged upon clothing.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This is for the Imperial service, the navy and the Imperial army stationed at Halifax and elsewhere.

For the expenses of the Government in the District of Keewatin..... $2,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that we expended last year a very large amount of money. It appears to me that with a careful investigation of the expenditure in connection with this item, a great reduction could be made.

Mr. FOSTER. The item is reduced by $2,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much did the Lieutenant Governor receive last year for all services in connection with this?

Mr. FOSTER. $1,697. My hon. friend will find in the Auditor General's Report that this expenditure was for the private secretary, for a clerk and stenographer for part of the time; and the expenses for the usual trips when they visited the district of Keewatin along the line of the lakes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is supposed to discharge the duty of Lieutenant Governor there?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba. By special Act, Keewatin is attached to his jurisdiction.

Mr. HYMAN. Are all the payments made to the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. HYMAN. Are his receipts accepted as vouchers?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The vouchers are sent down in the same way as other accounts from the West, they are all audited by the Auditor General, and the accounts are receipted by the parties who receive the money.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it in connection with this service that the boat *Keewatin* was built?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; for the preventive service on Lake Manitoba. She is still in the service of the Government, and has just come back from a trip. She is owned by the Government.

Mr. HYMAN. What amount was paid for her?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think $500 or $600.

Mr. WATSON. That information is surely wrong; that boat was never worth $500 or $600.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It will be in the Auditor General's Report for the last year. I do not recollect at the moment what it was.

Mr. WATSON. I believe Governor Schultz paid $250 for building the boat.

Mr. FOSTER. We did not buy her for Governor Schultz; we simply paid the bill which she cost.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not sure how many trips she has made from Selkirk up.

Mr. WATSON. I believe she has made three trips and has drowned three men by upsetting.

Maintenance of Keewatin and other lunatics—chargeable to Keewatin.. $4,000

Mr. WATSON. Where are these lunatics confined?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the Manitoba penitentiary at the present time. There may be some few in the asylum, but I think they have all been removed.

Mr. WATSON. Are they all Indians?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think there are any Indians at all. They come, not only from Keewatin, but also from the disputed territory, and there was an interview between the Minister of Justice and Mr. Mowat with reference to paying the cost of the lunatics from the disputed territory. Mr. Mowat explained the position, and said that they had to take charge of lunatics from other countries, and would not accept any obligation with regard to those in the penitentiary at Manitoba. The Government came to the conclusion that Mr. Mowat was correct; they are brought there, and we have to look after them.

Mr. WATSON. How is this large increase of $3,000?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The amount has increased both in Keewatin and also in the North-West Territories. For the 10 months from the 30th of April, the cost of that asylum was $2,784. We want the whole of that money.

Mr. WATSON. How many lunatics from Keewatin have been confined during the last year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The number varies every month. Some come in and others go out.

Mr. WATSON. According to the Auditor General's Report last year, the maintenance of the insane in Manitoba penitentiary cost $3,915. Is that the amount that was paid last year?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I presume it appears in the Auditor General's Report. From November, 1888, to 30th June, 1889, there were 40 patients; from 1st July, 1889, to 30th June, 1890, there were 42; and from the last date up to the 31st of March, 1891, there were 46 patients. The cost is $1.02 per day per patient.

Canada Temperance Act..... $2,500

Mr. McMULLEN. Are there some items not settled yet?

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose some of the counties now having the Scott Act petitioned for its repeal, this amount is required to have a vote taken. If any county petitions to have the Act brought into force there, an expenditure may be required.

Mr. WATSON. In how many counties is the Scott Act in force?

Mr. FOSTER. The Scott Act is not in force in any counties outside of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. I cannot tell the number of counties, but they form the larger proportion of those provinces.

Compensation to Members of the North-West Mounted Police..... $2,000

Mr. WATSON. What is the nature of the injuries for which compensation is given by the Government?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Ordinary accidents in the discharge of duties. $2,000 has been voted for many years, but not more than $1,000 has been expended. Last year $649 were expended. It is given as compensation after the man has left the force.

Hector Fabre, salary and contingencies of Office..... $3,500

Mr. TROW. Is this the agent who in 1889 sent out one emigrant for his salary? How many emigrants did he send out last year?

Mr. McMULLEN. Where shall we find a report from Mr. Fabre?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether it is included in the report of the Minister of Agriculture or not. I have seen his report printed, not this year's report but that of previous years, in pamphlet form for the use of members; and I supposed that, probably, it was included in the Agricultural report.

Mr. LAURIER. Was there anything to report last year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, and it is a very interesting report. The duties of the representative of Canada at Paris, as most hon. members will admit, are not limited to sending out emigrants. We all know that the French people, as a people, are not fond of leaving their beautiful country to go to other countries. However, the services rendered by Mr. Fabre in Paris, all those Canadians who frequent the great capital of the French republic and take an interest in matters connected with the commercial relations between France and Canada, will admit that we have a most energetic representative in the person of Mr. Fabre. So far as his reports are concerned, they have been most interesting reading to me. Some hon. members, I am afraid, overlook these reports because they are published in French; but I can tell hon. gentlemen

that all those Canadians who visit France give testimony to the energy, skill and experience which Mr. Fabre has acquired among the public men of France.

Mr. TROW. What are his duties? Are they confined to entertaining Canadian Ministers when they take a trip to Paris, or receive Canadians when they happen to go there?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Government owe this Committee full explanations with regard to this expenditure which has been voted year after year. It costs about $4,000 to keep this man in Paris. Ever since I have been in this House I believe this man has occupied that position, and I have noticed that every year the Opposition have asked for information with respect to Mr. Fabre's duties, and what he did for this money, and never yet have they obtained the slightest information, except on one occasion the Minister stated that one emigrant had been sent out by this agent in Paris. It is high time the Government should either tell this Committee the purpose for which this money is spent, and show that it is wisely spent, or drop the item. I do not see that the explanation of the Minister of Militia has any bearing on the question. He says that when Canadians go over there this gentleman, who is no doubt very polite and entertaining in his manner, delights them with his attentions. Can this country afford to keep a man in Paris to show about Canadian tourists who visit the French Capital? It may be very well for the Minister of Militia, or the Secretary of State, and other members of the Government to have some man like Mr. Fabre who can tell them how to see the sights of that beautiful city. That may be very well, but if the Ministers of the Crown desire to have a man to introduce them to Parisian society, they should pay the man out of their own pockets and not tax the people $3,500 to $4,000 for the purpose. I do not know that Mr. Fabre has ever done any good in his position. The Government have failed time and again to explain why this expenditure has been incurred, and if they cannot give some satisfactory explanation as to the value received by this country for this expenditure, they should drop this item and recall this agent from Paris. The Minister of Militia tells us that Mr. Fabre performs certain duties. Is he in Paris, as Sir Charles Tupper is in London, as High Commissioner? He has, at all events, the salary of a High Commissioner. The Minister in charge should be required to give some report of the duties required of him and to show the Committee what value he renders to the country year after year. I do not know whose favourite pet he is; he must be the pet of some member of the Government. I say without hesitation that he has been kept in Paris eight or ten years at the expense of the people without rendering to this country one dollar's worth of service. It is high time a stand was taken on this item, and if the Government cannot explain the way in which this money is expended, the Opposition should insist that this item, which is of no value, should be dropped from the Estimates.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have carefully watched the reports which Mr. Fabre has sent during several years. I well remember reading these reports, and with what confidence this French agent pointed out, and in what hopeful utterance he declared, that we were on the brink of receiving a large flow of emigration from that country of French origin. As my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Trow) pointed out, Mr. Fabre reported in the year 1889 that he had sent one immigrant to this country. That was the first instalment of the grand flow of immigration that he expected would come from France to Canada. That one person was a woman, I believe, and we are glad to have a woman immigrant, when we cannot get men to come here. I think it is time that this item should be dropped. This gentleman gets $2,500 a year salary, and $1,000 a year for incidental expenses without any detailed statement as to what these expenses are for. I do not think it is right that this House should be asked to vote $3,500 until the Minister is prepared to lay before the Committee a report of the gentleman's duties for last year. I can find nothing about the work of Mr. Fabre, in either the report of the Minister of Agriculture, or that of the High Commissioner in London, who is supposed to supervise the duties of our agents in Europe. I dare say Mr. Fabre dances around and pays a great deal of attention to the High Commissioner and members of the Government when they go to Paris. As my hon. friend said, he is able to show them the different sights and the different ways in which they can spend a pleasant evening and that kind of thing, but it is quite an item for the people of this country to be called upon to pay $3,500 a year for the purpose of having Mr. Fabre to dance around and hobnob with every dandy we send over to that country, that may happen to be a Minister of the Crown or a High Commissioner. I may say that our High Commissioner in England gives us a very poor return for the enormous amount he costs us. Any person who carefully scans his report will see that the services rendered to this country are a miserable pittance compared with the expenses to maintain that office. The payment to Mr. Fabre appears to be as bad if not worse. We are asked to swallow this item and to vote $1,000 in a lump sum without having details as to what it is for. I respectfully suggest that we should not be asked to vote this item, and that it is not courteous to the House to ask them to vote it, until we are given some idea of the duties which Mr. Fabre performed in 1889.

Mr. TROW. The defence offered by the Minister of Militia was a very lame one indeed. He seemed to state that Mr. Fabre was not there for the purpose of inducing emigrants to come from France, because he said as a rule the French people do not emigrate. That was a very lame excuse for the expenditure of between $3,000 and $4,000 per annum. If Mr. Fabre is a special favourite of the Government and they want to give him a position, why not remove him over to some of the Eastern States or send him to Massachusetts or New York, where you will find thousands of French Canadians who have left Quebec, and who are now residing in the States, and whom you might induce to return here. Mr. Fabre might be of some use there, but he certainly is of no use in France.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no doubt at all that the office this gentleman fills is a sinecure, and the payment and the voting of this money is indefensible. Members on both sides of the House know that, and if there was any doubt about it

before, it is painfully evident now from the lame excuse offered by the Minister of Militia. Years ago the propriety of voting this money was severely challenged by gentlemen on this side of the House, and explanations were attempted to be given then that Mr. Fabre was fulfilling the duties of emigration agent, in some way or other, but it was then pointed out that he had only sent one man over here.

An hon. MEMBER One woman.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The answer was given that he was engaged in immigration work, and that the result would appear some years afterwards. We have been going on voting this money year after year, but the results are *nil*, and the Government refuses to tell the House what the duties of the agent are. I say that the representatives of the people are not justified in voting $3,500 a year for a gentleman whose duties they knew nothing about. There are hundreds of hard-worked officials in the outlying parts of the country who have not got salaries enough to maintain their families properly, and when applications are made from time to time for a small increase for meritorious officers we are told that the finances of the country will not permit of it and that we must go along on an economical line. If this economical rule is to prevail, and I shall do all I can to cause it to prevail, I shall protest against $3,500 being paid out year after year for an office which gentlemen on both sides of the House known is of no value to the country and which is simply a sinecure.

Mr. FRASER. I think perhaps that hon. gentlemen are expecting too much from this office. They should give it time.

An hon. MEMBER. It has been given ten years.

Mr. FRASER. What is ten years? The explanation of the Minister of Militia reminds me somewhat of the letters which come from the missionaries in the South Seas and other such countries. They are not doing very much, but they are expecting great things. I understand from the Minister of Militia that the French population are loth to leave France, but it has been pointed out that Mr. Fabre induced one of them to come over here, and in a few years he may induce some more. He is doing a kind of missionary work in Paris, and with his help, and the assistance of some of the brilliant members of this Government who go over to Paris occasionally, I have no doubt that some of the people of France will be induced after awhile to immigrate to this country. We should pass this vote without a word. Why should we not have an official in Paris when we learn that he is of such great service to gentlemen who go there on a visit of pleasure? We have a man in London, and why not have one in Paris to show the people around that beautiful city. I can understand how glad this country should be, for example, when the Minister of Militia or any other gentleman like him should go over to Paris and see this agent of ours driving along the Tuilleries, and visiting the sights of Paris, and mutually admiring each other, making introductions: This is our agent, and this is our Minister from Canada. The marvel to me is that there has not been an exodus from France to this country, when we have a man like that over there to show around some of our brilliant gentlemen who go from this country to Paris. There surely must be some mistake in the census figures brought down when we have not got more people from France into this country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is not the filling up of this country; it is the filling up of the men who go to visit there.

Mr. FRASER. Be that as it may, I think that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House should not seriously offer opposition to this vote. Life does not altogether consist of dry facts. What does it matter to the Government whether we get a return or not for this money, when we have an agent in Paris who is able to show these hon. gentlemen around the city when they pay him a visit over there? Our friends opposite will return with large ideas about the world; their gigantic intellects will be educated by the experience which they gain in that beautiful city; and will anyone say that $3,000 or $4,000 a year is too much to pay to a man who assists them in gaining that experience? I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite can learn a great deal in Paris, and that when they return here they will bring back to this Parliament of Canada all those graces and charms which make the average life in Paris all that it is and all that it is reputed to be. If we can introduce that Parisian spirit here I have no doubt that it would be of immense benefit to this Parliament.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What spirit?

Mr. FRASER. Numbers of spirits, and bring them here. I am sure that this investment of $3,000 or $4,000 is well made, and nothing should be said against it. It is true, the return of immigrants is not as large as we might wish it to be; but we were assured a few evenings ago that for the last ten or twelve years we have been laying the foundation, and are now ready to make a start. We are laying the foundation in Paris, and I am sure that we should be derelict in our duty if we failed to have an agent there to sound our praises, and to help our people, when they go there, to understand the inner life of that city, so that when they return to this country they will bring back something of that life which makes Paris so brilliant and attractive. I object to hon. gentlemen raising any objection to this vote. I might go on for hours to show that it is one against which nothing should be said, in view of the good results from it which the hon. Minister of Militia has demonstrated.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I should be very sorry to detract from the great merit of the speech which the hon. gentleman has delivered. He has spoken as usual in a most remarkable and eloquent manner; but he has spoken on a text very different from the one which I humbly submitted to the House when I made a few remarks with regard to the agent of Canada in Paris. I stated that business men going to Paris on commercial matters were very happy, indeed, to find a gentleman of the intelligence of Mr. Fabre, who was thoroughly *au fait* with the commercial enterprises connecting Canada with France, and that he was of use to those gentlemen in that particular business. What I stated I repeat. The hon. gentleman may know a great deal about the other portions of the commercial interests of Canada, but others have taken an interest in the development of commercial intercourse between France and Canada. I can tell the

hon. gentleman that even at this particular moment parties representing wealth and great commercial interests are attempting to procure a new line of steamers to sail between Canada and France. Well, Sir, if it be admitted that that kind of commercial intercourse may exist between the two countries it does not require all the brilliant imagination of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat to find out that an agent of Canada in a country so intimately connected with Canada as France is may be of advantage to our commercial community. This is all I intended to say, and I am perfectly certain that the hon. gentlemen will recollect that, if we have made a mistake at all, it has been in selecting as our agent in France one of the friends of his own party, who had been appointed by the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, the leader of the late Government, as one of the members of the Senate.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I repent.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman may repent, but I think he had no reason to repent of what he did, and we have been following in the wake of the leader of the Government in sending Mr. Fabre to France.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the explanation of this expenditure thus far given is an absurd explanation for any Minister of the Crown to give. He gives us no details; he tells us nothing whatever that this man has done. In his first speech he did not refer, if I remember rightly, to any commercial men at all, but spoke of visitors who went to Paris to see the sights, whom he was instrumental in showing around. Now he says that this man is influential in commercial matters. I would like him to tell us any single way in which he has advanced the commercial interests of this country during the many years that he has been there receiving $3,000 or $4,000 a year. If the Minister of Militia has stated what is the fact, then he must be in possession of some information which will back up his assertion. We want some better proof than the mere assertion of the Minister of Militia that this man is of some benefit to the commercial men who go to Paris to do business. But I contend that this Government has nothing to do with attending to the interests of the commercial men who go to Paris to do business. The commercial men of this country are capable of attending to their own business, without our paying a man $4,000 a year to introduce them to Parisian society. There is no defence for this vote. The hon. Minister does not say that Mr. Fabre has tried to secure any commercial treaties with European countries. We have been told year after year that Sir Charles Tupper has gone to Spain, I do not know how many times, to secure a commercial treaty with that country; but Mr. Fabre has always failed to do anything for the commercial interests of this country. If we are going to establish agents all over the world to influence business in favour of our commercial men, why confine ourselves to Paris? We ought to have agents in other large cities of Europe, South America and other countries. But I understand from a debate that took place here some time ago that the British Consuls help our commercial men when they visit foreign countries. Now, I contend that we have been paying out this money long enough. This country cannot afford to squander money. The revelations which have taken place this session, showing that hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money have been illegitimately squandered, shows that we must commence cutting off useless expenditures even in small matters, in order that the gross total of the public expenditure of this country may be reduced. The people of this country demand intelligent economy in the administration of our affairs, and we may as well commence at an item like this, which we know cannot be defended, which has not been defended for years past in this House, and which no member of the Government attempts to defend to-day. I say there is no defence for it. If the Government wish to make a pet of Mr. Fabre they should put their hands in their own pockets and pay for his keep, if they want to have him in Paris to show them around when they visit that city. The Minister of Militia tries to draw a red herring across the track by saying that Mr. Fabre was advanced by the Liberal Administration. What was the response made by the venerable gentleman who administered the affairs of this country so well when he was its Premier? He said he regretted it, if he did advance that man; but he did not advance him to the position he now occupies. Year after year no defence has been offered or can be offered of this expenditure, and this Committee ought to insist that the Government shall show that this expenditure is justifiable, or else we should sit here until we compel them to strike it from the Estimates. There is no justification for it, and the people of this country must have some justification for the expenditure of public money, even if it is only $3,500 or $4,000 a year.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Fabre is not only personally familiar to many of us amongst the older members, but he forms a very familiar item in the Public Accounts. Year after year we are voting money for him; year after year we are asking what he has done; year after year we get nothing but the same vague general statement which has been made to-day. Now, Sir, I am sure there is nobody in this House who would grudge this amount or even more to Mr. Fabre if any results appeared in the shape of increased intercourse with France, increased immigration from that country, or increased commercial dealings with it. We are all anxious to do as much business with France as possible. We should all be glad to see thousands of French emigrating to this country and occupying our land, but we do begrudge an amount of $4,000 a year, expended in keeping up an ornamental man in an ornamental position. The fact that he has secured no immigration from France has been often pointed out. It has been asserted to-day that he has been of use to commercial men; but, as my hon. friend from North Brant has said very truly, commercial men do not need any introduction from him. If they have anything to sell they know where to go to dispose of their goods, and Mr. Fabre's introduction will not be of the slightest use to them in that respect; and if they want to buy they can do so just as well without his assistance. Even if it were possible for him to help commercial men, it has not been shown in what respect he has been of any assistance to them, and we must come to the conclusion that he is purely ornamental. Mr. Fabre no doubt is a

clever literary man, and a very pleasant, genial gentleman, who produces a good impression in Parisian society and has a very good time, and the country pays him very handsomely for it. In the past ten years we have paid him something like $40,000. The Minister of Militia says that as he was appointed to the Senate by the leader of a former Government he must be well fitted to represent us in France. I do not think it would be safe to lay down the general principle that every man who has been made a senator, even by hon. gentlemen opposite, is qualified to represent us at a foreign court and to draw streams of immigration and commerce from France to Canada. But Mr. Fabre was not appointed agent at Paris for the same reasons for which he was appointed senator. If he had not made a diametrical change in his views and in the line taken by his newspaper at Quebec, if he had not deserted those who put him in the Senate, he would never have been given the office he now holds. He owes that office simply to his desertion of his party. It is not because he uses influence in Paris to help Canada, but because he still uses influence in Quebec to help the Conservative party, that he is retained in office. When Mr. Fabre was appointed a senator he had been a consistent Liberal, but on obtaining his present position he became an active supporter of the Government, in contravention of the views he had always expressed and of the gratitude and loyalty he owed the chiefs of his own party. It is too much to expect us, knowing what we do of Government methods, to agree to the payment of $4,000 to a gentleman nominally our representative, but who is virtually an election agent for the Conservative party.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. I am disappointed at the direction the discussion on this item has taken. Mr. Fabre happens to be located in Paris, but if he had been in Berlin or some other city perhaps so much would not be said about him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No ; that is nonsense.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. He happens to be located in the City of Paris, I may say the capital of the world, and in that capacity he has been in a position to render good service to his country.

Mr. McMULLEN. Show us his report.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the hon. gentleman and would ask him not to interrupt. Some of the returns which perhaps are not in the hon. gentleman's mind or within his knowledge are these, that he has been the means of inducing a large number, not only of French people, but of Belgians to emigrate to Manitoba.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. That is a fact. Mr. Fabre is just as much in Brussels as in Paris, and there is not a meeting of the Geographical or any other society, which takes an interest in the knowledge of the world, which Mr. Fabre does not attend, and on many occasions he has addressed public meetings in Paris, and in other cities in France, as well as in Belgium, and anyone who reads the weekly French paper which he publishes in Paris, called the *Paris-Canada*, must be aware of the good he is doing for Canada. The paper Mr. Fabre publishes in Paris is a Canadian paper, and there is not a day in which some leading article in that paper is not reproduced in the leading papers, not only of France, but of Belgium and other countries. I may say I have also read in it some interesting sketches of public men of Canada. Even the leader of the Opposition has been well written up in that paper, and I was proud of the way in which that subject was treated, because I believe it was a deserving one. Mr. Fabre does not write from any political standpoint. The fact that he has been acting as the mentor, I may say, of Mr. Mercier, when Mr. Mercier last visited Paris, shows he does not look upon his position as a political one.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What does he say about the scandals in his paper ?

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. The hon. gentleman can find that out for himself. During the last few years Mr. Fabre has been the means of inducing a large number of people to come to Manitoba. They may be counted by hundreds, and not only by one as has been stated. Everyone who reads the weekly *Paris-Canada* will see that every week from ten to twenty people coming from Canada call at his office in Paris, No. 10, rue de Rome. With this information before us, I believe we cannot hesitate one moment to vote the paltry sum of $3,500 for the services which that gentleman is called upon to perform.

Mr. LAURIER. The House will be sorry, I am sure, that the hon. gentleman should have thought fit to make such insinuations as he has in regard to this item. The remarks he has made are totally uncalled for. There is not the shadow of a pretense to show that there is any attack upon Mr. Fabre because he is in Paris instead of being in Berlin. The reason why this item has been attacked time and time again is not, as the hon. gentleman insinuates but dare not assert, that Mr. Fabre is stationed in Paris, but he tries to raise national prejudice, of which we have altogether too much in this House. If this item has been challenged it is because, as the Government themselves know, they dare not defend it upon its merits upon the floor of this House. Why is this agent retained in Paris ? What is his title, and what are his functions ? His official title is that of an emigration agent, and the functions of an emigration agent are supposed to be his ; but everybody knows, and the Minister of Militia has intimated, that the French do not emigrate, that it is useless to keep emigration agents in France for that reason.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I was answering the attack which had been made because a larger number had not come out.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the answer worth, if you admit, and the Government are forced to admit, that the French are not an emigrating race ? There may be justification for emigration agents in the British Isles, in Germany or in Scandinavia, because we know that we can obtain emigrants from those places ; but, as the hon. gentleman says, the French do not like to leave their beautiful country ; and, although there may be stray wanderers from France to Manitoba or the Province of Quebec, there are not enough to speak of immigrants from France. Although Mr. Fabre is spoken of in the official report as an emigration agent, that is not the title by which he is known in Paris. The title he is given in France appears to be that of

High Commissioner for Canada. In *Le Paris-Canada* we find:

"Inscrits au commissariat-général du gouvernement du Canada."

Inscribed in the office of the Commissioner General of Canada. Is Mr. Fabre the High Commissioner of Canada in France? If that is so, let us say so. If you believe that we can have a consular service and a High Commissioner not only in London, but in Paris, with advantage to this country, let us say so. I do not say that the time may not come when we should have more High Commissioners in foreign countries than we have to-day, but I do say that, during the ten years or more that Mr. Fabre has been an emigration agent in France, there has not been one year in which the House has been honestly dealt with by the Government in regard to this matter. If he is anything at all, he is not an emigration agent. We have not had any report from him this year, and for the obvious reason that he has nothing to report. If he is anything, he is what he tries to make himself out to be, the Commissioner General of Canada. Let the Government come out with their policy on that question and we can discuss it, but there is not the slightest ground for calling him an emigration agent. The hon. gentleman said that we on this side should not object to this vote because Mr. Fabre was appointed a senator by the Liberal Government. I do not know if that was the reason why he was selected for this office. Mr. Fabre was always a friend of mine, even after his appointment to this office, but you cannot justify this vote for him on the ground that he is an emigration agent in Paris.

Mr. BAIN. I confess that the last statement of the Minister of Militia may be taken as a fresh reason to retain Mr. Fabre as our representative in Paris. My associations with him when I was there showed that he was a man who occupied a tony position in Paris at our expense. Now the Minister of Militia says he represents our commercial interests there. That statement is one which demands our attention. This Government allege that the National Policy was going to develop our commercial interests in foreign countries, and it cannot be doubted that our interests in that respect are not always advanced in the best manner by the British consuls in foreign ports. In the performance of their duties they feel that they are first due to the British manufacturer and secondly to the colonies, and if our manufacturing interests are to be successfully represented they must be represented by others than the British consuls. On the other hand, if we find by our trade returns that our interests have not been successfully promoted it is time to appoint some one else than Mr. Fabre to look after them. Our exports to France in 1879 were over $700,000 worth, and in 1880 they were over $800,000 worth, but afterwards, whether in consequence of Mr. Fabre taking charge of our commercial interests there, as he did about that time, or for any other reason, they have gradually dwindled down, until the last returns show that they only amounted to $278,000. I submit that it is obvious that Mr. Fabre is a conspicuous failure in regard to taking charge of our commercial interests, and that the record contained in the Government returns is reason enough for dispensing with his services. If he keeps that position on for a few years he may probably wipe out our trade with France altogether, and then we will not have even the beggarly excuse that he is there to take charge of our commercial interests. I think the Frenchmen know enough to introduce their goods into Canada if they desire to do so, so that we need not care about that; but we should look after the exports from Canada to France and to other foreign countries, and I think it is evident that our High Commissioner, or whatever he calls himself, has been of no use in the development of those interests. Turning to the statement made by my hon. friend from Manitoba (Mr. LaRivière) as to Mr. Fabre's value as an emigration agent, it has been correctly remarked by the Minister of Militia that the Frenchmen are unwilling to leave their beautiful country, and that they have ties that bind them to their homes. I think it has been shown after a long series of years, from this gentleman's efforts and the other efforts that have been put forth in that direction, that we can scarcely hope to attract to our shores any large proportion of the French population. I think it is a matter of regret to us, because I feel they have many qualities that would make them a very desirable population to mix with our own population in this country in developing our North-West. But we have got the stubborn record of the fact that last year he succeeded in bringing out only one French immigrant to this country. Now, my hon. friend says that he is half of the time in Brussels, and that he promotes our interest by inducing Belgians to come to our country. Here, again, I must say that his record as immigration agent is exceedingly unfortunate. If you turn to the official records of the French and Belgian immigration to this country, as presented to us in the report of the Department of Agriculture, you will find that for the last ten years it has fluctuated from 150 to 300 per annum. Then there is this remarkable fact that for the last three years the migration from Belgium and France to Canada combined has steadily decreased. Last year the whole immigration from these two countries combined, according to the official returns, was only 147. Now, I submit under these circumstances that in both these respects our High Commissioner, or whatever high title you apply to him, in Paris, is a conspicuous failure. I think that we should pursue the same course in administering public affairs that we would in our private affairs; and if any man occupying that position, for any one of us, as business agent for a series of years, could only show those results, we would simply say that his usefulness was gone, that his salary was not being earned, and we would dispense with his services. Now, I say that from both these standpoints our commissioner in Paris is an utter and absolute failure, and the sooner we recognize the fact the better. If he is worth $3,500 a year to us for the purpose of writing biographical sketches in a nice style—and I have no doubt they are beautifully written—of the public men of Canada, and introducing them to the notice of Frenchmen, let us understand it. If he is paid this salary for this purpose, let us occasionally have a sketch translated, so that we can know what kind of characters our public men are displaying to the public eye in Paris through our agent there. But after all, if that is all the actual work he does for his salary I submit that the people of Canada, from a business standpoint, should decline to endorse the

action of the Government in maintaining a representative at Paris with this high salary.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not understand from the leader of the Opposition whether, if he came into power, he would dispense with the office of High Commissioner, or whatever other little title he applies to Mr. Fabre, and from the tone the debate has taken we ought to know that.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Wait till we get there.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. gentlemen frequently ask us to wait till they get there. But we know the old distich about the Whigs, which ran something in this way: that when in opposition they were loud enough in their cries for economy, but once in office they grew dumb. Now, I want to know, because I am interested in French immigration. I listened carefully to what fell from the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Laurier), and there was not a single promise, in tone or sentence, or word, to give us the impression that if he had power to-morrow he would dispense with that office. He might get rid of Mr. Fabre; he might resent the fact that Mr. Fabre had left one side of politics for the other; but there is no evidence, and no definite promise, that this money would be saved and that this sinecure office, as the hon. member for Queen's calls it, would be dispensed with.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). And put Pacaud in his place.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, I happen to know something about this office. I know a good deal about Paris. I have visited Paris often; I have visited Paris since Mr. Fabre has been there. I made it a point to go to the office. I went to the office actually to see what was being done of a business character; and I found a regular office there; I found a clerk of Mr. Fabre's there; I found precisely what you would expect from a business man carrying on the emigration business of a country in Paris.

Mr. INNES. Did you find Mr. Fabre there?

Mr. DAVIN. I found Mr. Fabre there.

Mr. INNES. Running his newspaper?

Mr. DAVIN. The newspaper, Mr. Chairman, is not a paper of Mr. Fabre's, but a paper run wholly in the interest of Canada; and the question is this: Whether it is desirable—I am ready to discuss that question—perhaps I have my own ideas upon it—the question is whether it is desirable to make Canada known in France? I gather, even from what fell from the leader of the Opposition, that he, like many of my friends around me, is of the opinion that there is no necessity for ventilating the advantages of this country in La Belle France. I gather that if that be so he would get rid of that office. But I may say that, notwithstanding the fact that the fruits of this office are not what they were expected to be, we have in Eastern Assiniboia some of the best settlers in the whole North-West who are from old France. We have men who came there with means, and who, before we had the experimental farms, which have been established by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, and which are now educating the people of Canada into the higher agriculture—those men have actually performed the achievements of that farm, and by their exhibits at our agricultural fairs from 1882 onward they have shown what the North-West could do in producing, not merely the ordinary garden fruits and farm products, but they have actually demonstrated that in that country, which is supposed to be a semi-arctic country, they could produce some of the choicest fruits and products which are native to the south of France. Now, I do not know whether Mr. Fabre was instrumental in bringing this gentleman out——

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It was a woman, it appears.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend is more interested in the women than he is in the men. I do not know whether the women will return him the compliment. But I know that, notwithstanding that during some generations France showed a splendid spirit of colonization, and that there was afterwards a complete stagnation in her colonizing energy, there still appears to be a class very like the class we have now in Ireland in consequence of the Home Rule movement, a class of gentlemen who have no longer the same hold on the old populations and old retainers that they had formerly, and who are getting discontented with their position, partly owing to the decay of the feudal ideas and partly owing to the impoverishment of their estates; and these people, I am told, are on the wing, and if they are on the wing, judging by what came to the North-West, we may as well get them as any other country, because there cannot be the least doubt that these gentlemen, of whom I speak, are some of our choicest settlers. Now, if, conjointly with the functions of his emigration agency, if emigration agency it be, he can attract the attention of these people to Canada, I do not know that that is a thing we should deplore. I am not sure it is not a thing we should welcome, because, athough I will not go so far as saying that to-day, as the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. LaRivière) said, Paris is the capital of the world, it is after all the capital of the know-how-to-live of the world. I am translating the phrase that would at once occur to me, but I think it is better to translate it at first rather than at last, for some hon. gentlemen would be sure to have cried out "translate." It is in that respect a capital of the world; it is a capital of refinement; it is thus what you can hardly say of any other city; it is positively an education in artistic feeling not merely to visit its galleries but to walk through its streets. You cannot walk through the streets of Paris without feeling that this splendid city which is around and above you and through whose streets you march is itself a temple of art. Under these circumstances, I do not think it is a thing we should resent. I rather think it is a thing we should welcome, if the wayfarers of this country, who were described by Goldwin Smith at one time as "rough, raw and democratic," should be able to obtain the service of a man representing Canada, who would be able to tell them how best they might put in their time if they wished to spend a week or fortnight in Paris. For to see Paris, to see all that Paris has to show in the way of intellectual and artistic significance, would take you months instead of weeks: and I am bound to say that, even taking the suggestion of the Minister of Militia, I would not be inclined to resent it very much if some part of the time of Mr. Fabre were given in that direction. As I heard the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), and the member for North Brant (Mr.

Somerville), and others speaking about a gentleman showing gentlemen round, I well remember what a friend of mine told me, who was not born in the purple but had risen from a very humble position, and had made money and had taken it into his head to go to Paris. I met him afterwards, and said: "Well, Tom, how did you enjoy yourself in Paris?" "Oh, Mr. Davin," he said "I never could tell you, but if I had only some one to show me the 'Tuile-yards and Boule-erilles' I would be perfectly happy." I could not help thinking that it would not have been amiss if some of our friends who have been there had had an artistic eye to guide them around "the Tuile-yards and the Boule-erilles." I want to discuss this vote as an immigration vote. It is palpable to me that it is given for immigration purposes. I want to say this, that nothing can be fairer, nothing can be more fit than that hon. gentlemen should canvass it as it has been canvassed here; it ought to be questioned; we ought not to pass an item unless it is an item we can conscientiously support. I admit that the test that hon. gentlemen apply to it is a proper test, that is to say, the test of results. After all, the greatest voice heard in this world, when he came to a barren fig tree, said: "Cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?" If we come to the conclusion that this is a barren vote, my voice will be raised just as high as that of any one here: "Cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground." My hon. friend near me, with an egotism that I will not emulate, says there is always a "but" when I am speaking; and I may say—I do not mean to be personal—he gives a beautiful countenance to the proposition. Before I can come to vote for the excision of this item from the Estimates I must come to the conclusion that we should not keep any one in Paris to represent us, that there should be nobody in Paris to lay before probable as I am informed—possible, as even the leader of the Opposition will not deny, French emigrants. If at one time, and this country by its dual language attests it was so, the French people, the very same race that at present inhabits France, was one of the most forward of the colonization races, and there is no chapter in the history of heroism that will surpass the history of their early efforts at colonizing, why should they not again become a colonization people, why should they not again find the bounds of France too narrow for them, and spreading their wings cross the broad Atlantic throw in their lot with the children of the West?

An hon. MEMBER. Ah, why?

Mr. DAVIN. Ah, why? It was something between an articular expression and a grunt, but nevertheless it conveyed the hon. gentleman's idea to me, such as it was. I will tell you why. Because I do not think dry rot has entered into that race. I suppose I have more faith perhaps in the race than even the leader of the Opposition. I have lived in France; I know the French people; I know what is their character; and I know what is the charm of their character. I know this, that there is not a race on the continent of Europe with a finer physique than the people of old France. Why, then, should not these people grow too big for their surroundings, for their country, as the Germans are growing too big, as the Austrians are growing too big, as the Italians are growing too big? My hon. friend near me says they are like me, they are not producing. But my wife is my country. If you come to the conclusion that that race has been stricken with an incapacity of expansiveness, then you may possibly excise this vote. The leader of the Opposition will have read probably one of the greatest books that France has produced in modern times, *La France Nouvelle*, by Provost Paradol. It is one of the most delightful books ever written, it is one of the most suggestive; it is in some respects one of the saddest books ever written, especially when we remember the disastrous fate of that great man. Even he, although at times he doubts as he goes with a rigid analysis into the laws that would inevitably lead to the Sedan he never saw, still holds out the belief and the hope that the race still had expansion in it, such an expansion as would lead to the founding, if necessary, of a new France on the shores of Africa. I say you must, to excise this vote, come to the conclusion that it is vain to hope that ever again we shall see emigration from France. If you come to that conclusion I, for my part, will go in for its excision. I grant that this office has been in existence for some years; I grant it has not produced the results we looked for; I grant it is a thing for the Government to seriously enquire into as to why this is the case; and I grant this further, that if it should happen that year after year the same phenomena as to colonization and emigration appear in France, it may then be a question whether you should not abolish this office as an emigration agency. Even then, might it not be desirable to have somebody there to represent us? Have we not risen to a position far higher than many nations that support consuls, and I must say, looking at the cost of that office, if we were to regard him as a consul at one of the great capitals of Europe the sum seems to me very small.

Mr. LAURIER. Insignificant.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes. Qualifying my vote with these remarks, I have to say that I intend to vote with the Government, if it should come to a vote, for the retention of this office, but at the same time I say that it is a matter for fair criticism.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Chairman, as the hon. gentleman has made an appeal to me, I think I owe it to myself and to himself also to give him an answer to the questions that he has addressed to me directly. In the first place, I cannot say that I am surprised to hear that he will vote with the Government upon this question, apart from his general conduct, but particularly from the premises which he has laid down as well. The hon. gentleman asked me what the policy of the Liberal party would be upon this point if they came into power? We are in the cold shades of Opposition at the present time and we do not give promises. The only policy which we avow is that we are in favour of unrestricted reciprocity with our neighbours, but as to details of this nature we will await until we are on the Treasury benches to see what we shall do. Notwithstanding that the hon. gentleman has reminded me of a matter on which he had no reason to remind me, that is, that I am of French origin, I have at all events no hesitation in saying that I do not see what is the usefulness of this vote if it is to bring immigrants from France. My hon. friend has asked how, if it can be avowed on the floor of this Parliament, that the great French nation which in the 16th and 17th,

centuries did do much for colonization, has ceased its power of colonization for ever? Sir, it is not because the French race has retrograded that there is no immigration from France to-day, but the reason is very obvious: it is because France to-day has to give every year the flower of its youth to the Minotaur of Militarism, it is because the French nation to-day has to give the best of its blood, the best of its strength and the best of its young men every year to the army of 1,000,000 men and more which she has to maintain in order to keep up her position in Europe. Let this evil be wiped out, let France come back to the position which she occupied in the 16th and 17th centuries, when, although a military nation, it was not such a military power as it is now, and when she had at that time the same system which England has to-day of a voluntary army, if I may so call it. Then, Sir, France will be able to resume her position also with respect to colonization as she did in these times. It has been said also that Germans are also subject to conscription, but that they emigrate. The hon. gentleman has pointed out that although many Germans immigrate to avoid conscription there is not a Frenchman—with but very few exceptions—who ever leaves his country to avoid conscription. On the other hand, if a Frenchman goes abroad he will go back to his country simply to draw his lot and pay the tribute of blood to his country. Until such times as France has got rid of militaryism I say it is of no use whatever to have an immigration agent sent to France. What has been the history of France since the present republic has been established? The French Government have attempted again and again, not only to revive their colony of Algeria, but to found a military colony in Tonquin; but so far as I can see, not even in Algiers, not even in Tonquin, have their efforts been crowned with any success whatever. It is not because the race is devoid of virility; on the contrary, every man must admit that the French nation since the war has shown immense power of recuperation. They have shown themselves a marvellously great people in that respect, and no nation ever retrieved disaster as the French have done since 1870. At all events, that may be another reason why immigration will not be successful in France, because all the energies of of France have been concentrated towards building up her power and strength. Now, that is a very different question from the question as to whether we should have an immigration agent or not, or whether we shall have a consul or not in Paris. That is a question which it is open to the Government to discuss, and if they bring a proposal in favour of having a consul or a commissioner general, or something of that kind in France, we will debate that question. I have no hesitation, however, in saying that to keep this vote in the Estimates, simply with a view of bringing French immigration to this country, is altogether illusory.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has given us one reason which appears to weigh with him considerably in reference to this vote. He has told us very truly that it takes a long time to get thoroughly acquainted with the city of Paris, to find out all its beauties and to appreciate all its art treasures, and he thinks that with a view of perfecting Mr. Fabre's education he ought to be left there a little longer. I beg to differ from him a little in this respect. Mr. Fabre has had ten years of it, and if he is not capable of knowing his Paris thoroughly in that time he ought to be recalled and somebody else ought to be given a chance. I would suggest, for instance, that the office be passed around amongst those members of the Government who want a little holiday; that the Minister of Militia and the Postmaster General and anybody else you choose to to name should be afforded an opportunity of spending a few months of the year at Paris, which would not increase the expense of the office as now constituted, and would give to the Government the vast advantages of culture and instruction which Paris affords. I think that this proposition would be more useful than the present one, and that it would result in the country being equally well represented in Paris. The hon. member from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) compares Mr. Fabre to a barren fig tree, and, although he has borne no fruit for ten years, he is still unwilling to cut him down and have him thrown on the brush-heap. He would rather dig about him, and cultivate him, and supply him with proper nourishment for a few years more, to see if some fruit might not be found from his boughs. He makes bows enough, no doubt, but there is no fruit from them. But, in spite of Mr. Fabre's culture and literary ability, even the excuse that he is making Canada more widely known in Paris and France does not seem to me to apply. If there is any credit due to anybody for making Canada known in France it is not due to our agent general, or whatever he may be called. It is due to the unaided genius and enterprise of our own people of Canada. It is due much more largely to a Fréchette than to a Fabre—to the young native Canadian who has not only taken his stand amongst the literary men of France, but has shown himself at the head of the rising generation of French men of letters. The one fact that Mr. Fréchette took the great prize for poetry at Paris, some time ago, has done more to advance Canada in France than all that has been done by Mr. Hector Fabre and the $40,000 that he has cost. But to come to other Government emissaries: I venture to say that the late lamented Curé Labelle did more to advertise Canada in France than Mr. Fabre has done. One visit of the Curé Labelle or one visit of the present Premier of Quebec has done more to advance Canada there than all the agencies of this Government. If you doubt it, look at the French papers, and you will see that the names of those gentlemen are well known in France. They have made the rounds of both France and Belgium, and have not only advanced the country, but have taken every possible means to obtain information in Belgium and France that might be useful to the farmers of this country. They have thoroughly investigated the sugar beet industry, for instance, and brought home a large amount of information in regard to that. I am glad to learn from the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that the climate there so much resembles that of the south of France and that, strangely enough, farmers of Belgium have not only been able to instruct the settlers of Assiniboia as to the modes of agriculture especially fitted to that climate, but have also been able to introduce the fruits of the south of France. That is an item of information which it must be very pleasant for the House to hear amongst so much of the dry rot which the hon. gentleman has referred to as having been talked on this question.

He tells us that this dry rot has not yet invaded the French race. I am glad to hear it. It is very gratifying to find that Mr. Fabre does not circulate any of the hon. gentleman's speeches amongst the intending emigrants of that country. But, putting aside all chaff, I wish to make these points seriously. Mr. Fabre has shown no results. Whether the place be abolished or not, it is quite certain that Mr. Fabre should be abolished. It may be necessary to have an agent at Paris, but it is quite evident that Mr. Fabre is not the man, if any man could be of use. It is either useless to send an emigration agent there at all, or it is useless to send Mr. Fabre. Now, it is quite certain that it is useless to send Mr. Fabre; it is not certain that it would be useless to send anybody else. In the next place, this country has been advanced by other agencies much better than by the Dominion agent there—by the genius of young Canadians and the efforts of the Local Government and its representatives in Paris.

Mr. FOSTER. We have spent now a fairly generous proportion of time over this vote, and it has been pretty thoroughly canvassed. We are possessed of the information supplied by a large number of gentlemen on the opposite side, and we are indebted to this discussion for some very interesting dissertations on the genius and spirit of the French race and the prospects of the French nationality. I did not understand my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition to dissent at all from the view that it would be, as a matter of policy, fairly debatable, and that a great deal might be said in its favour, that our commercial agencies or semi-consulships, so to speak, should rather be enlarged than diminished. I think myself that there is a great deal to be said in favour of that policy. Not only as regards Paris, but as regards other commercial centres of the world, a reasonable and well-digested system of commercial agents or semi-consular agents representing Canada would be of very great service to us as a people and to our commerce as well. A good deal has been said as to Mr. Fabre's designation. He is really a Canadian agent in Paris. Whatever he can do in spreading information which tends towards emigration, Mr. Fabre does, and does this not only through the documents distributed by him, but very effectually in the little weekly paper, *Paris-Canada*, which has a fairly large circulation, and in which Canadian subjects are every week more or less treated. There is another point, too, in which it is useful to have a gentleman like Mr. Fabre in Paris. There are a great many influences at work there which are not seen upon the surface, and I know that numerous enquiries are made of Mr. Fabre, known as the Canadian representative in Paris, with reference to commercial and agricultural and manufacturing prospects in this country; and that Frenchmen of means, and those who have projects of one kind or another in these lines, have had conversation with him and got information from him, which have to a certain extent already resulted in their making connections in this country, which, though of slow growth, may ultimately expand into giving us what hon. gentlemen opposite seem to desire, the representative results of the expenditure we make. Then, as has been said, Mr. Fabre visits Belgium and expends his energies, not only as a journalist, but also as a lecturer and speaker, before bodies which are largely representative, where he never fails to give very interesting and useful information in regard to this country. Well, now, is it best for us, at this particular time, after we have secured a name and a place in Paris as being represented there, and after certain affiliations and connections have been formed, immediately to blot these out, more especially at this time when we might, judging from the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, come to the conclusion that France is getting into a position to be better able to take advantage of foreign countries in the way of emigration and colonization than she has done heretofore. The great drain on France, in order to make up the losses of the Franco-Prussian war and the indemnities that had to be paid, has been so heroically met, and France has supported so many burdens in past years, and has been so successful in throwing them off in the last few years, that she is now better able to devote her energies to colonization and emigration. If we wait until the rule of militarism has passed away in Europe, I fear we may have to wait a great many years. It does not seem to me that the prospects are favourable at present for the French people laying down their military system and introducing a volunteer system like that of Great Britain. It is certainly not to my mind wisest and best for us, after having created a certain centre of influence in France, now immediately to uproot that. My hon. friend who spoke so eloquently in reference to the French people and introduced the Scriptural incident called to my mind that at that time the proposition was made in reference to that fig tree, that it might well be spared for another year, that it might be dug about and trenched about and that fruits would probably appear. Now, we have gone through pretty nearly half the year. I do not suppose anyone wishes to oust Mr. Fabre, after such a length of time has passed, and send him from his place at short notice. Three or four months of the year have already gone, and Mr. Fabre had a perfect right to assume that his services would be retained for the balance of the year. What we might do is this: After this discussion, more or less pertinent and very interesting in parts, to which the Government have paid much attention, I think I may promise for the Government that they will carefully consider this question during recess, and be prepared next session either to abolish the office or give good grounds for its maintenance. With that understanding, and knowing each other's opinions, it would be better for us to pass the vote, and next session we will be prepared to discuss the policy which will guide us in the future and to which this Parliament will be asked to give its adhesion.

Mr. McMULLEN. We would on this side be willing to accept the suggestion of the hon. Minister if we had not similar promises made to us in the past, with the result that the vote is still before us. When discussing this item last session I am quite certain that the Committee were led to understand either that more labour would be exacted from Mr. Fabre or that we would be given some evidence that he was earning his money. I would ask the Minister of Finance what he has to say in reply to the remarks of the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), who has shown us that instead of the exports from Canada to France

increasing they have decreased, so that if Mr. Fabre is there for the purpose of encouraging trade, his efforts have evidently had the contrary effect. We have been told that Mr. Fabre exercises very desirable influence in the direction of promoting emigration from France to this country. Will the hon. Minister lay before the Committee Mr. Fabre's report on that point?

Mr. FOSTER. I will bring down everything.

Mr. McMULLEN. We want his written report. Surely, as agent of Canada, he must have prepared a report to lay before Parliament, showing what work he has done; and I would like to compare that report with our Trade and Navigation Returns, so that I might be able to find ground for our paying $3,000 to $5,000 to continue Mr. Fabre in office. The Finance Minister says he has been there four months of this year, and asks if he is to be turned out on the street penniless? No one desires that he should be sent adrift penniless. We are willing to pay him up to the last moment, but we do not want to continue him in an office in which it has been proved he is utterly useless to this country. It is by items of this kind that we are continually adding to the annual expenditure of the people until it has come up to $38,000,000; and it is the duty of every member of this House, I care not whether he be Conservative or Reformer, to resist such votes at this. I believe there are members on the opposite side who would be willing to wipe out such items if the Government were not in danger. We should act firmly and promptly, independent of politics, in putting a stop to this system of keeping men dancing round at the cost of the country in foreign lands, We cannot afford it. The Trade and Navigation Returns show we cannot. The people of the country cannot stand being bled in that way.

Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committe.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. Before six o'clock we were discussing the item of expenses of Mr. Fabre's agency in Paris. Last year no report was submitted to Parliament by him. Mr. Wilson, then member for Middlesex, said: "I think we should have some explanation of what he is doing, whether he is succeeding in sending us out any emigrants." To this Mr. Foster replied: "He is sowing the seed for future results; it takes time." Mr. Wilson added: "We ought to have some report from this gentleman." And Mr. Foster said: "I acknowledge there ought to be a report. I think there is one, but the Secretary of State is not in his place." Then Mr. Davies, of Prince Edward Island, moved that the item be struck out, and on a division the item was carried, and the Minister of Finance said he would lay the report on the Table. If there is a report, we ought to have it now, or we should let the item stand until we have it.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not mean to leave the House to suppose that there was a report, upon my authority, because I am rather inclined to believe there is no report. I said I would enquire, and if there was I would have it brought down.

Mr. McMULLEN. Everyone of the other emigration agents we have furnish us with a report, and so does the High Commissioner; and it is very extraordinary that the Government should allow this man to live in Paris at our expense and have no account from him as to what he is doing. How many years has he been there?

Mr. FOSTER. I think ten years. The hon. gentleman had better let the matter go as I suggested. I do not think it would change the opinions of any to waste more time.

Mr. McMULLEN. What did the hon. gentleman say he was going to do?

Mr. FOSTER. I said we were now far advanced into the year, and I did not think it would be advisable to break up the establishment of Mr. Fabre in the beginning of the year, after he had made all his arrangements and rented his office. I added that during recess the Government, having heard the expressions of opinion of hon. gentlemen, would carefully consider the matter and be prepared either to give good reasons for retaining the agency or adopt the opposite course and do away with it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then, we are to understand that the Government admit they have not given any good reasons this or any previous session for keeping him there?

Mr. FOSTER. I said we would then be better able to decide what policy to adopt for the future.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understood the Minister of Finance to say that, if we waited till next session, the Government would be prepared to give good reasons for keeping him there.

Mr. FOSTER. Or the opposite.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure the hon. gentleman will admit that his explanation is not at all satisfactory. Still, I understand it is the best he can give. At all events, apart from the question of policy, in regard to which it seems to me there cannot be two different opinions, it is evident that this office is altogether uncalled for. There is no use for an emigration office in France, because it is barren of results and cannot produce any results. Apart from that, however, if you have an officer there who is paid to look after that office, you should at least have a report from him of what he has been doing.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. LAURIER. But for two years he has not made any report. I understand that Mr. Fabre, who is, as we all know, a very clever man, may have found himself embarrassed in making a report because he has nothing to report. If he could say that many hundreds of emigrants had been sent out from France I am sure he would be glad to do so. I believe he once made a report showing that one emigrant had come out here, and if he could show an increase of 100 per cent. on that he would be glad to do it. Therefore, the hon. gentleman must see that there is no reason for continuing that office.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It might be possible for an agent to be employed there in commercial interests if he understood trade and commerce, but I understand that Mr. Fabre has not been engaged in business, and would not be the kind of agent employed in that capacity. If he was employed for commercial reasons, the object has signally failed, because our exports to France have been

diminishing almost every year since he has been there. In 1873 our exports to France amounted to $631,000; in 1876 to $553,000; in 1879 to $741,000; in 1880 to $812,000; in 1882 to $822,000, but they have been declining since that time, and last year our total export trade with France was $278,552. If we desire to have an export trade with France we had better abolish that agency, and I think it would be just as well to have that office closed. A treaty has been recently made between England and France which discriminates against our products going into France, and I should like to know what is the use of keeping an agent there when our export trade has been falling off almost every year. This has been going on for ten years, with the result that one emigrant came out. I think this item should be dropped.

To meet cost of litigated matters.....$ 5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How is it that so much is asked this year? Only $1,600 was paid last year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That was the year before last. Last year's grant was not enough. This vote is intended to cover the cost of litigated matters not elsewhere provided for.

Payments to extra clerks for services rendered in preparation of Returns ordered by Parliament.....$5,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What check have the Government on the expenditure for services of this kind in making returns for the House of Commons. I understand that a great number of the irregularities that have occurred in the various departments, as to the payment of money for extra services for returns to the House of Commons, have arisen from the system adopted as to the preparation of those returns. I have been informed—and I believe my information is correct—that a very large amount of money is squandered every year in preparing these returns, and that it is from this fund that a large proportion of the amount expended is obtained to pay extra clerks, and that in many cases they are paid for services which are not rendered.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government have the same check on this expenditure as they have on any other expenditure for extra work done by extra clerks. My hon. friend says he is informed that there is a great deal of fraud in these payments, and that work which has not been done is paid for. That can hardly be. It is not a very huge sum. The whole expenditure last year was only $2,000.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It was smaller last year than usual.

Mr. FOSTER. Because not so many returns were asked for. This expenditure depends upon the voracity displayed by Parliament, and especially by hon. gentlemen opposite, in regard to returns. The work is given out by a responsible officer, and is paid for by folio or by hour, and I do not think there is any abuse existing in regard to this.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think if the Government employ a greater number of clerks than usual they should be able at all events to bring down the returns. I think one clerk could bring out some of the returns to which I refer. We should have the satisfaction of getting the returns in proper time, or they are of no value to the House or to the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN.

Commercial Agencies..... $5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is this for?

Mr. FOSTER. Formerly the vote for this was $10,000, but I thought it was rather large, and last year I reduced it to $5,000. If we desire to send anyone to a foreign country for commercial purposes, this is the vote out of which we take the expense.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who was employed on that last year?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think anyone was employed last year. There was $5,000 voted, but I do not think there was any expended.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the use of voting it if it is not expended?

Mr. FOSTER. It would be well to have it if we wished to expend it.

Survey, construction of roads, bridges and other necessary works in connection with the Hot Springs reservation, near Banff Station, N. W. T.... $10,000

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to, me from the evidence we have made before Parliament this session, that this is another sink of expenditure. Every year money is virtually sunk, and we do not appear to have any returns whatever. I put the question in regard to this matter on the 17th of August, and the reply I got was as follows:—

	Expenses.	Receipts.
1885-86.....	$ 4,300 00	
1886-87.....	36,170 97	
1887-88	36,612 48	$2,951 58
1888-89.....	24,684 20	2,528 73
1889-90.....	19,286 61	1,094 37
1890-91.....	16,999 84	2,347 35
	$141,254 10	$8,922 03

From the answer given to my question with regard to the expenditures and receipts, it is nothing short of folly to go on spending enormous amounts of money on Banff Park. It may be a very nice and pleasant place for those to go to who can afford to take a trip over the railway and spend a few days at a fancy hotel, or to stop at Banff Park as a kind of half-way-station between ocean and ocean. But I say it is unreasonable to ask the people of this country to spend $10,000 more in addition to the amount we have already expended, which will make a total of $150,000. That sum, placed at interest at 4 per cent, would give $6,000 a year. Then we have the annual expenditure connected with it. Last year there were expended on the Hot Springs $19,767.83. Mr. Stewart, Superintendent of the Park, 12 months, $1,800, and we pay him travelling expenses, $48.35. Then we have Jacob Smith, draughtsman, 365 days at $4 a day, and it appears the work is so urgent that we keep him busy Sundays as well as every other day. He gets $1,400 a year. We pay the keep of a horse for Mr. J. Connor, 13 months and 14 days, $161.20. We bought him a cutter, $55, and we paid his horse-shoeing, $12. Now, I think it is carrying matters too far to ask the Committee to consent to a still further expenditure of $10,000 on the same line. It is quite clear, from the number of men here, that they put in their time very comfortably and draw respectable salaries for virtually doing nothing. I see here that Connor is forest ranger, for which he gets $900 a year, on the reserve

of Banff Park. We have a draughtsman at $1,400, and a superintendent at $1,800. Then we have a caretaker, J. Moir, 11 months, $600, and a nurseryman, and so on. I would like to know from the Minister if it is the intention to keep all those men employed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the first place, I think John Connor has been dead twelve months. The accounts the hon. gentleman has been reading are eighteen months old. Jacob Smith, who was the surveyor, has moved away. It was necessary to have a surveyor during the laying out of the park. The only salaried officials we have there now is the superintendent, who draws $150 a month; and the caretaker of the cove and basin. The hon. gentleman has been there probably, and has seen where the public take their baths and pay for them. The caretaker gets $60 a month. Then Moiris no longer there. But there is a caretaker named Cobbs, who looks after the office of the Superintendent General, and looks after the hot springs, that is, where the water is taken away into the pipes, and which point has to be continually looked after and inspected. He gets $15 a month for one, and $10 for the other, that is, $25 a month. So that the only salaries we pay out at the park are $1,235. This sum is asked for to complete the road which has been in contemplation for some time. I think I explained that last year, saying that these were driving roads round the mountain to different points of interest in the park. The expenditure asked for this year will build all the work that we think will be required.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the annual rent received for sites for buildings?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is hard to say. The receipts from the rent of the different town lots have been unsatisfactory, on account of the different opinions of the people who lease those lots. The first contention was that the leases were not long enough when we made them twenty-one years. Eighteen months ago a deputation came here asking that the leases might be extended, and we gave way in that regard, and made the leases forty-two years instead of twenty-one. I was under the impression that everything was satisfactory then. Subsequently, we are asked that these lots might be sold out in fee-simple. This, of course, I am unable to do, because the Act of Parliament says that the lots shall only be leased, and we have remaining in abeyance an amount of over $6,000 owing to those leased lots. Parties owning them first pressed for an extension of the lease, and next pressed that the lots might be sold out and out.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this Mr. Stewart a professional man?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, an engineer. A professional man's services will not be required, however, after the present year, as the extensive works will be completed.

Mr. BAIN. What is the scale of rentals for the lots?

Mr. DEWDNEY. $30 a year. That is what the lots lease for.

Mr. TROW. Have not some lots been sold absolutely?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says no lots have been sold absolutely. I do not know what are the instructions of the department with respect to this matter; but I can convince the hon. gentleman that lots have been sold absolutely, and I can understand, from the document placed in my hands, there has been quite a feeling of discontent created among settlers at Banff, because they think the Government have not kept faith with those who purchased lots absolutely. I have a communication from Banff, in which this is stated:

"In the winter of 1886 and the spring of 1887, the Government offered the lots in Banff town site for sale; a large number of these were sold, part payment being made, until the deeds for the same should be issued. The Government subsequently withdrew these lots from sale, and through intimidation and compulsion induced several of the said purchasers to accept leases, and now have the hardihood to deny that they ever offered the said lots for sale. Several of the parties who so purchased did not and will not accept leases: consequently the Government is now adopting coercive measures, threatening eviction and forfeiture of improvements, &c., and have recently re-let two lots to parties upon the payment of back rent. The said lots have good houses upon them, the value of which is far above the amount due for rent. This was done without being advertised."

The hon. gentleman may tell me that this is simply the statement of one individual. But I hold in my hand two receipts which speak for themselves, and which show conclusively that these lots were sold absolutely. The first reads:

"BANFF, May 10, 1887.

"Received from Patrick Carr, Esq., the sum of $5 as first payment on lot 13, in block 6, of Government town site.

"F. M. STEWART."

This gentleman is the Government agent. This first receipt is dated 10th May. Here is another:

"BANFF, May 14, 1887.

"Received from Patrick Carr $10, being the second payment on lots 12 and 13, block 6, of Government town site.

"F. M. STEWART."

And to this is appended an affidavit from Mr. Carr as follows:—

"N. W. T.
"District of Alberta,
"In the matter of Lots (12) twelve and (13) thirteen, block "(6) six, town site of Banff.
"To WIT:—
"I, Patrick Carr, of the town of Lethbridge, in the district of Alberta, tailor, do solemnly declare:
"That the document hereunto annexed, marked Exhibit A, contains true copies of two certain receipts given to me by F. M. Stewart while acting in the capacity of Dominion Government land agent at Banff, for payments made by me on account of two lots or parcels of land known as lots twelve (12) and thirteen (13) in block six, in the town plot of Banff, according to the Dominion Government survey thereof.
"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act respecting extra judicial oaths.

(Sgd.) "P. CARR.

"Declared before me at the Town of Lethbridge, in the District of Alberta, this 9th day of April, 1891.

(Sgd.) "CHAS. F. P. CONYBEAR,
"*A Commissioner in B. R. and C.*"

Here is a case, therefore, in which the agent of the Government received two different instalments for the purchase of certain lots, and although, as I am informed, this man has been ready to pay the balance of the money he agreed to pay, he has been unable to do so.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In what year was it?

Mr. LAURIER. May 10, 1887.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Act prohibiting the sale was passed 6 months afterwards.

Mr. LAURIER. That may be, and it is that of which this man complains. The hon. gentleman must understand that it is no defence, in the case of this man who had purchased these lots, to say that an Act was subsequently passed prohibiting the sale. The propriety of passing such an Act is a question of policy on the part of the Government and those interested; but so far as this man is concerned, his rights cannot be affected in any way by the Act passed subsequently, and it is a denial of justice to this man to tell him now, when the Government have accepted his money, that an Act has been passed subsequently prohibiting the sale, and that he cannot have his deed. You must admit that as regards all those who are in the same position as Carr, who purchased lots from the Government and whose money has been accepted by the Government, that their position cannot be affected in any way by any legislation passed afterwards. I hope the hon. gentleman will agree to that proposition, and give an answer to these men in that sense.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will be able to show that the money was not paid in part payment of lots purchased, but as a deposit in order to get the first opportunity of securing lots in the event of their being sold, because it was uncertain whether they would be sold or leased. There are no less than 45 others in the same position as Carr, who paid in a certain sum—because $5 would not have been the proportion of the first payment on the two lots alleged to have been sold to Carr—some persons paying in $10 and some $5. I have not Patrick Carr on the list, but I have Joseph Carr, who paid $10. I cannot find anyone down for lots 12 and 13 of block 6, or that those lots have been dealt with in any way. But there were 45 applicants when the first plan was prepared and was only in pencil, before it was submitted to Ottawa. They applied to be allowed to register names and pay a small sum, in order that when the land was put on the market they would be the first applicants to purchase. Some of them, on the strength of having made the deposits, commenced speculating in the lots, and within 24 hours had transferred them to other parties at large advances. Out of the 45 parties who endeavoured to secure these lots, one party of the name of Blackwood and his friends secured not less than 20 out of the 45 lots. In the summer of 1888 a survey of the town site was made. During that period several persons applied to purchase lots. Mr. Stewart informs me that in the summer of 1886 the survey of the town site was made, and during that period several persons applied to him to purchase lots. "At the time of these applications the survey had not been completed nor had any plan been made, except the rough draft plan used by the surveyor as his guide in laying out the lots and streets. A copy of this plan however had been forwarded to the head office, Ottawa, for the approval of the Minister, as to the mode of laying out the lots and the streets. Between then and the final completion of the plan in 1888 several changes were made, particularly as to the extent and limits of the town site. Immediately after the posts were put down defining the size and position of the lots, several persons applied to purchase lots, as it was then understood that they would be either leased or sold on the town site. It was explained to these applicants that the final plan was not yet completed and that alterations would probably be made. However, they wished to secure the first choice of lots and their names were noted down as a memorandum simply. No land books were opened or entries made of these transactions. After making these applications some of the parties disposed of their lots at greatly advanced prices. Returns were made to the head office of these applications, and are generally called 'sold lots,' to distinguish them from 'leased lots,' and I am certain that the Minister did not consider these applications as a bargain binding on either party. The prices at which the lots should be sold had been fixed but not the terms, although it was suggested by the late Minister that he would prefer that the whole purchase money should be paid down at the time of the purchase. As regards the deposits which were paid in by the applicants (and for which I gave a receipt), it was quite optional with them to do so, and the greater number of them paid no deposit at all, but those that did were persons who lived at a distance from Banff, and had selected choice lots and thought that by paying a deposit the lots would be held for them till the sale took place. In the case of land sales generally, the whole of the purchase money, or a first instalment, is paid when the sale is made, and the other instalments follow according to the terms, but in the case of these applications, the terms were not even spoken of nor were they decided on by the Minister, and the deposit consisted of such an amount as the applicant thought fit to pay. With respect to the remarks made by the late Minister and Sir John A. Macdonald during the debate on the park expenditure in 1887, I cannot see anything to lead one to believe that they considered the transactions connected with these lots up to the time of the debate as anything more than applications, and not such a transaction as was binding on either party. These references in the debate are on page 194 of *Hansard*, when Mr. White says that $15,000 had been applied for, and Sir John A. Macdonald refers to the same on page 245. There could be no intention on the part of the Government to treat the mere application of these parties for lots as an actual sale, as the Park Act was not at that time passed, nor for six months afterwards, which Act authorized the Minister for the first time to dispose of the lots in any way. It is evident that I did not look upon the application for these lots as a binding sale on the part of the Government, from the fact that I had not received official notice from the Minister as to the terms of the sale, and could not and did not state to any of the applicants what the terms would be. I append hereto a schedule of the lots applied for by persons who paid deposits; the amount of deposit and the date of the application." Then follows a schedule attached containing the names of the parties. There were forty-five applicants, twenty of which were purchased by Blackwood Bros. Fifteen of them refunded the money when they found the sales were not to be made and one or two of them had it applied on the rent of their lots. These are the circumstances connected with the lots in question.

Mr. TROW. I can confirm the statement of the hon. the leader of the Opposition in his advocacy of those parties who had made the purchase abso-

lutely of these lots. I am not acquainted with the parties, but I have heard conversations from one and the other during my visit to that place in 1887. I was then offered several lots myself for cash value, and I examined with Mr. Stewart several lots that I felt inclined to purchase. I had no idea that they were not in the market and at open sale. I was prepared to pay for them, and Mr. Stewart was prepared to sell them to me. I selected my lots and I told him on my return from the coast that in all likelihood I would confirm the bargain for four different lots, in a very eligible position, between the Sanitarium and the Canadian Pacific Railway Hotel. I think it is a mistake that they were withdrawn from the markets. I think there is a large tract of good lands that can be sold in that locality at remunerative figures. At that time they could be well sold at all events, and I have no doubt they could be sold to advantage now if they were put on the market. Very few people will erect permanent buildings on the uncertainty of a lease for a certain number of years, because every person would be inclined to have a deed in fee-simple from the Government as some security that the property was theirs and nobody else's. Mr. Stewart gave no intimation to me that I was to have a lease. It was to be a permanent deed absolutely, and under this impression I think others were purchasing at the same time. I am aware that since that there has been an alteration, and that they were leasing the property, but I think it is a great mistake on the part of the Government. The land should be sold. You have there a park twelve miles by twenty-four miles, and the place is well selected. I do not know any better on the continent, and I question in my mind whether it is not in some respects superior to that of the Yellowstone Park. However, I think that the Government is somewhat extravagant just now in their expenditure there. I can understand that a few years ago when they were opening new roads and putting up buildings over the caves that there was considerable expenditure necessary, but I do not see why it is necessary to employ so many men there now. I would like to know from the Minister whether the Canadian Pacific Railway or the proprietor of the sanitarium pay any rent for the use of the water from the hot springs?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Oh, yes; they all pay rent for the water. They pay so much for every bath and so much for every plunge bath. The Canadian Pacific Railway has a large plunge bath, and I think the sanitarium has two. They all pay for the water.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not got the scale of prices here, but they are fixed by Order in Council.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry that in reference to the question which I have just raised that the hon. gentleman has given me such an answer, because if he will look at the case again he will find that the attitude which he is now pursuing is an absolute denial of justice to the parties who purchased those lands. The hon. gentleman says that the agent simply received their money and did not enter into a contract with them, but simply took their money, reserving whether or not he would be in a position to sell or not to sell. The hon. gentleman referred me and referred the House to the opinion of the late Hon. Mr. White, the Minister of the Interior of that day. He pretends that the language then used by Mr. White will confirm his view of the case. The language of Mr. White is quite the reverse, and it says in so many words that these lands at the time he spoke, which was on the 29th April, 1887, were open not for lease but for purchase. Here is the language which is to be found, as stated by the hon. gentleman, at page 194 of *Hansard*:

"There is no exclusive property in the springs given to any one. On the other side of Bow River there is a town site. The Government have already surveyed it and laid it out, and are selling lots ——,

Mark you not "leasing" but "selling"—

—"and I am told by the secretary of the department, who has recently been up there with a view to making a report as to the progress of matters and to determine the conditions on which sales should be made, that $15,000 worth of lots have already been applied for."

Now, Mr. Chairman, nothing could be more positive than that, and it absolutely confirms the statement I have made. That language was spoken on the 29th April, 1887, and on the 10th May, about a week after that, the agent received from Patrick Carr $5, not for the lease but as first payment on lots 12 and 13 Government town site. Four days afterwards, on the 14th May, the Government received from Patrick Carr $10, being second payment for lots 12 and 13. At that time, we have in the language of Mr. White, that the Government did not determine the price at which they should sell, but the Minister then said positively that they were selling, and these men have purchased. It is preposterous to pretend, in the face of the receipt which was given by the agent, that he was receiving the money for a lease and not for a sale. If he had given the receipt for a lease he would have so stated; but he received the first and the second instalments of the selling price. At that time the lands were open for sale. It is true the Government afterwards withdrew them from sale, and with regard to any transactions which took place afterwards I have nothing to say; but as to what took place in the months of April and May, 1887, it is manifest that these men purchased, that they intended to purchase, and that the Government intended to sell; and if at the present time they do not receive their deeds of sale, let the Minister say what he will, it is a breach of faith. These men cannot be affected by any legislation which took place afterwards, in the face of the fact that the Minister of the Interior of that day stated that the lands were open for sale at the very moment that this receipt was given. It is preposterous to say at the present day that the land was not sold, but leased. It was sold, and this is only a repetition of what we have seen on other occasions, that faith is not kept with the settlers of the North-West; faith is broken every day with them. You invite people to come from Europe to settle in the North-West, and if after they come it does not suit your caprice to keep your agreement with them, you break it. Under such circumstances, it is a denial of justice to these people, and I hope that the House will force the hands of the Government in this matter, and see that justice is done to these people.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is not a question of settlers in the North-West at all. On the one side the facts set up here these: That when the Government proposed to make a very important public improvement, in the shape of a national park

in a portion of the Rocky Mountains, certain speculators, although these lands were not open for sale at all, sought to compel the Government to sell them, and sought to obtain an advantage over the public by depositing sums of money with a person who had no more authority to sell them than one of the pages on the floor of the House. The question of these lands being open for sale did not depend on what was said by Mr. White in the House: but it depended on the possession of authority by the Minister and his agent at that time to sell them. On the facts set forth by the hon. Minister of the Interior, the Minister at that time had no power to sell these lands or to recommend them for sale to A, B or C. They were absolutely withdrawn from sale; and neither the Minister nor the department had a right to receive an application for their purchase. But the persons who sought to jump those lands, by paying a deposit, in the hope of selling them to other parties afterwards, no doubt thought they did a very clever thing; and now the plea is set up that we are doing an injustice to the settlers in the North-West if these jumpers do not receive the lands. If the set of facts alleged by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) are correct, namely, that the lands under the statute as it then existed were open for sale, and that these men applied to purchase them under the law as it then stood, the law which was passed afterwards would not stand in their way. But until we settle the facts it is vain to talk of breach of faith to the settlers in the North-West, or to instance this as a case of it. The facts are in dispute, and if they are as understood by the hon. Minister of the Interior it would be an outrage to give these claimants the lands, and they will not get them unless by process of law.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has an advantage over me. I do not know what the law was at the time, but I know what the language of the Minister was. The hon. gentleman says it does not matter what Mr. White said at that time. If this is the doctrine laid down by the Minister of Justice, that the word of a Minister of the Crown on the floor of Parliament has no weight or value, that the people are not to rely upon it, that if they do they do it at their peril, and that if the Minister is wrong he will not suffer, but they will suffer, it is a new doctrine which we ought to understand in this country. But be the law right or wrong, if the Minister gives a permission to the people to buy lands which he has no right to give it is he who should suffer and not the people. The Minister used these words:

"The Government have already surveyed it and laid it out and are selling lots."

What the facts at that time were I do not know, and I suppose the hon. gentleman does not know; but I say this, that if the Minister of the Interior in 1887 was selling lots and had no authority to sell them, the blame is not to fall on the people who acted upon his word, but the blame is to fall upon the Government, who acted without authority; and whether they had authority or not, it seems to me it is a monstrous doctrine to utter on the floor of Parliament that the settlers in the North-West can be deceived by the word of a Minister.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman cannot pretend that these lands were purchased on the word of the Minister. The Minister was making a statement as to the intention of the Government with regard to the public property there. It was quite immaterial whether the language he used had reference to selling or leasing. He was simply explaining to the House the policy of the Government as to not holding in their possession certain tracts of land. He might have used the word "sell" or "lease"; but it was not on the authority of those expressions that these men proceeded. When they went to the land office to buy these lands they did not go on the authority of *Hansard*. These purchases were not made on the explanation of the Minister given in this House, but on the provisions of the law as it then stood; and any person going to the agent would not go with *Hansard* in his hands, but with the law as to whether the lands were open for sale or not. The statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior is that the agent had no power to sell, but that he said he was willing to receive the deposit of $5 in case the policy should afterwards be adopted to sell them; and I am told, notwithstanding this fuss about the word of the Minister, that these deposits and applications had actually been made before the Minister spoke.

Mr. FRASER. But we must not forget this one fact, that the conditions of sale are in the receipt. Who ever heard of making a second payment on a lease before the lease was executed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It does not make any difference.

Mr. FRASER. Surely, if the settler is to pay money, and if a subsequent Government puts a different interpretation on words which are as plain as words can be, what security has a purchaser, if an agent sells property, following the words of the Minister?

Mr. FOSTER. This was the year before the Minister spoke.

Mr. FRASER. The same year. Are we to understand that the agent of the Government at that place gives a receipt for money paid on a sale, and then turns around and says: I told him that if a sale were afterwards to be made the terms would be so-and-so? Are we to understand that an agent of the Government knows no more about a conditional sale or a direct sale than that? He had, at least, the authority of the Minister, and the presumption is very strong that he acted according to what the Minister said or understood. I am sure that no settler who receives a receipt for money paid upon a sale, or upon a promise of sale, ought to be told afterwards that the transaction was only to be held good in case the land should be for sale, and that the Government, if they liked, need not complete the sale at all. I must object to the statement that the word of a Minister of the Crown is to be questioned afterwards and his authority to give his word questioned. It will not do to plead that he did it in ignorance, for even if he did the Government are bound by his statement. In this case he did not do it in ignorance, but with a full knowledge of the facts, but subsequently it suited the Government to act differently. It will not do for the Government to say now that the Minister acted in one way when it was proved he acted directly the opposite, in order to put a construction on a statement of the Minister years ago to suit the policy of the Government to-day. There is no

denying the fact that that man bought the land and that he made a payment on account. The Minister says he can go into court. Is that the proper way to treat a man who has made a purchase from the Government, on the faith of the word of a Minister of the Crown and a written receipt for money paid? Lawyers may like that way of proceeding, but it does not suit settlers.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for Guysborough and I will not disagree in the slightest about this case when we agree on the facts. He differs from me as to what ought to be done and what has been done simply because he has not, I think, fully informed himself as to the facts. He perhaps did not hear what I said a few minutes ago as to some of the points in dispute; and moreover he has not taken into account the position in which Dominion lands stand in the North-West and everywhere else. He looks upon the case as he would one between private parties. I do not say that the same faith should not be observed by the Government in its dealing as would be by private parties, but the lands of the Government are not in the same position as the lands of private parties—that is, they cannot be sold by an agent here and there, or on the word of a Minister here and there, contrary to the statute, but must be dealt with as provided by the statute governing them, and no title can be given except under the provisions of such statute. In accordance with those provisions, these lands were not Dominion lands for sale or settlement at all, but lands comprised in a reservation set apart for the purpose of a national park, on which nobody had a right to settle, and which no agent was entitled to sell or lease or deal with in any way. The agent there had only the right to sell lands outside the reservation; and when Kerr came and deposited money with the view of securing land inside the reservation—lands which would be greatly enhanced in value the moment the Government converted the reservation into a park and spent money in improving and beautifying it—he knew the lands were not for sale, he knew that the statute did not authorize them to be sold, he was told by the agent that they could not be sold until the policy of the Government was settled as to whether they should be sold or leased or retained; and under such circumstances he understood, on his money being received and a receipt given therefor, expressing what the terms of the sale would be if there was a sale at all, that the transaction gave him no right or title in the land. Subsequently, on the matter coming before this Parliament, because all this took place a year before the Minister was alleged to have opened his lips about it——

Mr. LAURIER. The same year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am told the year before. Subsequently, Parliament was consulted. The Minister had no power to sell, the Government had no power to sell. I admit however again, if the Government or Minister had made an agreement or given authority to the agent to make an agreement the Government ought to have asked the authority of Parliament to carry out that agreement; but nothing more is alleged than that this man, having been warned that the Government had no power to sell to him under the statute, yet insisted upon paying his money and took the risk as to what the policy of the Government and Parliament would be. These are the facts on the one side. The leader of the Opposition says, rightly, that I did not look into the matter very carefully, but we will look into it; but what I do take exception to is, that until the facts are shown to be other than what the Minister has stated them to be no charge should be made against him as to bad faith.

Mr. LAURIER. I am glad the hon. gentleman takes this view of the case. The facts are these: In the year 1887 the statute had not yet been passed creating the Banff Park. Parties had gone on the land and made application for lots. The question is, whether they made their applications for sale or for lease. That matter was in abeyance; but the point to which I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice is, that the officer of the department in charge had gone there and authorized the agent to receive applications for sale.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. LAURIER. On the 29th of April, 1887, Mr. White moved the second reading of the Bill respecting the Banff National Park, and he said:

"There is no exclusive property in the springs given to any one. On the other side of Bow River there is a town site. The Government have already surveyed it, and laid out and are selling lots."

That is plain. The Bill had not been introduced then and the Government were selling lots. That was in April, 1887. Mr. White continued:

"And I am told by the secretary of the department, who has recently been up there with a view to making a report as to the progress of matters, and to determine the conditions on which sales should be made, that $15,000 worth of lots have already been applied for."

Nothing more certain than that the secretary of the department had been at Banff, had authorized the agent to receive applications for sale, that the price of land had not been determined, but that $15,000 worth of lots had been applied for. On the 10th of May, 1887, less than fifteen days afterwards, this man, Patrick Carr, made his application to the agent and deposited his money, which was accepted as a first settlement. Four days afterwards he deposited another amount, which was accepted as second settlement. Under the circumstances, authority or no authority, it is manifest the agent acted according to instructions from the department, that this man acted under the belief he was purchasing, and the agent acted under the belief that he could sell. If there was no authority of the kind there may be another remedy to give that man, but he is entitled to his remedy, because the agent acted under the authority of the department and the dates show it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The secretary of the department went there to meet the agent with regard to the park and report. He gave no instructions to Mr. Stewart to receive money for lease or sale, but to report to the Minister how many lots had been applied for, and the Minister would decide on the price if they were to be sold.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister says the secretary of the department had no authority to do this or that. This is what he did, according to the language of Mr. White:

"I am told by the secretary of the department, who has recently been up there, with a view to making a report as to the progress of matters and to determine the conditions on which sales should be made."

That was his mission. He was authorized to go

and report on "the conditions on which sales should be made." Was that in regard to leases?

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman will follow the debate on 3rd May he will see that the Minister of the Interior was perfectly clear in what he said, and he will find further on that Sir Richard Cartwright and Sir John Macdonald's speeches will leave no doubt with him as to the intention of the Minister of the Interior. On 3rd May, when the Bill came up for a third reading, Mr. White said:

"Then, as to the town site on the other side of the Bow River which has been laid out, and the cost of survey of which is part of the expenditure made, we have offers in two ways, either to sell or lease the town lots. The plans have only been got out within the last day or two, but my own feeling is strongly in favour of leasing, in order to retain absolute control of the character of the buildings erected and the general conduct of affairs near the park."

Then he will find that Sir Richard Cartwright says:

"I think a limit of time ought to be fixed for these leases."

And Sir John Macdonald says:

"There is an objection to fixing a limit. As I understand, a portion of the park offers some beautiful sites for villas, and I believe the plan of the architect lays these out to be leased to people of wealth, who will erect handsome villas upon them."

Further on he says that twenty-one years may be too small a time, and that the leases should be made for a longer period. The hon. gentleman will see that the whole tenor of the debate was that hese properties were to be leased.

Mr. LAURIER. No; the whole tenor of the debate shows that it was not decided whether they should be leased or sold, but that the secretary was engaged in arranging for sales.

Mr. TROW. There was no Minister more guarded in his utterances than the late lamented Thomas White, and you cannot place any other construction on his utterances than that the lands were for sale; and the agent must have received such instructions, because he offered me the lands for sale. I did not approach him on the subject respecting the leasing of land, but for the purchase, but I thought and do still think a great deal of the place. I had something to do with advising the Government to reserve that park. I think I was the first to telegraph to Sir Charles Tupper and the late Sir John Macdonald in regard to it. There were certain parties who were intending to reserve that land for themselves—Mr. Woodworth for one—and we had considerable difficulty in advising the Government to reserve that park. I was satisfied, however, that the land was for sale, and in September, 1887, the agent offered me a sale and I made my selection. The understanding was that I was to pay the cash before I left there.

Mr. BAIN. The last report of the auditor shows simply the items for labour $6,500, and $1,500 for teaming. The Minister said the appropriations this year would complete the original construction of the drives through the park. Has he any report later than that in the possession of the House, indicating what will be the actual cost of the maintenance of the walks and drives after the first construction? I would also ask him what the mileage will be when the work is completed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. My impression is that $1,000 a year will be sufficient to keep all the roads which will be completed at the end of this year in proper shape. There is also some expenditure in removing the fir timber and burning it. The dry timber is collected in the summer season and burnt when the snow is on the ground. We will have that to do in the future. But these are small items. In the management of the park, if we find that after this year the superintendent need not be a professional man, the cost would be decreased by one-third. We now pay $1,800, and I think a superintendent could be obtained for $1,000. Then there is the caretaker at the basin at $60 a month, and that basin of course is one of the largest sources of revenue. Then there is a small amount for looking after the pipes from the springs to the different hotels. The cost of maintenance will be very small when the work of making the roads is completed this year. As to the mileage, I can only give it roughly. There will be from 16 to 18 miles of driving roads, besides some bridle paths—perhaps twenty miles altogether.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not intend to re-awaken the discussion on this question, but I was asked by some friends in the district to watch certain interests on their behalf. Banff is not in my constituency, and my colleague from the North-West, the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Davis), was fully charged with this question. I asked him a few days ago when we expected this item to come up, whether he was fully satisfied. I do not see him here now, and I would ask the Minister of the Interior if certain moral claims, as they are called, made by Dr. Brett and his friends, have been considered and assented to by the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is the question we have just had up.

Mr. DAVIN. No; not that question fully. The question we have had up is a question of right. The hon. the leader of the Opposition asserts that certain gentlemen went into Banff, that they took up locations there, that they had a right to take those locations up, and in fact he contends that the state of the law was such that they would have a remedy in a court of law. I think he is mistaken in that. The position as I understand it was that Banff had not been surveyed at all, that even when Mr. Stewart was appointed—I happened to be up there at the time—Banff was not surveyed, for it was being surveyed by him, but it was not actually surveyed with a view to sale.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. White said it was.

Mr. DAVIN. I have what Mr. White said before me, but that was subsequent to what I am referring to. At that time there were certain persons squatting on the Banff property, and the main right they would have would be what is called squatters' rights; and, when you come to discuss that, it would be a moral rather than a legal claim. But Mr. Brett, as the Minister well knows, asks, as a favour, that the Government should put certain parties in a favourable position. He quotes Mr. White, he quotes Sir John A. Macdonald, and what he urges is that a few persons—himself I think amongst the number—should have deeds, and he urges that, under the circumstances, Banff Park might be as well managed. Now, as I say, my hon. colleague told me a few days ago that things were settled satisfactorily to him. This is not in my constituency, but I was asked by certain friends to look into this matter, and I think certainly that these people have a moral claim. Now, may I ask, is

there not an anthracite coal section deeded within this very property?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That was before the park was laid out at all.

Mr. WATSON. When was the park laid out?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think it was in 1885 or 1886.

Mr. DAVIN. As I say, it is enough for me that I have done my duty. I did watch it; I asked my hon. colleague whether he was satisfied, and he told me he was: and if he is satisfied, I suppose his constituents are, because he has been in communication with them. I was very glad to hear, in the course of this discussion, the utterance of the hon. Minister of Justice as he laid down very properly the principle that he saw no difference whatever between a contract between a Government and an individual, and a contract between two private individuals; and I hope before the session closes he will apply that doctrine to the second homestead question. I do not think that I am guilty of any impropriety if I say that the hon. and learned gentleman has given me a very strong impression that he agrees with my contention on the second homestead question.

Mr. WATSON. Has he got a "but" like yours?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not suppose there is any "but" in his case. I believe that before the House rises he will place my Bill on the Government Orders, or will make a statement in regard to it that will be of the same value. Now, I will say about the park, that I think it is very important that the park should be reserved for the public generally; at the same time, if any wrong was being done to any individual, I would certainly contend against it. I will say that I do not think that these persons who make the claims are exactly in the same position, for instance, as a homesteader would be. If a homesteader went to a land office and entered for a homestead he is in a position very different, in my opinion, from what these people were; although, looking at the debate, it is open to question as to whether, at the time the debate took place in May, it was decided to lease it or sell it. However, I rose to say that I think there is a stronger prospect of carrying the second homestead this session than there was before.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not know as I understood the Minister aright a moment ago, but I understood him to say that the anthracite coal mine had been disposed of before the lands were surveyed.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They had obtained a right before it was thought of establishing a national park there at all.

Mr. LAURIER. The lands were not surveyed at all at that time?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The park was not surveyed at that time.

Mr. LAURIER. Therefore they had acquired rights. That supports my contention that the parties who, after the land was surveyed, made their application in good faith to purchase, ought to have their titles as well as the parties who applied and got the coal mines. But there is a question of policy as to this, and it has been represented to me that the best policy would be for the Government not to lease the lands but sell them absolutely, and here is a reason which has been given in respect to that view:

"Now, as the success of the park mainly depends upon its being made an attractive and comfortable resort for tourists and invalids our experience of the management for the last four years certainly does not warrant our saying that it has been made so, nor is it likely ever to become so, as long as the same continues. The residents of the park have frequently petitioned the Government to place the lots in the town site again for sale, as the holders of the same will not be and are not warranted in expending money and improving and beautifying their property under a lease. Many visitors also have expressed a wish to obtain a lot and build a residence thereon, but finding they could only obtain a lease for the same they declined to do so."

Now, I am not sufficiently familiar with the place to venture any opinion, but I offer this suggestion to the hon. gentleman—it comes from a resident of the place—and it seems to me at first blush that there is reason in it. It is, that this park is intended to be set apart as a resort for tourists and invalids, and if parties cannot buy the land they would not put upon it the same amount of money for beautifying their residences as they would if they had it in fee-simple. It seems to me this reasoning is beyond the possibility of successful contradiction. There is another grievance which I was asked to bring to the attention of the Minister. At a meeting of citizens it was resolved:

"That this meeting is of the opinion that section 35 of the Regulations of the Rocky Mountain Park which says that no other than the superintendent of the park or officer of the Mounted Police shall act as justice of the peace or adjudicate on matters concerning the regulations of the park, is not conducive to the ends of justice."

Mr. DEWDNEY. With reference to the first portion of the hon. gentleman's remarks, I may say that the experience of the United States with regard to their parks, has not been such as to warrant their making any sales of the property in them. In fact, the Yellowstone Park cost the Government a great deal of money to buy out the old proprietary rights, and there is no land in that park that is sold. If we allow the sale of the property within the park, then we cannot control the buildings, we cannot control the business. When it was known that a sanitarium was going to be built in Banff Park, and that $30,000 or $40,000 were going to be expended in the improvement of the park, there was great excitement among a number of people, who rushed in there and wanted to settle in the park; that is one reason why Parliament agreed that the property should be leased and not sold. In reference to one of the regulations of the park, which states that no justice of the peace shall have any jurisdiction in the park except the superintendent and the North-West Police Magistrate, of course that can be very easily corrected. There are gentlemen in the park who would be well able to fill the office of magistrate, and I see no objection to an extension to them.

Mr. TROW. Why does the Government require to keep control? They sell lots to individuals, and the individuals can control their own lots. You have a superintendent in the park, and if there is fish or game to be protected, he can see it is protected, and you can enact laws as is done in other civilized communities. I am aware that at the time I visited Tacoma and Seattle there were scores of people who would have come to Banff and purchased lots for summer residences if the Government would open the lands for sale.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister says he expects to cut down the expenditure very materially in coming years. The highest sum ever received

from fees and rents was in 1887-88 when it reached $2,900. The hon. gentleman will observe that we have now expended $150,000 on this park. At 4 per cent. this would amount to $6,000 a year. Suppose the cost is placed at $2,000, and I question whether the Minister will be able to reduce the expenses even to $3,000, but suppose the interest and all amount to $10,000. $6,000 for interest and $4,000 for annual expenses, how long does he expect it will be before the country will realize $10,000 a year from this park ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is impossible to make a calculation. The revenue is increasing, it amounting in June to nearly $400. The number of visitors is also largely increasing, and it must always be remembered that the park is only a year or two old. It must be decided whether the properties must be leased or sold. If we sell, we should throw the park open ; and in that event I will certainly advocate that plan. If it is to be kept as a park, it is necessary we should keep control of the land. If that is understood, there will be no difficulty in getting the leaseholders to pay their rentals. There was an agitation to have the leases extended from 21 to 42 years, on the ground that if that were done better buildings would be erected as more money could be borrowed. We did that, and then an agitation was again aroused as to the sale of the lots, which I understood was then settled. If we let the leaseholders understand that they have obtained all which they can expect, we will obtain a revenue which will soon increase to $10,000 a year.

Mr. McMULLEN. What rent is paid by Dr. Brett ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. For the sanitarium Dr. Brett pays $300 a year ; the Canadian Pacific Railway Company pay $500 a year as ground rent for the land on which their establishment is placed. They also pay for the water for their baths.

Mr. BAIN. How large is the area covered by Dr. Brett's claim ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Three or 4 acres. The Canadian Pacific Railway about the same.

Mr. WATSON. Is the Government considering the advisability of giving a patent to Dr. Brett for the 4 acres ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is no chance of a patent being given to Dr. Brett. It is not on the side of the river in which those lots are situated in regard to which the right to purchase is claimed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the Canadian Pacific Railway possess a title in fee-simple ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No ; only a lease.

To assist in publication of proceedings of Royal Society $5,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Now that the Government has a Printing Bureau of its own, the printing of the proceedings of the Royal Society might be done more cheaply there than elsewhere. The printing and publishing of the report cannot cost $5,000. Each member receives a copy annually, and I am satisfied it does not cost that sum.

Mr. FOSTER. This is an amount we have given for several years to this association. It is to assist them in the publishing and printing of their proceedings. We never take a note whether it costs $5,000 to print their proceedings or not, and we do not propose, so long as this vote is given, to bring it down to the simple printing expense. It is a gift from the country of $5,000 to this association. It is the only amount we give by way of helping that class of scientific and literary endeavour in the country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Why not change the wording of the vote ?

Mr. FOSTER. It does not say simply printing. It is to assist in publishing and printing, and you cannot publish until you at first obtain the articles.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Why not put it in the Estimates as aid to the Royal Society ?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman is captious, I will put it in this way.

Mr. BAIN. I suppose no account is rendered to the Government ?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Classification of Old Records..... $2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What kind of records are these ?

Mr. FOSTER. They are records of the old Province of Canada, entirely historical.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that mean commencing from 1840-41, when the two old provinces were united, or does it go back over the early periods embracing the periods since the conquest of Canada ; or even earlier dates ? What is proposed to be done ?

Mr. FOSTER. It has the widest signification. I will see that the hon. gentleman obtains all the information in regard to it.

Mr. FLINT. There might be a catalogue printed as to what these documents are ?

Mr. FOSTER. Such an index could be given easily.

Classification of Old Records of Canada in Office of the Privy Council..... $1,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is doing this work ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is done under the supervision of the Clerk of the Privy Council.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is this work done by the regular officers of the department ?

Mr. FOSTER. No ; it is done by extra work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would it not appear that those records, if they belonged to the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, would go to the custody of the Local Governments ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A large number of documents properly relating to provincial affairs, such as registration of titles, and births, deaths and marriages have been returned to the Provincial Governments, but those matters bearing on Federal affairs are classified and kept.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do I understand that John J. McGee, Clerk of the Privy Council, collects these records and gets this money for himself in addition to his salary ?

Mr. FOSTER. He gets no part of the pay himself. The work is done by clerks under his supervision.

Collection of Revenue—Salaries of officers, and Inspectors of Excise.. $391,300

Mr. McMULLEN. I see there is a large increase here and we want some explanation.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The total increase is $11,023.75. The increase is made up in this way: Annual increments, $4,098.75; new appointments, $18,880; promotions, $2,543.75; unprovided for $1,976.25. Total increase in estimates $27,498.75. Then you deduct from that the total decreases as follows:—Superannuations, $9,412.50; over-estimated, $57.50; voted but not applied, $205; dropped, $4,800, that was in last year's estimate to provide for new appointments; for promotion examination, $2,000; total, $16,475, which taken from the $27,498.75, leaves a net increase of $11,023.75.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it a fact that some of the employés recently discharged from the Interior Department on account of being over age, are now employed in the Excise Department.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know of anyone employed in the Excise Department who was discharged from the Interior, or any other department?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There were a number of clerks discharged from the Interior Department lately, and I understand that some of these clerks are now in the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is one man, perhaps.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If it was contrary to the regulations of the Civil Service Act that he should work in the Interior Department, does not the Civil Service Act apply to your department as well?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Oh, yes; and we try to live up to the terms of the Civil Service Act as well as possible. The law provides that each department has the power to employ a temporary clerk when there is a press of work for a period not exceeding a month. If it exceeds a month then you have got to get an Order in Council, and to see that the terms of the Civil Service Act are complied with. There is the case of one man who was employed for three weeks, a period of less than a month, and I think he was one of the men formerly in the Department of the Interior. He was engaged for three weeks for special work.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is he still employed?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If his three weeks are up he is no longer in the employ of the department.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there were a number of superannuations in his department last year. Under what circumstances were these superannuations made?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In all cases the superannuations that have taken place in the Department of Inland Revenue have taken place on the report of the chief officer of the district in which the officers are located. It must be on a report that they are past the age of 60 and are incapacitated from performing their duties. I do not remember any case of superannuation under that age. Of course, the law provides that under that age, after a term of service of ten years, an officer may be superannuated on a medical certificate that he is incapacitated for service. The last case of superannuation I remember is that of a man who is nearly 80 years of age, an exciseman, who was continued until he was reported to be no longer fit to perform the duties, and he has been retired.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that the hon. gentleman superannuated A. B. Macdonald, deputy collector, who received $1,300 a year, who served 24 years, who had five years added to his time, and who gets a superannuation allowance of $721.80.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There were special circumstances which, I think, justified the addition of the five years in Mr. Macdonald's case. When I say the addition of five years, I may assure the House that any department must make a pretty good case to recommend the addition of even one year to the term of any officer's service. This man served more than the number of years I have stated. He was in the public service for a term that would place him beyond the maximum term of 35 years, but his service as deputy collector did not cover the 35 years. He was an assistant inspector of licenses for a number of years when that branch was a part of the Inland Revenue office; but those years were not counted to him, but in lieu of them we took account of the fact that his record was a good one, that he was appointed deputy collector many years ago at Toronto, and that for a great proportion of his time his salary was much below the salary fixed in the schedule for officers of the same rank.

Mr. McMULLEN. $1,300 a year is a fairly good salary for an assistant official of this kind. I can understand that in the case of the abolition of an office, there might be some ground for adding to the term of service; but when a man receives the good round sum of $1,300 a year for a number of years, I cannot see the justice of adding five years to his service. The hon. gentleman must remember that during the last year the increased drain on the superannuation fund is over $20,000, and I fancy that the aim of the Government ought to be in the direction of making that fund self-sustaining, instead of increasing it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that this man was getting this round salary for a number of years. It was only the last two or three years that he got the full benefit of the salary. His claim was for the 35 years on the score of service, and he produced certificates to show where he had been employed. We did not recognize his claim, and he feels very sore about it, and he and his friends brought the case before the Treasury Board.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can easily understand him and his friends pressing his case. The hon. Minister says that he only got the full salary of $1,300 for the last two years. It must have been more than that, because the superannuation allowance must be based upon the average salary of the last three years.

Mr. COSTIGAN. He must have been receiving it for three years, but it was not more than three years.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to ask the Minister if he applies the same rule in all cases? Mr. Samuel Grey, of Hamilton, was superannuated, I think, some time in July. He had no addition made to his term. He had served 25 years, while this man had only served 24 years.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The same rule applies, but the different cases have to be dealt with according to the circumstances. Mr. Grey did serve as long as Mr. Macdonald, but Mr. Grey had the highest salary he could get under the law from the date he entered the service until he left it. There was no special case to recommend additional years to him. If the hon. gentleman will go back, he will find that several superannuations have taken place. There is one later than that, the superannuation of a man who served longer than either of them, and does not get one year's increase.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Why was Mr. Grey superannuated?

Mr. COSTIGAN. On the report of the chief officer of that district that he was too old and physically unable to discharge his duties. He was long past the age.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the age?

Mr. COSTIGAN. At sixty, having served ten years, an officer is entitled to ask for superannuation, but he may pass sixty or seventy and not be superannuated. We have several men over seventy who are efficiently discharging their duties. They have not asked for superannuation, and we do not force it upon them so long as they continue to do their duty.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do I understand the Minister to say that at the age of sixty, with ten years' service, an officer is entitled to superannuation? As I understand the Act, it is only for ill-health or incapacity that he is entitled to superannuation at that age.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It may be granted or not, but he could not ask it before sixty.

Mr. FOSTER. It must be under the certificate of a doctor that he is not able to serve any longer.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it not a fact that sometimes officials are appointed to the service far beyond the age when they might be superannuated?

Mr. COSTIGAN. From memory I could not state a case. I can only discuss my own department, and I do not think any man would be appointed to a position there after sixty years of age.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rather think the worthy and esteemed friend of ours formerly a colleague, Mr. Ryan, must have been well over sixty when appointed collector of Customs at the port of Montreal.

Mr. COSTIGAN. He might have been.

Mr. FLINT. I am not able to find in the Inland Revenue Report the amount of revenue collected at some of the outports or districts included in the general district of Halifax. Are there not several of these ports in which more than the amount collected is paid in salaries, and would it not be advisable, if such be the case, and if it can be done without injury to the individuals at present in office, to so arrange that the duties at these outports should be performed by some other officials at a less cost?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Of course the report does not show the revenue in the different localities. It may occur that in some of the minor cases the salaries of the officers amount to more than the receipts, but some years ago, I did the best I could to meet that by introducing a section in the Inland Revenue Act giving us power in small places—and of course not only the collection of revenue but the convenience of the public has to be considered—where application is made for a bonded or excise warehouse, instead of appointing a special man to take charge, which would cost at least $500 per year, to appoint a public officer, usually an officer of Customs, and give him 5 per cent. on the collections up to a certain amount, and a smaller percentage when over that amount.

Mr. CASEY. Are the salaries of officers and inspectors fixed on any general principle as in the post office? Do they bear any definite relation to the amount of revenue collected? I notice that the salaries of collectors at some very important points differ very considerably. For instance, the collector at Winnipeg gets more than the collector at Halifax. I notice with regard to deputy collectors and others, that there are great differences in the sums paid, leading one to suppose there was some relation between the salaries and the amounts collected.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That would not be a fair basis on which to fix the salaries.

Mr. CASEY. I do not say it would, I was merely asking for information.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The whole Dominion is laid out in inspection districts, and these are sub-divided into divisions for collection, and the divisions are classified in seven different grades. One of the considerations is the amount of revenue, another is the extent of territory embraced, another the number of manufacturing establishments to be superintended. Montreal is fixed as class one and so is Winnipeg. The business in the Winnipeg division is very large, as it embraces the whole of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. An officer appointed in class one division would get the fixed minimum salary on appointment and the annual increment until he reached the maximum salary.

Mr. CASEY. What is the fixed minimum?

Mr. COSTIGAN. A collector in class one gets $1,800 to begin with; he gets lower in class two and still lower in class three; and the maximum is in the same proportion.

Mr. CASEY. I understand the Minister to say that the Winnipeg collector has authority over all Manitoba and the North-West Territories.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The inspector has authority, and the collector is collector for Manitoba and the North-West Territories.

Mr. CASEY. The inspector has no other office to inspect but one?

Mr. COSTIGAN. What is the hon. gentleman trying to make out? He must know that in Manitoba and the North-West Territories there must be more than one office. Collections take place at Brandon and Portage la Prairie. The breweries at Portage la Prairie have to be inspected. Then there are the weights and measures, and the officers under the Act to prevent adulteration of food and drugs.

Mr. CASEY. In what class is Halifax?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Second class.

Mr. CASEY. And Victoria, B.C.?

Mr. COSTIGAN. About the third class.

Mr. CASEY. Last year Mr. Jones, collector at Victoria, was only paid $800, while $1,600 was paid to Mr. Grant, the collector at Halifax, and $1,800 to Mr. Costigan, the collector at Winnipeg, and something over $2,000 to the collectors at Toronto and Montreal. At the same place, Victoria, the excisemen were paid $1,000 and the deputy collector was paid $1,200, or more than the collector.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Jones is getting $800 for that service, but he is also paid as gas inspector, and also as weights and measures inspector, for each of which he receives additional pay.

Mr. CASEY. Oh, yes; I see he gets $1,600 altogether.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many excisemen are there in the Stratford division? I see there are Brown, and Cavan, and Nichols.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Officer Brown is not at Stratford but at Goderich. Excisemen are appointed for the Dominion, but if we send an excise officer into one province we do it as a matter of exchange and bring another from that province in his place. If an exciseman is appointed for the province he is utilzed wherever he is required. Mr. Brown may have been at Stratford, but he has been stationed at Goderich for some time past.

Mr. McMULLEN. What officers are stationed at Palmerston, where there is a malthouse and a brewery? I understand Mr. J. T. Nichols is there.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think Nichols is the only officer at Palmerston.

Mr. McMULLEN. There were two there, and I understood Mr. Nichols was in charge of the brewery.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think so, because he is deputy collector in that portion of the division, and I presume he is in charge.

Mr. McMULLEN. Perhaps the Minister is not aware that the brewery has been shut up for over eight months, and the officer is still there drawing his pay?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot imagine that any of my officers would allow such a condition of affairs to exist, that a man should be in charge of a brewery which had been closed for eight months, without reporting it, unless the officer had some other duties to perform.

Mr. ALLISON. Is there any excise officer at Napanee?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Elliott is the Customs inspector there, and, instead of appointing a special officer there to inspect gas, we allow him $100 for that purpose, and whatever Excise collections he makes he receives 5 per cent. for.

Mr. ALLISON. I see there is an appropriation of $1,000 for that officer.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not an appropriation. I think that is in the Civil Service List, but that is a misprint.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Does the same system prevail in the Excise Department with regard to seizures and the payment of fees to officers as prevails in the Customs Department? The Auditor General's Report shows the list of seizures.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The general policy is about the same, I presume, in both departments; in working it out in matters of detail, there may be a little difference. There is this difference, that no officer in the Inland Revenue service above the rank of special class exciseman can participate in the proceeds of any seizure; no man in the position of deputy clerk or collector, or inspector, or any higher grade officer, can have any personal interest in any seizure. As for the minor officers, we allow a certain proportion to go to them when they make the seizure, and a certain amount to go to the informant, and the balance goes to the treasury.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The result is, that the higher officers never make seizures; the junior officers are allowed to make all the seizures in order to get the fees.

Mr. COSTIGAN. My reason for making that change was not at all to produce the effect the hon. gentleman supposes. I am satisfied from my experience that the practice works well. The higher grade officers are supposed to be men of integrity, having an interest in the service, sworn to do their duty, and they are paid fair salaries therefor. They do take an interest, and their record shows they have taken an interest in such matters, to see that the law is obeyed in their divisions. But the minor officers, the men sent out, and who do most of the work, receive small salaries; they occupy minor positions in the service, and can well receive a portion of the proceeds of such seizures without prejudice to the service, or to the public officers of higher grade, who receive very good salaries and require no special inducements. They are, therefore, men of more independence, and better able to give a decision as between the public and the revenue, than those who have an interest in the seizure.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Do the higher officers decide in regard to the seizure?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Very often they have to. They would have to report to headquarters if any question came up, and their report would have a great deal of influence with the department. They, being paid their salaries, being sworn to do their duty and protect the revenue, having regard also for the interest of the party seized, would have no other interest than to see that the law was carried out, and that the goods, if properly seized, should be forfeited to the Crown, or if improperly seized, through the interest the lower officer might have, they would see that the seizure was improperly made, perhaps made too hastily, or without sufficient grounds, and they would be in a more independent position to report to the head of the department.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the Minister is right, and if this course is pursued, as the Minister says, the higher officer has to act as judge with regard to these matters.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to remind the Minister that one of his officers, Mr. Craig, died suddenly the other day at Peterborough. Is any gratuity to be allowed to his family?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The law gives us power to give to the widow or family of any officer dying in the service, a gratuity not to exceed two months' salary. It is done in all cases. It will be done in this case; I think it has passed the Council now.

Mr. CASEY. Can the Minister assure us that this large item for salaries includes all the salaries that are paid this year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. It appears that last year some very important salaries that should have been provided for in the Estimates, were paid out of general excise contingencies. Salary of chief inspector, H. Godson, $2,800, was paid out of general excise contingencies; also the salary of John Davis, inspector of distilleries, $2,800, with travelling expenses, $1,315; also salary of W. J. Gerald, inspector of tobacco factories, was paid out of this fund, along with a lot of other items, including the British American Bank Note Company for stamps.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman is giving me information. I do not know where he gets it.

Mr. CASEY. I get it from the Auditor General's Report, page 269—C, under the heading of General Excise Contingencies.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The inspector is on the regular staff, of course.

Mr. CASEY. You will find it under the heading "General Excise Contingencies."

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is not salary at all, that is contingencies.

Mr. CASEY. It is marked salary here.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is a mistake in the report.

Mr. CASEY. This is our official document.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Oh, well, you may find an error in any document. I tell the hon. gentleman, if he well looked at the accounts in the Estimates of last year, he will find that Godson's salary, and the other salaries named there, are provided in the bulk sum of salaries for last year. The question asked by the hon. gentleman, in voting this bulk sum is does it cover all salaries? I say it does, and the salaries that are mentioned there have never been paid out of contingencies. The sum asked here covers Mr. Godson's salary, and he has not been paid out of contingencies, nor will he be paid out of contingencies. It is simply a mistake.

Mr. CASEY. I think this is very unlikely to be a mistake.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am sorry the hon. gentleman cannot accept my statement.

Mr. CASEY. We find all the other salaries under their proper headings. The salaries of the different collecting districts are put down in their proper places. Here, under General Excise Contingencies, we find these salaries and a lot of small matters about law costs, and a very big item which I cannot very well refer to under this heading. It would appear as if the vote last year for salaries had been exhausted.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I tell the hon. gentleman it is a mistake, it must be a mistake. These men have been paid in the regular way out of the money voted by Parliament, and I take the responsibility of asserting that here in my place as head of the department. I will have an assurance from the Auditor General for to-morrow that I am right in this.

Mr. CASEY. If a mistake of that kind is possible in the Auditor General's account, the matter should certainly be brought to his attention.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will do so.

Mr. CASEY. He could explain how it came to be so charged. I do not doubt for a moment that the Minister is stating what he believes to be true about the matter, but it appears to me that the Auditor, who has been through the accounts, would be better informed than the Minister who has no personal knowledge about these accounts. As I do not see elsewhere reference to Excise Contingencies I may now refer to them, especially to the large amount paid to the British American Bank Note Company for stamps, $22,800. Surely, the department should be able to estimate more closely than that the quantity of stamps required during the year. An unexpected expenditure must come under the head of contingencies, but not such an item as this.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The question of printing is regulated by contract with the different departments. On one or two occasions we have had increased expenditure, on account of changes involved in amending the law. This work is done by contract, and the contract will expire very shortly.

Mr. CASEY. How did it happen that in 1890 we required $22,000 odd more stamps than the department had estimated?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Simply because the estimate was reduced to the lowest possible amount and it was not found sufficient to cover the expenditure under the contract. We have a contract at fixed prices and we have the power to regulate or reduce the prices, and a reduction took place in two of the departments a few years ago, so we are obtaining the stamps at the lowest possible rate. During last year the amount of stamps actually used was larger than was provided in the estimate.

Mr. CASEY. This is the only payment I find for stamps from the Bank Note Company.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; there is a general appropriation for stamps. This was a special case.

Mr. CASEY. I do not find them anywhere except under the head of contingencies.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; there is an annual appropriation.

Mr. CASEY. Then this is only an excess of the cost above what was estimated?

Mr. COSTIGAN. An excess of quantity above the estimate.

Mr. CASEY. You do not bind yourselves to take any fixed quantity?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. CASEY. Then a great many more stamps were required than was expected. Can the Minister explain to what circumstances this increased issue is due?

Mr. COSTIGAN. To a change in the Act, I presume. On making enquiries, I find it is due to a re-arrangement of the item. A lump sum of $70,000 was placed in the Estimates for rent, fuel, travelling expenses and stamps. This was objected to by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and this year the items were separated,

something over $20,000 being put down for stamps and $50,000 for rent, fuel and travelling expenses.

Mr. CASEY. Then there should be a reduction under the head of travelling expenses, rent and fuel, of the amount of the stamps now estimated by themselves. Is that the case?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; and there is a decrease of $5,000.

Mr. CASEY. This is the whole amount paid for stamps, and the Minister was mistaken in supposing it to be an extra amount.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I said it was an extra amount and caused in the way I stated.

Mr. CASEY. So that last year the amount under the head of contingencies included rent, travelling expenses, stamps, &c. I see a reduction has been made in the amount for rent, fuel, &c. The Minister having been mistaken in regard to the stamps, he may possibly be mistaken in regard to the salaries, and I think he will find that such is the case. This leads me to the general question of contingencies, and to point out that too much is left under the head of contingencies. The amount in this case was $44,000. Under that item we find stamps and salaries of permanent officers. This system allows a latitude to the Minister that it is not intended he should possess, because it always gives rise to adverse criticism. He is following the right course in having stamps separated. I hope he will see that nothing but contingencies are paid out of this vote during the present year.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the reason that no tabulated statement showing the consumption of liquor *per capita* in the various provinces has been published this year? There is merely a statement for the whole Dominion, but it used to be given by provinces. Why has the change been made?

Mr. COSTIGAN. My attention was called to the fact by the Commissioner, and I agreed with him that it would be better not to continue that set of figures, for the reason that information is only valuable if it is correct. It would be impossible to get correct information from returns made up in that way, because it would show a greater consumption in some provinces than actually took place, and as you cannot get the correct figures it is better not to undertake to get the details. Our means of knowing what is consumed in the provinces is by ascertaining where the duty is paid. In Montreal, for instance, the liquor business is on a large scale, and the compounders and manufacturers send the liquor to Ontario and Quebec, while the duty being paid in Montreal it would be entered as being consumed in the Province of Quebec. That would give no accurate idea of the consumption in the Province of Quebec, and we discontinued this table as there was nothing in the law to bind us to give other than the fullest information possible.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That system has been followed ever since Confederation.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the system was imperfect that would be no reason for continuing it. If the hon. gentleman agrees with me in the reasons I have given he will see that the information could not be correct.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is doing an injustice to the parts of the Dominion which have the Scott Act in force. You classify the Scott Act districts with other portions of the Dominion, and consequently the consumption *per capita* is reduced all over the Dominion to the disadvantage, in comparison, of the Scott Act districts where they do not consume the liquor at all.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is taken for granted that liquor is not consumed in Scott Act districts.

Mr. CASEY. The same remark applies to the collection of Customs. We know that the goods entered at Montreal are consumed in other portions of the Dominion, but yet, we very properly I think have a statement of the goods entered at Montreal. There is no reason why the same figures should not be given in the case of the Excise.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The cases are different.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree with the hon. Minister that it would not be fair to give percentages for each province on the basis of the amount of liquor entered for consumption in that province, but it is necessary in order to our correct comprehension of where the revenue comes from, that we should have a full statement of the quantity of liquors entered at Excise in each port of the Dominion. If the figures are necessary to show the amount of Customs collected at each port, it is equally so with regard to Excise.

Mr. COSTIGAN. They are two different things.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot see that they are different.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman cannot see it I do.

Mr. CASEY. They are the two most important matters in our revenue, and we have a perfect right to know the amount collected at each port. Unless you show the quantity entered you cannot tell whether the proper amount of duty is collected upon it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We can tell that very easily. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put the case in this way? He says there is no reason why this table should not be issued, because the Customs Department issues it, but the Customs Department does not issue anything of the kind. They show exactly what our department shows, but the Customs statistics do not show the proportion of the different articles entered which are consumed in each province. It shows the collection of revenue, but it does not show where the articles are consumed, and we do not undertake to say that a certain percentage was consumed in this province or in another province.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman as to the percentages.

Mr. FLINT. The matter under discussion leads me to make a remark, although I do not see precisely under what head the remark, perhaps, would be technically proper. The report is very interesting, and for many years I have made a point of studying it with some care; but I think it would be improved if the department would insert in it a table of the receipts at each point where there is a collector or a deputy collector. In order to ascertain what is going on at any particular point, the enquirer has to go over a great many items and pages, and even then it is impossible, without communication with the department, to get at the items of revenue and expenditure at all the different points. Some such table, which would not cost much, would be of

great value to students of these matters throughout the country. I had some correspondence with the department in regard to the matter mentioned by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), and I must say that I was impressed by the position taken by the Minister, and I am inclined to agree with him that it was scarcely fair to some communities to charge them with a greater consumption of liquor than it would be reasonable to suppose them likely to consume, and it might also be flattering to other communities to have their consumption appear unduly light. I cannot see how the department could give accurate figures in that respect. The same argument would apply to the receipt of goods at certain ports for Customs. A great deal of ingenuity has been displayed by statisticians and others in the endeavour to ascertain the consumption of duty-paid goods in different provinces in the Dominion. I believe it to be a problem almost beyond correct solution, and I think it is perhaps as well that the department dropped those statistics unless they are prepared to guarantee their substantial correctness. I would urge on the Minister that, if convenient, in the next report a table be given of the points at which revenue is paid, carrying out the details across the page as to the quantities received or entered at that port, and the amount of duty paid. I think it would be very interesting, valuable and helpful to the members of this House and to students of the Act throughout the country.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the suggestion of the hon. gentleman is worthy of serious consideration, and it will receive it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. At page E—28 of the Auditor General's Report, a man named C. Curless is credited with receiving for his share of the seizures $1,101.99, more than half of the total amount paid to all the officers for seizures, and his place of residence is not mentioned at all. How does that come? What port does he belong to?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He is not attached to any port. He is one of the most energetic preventive officers we have, and if he receives more than half the total amount, it is because he makes more than half the seizures. He is sent to many difficult places where few men would go at the risk of their lives. He is a very trustworthy man, who discharges his duty fairly and moderately but determinedly, and he has made more seizures than any officers we have. If, for instance, there are reports of illicit distilling in the North-West he goes there, and he also goes to the Maritime Provinces. His home is in New Brunswick. He is the chief preventive officer who is employed continuously.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is he an officer in the department here?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; he has nothing to do with the department here.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Where does he draw his regular salary?

Mr. COSTIGAN. His salary is forwarded to him wherever he happens to be at work. He is not stationed anywhere. He is sent from one point to another according to the information received at the department.

Mr. CASEY. I regret that I made a mistake in reading a letter addressed to the Customs Department instead of the Excise, by the Auditor General. The terms are so similar that I made the mistake. It appears that on 29th April the Auditor General wrote to the Department of Inland Revenue requiring that each officer in receipt of public moneys from that department should furnish regularly to the department a certified copy of his cash book, showing in detail the several amounts received by him and the deposits made in acquittance, and stating that these returns after having been examined and certified by the department, should be forwarded to the Auditor General, accompanied by a certified summary; and he points out that he had written on the 5th of March, 1889, submitting observations in connection with the audit and examination of Excise revenue, to which he says, "I have not had any official reply." On 17th September, 1890, he writes again, referring to the previous letters and enclosing a copy of a Treasury Minute on the subject. There is an answer on 21st October, 1890, from Wm. Himsworth, secretary, referring to the request for a statement of arrears, and saying that there were no arrears; but I find no answer at all to the two communications from the Auditor General to which I have referred. Again on 17th November, the Auditor General wrote enclosing a statement of the receipts and expenditures on account of seizures, and he says:

"In some cases the expenditure of a district is in excess of the receipts, in other cases there is expenditure without any receipts, and the total expenditure exceeds the total receipts. To avoid misconceptions I have to ask you to explain how this arises, and I will publish your reply with the statement."

As there is no reply published here with the statement, I presume there was no reply given. Mr. Miall wrote, however, on 20th November pointing out with regard to seizures alone that sometimes seizures made in one year were not realized upon until the next. That was no answer to the question how the general expenditures of a district came to be in excess of the receipts, and I give the Minister an opportunity of explaining that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The only explanation I can give is that we are bound to make the seizures, and sometimes the cost of making them amounts to more than the revenue collected. We try to prevent illicit distilling or the infraction of the law in any way, though we may not be able to recover one dollar of the penalty imposed by the courts. It is easy to account for the expenditure exceeding the receipts.

Mr. CASEY. With regard to the other points.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot give particulars from memory, but will give the information later on.

Mr. CASEY. Will the Minister have explanations from the Auditor General, when we next go into Supply, about salaries charged to general contingencies?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

To provide for extra duty-pay of officers at large distilleries and factories....$5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. The Excise officers at these large places are paid very respectable salaries, from $1,200 to $1,600 a year, and I do not see why it should be necessary to spend this money on extra services.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The salaries alluded to now are to officers of the higher rank, but we pay—and Parliament has accepted the reasons given for it—

an additional amount to the officers connected with these distilleries on account of the fact that they work late and early at these places. They work longer hours than any other officers in any other branch of the service. As for the salaries, I think they are very low indeed, as regards the chief officers connected with the distilleries. You may say what you like, but the department has really but little control. Parliament may say how much duty shall be charged, but one of these officers has it within his power to defraud the Government to an enormous extent, and I think it good policy to give fair salaries, even larger than are usually given, in order to lessen the prospect of temptation. Parliament may fix the duty, but they measure the gallons and determine on how many duty shall be paid, so that it is in their power to defraud the Government, if they could be tempted or if the men in business would tempt them. Fortunately, we have had no accusations made, or reasons to suspect anything of the kind.

Mr. CASEY. It would be hard to find out if any fraud were committed, so much depends on the honesty of the officer.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There were two or three found out some years ago.

Mr. CASEY. I agree that the salaries of the men directly in charge of distilleries should be such that they will not be easily tempted, because temptation, no doubt, will come in their way. What bonds are required of them?

Mr. COSTIGAN. $2,000 and sureties for an equal amount.

Mr. CASEY. This is hardly enough. In financial institutions, officers controlling perhaps not more than $100,000 a year or $200,000 have to give bonds from $10,000 to $30,000, and these men in charge of the distilleries could defraud to a much greater extent than that. It would be better that their bonds should be increased, and it would pay the Government to give them a little, perhaps a good deal, more salary.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will promise to look into the increase of the bonds, but not into the increase of the salaries, and I am glad to have had the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

To pay Collectors of Customs allowance on duties collected by them.....$3,500

Mr. McMULLEN. I must say this is an item which, in my humble opinion, we ought not to pay. Where you have collectors of Customs drawing salaries of $1,200 to $1,500 a year, they should be required to perform any little duties in connection with the Inland Revenue, or any other department, without extra pay. I cannot understand why men engaged by the country should, because you ask them to step outside their little sphere of duty, demand increased pay. This system has not been inaugurated very long, but the civil servants appear to be getting aware of it, and a number of them are making demands. I do not think we should encourage this system. Last year there were 480 claims allowed for extra pay and this year there are over 600. We are paying about $120,000 to $130,000, for extra services to men already well salaried.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Before the Act was amended, when we required the services of an officer we were obliged to appoint one, and you could not appoint a man as Excise officer at less than $500. I had the law amended by taking the power, in small places where it was necessary to have some duties performed, instead of appointing an officer with a salary, to impose the duties on a Customs officer and give him 5 per cent. Theoretically speaking, it is very fine to say that we might impose these duties on the collectors at those places. The collector would reply that he had his work to attend to and could not leave his office, but when we give him the additional 5 per cent. he will undertake to do the two duties, and the country is the gainer.

To enable the department to supply methylated spirits to manufactories, the cost of which will be recouped by the manufacturers to whom they are supplied.....$5,000

Mr. FLINT. Does the department undertake to manufacture methylated spirits, and if so, where

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; here in Ottawa.

Mr. FLINT. Are private parties allowed to import methylated spirits, from the United States, for instance?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The manufacture of methylated spirits was formerly allowed, but it became an abuse. They are manufactured from wood alcohol mixed with ordinary spirits. We found that by allowing them to be manufactured indiscriminately, we were losing control of the manufacture, and that it was to a large extent replacing potable spirits. Still, scientific institutions required methylated spirits, and we undertook to import the wood alcohols, and buy the spirits and manufacture it ourselves, and distribute it to the manufactories. We have made such a large profit on this that we are now bound to reduce the price, as we have no desire to make a profit on it, but I promised Parliament at the time I introduced the measure that the country should not suffer from any deficit.

Mr. FLINT. I received my information from a trader who had evidently undertaken to import methylated spirits, and he said he was not allowed to have them, even if he paid the duty.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Methylated spirits could not be imported from the United States, because they do not make them there, but they could be imported from England if it were not that the duty is so high that they could not compete with us, as we sell them for the cost and charges.

Mr. SPROULE. It became common some time ago for druggists to use methylated spirits instead of proof spirits, but now it is not legal for them to keep methylated spirits.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.25 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 8th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FEMALE OFFENDERS IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Bill (No. 143) respecting certain female offenders in the Province of Nova Scotia was again considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

DUTIES OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that it be an instruction to the Committee on Bill (No. 155) to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs, that they have power to make provision therein in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the House on the 24th August last, in reference to Customs duties on ale, beer, and porter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would ask the hon. gentleman that as it is arranged that we shall have a day's notice for the third reading, I would like to say Thursday next if it is convenient.

Mr. FOSTER. We will put it through Committee to-day and let it stand for the third reading on Thursday.

Bill considered in Committee and reported.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 146) further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). This clause of the Bill I had the honour to introduce in a separate Bill at the beginning of the session. Its sole object was to prevent frauds such as were perpetrated under the law as it formerly stood. Under the provision allowing an agent to vote in another polling sub-division than the one where the qualifying property was situated, it was found that numerous frauds were perpetrated. There was no special form of oath that the returning officer could administer to him. The voters' list could not be shown to him, and he could not therefore be asked if that was his name on the list. To get over the difficulty, so as to compel agents, deputy returning officers and poll clerks to give an honest vote, I proposed to amend that section by making it compulsory upon them to take the ordinary form of oath before they could get the certificate from the returning officer of their right to vote in a polling sub-division other than that where the property qualification lay. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Justice has not adopted the form of oath which I appended to my section of Bill No. 9—the hon. gentleman has eliminated that, and introduced a new form of oath which does not seem to me to cover the difficulty at all. Thus the Minister of Justice requires the agent to take an oath that he is actually entitled to vote. I say that is not particular or specific enough. His name may be upon the voters' list, and yet he may not have the right to vote. He may be a minor, an alien, he may have been bribed; and in any of these cases, under this form of oath, he could take it with impunity. I can see no good reason for the change the Minister of Justice has made. I can see no reason why the form of oath the ordinary voter has to take should not form part of this section, and be a condition to the agent obtaining from the returning officer a certificate enabling him to vote elsewhere than where his property qualification lies. I trust the Minister of Justice will still go back to the form of oath appended to section 2 of the Bill I had the honour to introduce, Bill No. 9 I made the voter swear he was a *bonâ fide* voter. The hon. gentleman has changed that into "actually entitled to vote." He may have changed that because a great many people would not understand what *bonâ fide* voter means. So much the better; it will be more terrifying. The use of words, Latin, French, Greek, or German, strikes terror into them. They think there is something terrible behind, and I think, upon the whole, it would be better to leave the oath as I worded it. It is the form of the words in the old oath, and I can see no reason for changing it. In one of the polling divisions of my election in 1887, six votes were polled by agents, only one of whom had a right to vote, but under the mode of swearing they were at liberty to put in their votes. This oath is an improvement on the law as it stood, but it is not sufficiently distinct and specific.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What I propose in regard to section 2 is this: The long first sub-section is a repetition of the present law except the last words.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The whole of section 44?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Section 44 is repeated here with the addition that a man shall not have the right to vote at a polling station other than where he is entitled to vote, unless he has been actually engaged as deputy returning officer, poll clerk, or agent, as the case may be. What I propose is that we shall not repeat that section at all, but that we shall say at section 2: Section 44 of the said Act, as amended by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 11, is amended by adding thereto the following sub-section; and then come down to sub-section number 2, leaving out the paragraph which is numbered 44. The reason is this: The only object of re-enacting that paragraph is to provide this test, that he shall have been actually engaged as deputy returning officer, &c., before he shall have the right to vote. Under that clause, as it is framed, even the oath itself would not suffice, for a man would actually have no right to vote unless he could prove the fact that he had been so engaged. Of course he cannot prove that at the beginning of the poll, and that is the time when these officers generally vote; that is to say, the poll clerk and the deputy returning officers, and, generally speaking, the agents too. It does not seem to me we ought to establish that test. As to the reason why I did not follow the hon. gentleman's draft of oath, I found it too cumbersome and obscure. The hon. gentleman says that the Latin it contains has terrors for the evil-doers, but I do not think so. I think it is for the innocent and conscientious voter that obscure language in an

oath has terrors, and we ought not to prevent their voting. The wrong-doer will swallow the words, whether he understands them or not. The hon. gentleman's form of oath runs thus:

"I., A. B., of &c. (*deputy returning officer or poll clerk or agent*, as the case may be) for C. D., one of the candidates at the election for the House of Commons for the electoral district of , do solemnly swear that I am a *bonâ fide* voter, and by law entitled to vote for a member for the said House of Commons for the said electoral district at the present election.

"That I have been duly and *bonâ fide* appointed such (*deputy returning officer, poll clerk or agent*, as the case may be), and not merely for the purpose of enabling me to vote at a polling station other than the one where I am entitled to vote.

"That I intend to act, and will act at the present election as such (*deputy returning officer, poll clerk or agent*)."

My objection, besides the words *bonâ fide*, are these: He has to swear that he is a *bonâ fide* voter and by law entitled to vote for a member of the House of Commons. But the returning officer settles that when he gives him a certificate. He ascertains where he is entitled to vote, and if his name is on the list he is surely entitled to vote. You make him say further that he has been duly and *bonâ fide* appointed. Many of these persons do not get their appointments directly from the candidate but from the candidate's agent or the secretary of the organization, as the case may be, and know nothing whatever of the appointment except that they receive it in good faith and act upon it. If you make them swear that they have been appointed *bonâ fide* by the candidate, you virtually make them swear to the *bonâ fides* of another man, which is very unreasonable. Then, again, he must swear that he has been appointed, not merely for the purpose of enabling him to vote at that poll. So that he has to declare on oath the intention of the man who appointed him. It seems to me we ought to leave sub-section 2 as I have said, and sub-section 3 ought to read:

"Every person so appointed deputy returning officer, poll clerk or agent, entitled to vote by virtue of such certificate, shall before voting take oath to the following effect:—I do swear that I am actually entitled to vote for a member of the House of Commons for this electoral district at the present election."

That gives the requirements which the hon. gentleman wants as to qualification and so on, and covers his *bonâ fides* and so on. We ought not to require him to swear, for instance, that he has acted, or, as the hon. gentleman says, that he intends to act and will act. If you take the hon. gentleman's clause as a whole, you will find that he requires as a test of eligibility to vote on the part of the persons holding these certificates, that they have been *bonâ fide* appointed, that they intend to act, that they will act, and that they have acted. One class of the provisions prevents the officer from voting at the opening of the poll because he cannot swear that he has acted, and the oath prevents him from voting at the close of the poll because he has to swear he will act. I think we ought to have it as simple as possible, and it is sufficient if we make him swear that he has the qualifications of a voter.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me the amendment of the hon. gentleman meets the case. Perhaps it would remove many difficulties if it were provided that this oath would not prevent a man from being subjected to the ordinary oath of the voter, because though on the list he may not be qualified as a voter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to add: "In addition to any other oaths he may be required to take."

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). He cannot be required to take any other oath. You will have to change the form of oath in the Election Act. At present the person has to swear that his name is that which appears on the voters' list shown to him, but an agent voting in another polling place than that in which he is registered would not be shown the list on which his name appeared. You can get out of that by adding another section providing an oath of a suitable character.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What we are requiring is that these persons shall take this oath in addition to any other oath which may be required by the law. The certificate shows from what division the voter is transferred.

Mr. SPEAKER. The certificate given to an agent, or a deputy returning officer, or a polling clerk entitling him to vote in a sub-division other than the one in which he appears on the voters' list contains the number of the sub-division in which he is entitled to vote, and I think that certificate becomes part of the list in the polling sub-division where he does vote.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is no form of oath provided for that case.

Mr. SPEAKER. He has to take the same form of oath as the others.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Act prescribes that the voter may be called upon to take this oath, but he may also take the other oaths mentioned in the Act.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is no doubt about that in the case where the voter lives in the polling sub-division, but, if the hon. gentleman's argument is correct, his amendment is unnecessary, because that is the law at present. In 1887, when I was defeated, there were agents at three sub-divisions who voted. My agent required them to be sworn, but the deputy returning officer declared, and he was sustained in that, that he had no power to swear them under those circumstances. I intended to take proceedings, but I consulted some of the most able lawyers in the province. There is no form that was applicable to that case, hence the necessity for this amendment. If the hon. gentleman's construction of the law is correct there is no necessity for it at all, and we ought not to make the amendment simply because the amendment is asked for.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I agree that it is not necessary. I have seen these oaths put time and again to agents, and I have known agents to refuse to take them, and because they could not take them their votes were rejected. But the hon. gentleman tells me that others hold a different view, and for that reason I am putting in this Act that they shall take oaths which could not be put to an ordinary elector.

Mr. BARRON. So far as I understand, the only point of difference is this: That the oath proposed by the Minister of Justice is applicable to a man who presents himself as an agent, for the reason that his name is not on the list of voters with

regard to which list that affidavit applies. Now he is asked to swear that he is the man whose name is on that list of voters.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, on the list of voters for the polling district. He may be voting in No. 1, and he is on the list of No. 100, and he will swear that he is on the list of voters for No. 100.

Mr. BARRON. But the hon. gentleman must concede that the deputy returning officer only has power to administer the oath in regard to the particular list of voters which he has in hand, and in regard to which list he is empowered to have jurisdiction as deputy returning officer, as the one authorized to have jurisdiction in regard to that particular polling division.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is nothing of the kind in the Act.

Mr. BARRON. It seems to me that is so. I think the Minister refers particularly to the list of voters in addition to the list where he is empowered to act. He has no power to act in regard to a polling division 160 miles away; he has only power to act in polling division No. 1, but the deputy administers the oath, and he cannot ask him if he is on the list of voters of polling division No. 1 at all, because he has no power in regard to that. Now, this is a serious matter, because I know of my own knowledge that men have presented themselves as agents in polling division No. 1, for instance, which is 60 miles away from another polling division, No. 100, and they vote. It seems to me the difficulty is this: The deputy returning officer has no power to administer that particular oath to the agent who votes in another polling division, and in regard to the list of which other division he has no authority over.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If the hon. gentleman is correct—and I do not think he is—I see no objection to putting in, in addition to the affidavit he now proposes, a second clause compelling the voter who proposes to vote at a polling sub-division other than where his qualification is to take an oath that he is duly qualified for his own sub-division.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection in doing that. It is exactly what I thought I was doing. But if the hon. gentleman thinks it can be done in a better form, I will accept it. I ask that sub-section 56 of section 2 be amended by striking out all the words after "parcels" in the 8th line and substituting the following words:—

Shall be endorsed so as to indicate their contents, and shall be sealed by the deputy returning officer, and shall be initialled with the initials of any agents present in the booth, who are willing so to do, across the flap thereof, and shall then be put back in the ballot box.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If the object is to prevent tampering with the envelope, I fear this will not be secured by using ordinary mucilage. If this is used, an envelope can be easily opened and closed without discovery. If it was stated that wax should be used, that would afford some protection. The amendment is a capital one and affords some protection for honesty in dealing with the ballots.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is very important that the envelopes should be sealed with wax. In the case of the ballot stuffing that occurred in South Grey, during the examination before the judge it was found that those envelopes sealed with wax were not opened, while those sealed with simple mucilage had been opened and tampered with. I hope, moreover, that indelible pencils will not be used, but that the ordinary pencil will be substituted. The reason is that if indelible pencil is used it makes a double mark, one mark being opposite the other candidate's name. So it appears as if the elector had voted for both candidates. No doubt the writing of the names of the scrutineers across the envelopes will be a protection, and I hope the suggestion in these other two particulars will be adopted.

Mr. BARRON. This amendment is a very proper one. If I remember rightly, it is practically the amendment I suggested myself; but the Minister will see that I provided that the envelopes should be sealed with wax.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. BARRON. I was criticised a good deal because I proposed to give the returning officer so much trouble. As sealing wax is given to the officers, it would be very little trouble to seal the envelopes with it, and also to use a stamp if they have one.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Without insisting on the use of sealing wax, we will undoubtedly prevent fraud by having five or six persons write their names across the envelope, for it will be absolutely impossible to open such an envelope without detection. The difficulty of absolutely acquiring sealing wax is that these duties would have to be performed by a great many persons who do not use sealing wax from one end of their lives to the other. If we may say that "he shall seal it," it enables him to use sealing wax, and if any of the agents insist on that and give him sealing wax, it can be used. That can be left to the candidates themselves.

Mr. BARRON. I think the suggestion of the Minister of Justice, to enable the agents to insist on the using sealing wax if it is there, is a good one. If you insist on an officer doing a thing by statute, and if innocently he should not do it, it leaves everything open to suspicion.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot quite agree with my hon. friend in that. I think that sealing wax should be provided and its use made obligatory, as in the case of the provincial elections in Ontario, where I am not aware that any returning officer has been found incapable of using the sealing wax. If he is not accustomed to use sealing wax himself, there would no doubt be somebody present who would show him how. I would also suggest that a small stamp with some plain device, such perhaps as the outlines of a Crown which is used by members here might be supplied with which to make an impression on the seal. It is quite possible to break a plain seal and replace it with another daub of wax which would have practically the same appearance, but if the stamp were provided it would be a great improvement. The writing of the name across the flap of the envelope is in itself no protection. It might serve to deter people from trying to experiment on opening the envelope, but once it was opened there would be no difficulty in closing it again so that the different portions of the name would match just as originally written. I would strongly urge on the Minister the necessity of making it imperative that

sealing wax should be used, and that the wax should be stamped, which is the only absolute security that we can have. As to the argument that requiring things that would not be done would leave it open to suspicion, I think that the proposal to leave it optional with the agent to insist on sealing wax being used would much more tend to complicate matters. I think the only safe plan is to make the use of sealing wax and a stamp obligatory.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is another matter of paramount importance to this. When the deputy returning officers have placed the ballots of the respective candidates in their respective envelopes, they seal them and they are then taken to the returning officer. The returning officer, the day appointed, counts the statements for the respective candidates and declares whoever has the majority elected, but it is just as important then that the envelope should be sealed with wax, if not sealed already, because, between the declaration and the recount, if a recount is asked for, these envelopes may be opened and the ballots tampered with. Ballots may be stolen and forged, and the results changed, and when it goes before a judge he is in a dilemma, because it is almost impossible for him to diagnose between the fraudulent and genuine ballots. It is quite as necessary after the returning officer has made his declaration that all precaution should be taken.

Mr. TROW. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in reference to the returning officer opening the ballots. He has nothing to do with that, as he only takes the certificate of the deputy returning officers. The hon. gentleman is entirely astray in his calculation.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In case some of them come to him without being sealed, it should be imperative on the returning officer that they should be sealed, so that no difficulty would arise. I quite understand the duties of a returning officer as well as my hon. friend.

Mr. TROW. You did not say so.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am speaking of those envelopes that are not sealed when they are sent to the returning officer. If the sealing is neglected in the first instance, they should be sealed by the returning officer, and he should understand how to use sealing wax. The difficulty may arise with the ballots, after the declaration, and between that and the time of a recount, if a recount is demanded.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is no doubt there is a good deal in what the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) says in reference to the subject we are discussing now. I believe that the law ought to be more specific and more stringent with respect to the ballots in the boxes after the poll is closed, and I believe that the law should be far more stringent with respect not only to the ballots in the boxes, but to the ballot boxes themselves up to the last moment. What we are discussing now is, how best to protect the ballots that are closed in the envelopes put into the ballot boxes. The Minister of Justice admits by his amendment that the law requires to be more stringent than it is now, and admitting that, it is his duty, and the duty of Parliament, to surround these ballots with every protection that the law can possibly surround them with. I submit for his consideration whether or not enclosing them in an ordinary common envelope with the ordinary mucilage is the kind of protection that the hon. gentleman desires to have. The hon. gentleman thinks that permitting the agents of the respective candidates to write their names across the envelopes sufficient protection, but I venture to say that if the hon. gentleman will write his name across an envelope he will find that the envelope can be opened and sealed again without leaving any trace whatever of its having been tampered with. This is not a question of politics. This is a question that affects everybody, and what may benefit one side to-day may be a benefit to the other side to-morrow. The object of all ought to be to protect these envelopes inviolate from the inroads of men who disregard the law. I believe, so far as I have been able to see, that the best way is to make it compulsory that the deputy returning officer shall seal the envelopes with sealing wax. I do not believe in what my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) says about using some device or seal, because that goes into the possession of the deputy returning officer and if he desires to act a fraudulent part he can again easily open the envelope and use the same device, thus concealing the evidence of his own fraud. I would sooner that the deputy returning officer would seal it with his thumb than with a device, because we might have some guarantee then that the seal was not tampered with.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He would not be likely to do it again.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That would depend on how hot the sealing wax was. In any event the sealing of the letter with sealing wax is a much greater guarantee of safety than the sealing in the ordinary way with mucilage. I think the Minister of Justice will see the necessity of devising some scheme by which the envelope cannot be tampered with without it being known. The hon. gentleman must realize thoroughly the necessity of this. The disclosures that were made at the last general election in two or three counties were simply shocking. Envelopes were opened and ballot boxes were tampered with to the injury of somebody, and it is not creditable to the statesmen of Canada that they cannot devise some mode by which not only the ballots themselves, but the boxes in which the ballots are contained shall remain safe until the last moment they are required to remain safe.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that there would be no more safety in sealing with sealing wax than there would be in sealing with the ordinary mucilage. The hon. gentleman says that he does not wish them to use any distinct seal for a stamp, because the deputy returning officer, if so disposed, might open the envelope. What is to hinder the opening of an envelope that is sealed with sealing wax if no stamp is used, and then closing it and sealing it with more sealing wax? There is no more difficulty than taking the wrapper off a newspaper. I think there is more protection in writing the name across the envelope than the hon. gentleman supposes. It is contended that if the envelope is sealed with mucilage and the name is written across, it would be more likely to be opened. I think the only way in which you could open an envelope sealed with mucilage is by heat and moisture, and if you applied moisture the ink would commence to run

and it would be plainly noticed. Therefore, I think there would be greater protection in sealing with mucilage and writing the name across than in sealing with sealing wax. Then, I think with the hon. Minister of Justice, that if we provided that the envelope must be sealed with sealing wax, we would have to go further and provide a seal for every returning officer, and the requirements would be multiplied so much that there would be a greater probability of mistakes than there is at present.

On section 3,

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think this clause should not be adopted in its present form. One of the causes of fraud in elections is the delay in making the declaration. In four elections which I have had previous to 1887, two under a Conservative Government and two under a Reform Government, the declarations were invariably made on the second day after the elections. In 1887 a change was made. The declaration was to have been made, I think, on the following Monday, that is, four days afterwards, the reason assigned being that they could not collect their ballot boxes; but the time was enlarged continuously, so that the declaration did not take place until 18 days after the election, that is, on the 12th of March. In the last election, which was held on the 5th of March, the declaration was to have been made a week afterwards, but it was again enlarged until the 16th, just two days after the hon. member for East Grey, the hon. member for North Grey and the hon. member for North Bruce were gazetted. Now, there should be something done to prevent this. There is no reason why in South Grey the declaration cannot always be made on the second day. In the local election last summer the declaration was made on the following day, and in all the elections that I have had except the last two the declarations were made on the second day after the elections; and I do not think that anybody can contend that what has been done in four successive elections cannot be done again. To permit this delay in making this declaration is to offer a temptation to men to commit fraud. In the election of 1887 a good many of my friends believed that the ballots were stuffed, and at the last hour their courage oozed out, and they were afraid to have a recount. In the last election the ballots were stuffed, and 51 ballots were changed either between the time the ballot boxes were returned and the time of the declaration, or between the declaration and the recount. Now, it is not to the credit of a Government that claims to be progressive, that delays of this kind should take place, because it certainly is a temptation to men to do wrong. In the case of South Grey, the returning officer informed us that he kept the ballot boxes in his own house until the day of the declaration, and after the declaration he had them taken to his office. After the declaration he went away from the riding, leaving the ballot boxes in his office and the keys in the ballot boxes, and when they were opened it was found, on examination of the envelopes, that they had been tampered with in ten divisions, and I will show you how they changed the final result. In division No. 1, the deputy returning officer declared that my opponent, Mr. Blyth, had seventy-five votes, and that I had eighty-eight. When we came to examine the envelopes, we found in those marked for my opponent seventy-five ballots, but in those supposed to contain my eighty-eight ballots, eighty-four were found for me and four for Mr. Blyth. In division No. 2, we found that seventy-seven had been declared by the deputy returning officer for Mr. Blyth, and fifty-five for me; and when we opened the envelopes we found that two ballots had been extracted from my number, making it fifty-three, and two added to Mr. Blyth's, making his number seventy-nine. In No. 4, my opponent was declared to have seventy votes, and I eighty-two; but when we came to examine the envelopes it was found that one ballot was marked for Mr. Blyth in my envelope. In No. 10, four were stolen from me and four forged for Mr. Blyth. In No. 16, five were stolen from me and five forged for Mr. Blyth. In No. 13, three were stolen from me and three forged for Mr. Blyth. In No. 18, there were three; in No. 21, there were three; in No. 24, there was one; and in No. 35, two. Now, if you examine these, you will find that they make a total of fifty-one votes, which were changed in that election from the time of the election to the time of recount. Whoever did this business reckoned that if there was no change made by the judge, this would give my opponent a majority of five; and this is what I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to, because had it not been that I made a gain in the recount to the amount of ten, which, instead of forty-six, gave me really a majority of fifty-six, I would have been counted out by a majority of five, and the will of the majority would have been set aside. It is well that the Minister should understand this, and endeavour, in the amendment he is about to make, to prevent the possibility of a recurrence of such frauds. If he will view the political history of this country, he will find that where the Government have taken to themselves the power of appointing returning officers, fraud has crept in. That has been the history of elections ever since Confederation. In the election of 1872, the Government took the power of appointing their own returning officers, which practically gave them the power of appointing their deputy returning officers also, and we find that the returning officer in West Peterborough returned the man who had the minority of votes. We found the same thing occurring in Muskoka. In 1874, without a change in the law, sheriffs and other public officers were appointed as returning officers, and not a single fraud was perpetrated that I know of. In 1878, the law had been changed, and the sheriffs and registrars throughout the country held the elections, and no frauds were committed. In 1882, the law was changed by the Redistribution Bill, and the Government again took to themselves the power of appointing their own returning officers. What happened then? The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was disfranchised by a returning officer appointed by the Government, put to great expense, and kept out of his seat during one session. The hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island, was also kept out of his seat for a whole Parliament by reason of the high-handed act of a returning officer. In 1887, there was the case in New Brunswick, where a candidate elected was kept out of his seat, although the majority was in his favour, because the returning officer declared his opponent elected. At the last elections,

there was a widespread system operated by which many members were almost deprived of their seats through the action of the returning officers. If the Government desire to prevent this state of things, they must take a stand and show that they will not connive at the acts of the returning officers, and show these officers that if they commit frauds they will not go unpunished. There is nothing so much calculated as these frauds to stir up bad feeling among people who ought to live together in harmony. If after an election has been fought out you have an officer who will allow the ballot boxes to remain in position where ill-disposed persons can reach and change them, you will have crimes of the worst character committed by persons willing to snatch a verdict, no matter what the means may be. There is a case I may mention, into which the Government should look closely. I find that in the return which was made to this House, the returning officer says:

"I have also to report that at the said recount—(that is the recount which took place in South Grey)—it appears that seven ballot boxes had been tampered with and the ballots altered, but when and by whom I cannot say. Should you desire further information as to the deterioration of the ballots, I will be pleased to give you all in my power.

"LEFROY McCAUL."

When the judge summed up the results, if it had not been for the gains made on my side the majority of forty-six given me by the people would have been converted into a minority by the count. The judge said he wanted to adjourn the court until the next day in order to find a precedent as to whether he could disallow or reject the fraudulent ballots. There was no doubt in his mind as to their fraudulent character, and he so expressed himself, but he was doubtful as to whether the law gave him authority to disallow them. But as I had a majority in any case, I was willing that he should declare me elected by three instead of fifty-six, rather than remain over another day. The law should be so amended as to give the judge power to reject fraudulent ballots when he was satisfied they were fraudulent. I trust the Government will consider this matter, as the same thing might occur in other places; and if these high-handed measures are to be permitted, they will have the effect of destroying every vestige of honour and honesty among candidates and constituents. I may add that the returning officers have all made affidavits, in the case to which I have referred, that where any changes were made in the envelopes and returns of ballots they were made fraudulently. There is another matter which I might mention, as it came up in the recount, and that is as to the initialling of the ballots. In one polling sub-division there was only one ballot initialled and that was rejected, and when we came to have a recount it was found it had been tampered with, and the judge allowed it. None of the other ballots were initialled, although the judge admitted them, according to the rulings of some other judges. I think there ought to be some general rule for this, so that nothing of this kind could take place. In the case to which I refer, the number should have been on the counterfoil and the initials on the ballot, but I fancy the initials and the number were both on the counterfoil. If the bringing of this case before the House will have the effect of directing the attention of the Government to the desirability of having the declaration take place sooner than it does now, it will have a good effect, because no one can tell me that, when a local election takes place, Mr. Mowat can have the declaration made in South Grey the next day, and that there is any reason for this Government to delay the declaration for 18 days. No one can make me believe but that fraud is intended when the declaration is delayed in that way, and my friends believed that fraud was intended in 1887, and asked me to get a committee on that subject, but I went to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and found that the ballots were all destroyed after one year. If this will prevent the long delays which have occurred, it will be of great advantage. When I am told that these delays have to take place from time to time in making the returns, I believe there is a sinister motive at the bottom, as has been shown in this case.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether it was the day after the election for the Province of Ontario when the declaration was made in the hon. gentleman's riding, but I know that in Centre Grey some days elapsed between the election and the declaration. In any case, the difference between the time of the declaration in the Provincial and Dominion election is largely due to the fact that in the Provincial elections it is provided that the deputy returning officers shall take the ballot boxes to the returning officer, but in the Dominion the clerk has to collect them. You can easily understand that it takes a long time to bring all these ballot boxes to one centre when collected by one person. That is one reason for the delay. Then, the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) forgets that at the time of the Dominion elections there was a very heavy snow storm, and it was alleged that some of the parties could not get through the roads, that the party which was collecting the ballot boxes could not get them in time, and any hon. member can understand that if it were stated that the declaration was to take place the next day after the voting, and a severe storm occurred, it would be impossible to get the ballot boxes in within the time, so there must be some provision made for adjournment from time to time until the ballot boxes are received. That is exactly what took place in South Grey. I know that the returning officer telegraphed to our polling sub-division for the returns, because, though the ballot box had left some time before, it had not reached the returning officer, but that was not the fault of the returning officer, but of the party who was collecting the ballot boxes. I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) blamed the returning officer for all that he alleges took place in South Grey, but I understood before that he and his friends believed that the returning officer did his duty, and that the tampering with the ballot box, if there was tampering, was done by some other parties. The law is strict enough as to the care of the ballot boxes until the declaration is made or a recount takes place both in the Dominion and the Provincial elections. The hon. gentleman complains of the appointment of the returning officers by the Dominion Government. In the Provincial elections the Government appoint the returning officers. If the parties named in the Act are not available, they appoint others in their places. The only difference is that the Dominion Government holds the appointment of all the returning officers in its own hands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a very big difference.

Mr. SPROULE. In any case, the officers who have to be appointed by the Ontario Government are the registrars and sheriffs, who are the servants of that Government from year to year, so that, if the argument of the hon. gentleman is correct, it would apply with double force to the Ontario Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In reference to what the hon. gentleman has said——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think I may ask that this discussion should be confined to the clause before the Committee.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was about to make a statement in reference to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman stating his case.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am glad the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has referred to the snow storm which took place, but he forgets that the snow storm took place after the election.

Mr. SPROULE. The day before.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There was some snow the day before and there was good sleighing on the day of the election, but the snow storm that did the damage took place eight days afterwards, which proves that delays are dangerous. I did not say that I blamed the returning officer or anyone else in the riding, or that I knew who did this. If I knew who it was, I would make a pretty warm corner for him.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did you say: It is the result of the appointment of the officers by the Government?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I say that is the result in a number of cases.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you mean in your case?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was only speaking of the system, and I desired to give the hon. gentleman some information if he would have listened to me. I do not say whom I blame, but I know that the same returning officer acted on both occasions. The only thing I blame him for was for yielding. I believe he only yielded to the powers that be in that riding; because the candidate who opposed me, although he came to Owen Sound on the day before the recount, during the whole time of the recount he never entered the court room, although he took the trouble to go from his own place to Owen Sound. During the time the recount was going on he never fyled an appearance there. I am not going to say anything about that. I am just giving you the history, and I will let you make your own inferences. I give the Minister of Justice the facts, so that if possible he may prevent, in Heaven's name, the recurrence of these outrages in the South Riding of Grey again. That is the only thing I am anxious for. I am a Canadian, and I do not want this stain to crop up in Canada at every election. I do not see why we should not agree to lay our political contentions aside, and endeavour to have our elections conducted honestly. I believe that is the duty of every man on both sides of the House. I do not think there is anything to cause rejoicing in gaining a victory by fraud of a stupendous character of this kind: I think it would be worse than victory, it would be a disgrace. Now, as the hon. member for East Grey has spoken, in order to show you the advantages of partyism in elections, I will just note this one circumstance: The hon. member for East Grey can reconcile it to the House, he can reconcile it to his constituents, as he pleases. The hon. member's election took place on the same day that my election took place. The hon. member was gazetted on the 14th of March, nine days after the election.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Probably there was no snow storm in that part of the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, but there was in mine, apparently. He was gazetted on the 14th, although there was a snow storm as he tells us, and the time of holding protests is limited to 30 days from that time. The hon. gentleman stood away up in the list, and when the time expired for holding a protest in his riding, the hon. member for East Grey, with characteristic magnanimity, came over to my riding to see if he could not get up a protest. It was very magnanimous, after the snow storm, for him to get gazetted, and then come over to my riding and endeavour to get his friends there to enter a protest. If they had protested against ballot-stuffing, it would have been more creditable to him.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We cannot possibly run these two elections this afternoon and this Bill also.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I wish the hon. gentleman would be good enough to allow me a little latitude, owing to the fact that there was a big snow storm.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I wish to insert a clause before the third section as an amendment to section 58. Section 58 is the clause which provides how ballot boxes shall be collected after the election, and I propose to amend it. We now provide that the ballot box, after being locked and sealed, shall be delivered to the returning officer, or to the election clerk, who shall receive or collect the same. The plan at present is, in some places, that they are kept by the deputy returning officers until the returning officer comes round, but there is no duty laid on the deputies to deliver them. I wish to provide that the ballot box shall be locked and sealed:

And shall be forthwith delivered by the deputy returning officer to the returning officer, or to the election clerk, who shall receive or collect the same, or to one or more persons specially appointed for that purpose by the returning officer, and such person or persons shall, on delivery of the ballot boxes to the returning officer, take the oath in the form of the first schedule of this Act.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That might imply that the returning officer shall go round and collect them.

Mr. LAURIER. The provision that the returning officer shall receive or collect them, means, I suppose, that if he does not receive them, he shall collect them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; to provide for the two cases. If the returning officer does not send round for them immediately, as he may in the vicinity of the town where he lives, then the deputy returning officer is to deliver them to the person whom he sends, but if he does not send anyone to collect them, then the returning officer himself forthwith is to collect them.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think it should be the duty of the deputy returning officers to deliver these boxes to the returning officer and get their mileage for it. The returning officer now charges his mileage for going round and collecting them, and half the time he does not do it. The deputy returning officers go into the county town, and, as they are desirous of hearing the news about the election, they take the boxes in with them, but they get no mileage for that. I think it would be better to say that the deputy returning officers shall take them in to the returning officers.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is just the object of the amendment. I do not want to say that the deputy shall in all cases take them in. I merely want to provide that forthwith he shall see that they get into the hands of the returning officer, because it may be that the returning officer may go to the deputy more quickly than the deputy can go to him. I want to permit it to be done either way.

Mr. CASEY. If the Minister proposes to permit it to be done either way, then he fails to do what he says he wants to do. He wants to put the duty upon the deputy of bringing them in forthwith; that is the highly proper object of the amendment. But if you leave a duty optional between two persons, you may be sure it will not be done properly by either. You must put it positively upon one or the other. If you make it absolutely obligatory upon the deputy to come in forthwith, personally, and deliver the boxes to the returning officer, then it will be done, and you should allow him his mileage; but if you leave it open to the deputy to suppose that perhaps the returning officer will be round for these boxes in a day or two then the boxes will remain in his hands for a day or two, and the very evil we are trying to avoid will continue.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Under the present system it has only happened in two elections that the returning officer sent out and gathered up the ballot boxes. Before the change that took place in 1887 the deputies always took in the ballot boxes; and if the Minister of Justice were to witness the collection of the ballot boxes under this system, I do not think he would leave it optional whether the deputy carried the boxes to the returning officer, or whether the returning officer himself collected them. I have seen ballot boxes after both those elections gathered up and placed in a sleigh, and left there while the parties went into a tavern, these boxes in the sleigh being left without anyone to guard them. In another instance I was told of the boxes being placed in a shed behind a hotel with no one on guard, these boxes again being in a sleigh. Under the other system, if the deputy returning officer would take the boxes directly to the returning officer there would be no confusion and no disgrace, because I feel it is a disgrace to have ballot boxes containing the people's ballots standing around a hotel unprotected and uncared for, open to any one who saw fit to steal them, and bring on endless confusion. I am very glad to see the clause proposed, and I should like to have it made imperative, so that it shall not be left to the *ipse dixit* of the returning officer to say whether he shall gather the boxes or not. I do not wish to see an election in Grey when the ballot boxes are allowed to stand for hours at the mercy of anyone. Under the other system the deputy returning officer would gather the ballot boxes in every constituency, with the exception of Algoma, on the next day, barring snow storms, that, according to my hon. friend, occurred a week afterwards.

Mr. SPROULE. If there were fifty deputy returning officers coming in at one time there would be more reason to fear tampering with ballot boxes than if the work was done by one officer. I think hon. gentlemen opposite display a little too much sympathy for fair-play. I can give the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) the names of persons who, under the provincial law, took ballot boxes, stopped with them at hotels, and got drunk there—in fact, stayed there all night, and the ballot boxes were delivered by other persons.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That was in East Grey, and not in South Grey.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman also calls in question my statement as to snow storms. He must know that there were snow storms only two days before the election, when the roads were blocked; and also eight days after the election, when the declaration was made. Such storms, of course, interfere largely with travel in the country.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What we on both sides of the House desire to attain is the same object, and that is, to prevent the delay of returns by the returning officer sending officials round to collect the boxes. I think the amendment accomplishes this object, because it places the duty on the deputy returning officer of getting the boxes into the hands of the returning officer. The only point at which the amendment stops short is that it does not say he shall travel with it himself, because there may be a more expeditious way of getting in the returns. In my province there never has been any complaint by either side of delay or tampering with the getting in of the boxes, except delay on account of the weather. The two systems are, of course, suited to different localities. In my county the deputy returning officer immediately at the close of the poll takes the ballot box, and, after as little delay as possible, conveys it to the returning officer. There is another county where a stage runs for a distance of 100 miles, and the returning officer being desirous of getting the returns quickly, sends a responsible person on the coach to traverse the whole of the district and get in all the boxes. If you say he shall not do that, but the deputy returning officer shall in every case travel into the shire town, you will have all the deputy returning officers travelling over that route at great expense and increased delay. So all we can safely do, considering the different circumstances of the respective counties, is to impose the duty on the deputy returning officer of sending as speedily as possible the ballot box to the returning officer. And if he can discharge that duty more quickly by sending the box by express, or coach, or other means of communication, as he can do in many cases, I should allow the returning officer to send for them in that way.

Mr. BARRON. The suggestion made the other night by this side of the House was similar to that made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). I think the difficulty might be obviated by eliminating the words "or collect."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to striking out the words "or collect."

Mr. McGREGOR. I think the deputy returning officer should take the ballot boxes to the returning officer. I live in the County of Essex, and there is no polling place more than six miles from the railway, and yet it took 18 days to collect the ballot boxes at the late election. Some came in by waggon, some by railway, and I believe one box came 17 or 18 days after the election on a freight car. There was no system followed. I called on the returning officer several times, and asked him if it was not possible to have a declaration made. He said he had no power to pay a man to go round, but he would telegraph and send some one after the boxes if it was found necessary. In the local elections the deputy returning officer returned the ballot boxes next day, and we had the returns almost at once. In my county there is no excuse for delay, because the railway stations are close to the polling booths, and we can get the ballot boxes in next day without there being any danger of fraud. At the Dominion election they were allowed to lie around a great many days. Even after they had been gathered, the returning officer allowed them to remain in an isolated office, where mischief could have been done if people wished to do so. So I feel disposed to think that if we had the returns made at once by the returning officer great danger might be obviated that might otherwise crop up in regard to this matter. I am strongly in favour of having the deputy returning officer return the ballot box himself as soon as possible to the returning officer.

Mr. TEMPLE. I have had considerable experience in elections and in ballot boxes. I held elections for 19 years, and I do not recollect any time when the ballot boxes were lost or went astray during that period. I think the Minister of Justice is right in allowing the ballot boxes to be collected either by the sheriff, the returning officer, or his deputy. I have held provincial and also Dominion elections, and the plan I pursued was to send the deputy sheriff to hold a poll, say 60 or 80 miles, wherever the most distant poll was, carry the boxes, distribute them around to the different deputies, and then on his way back that night or the next day return them to the returning officer. I never found any trouble at any time in this mode of procedure. I think the best way is to allow discretionary power to the principal officer to collect the boxes as he sees fit.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister would propose to leave things just as they are.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; I amend the law by imposing on the deputy returning officers the duty of delivering the boxes, whereas the present law imposes the duty on the returning officer of getting the boxes.

Mr. CASEY. I think that persons specially appointed for the purpose should be sworn before they go for the boxes, because it would never do to allow the deputy to delegate the custody of these ballot boxes to persons who are not sworn for the purposes of that election. The object of the law is to keep the ballot boxes in the custody of some sworn official until the ballots are finally counted. Unless you make some provision of that kind the returning officer may send his hired man, or anybody he likes, to get these boxes, and the object of the amendment would be defeated.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The moment he hands in the boxes he has to swear that they were not interfered with, and that they were in his custody all the time, and were handed over in the same condition as when they came into his possession.

Mr. LAURIER. The difficulty is just as has been stated by the Minister of Justice. If all the counties were like small counties, and the polling booths were within 20 miles of the shire town, the proposal made by the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) would work admirably. But in such counties as the Minister of Justice refers to, where the polling booths may be 50 or 60 miles from the shire town, there might be eight or ten deputy returning officers on the road with their boxes at the same time. It seems to me it should be an instruction to the returning officer to have an officer on the way to collect these boxes immediately after the close of the poll. If there were such a provision in the Act I think it would be satisfactory.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The illustration given by the Minister of Justice is a good one with regard to a few particular counties, but there are some counties that are so situated that it would require a dozen different officers to be sent in a dozen different directions to collect these boxes. It seems to me, from what has been said by the member for Essex (Mr. McGregor) and others, that the delay in bringing in these boxes is due to the fact that the deputy returning officers are not allowed any mileage, and they send them in by freight car, or by stage, or by some irresponsible man who is going that way. The difficulty would be got over if there were a provision in the Act that the deputy returning officers shall be allowed mileage for the number of miles necessarily travelled for the purpose of delivering the ballot boxes to the returning officer or the person authorized to receive them.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think that with all the safeguards you can surround it this plan of having one person go after the ballot boxes is safe. Undoubtedly it would not be safe unless he was sworn previously as well as afterwards. Before he takes charge of the boxes he should be sworn that he will perform that duty faithfully. An unsworn and irresponsible man, say the hired servant of the returning officer, might get possession of these boxes and not bring them to the returning officer at all. He might be careless, or he might get drunk and lose the boxes. The person should be sworn before he is sent out on this duty, and if you provide in the law that the returning officer shall be personally liable for all boxes delivered to the person sent out by him it would go some way to meet the difficulty.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The duty is imposed upon him, and when he appoints the agents he is responsible for them.

Mr. CASEY. That is all very well, but it does not prevent the disappearance of the boxes in the hands of these possibly incompetent or bribable agents. I must insist on my contention, that if persons are to be sent out for the ballot boxes they should be sworn before they undertake the duty as well as after they discharge it. All the arguments urged by the Minister of Justice himself are in

favour of the personal protection of the ballot boxes by the deputy returning officer, or the returning officer himself, or his clerk. It is the simpler plan, but the hon. Minister says that it is not the cheaper, because it would involve paying mileage for a large number of people instead of a small number. But no one collector can attend to a whole county; there must be several sent out. Then notice will have to be given to each deputy returning officer of the time that the collector will be there, in order that the deputy may meet him, and the giving of that notice will take time. Two things are quite clear—that the saving of expense will be very little, because several collectors will be necessary, and that the deputies will have to be paid mileage to meet them. There will be almost as much mileage paid, and there will be an undue loss of time. But if one plan is safer than another, the question of expense should not be allowed to stand in the way of its adoption; and it seems to me evident that the safer plan is that the deputy should bring the boxes himself. It seems to me obvious that a man can take better care of one box than he can of ten or twenty. If the Minister really wishes to carry out the reform in the law to which this proposed amendment is directed, and to make it the duty of the deputy returning officer to see that this box is put into the hands of the returning officer himself at the earliest moment, I think he should knock out this alternative plan altogether. Where a duty is divided between two people it will not be as well performed as where it is imposed upon one: and I think that by striking out the word "collector," and not adding these other words about persons sent to collect the same, the Minister will obtain what I know he wants to get at, the prompt delivery of the boxes.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It seems to me that the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister of Justice meets what we all want. It is the alternative feature of it that commends it to my judgment. It must not be supposed that in every electoral district there is one large town towards which all the deputy returning officers are anxious to go on the night of the elections. In several electoral districts there are several towns of equal importance, in which celebrations are held by the victorious party on the night of the election, and the deputy returning officer in these will not perhaps want to go to the locality where the returning officer resides. In a case of that kind, we might be met with the same difficulty that we have now, of the tardiness of the deputy returning officers to visit the returning officer. It may be that the deputy returning officer will not go in for three or four days.

Mr. CASEY. He is liable for penalties if he does not.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). They have been liable for penalties for a long time, but they risk them. I think it is much better that some officer should be appointed to collect the boxes, just as the Minister proposes. It seems to me to be too clear for argument.

Mr. CASEY. It seems to me to be too clear for argument that by admitting an alternative plan you destroy the object of the proviso. It is not a question of where the deputies want to go, or whether they would go with the boxes or not. What we want to do is to compel them to go in with the boxes forthwith.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). What do you mean by "forthwith"?

Mr. CASEY. Whatever the courts decide it to mean, and it would be a good deal sooner than the boxes could be collected in any other way. If the hon. member for Brockville agrees that delivery by the deputy is a proper way to do it, then the admission of the alternative puts it in the power of any person who does not wish to adopt that course to go outside of the law.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). The alternative plan is found to work the best in the district which I have the honour to represent. I will give you an idea of the difficulties that would be experienced if it were compulsory on the deputy returning officers to bring in the boxes. The plan adopted there is to send a messenger to gather up the boxes throughout the district, and he is sworn before he departs as well as when he returns with the boxes. If the deputy returning officers were compelled to carry in their boxes each one would have to travel from ten to a thousand miles. The longest distance would be 1,190 miles travelled one way, and the shortest distance ten miles. Say they travel on the average but one-half the distance, we would find eighty deputy returning officers travelling altogether 40,000 miles, which, at 10 cents a mile, would cost $4,000 one way to bring in the ballot boxes in one electoral district. My experience is that it is the hardest work in the world to get men paid at present by the Auditor General for the work they do. If such a cost as this stared the Auditor General in the face, I fancy it would make him go crazy. As it is, he objects to paying 10 cents a mile for the messenger who was actually engaged in gathering up the ballot boxes in that district; he thinks he should only get 7½ cents. If it were compulsory on the deputy returning officers to bring in their ballot boxes, you would find the very same thing operating in smaller constituencies, though in a smaller way.

Mr. CASEY. We cannot make a law just to suit Algoma.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). There are a number of other constituencies in a similar position—Manitoba constituencies.

Mr. CASEY. There are not a number where the deputy returning officers will have to travel 1,190 miles with the ballot boxes. But suppose there are, it is just as hard for a messenger or collector to go for the boxes and come back again as it is for the deputy returning officer. But suppose Algoma were a hopeless case, why not except Algoma, which is excepted in many other respects? These enormously large counties could easily be excepted.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am very much afraid that the Minister will find that the old practice will be continued under the new law. The deputy returning officers are the servants of the returning officers; and if the returning officer is anxious to earn mileage he will instruct his deputies that they are to deliver the ballot boxes to him.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Has the Minister of Justice come to any conclusion about fixing a limit during which a declaration must be made?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have not put in any clause fixing a time for the return. I think we could not fix an exact time for all the counties.

Mr. O'BRIEN. A limit of fifteen or twenty days might be fixed to prevent any undue extension of time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The great difficulty in fixing a limit is that, if by accident or delay it should be exceeded, the election must be gone over again.

Mr. O'BRIEN. In my election the declaration was delayed a month. The returning officer made it his business to collect his own ballot boxes over the whole district, and he encountered the snow storm we have all heard of. The declaration did not take place until nearly a month after the election, and if a limit had been fixed he would have found means to get the ballot boxes in within that limit.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Bill will not be an improvement unless that is fixed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Section 59 is amended by adding the following:—

And they shall also forthwith, after the close of the poll, mail to each candidate, at the address stated in each ballot paper, a blank certificate by registered letter.

I propose to add to section 60 the following sub-section:—

The returning officer, upon the receipt by him of each ballot box, shall take every precaution for its safe keeping and for preventing any other person but himself and the election clerk having access thereto; and shall immediately, upon the receipt of the ballot boxes, seal the same under his own seal, in such a way that it cannot be opened without such seal being broken, and this he shall do without effacing or covering the seal of the deputy returning officer.

Amendments agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to amend section 64 by adding the following sub-section thereto:—

The judge may, at the time of such application or afterwards, direct that the service of the notice aforesaid upon the candidates or their agents may be substitutional, or may be made by mail or by posting, or in any other such manner as he may think fit.

Amendment agreed to.

Committee rose: and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee on the Bill.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Culling Timber..... $30,050

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the same staff employed now in this work as formerly?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; some two years ago I stated that a great reduction would be made, and I made a very large reduction, to which we have adhered.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

Mr. McMULLEN. I remember that some years ago the hon. gentleman stated that there was a considerable shrinkage in the work, and that it was gradually growing less. Is it still growing less?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not to the same extent. I had made reductions before that, but, as I stated, the work had fallen off as compared with what it was ten or fifteen years ago. I reduced the cullers from fifteen or eighteen down to seven, but I said that, if there was a great output of timber in any one season, we would employ extra cullers and pay them for the time they were occupied. This year I think the output of square timber will be much less, and it will not be necessary to employ any extra cullers.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the revenue from this source last year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will get that information. Last night a question came up as to the manner of charging the salaries of some of the principal officers, and I said then I thought there must be some mistake, and that I would get the information from the Auditor General, as his report had been quoted. I asked the Assistant Commissioner for information on the subject, and I will read the letter sent by Mr. McDougall to Mr. Gerald:

"OTTAWA, 8th September, 1891.

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter of this date, in which you inform me that last evening, in the House, the attention of the hon. the Minister was called to the fact that as per statement of the General Excise Contingencies on page C—200 of my Report for 1889-90 it was made to appear that the salaries of Chief Inspector H. Godson and Inspector of Distilleries John Davis were paid from the contingent vote instead of that for salaries.

"I have to state that these salaries were paid from and charged properly to the salaries vote, but as the services are general for the whole Dominion, they are classed as General Contingencies in my Report. I beg to say that there is a separate sub-head in the general vote for Excise to which the salaries were charged. In entering the salaries in our accounts under the head of General Contingencies we were following your classification. (See your last Report, pages 10 and 11, where salaries, travelling expenses and sundries are all charged under the head of General Contingencies.)

"Another year we probably both can make a more approximate heading for salaries.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"J. L. McDOUGALL,

"*Auditor General.*"

It was only a confusion in entering it. The important fact is, as he states, that the salaries were paid from salaries' vote, and not from contingencies.

Mr. McMULLEN. There have been no more superannuations made in connection with this staff since the superannuation that took place two or three years ago?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No change.

Contingencies..... $6,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is an increase in this item, for which I am afraid I shall have to hold the Finance Minister responsible. Our contingencies were based, as I stated before, upon the very lowest amount to which we could reduce the work of that office. Although we put our contingencies at what we thought sufficient, Parliament only voted a small amount, and they have overrun that amount by nearly a thousand dollars. Now we are simply asking for the estimate we made before, and for the actual expenses. There is no increase at all in the actual expense.

Salaries of Officers, Inspectors and Assistant Inspectors of Weights and Measures, including Assistant Inspectors at: Charlottetown, P.E.I., $500: Port Arthur, Ont., $500: Edmonton, N.W.T., $500 ..... $56,050

Mr. McMULLEN. When this account was before the House last year I urged, in the interest of the trade, that some change should be made in the system of weights and measures. You may have, perhaps, an efficient staff of inspectors; still, from the fact that a small amount is collected from every one whose weights are inspected, there is a disposition on the part of some poor traders, people that are anxious to save every cent, to put their weights out of the way of the inspector so as to avoid inspection, and they are used afterwards. I am positive such things are done. While I say it is desirable in the interest of the buyer as well as the seller that all weights should be inspected, it is unjust to the seller to compel him to pay, in every instance, the cost of inspecting his weights; because the buyer has just as much interest in correct weights as the seller; both have an equal interest, but you exact from the seller the fees. You may say that the seller will add it to the price of his merchandise: it is one of the items of expenditure in connection with his business. That may be true in a sense, but after all it results in many cases in the weights being used without their being inspected. Now, you may say that a person who refuses to allow his weights to be inspected is subject to have them cancelled or destroyed. So he is, but nobody cares to interfere. For instance, if a poor grocery woman, or a poor man who has a large family, is driving a small business, and he has two sets of weights in his store, he does not care to put up $1 or $1.25 to have them inspected, and he will perhaps put them under his counter until the inspector goes away, and he pays no fee. Now, I make an appeal on behalf of the entire trade, for I think it will be far better that the weights should be inspected free of charge, and that they should be carefully and correctly stamped, so that any person who is buying or selling would see that they are stamped. I would suggest, in connection with the inspection of weights, that a man should be required to keep up, in a conspicuous place in his retail store, we will say, a certificate showing that his weights have been inspected, the certificate being duly signed by the inspector, the same as is done in connection with licenses for hotels or shops under the Ontario License Act, where they have to keep up a notice and show their license, so that it can be viewed by every person. They could easily keep a certificate that the weights were inspected in their shop, posted up with the date, the same as the Ontario License Act requires. This certificate should state that the weights have been duly inspected and pronounced correct, and if any person wished to assure himself that the weights were correct this certificate would be evidence. You should aim at seeing that correct weights are kept so that the buyer and seller, who have an equal interest in the weights being correct, may both stand on an equal footing. When you make it a matter of common interest by taking out of the Dominion treasury the sum necessary to pay the expenses, both buyer and seller will have a common interest in seeing that the weights are correct, and both will get equal justice to a greater extent than the present system affords.

Mr. COSTIGAN. So far as distributing the burden of the fees is concerned, they are now distributed—that is, about one-half is upon the trade and the other half upon the public generally, and, I think, it would prolong the session a great deal if I were to propose that the whole expense should be taken out of the Dominion treasury. That principle has been frequently discussed in the House. The great charge against this branch of the service has always been the deficit every year, and I have been trying to reduce the number of inspectors and chief officers—to reduce the expenses as much as possible. I have brought the branch now to such a condition that the House has taken it for granted that it would only be fair that half the expense should be sustained by the country. I do not think I can undertake to go any further than that. With regard to the idea about the certificate of license, there is no necessity for it, because a certificate is given to every man who has his scales examined and verified. I think it would be a good idea to have it posted up, and I will look into it and see if it can be done.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the salary paid to the inspectors?

Mr. COSTIGAN. $1,000 for inspectors and $500 for assistant inspectors. We have three or four large divisions which show a surplus over expenditure, and the salaries there have gone up to $1,300—Hamilton and Montreal. There the salaries seem to be justified from the receipts being considerable and the district being five times as large as some other districts.

Mr. McMULLEN. I commend one change made during the last few years, that of issuing stamps for every scale inspected and providing that they must be cancelled. It is a very desirable check, not for a moment hinting that there are any dishonest men among the inspectors. Are they allowed travelling expenses in addition to their salaries?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; they are allowed their actual expenses. We have cut them down very closely. Some men wanted to use their own horses or hire horses. We do not allow an officer to do this, because it is more expensive. We have advised the officers to travel by rail, boat or stage, and they are only permitted to hire horses when the place cannot be reached by these modes of travel.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the net loss last year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. About $30,000, speaking from memory.

Inspection of Gas..... $13,600

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the cause of the increase?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The increase is due to some increase in the salaries of the officers. The gas inspectors proper and the weights and measures officers are exceptions to the general service; because of the deficit in those branches of the service the officers do not get the same promotion or increases of salary as in other departments. They complain of it, but they know it when they accept the positions. Formerly, Mr. Aubin was inspector

of gas at Montreal, and consulting engineer for the whole Dominion, receiving a separate salary for the latter office. After his retirement from age, the office of consulting engineer was abolished, and to save travelling expenses we allow Mr. McPhee, inspector of Hamilton, $200 more salary to do the western portion of the Dominion, and we also allow $200 for same work in the eastern provinces.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the inspection of gas self-sustaining?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not yet, but we will hope to make it so, because, by Order in Council, we now have power to fix the rates of Government inspection. Last year I proposed to introduce a Bill respecting gas inspection, but as the electric light was becoming so common it was thought it should be dealt with in any measure respecting gas. I deemed it to be impossible to prepare a measure that would cover the electric light, because it is so complicated: but in the meantime by Order in Council we can regulate the fees paid on gas inspection.

Mr. FLINT. The argument in favour of the country paying any portion of the expenditure for weights and measures inspection could not apply to the case of gas inspection. The department should, on behalf of the population of the country, see that gas inspection paid its own way, because the cases are not parallel.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I never argued they were.

Mr. FLINT. As the Minister says, the use of gas for illuminating purposes is giving way to a large extent, and I presume the department is taking into consideration the changed conditions.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Rent, Fuel, &c., Weights and Measures.. $15,950

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a decrease of $200. Do you allow some of the men to keep horses?

Mr. COSTIGAN. None of them: we have ruled against it. The officers cannot keep a horse of their own, nor are they allowed to hire a horse, unless they are able to show that they are unable to go over the ground by rail, boat or coach.

Mr. McMULLEN. Have you laid down a certain charge for horse-hire?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There are very considerable checks on the accounts. Take Nova Scotia. An assistant inspector does some travelling. On his return he sends in his account. It goes to the Inspector of Inland Revenue. Then it is forwarded here, and goes through the hands of the accountant.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Minister of Inland Revenue has stated that under the present ruling of the department no inspector is allowed to hire horses or use his own horse for the purpose of driving over any portion of the country where the railway can be utilized. I can point out that this system has not, in my opinion, resulted in economy to the department. I can tell the Minister how. In my own county there are certain towns along the line of railway, not very distant from others, perhaps not more than 10 or 12 miles, and in the vicinity of these towns there are other towns where inspections are to be made. I have been informed by the inspector of that particular county that more economy would be secured by the department if he were allowed to take his own horse or hire a horse and drive to these towns along the railway, taking in those in the vicinity of the railway as well as those along the line of the railway itself; because when he is obliged, as now, under the regulation of the department, to use the line of railway, he has first to employ a horse at the station to take his standards from the station to the place where he intends to have his inspection in the towns along the line of railway. In addition to that, when he comes to a town along the line of railway, after he has done his inspection there, he may want to go to a town or village within five or ten miles of the place where he held the inspection, and instead of being allowed to take his own horse and drive from one place to another, he has to employ a horse at this particular station and drive to villages midway between the place where he held the inspection and the next station along the line of railway. As a matter of fact, I believe that the mode which has been adopted within the last two or three years has not resulted in so much economy to the department as the Minister of Inland Revenue thinks it has.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I fully recognize the set of facts alluded to by Mr. Speaker, and I remember the particular case of that district being brought to my notice, where the assistant inspector owned a horse, and he had a good deal of travelling to do in an immense district. I believed that in his case it would have been economy, and I insisted then that the privilege should be allowed him under the circumstances. But it is not for one district that we have to regulate this question, and while it would be economical in this case, it would be quite the reverse in some other, as we know from experience in their sending in the accounts. We found that the privilege was abused to swell their accounts for expenses, and while it might have operated harshly in this district, on the whole it was an economical arrangement.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can endorse the remarks made by Mr. Speaker. I know that in my district the railway runs alongside of an old-travelled road, on which nine-tenths of the trade of the county was done, and if the inspector travelled by rail and had to hire a horse at the different stations in order to reach the small shops, it would entail a great deal more expense. In my own section I believe that if the inspectors were allowed to travel by team or to have a good strong horse sufficient to carry around his goods, he would accomplish his duties more efficiently, and more cheaply, than if he travelled part by rail and part by team.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The inspector can hire a horse in such cases: but we did not recognize the right of an officer to keep a horse of his own. This is not a cast-iron rule, and where the duties can be discharged more efficiently and more cheaply by hiring a horse, or by travelling by stage coach, the inspector can do the best under the circumstances and with the most economy.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know that some time ago the inspector came around in my district and took a rig and driver with him. Of course that was an expensive way, as he had to pay the expenses of the driver, but if he drove the rig himself it would be cheaper than travelling part by rail and part by team.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think it was last session I drew the attention of the Minister to the desirability of considering the expediency of abolishing the fees that are paid by business men for inspection of weights and measures. If it is in the public interest that scales should be inspected, it is pretty hard to make the individuals pay for it. It appears to me that as this is in the general interest of the country the inspection should be free. This is a special tax and it is obnoxious to the business men of the country. I think the time has come when it should be abolished. There was another point which we brought before the Minister, and that was that some years ago all the inspectors and deputy inspectors of weights and measure, with one or two exceptions, were legislated out of office, and it was thought that they were entitled to some compensation or pension. Has the Minister considered the question since last session?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I considered it a long time ago.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Has it resulted in anything being given to these parties?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is nothing in the Estimates now before us.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does not the Minister consider they are entitled to some consideration?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think they are entitled to a good deal of sympathy, but voting money is more than that.

Mr. FLINT. I would ask how it is that there are such heavy travelling expenses connected with gas inspection? I could understand this item in connection with the inspection of weights and measures, but the inspection of gas is mostly in towns and cities, and yet there is quite a large amount charged as travelling expenses.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We have two consulting engineers, one of whom travels in the western section of the country to fit up new offices that are established, and there have been a great many so established within the last few years. The one in Montreal looks after the establishment of the offices in the eastern section. Then when any dispute occurs with regard to the quality of gas the officer has to go and investigate that. We have a chief inspector who visits all these establishments at least once a year, and who is also inspector of weights and measures, and I presume a part of his expenses as inspector of weights and measures would be charged to gas. The bulk of this item includes rent and fuel.

Mr. FLINT. I can quite understand the item after that explanation, but the impression from the Auditor General's Report would be that these expenses were incurred in the district, and not by officers travelling from headquarters at Ottawa.

Inspection of Staples..... $3,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How much of this was spent last year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The same vote has been taken, I believe, since Confederation. Last year there was $2,100 spent.

Mr. McMULLEN. We had it stated here a few evenings ago that some firm in Ottawa got as much as $400 or $500 for inspecting flour tendered for supply to the Indians. In what way was this money spent?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We do not inspect the flour. It is inspected by officers appointed upon the authority of the boards of trade. The samples are purchased through the secretaries of the boards of trade, and they draw on the account here to pay for the purchase of the samples.

Adulteration of Food..... $25,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What portion was spent last year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. $23,259. There is an analyst appointed at each of the following places: Winnipeg, London, Toronto, Ottawa, Quebec, St. John and Halifax. They are appointed by the Government; they get fees for the analyses made by them, and their income depends on the number of analyses they make.

Mr. FRASER. Are they required to make any inspection of the food sold in these various cities, or only to make an analysis?

Mr. COSTIGAN. They have no authority to select the samples; but from information obtained here they are required to send out food inspectors —officers who go around and gather samples of certain classes of food or drugs. These are brought to the analyst of the district, who makes an analysis and reports to headquarters. With this vote we could not undertake to have every article of food and drugs inspected and analysed, but we do all that can be done with this amount.

Mr. FRASER. Certainly; but what information is given in order that the results may be made practical?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Bulletins are published showing the results of the analyses, and the newspapers copy the bulletins and spread the information very generally. The result has shown very great adulteration in some lines of goods, such as baking powders, common black pepper, and coffee, and less in other lines. The law imposes penalties, but until lately we found the law a little lame, and we were non-suited in some cases; but last year the law was amended, and I think we shall hereafter be in a better position to prosecute.

Mr. FRASER. I do not think the Government should depend upon the enterprise of the newspapers to give information of this kind to the public. Such information is of the greatest possible importance to consumers, and if the analyst simply makes the analysis, and then leaves it to the enterprise of the newspapers to publish it, the result will not be of very much service. Should not the Government make reports of that kind as open as possible, and secure the spread of the information by the distribution of the bulletins? What is the use of the bulletins unless there is a method by which any person who wants the information can get it? We all know that bulletins may issue by the thousand, but if they are not practically used, the result will be worthless. I consider this a matter of very great importance to the people of this country, especially now when our cities are growing larger, and the Government should be alive to see that not only the sellers of goods, but all purchasers should have this information; and we should be looking forward to the time when we shall have

in this country results such as those achieved in England, so that all purchasers will feel safe in purchasing goods from the data supplied by the Government.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Of course, I cannot undertake to say that I will see that these bulletins are printed and distributed all over the country, which would entail a great expenditure. But I will have a larger number of bulletins printed and distributed amongst the members, so that they may send them to their constituents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What steps does the hon. gentleman propose to take to punish persons who introduce injurious substances into food?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The law provides that they shall be prosecuted, and punished by fine, and also by imprisonment in some cases. I think that the amendment made in the law last session gives us power to proceed vigorously.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What have you done since last session?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No gross cases have come under my notice since last session. The introduction of substances injurious to health will expose a man to prosecution; or an article of food may be adulterated in the sense of depreciating its value, without its being injurious to health. Or an ingredient may be introduced, necessary for the shipment, that does not affect the quality; but in that case I think it has to be stated. If any adulteration takes place which is injurious to health the parties are liable to prosecution. The analyst has reported in some cases adulteration by substances injurious, but not in a very high degree. We took proceedings in several cases, some years ago, but we were non-suited, and we had the law amended so as to give us the necessary power.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand it is the intention of the Government, and a very proper intention, to proceed rigorously when any case is brought under their notice of adulteration of food in such a way as to render it injurious.

Mr. COSTIGAN. On notice being given, the department is prepared to prosecute. Otherwise, we might as well not have the law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As regards the other cases, possibly the process of advertising them will bring the parties to their senses, but their names should be always published. I am not sure that that has always been the case.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is being done now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that the chief advertising done by the hon. gentleman was in the *Canadian Mining Review*, amounting to $234, under the head of adulteration of food. One would think that was hardly the best paper in which to advertise this matter.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Perhaps I have been a little remiss in that. It was not my intention to allow an advertisement of that kind to remain so long, though I must admit it was there through my authority.

Mr. McMULLEN. What advertising was done in the Ottawa *Citizen* for $75?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Something in the same line, or of weights and measures; I do not know which.

Mr. FRASER. Is it necessary there should be more advertising in Ottawa than elsewhere? Is there more adulteration here than in a city like Montreal?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It was not the analysis that was published: it was the regulations.

Mr. FRASER. That would show it was more necessary to put the Act in operation here than elsewhere.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Perhaps so.

Mr. FRASER. Do I understand there is a worse state of things in Ottawa than elsewhere?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is the hon. gentleman's interpretation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I really think the results of the analyses should be published in the interests of the consumers, with the names of the parties.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The names are published now in these bulletins, and these are published in the newspapers of every locality. I will try and go a little further, and have a larger number of bulletins published and distributed to the members, who may distribute them in their localities.

Mr. DAVIN. I would suggest that an arrangement might be made with the papers throughout the country to publish the information at a rate that would barely cover the cost of setting the type. Very often these bulletins are thrown aside in the newspaper offices and not considered of sufficient interest to publish, but if the arrangement I suggest were made we would secure their publication at a nominal cost.

Mr. FRASER. I think those newspapers which already receive such a large amount from the Government ought to do that little work without any extra charge. I do not think they should be paid even at the rate mentioned by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

Mr. COSTIGAN. We do not propose to pay. It would cost too much.

Mr. FRASER. It is in the interests of the consumers to know where they can get the best food. The Minister has said that the papers publish these bulletins.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I said that they generally do.

Mr. FRASER. Now, I understand from a prominent journalist that is not the case. I am certain I never saw the name published of a single individual who was to be shunned by the purchasers.

Mr. FLINT. This matter is much more difficult than it appears. The papers will not publish this information. In the first place, it is not interesting to the public, and, in the second place, the papers are not anxious to publish the names of individuals in any community, because that would place them in an embarrassing position with regard to their own subscribers and the community. I think that a great deal of consideration should be given to this by the department, if they wish to have this important information distributed generally throughout the country. I am not at present prepared with any suggestion, further than that a larger number of bulletins should be printed and placed in a large number of hands, and, perhaps, sugestions might be asked from persons in regard to this subject. I have always read these bulletins with interest, and have desired to see them in the

press; but, as a rule, they do not appear there, for the reasons I have given.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have received some of the bulletins sent out from the analyst's office, and, lately, I have paid some slight attention to them, and I must do the Government the justice to say that the names of the parties who manufacture the articles are appended in the bulletins, but I have never found any one outside of members of Parliament furnished with those bulletins. I read a good many newspapers pretty carefully, and I have never seen the public attention called to the fact that this adulteration is going on. I would ask the Government if they intend to take any steps to punish the fraud of adulteration. I remember last year getting the report of the public analyst on the manufacture of mustard, and it was fearful to see the ingredients that were put in to make up the bulk and the weight. In many cases those ingredients were harmless, but they were utterly worthless; in other cases they were doubtful, and in the other cases they were positively injurious; but I have yet to learn that the Government have taken any steps towards punishing the perpetrators of these frauds. If a farmer were to sell a firkin of butter with a stone in the centre of it, he would be sent to the penitentiary. Is it fair for these manufacturers to put a large percentage of worthless material in a valuable article and sell it as genuine? If I remember aright, I think there was 40 per cent. of worthless matter in some of these samples of mustard. That is a serious matter, and it is the duty of the Government—and it is the only use I can see in having a public analyst—to see that this wrong is rectified, and that the innocent purchasers get the article they desire to purchase. I hope the Government will seriously consider this matter and will give greater publicity to the reports.

Mr. FRASER. When the Government, after the analysis is made, find the article of a first-class character, do they give a certificate or get the manufacturer to put something in his advertisement or on the package to show that it has been analysed by the Government officer?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The manufacturer can have a copy of the result of the analysis on application.

Mr. FRASER. But take mustard, for instance: if the Government find one sample of mustard is good and another not so good, do they compel the manufacturer to state what the character of the manufactured article is, so that any person may know what he is buying?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman had been here for two or three sessions he would be aware of the difficulty of dealing with these questions. We cannot compel a man to brand his goods in a particular way, but there is another law which prevents a man from branding any goods as pure if they are not, or canned goods, for instance, as having more in the cans than they actually contain. That would be a fraud, and would be punishable. The hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) says he is afraid that the Government have not taken steps to punish parties who are shown to have adulterated articles containing ingredients which are injurious to health. We endeavoured to do that, but we were non-suited, because the courts held that there was a defect in the law, and that we could not enforce it until it was amended. The intention is to punish adulteration wherever it occurs, and we mean that this vote of $25,000 shall be expended in the interests of the public. If any frauds are committed it is the duty of my department to see that they are punished, and it is my intention to do so.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that $7,056 is expended for salaries at Ottawa. What is the extent of the staff? Does it include Mr. Code, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Bowman and others? What is the staff at Ottawa composed of?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is the chief analyst, Mr. Macfarlane; there are two assistants, one laboratory clerk, and in this district one food inspector. As I have explained before, the food inspector in each district, in the interests of economy, is not selected for that purpose alone, but some officer whose duty is outside is paid a certain proportion out of that vote and the balance out of Excise. The salaries of these men for food inspection are charged in that bulk sum, because they are not otherwise chargeable. That is why the amount swells up to $7,000, because that includes the payments made to all the food inspectors throughout the Dominion.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why is it necessary to keep outside stations? Are not all the samples sent to Ottawa for analysis?

Mr. COSTIGAN. A great many samples are sent to Ottawa, but the outside stations were established before the chief office was established here. It is true that it might all be centred here, but I think it is more in the interest of the public that, where the analysis can be made by a reliable and competent man in the large centres, it is better than to send them here, particularly in warm weather.

Mr. McMULLEN. Of course, there are some cases where, perhaps, in transit, a certain character of stuff might suffer deterioration, but my impression is that if you conducted the entire analyses at Ottawa it would be much better than having it done by these men scattered at outside stations. I think you should either abolish the establishment at Ottawa or these outside offices. I cannot see how you can make them work together. We will suppose that you have an analyst at Toronto who may inspect an article of coffee, and he will give that article a certain character, according to its ingredients. Now, the manufacturer of that coffee may get for that particular brand of coffee something that he would not get if he sent it here to be analysed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman is speaking without full information. The sample of coffee is sent to the analyst at London for analysis, and the result of that analysis is sent to the department here, and the chief analyst goes through it and examines it to see whether it is a *bonâ fide* test of the ingredients. The hon. gentleman must not be under the impression that this adds to the expenditure, because the analysts are not salaried officers. They get regular fees on each sample.

Mr. McMULLEN. In the first place, the analyst makes an analysis in London, and then sends the result of his investigation to the head office here, where a test is made by the chief analyist. Now, a fee is paid to the man in London, and at

the same time we are keeping an additional staff of officers here further to investigate the results of the analysis that takes place in London.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We have applications from every town in the country, and we are trying to keep down the expense as much as possible.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not think the Minister gave any reason why the *Canadian Mining Review* should be patronized to the extent of $234 a year in advertising. This *Review* is a monthly paper published in Ottawa; it circulates principally amongst miners and the manufacturers of mining machinery; it has no general circulation amongst the public who are interested in the analysis of food. Why should this paper be selected to receive $234 worth of patronage from this department, when the public are really not benefited at all by these advertisements. You are paying this paper about $20 a month for advertising for that one department alone. I see that the paper is largely patronized by nearly all the departments of the Government—whole half pages of advertisements—the Intercolonial Railway, mining regulations, North-West Mounted Police, money orders, and everything of that kind. Now, it appears to me that the Government do not advertise this branch of the public service in this paper for the purpose of benefiting the public, but for the purpose of sustaining this newspaper—that can be the only reason. Why should that amount of money be spent on this paper? There is no advertisement in any other Canadian newspaper except the *Citizen*.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have no objection to state that the item is more than I expected, though it is done with my authority, of course, because my authority had to be given for the insertion of any advertisement. When I gave authority for this advertisement I had no idea it would be used to such a large extent. It has exceeded my expectations. The hon. gentleman is right in calling my attention to it. I will take good care that it is not repeated, and the hon. gentleman will have no reason to complain again. We have had numerous claims from all over the country for advertising without authority. Nearly every paper in the Dominion has inserted that advertisement without any authority, and their claims amount to over $5,000, which, of course, we shall not pay, because they were not authorized.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This paper did not insert it without authority?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; I admit it had my authority, but I had no idea the advertising would run up to that amount.

Ordnance Lands.. .... $3,605

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice in that expenditure an unusually large sum appears to have gone for legal expenses; so far as I can see, close on to $3,000 of this amount seems to have gone for legal expenses, as appears by C—275 of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not recollect to what those items refer in the Auditor General's Report, but I think they are some eighteen months old. Out of this item, I am asking for $2,500 for legal expenses. Whether the cases we have on hand are those the charge refers to I cannot say.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are there no officers here who can give you the information?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They were here all the afternoon, but I don't see them now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Justice may possibly know something about it. I find here charges like these: J. S. Hall, $264; Kingsmill, Symons, Torrance & Miller, $1,000; Charles Moss, $200; D. O'Connor, $691.20; C. Robinson, $500; making in all, as I say, nearly $3,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The greater part of the expenditure is for services in connection with the claims on the Government by the heirs of the Sparks Estate in the City of Ottawa, where they claim a large tract of ordnance land, and the suit is a very heavy one indeed. For instance, the payment to the firm of Kingsmill, Symons, Torrance & Miller is in connection with the dispute between the Ontario and Federal Governments relating to the chain reserve along the Niagara River. It has always been considered and disposed of as ordnance lands, but it is claimed by the Provincial Government as public lands of the province, and they have sought to eject our tenants from it. A suit is now going on with a view to settle the title.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the property claimed by the Sparks Estate cover?

Mr. DEWDNEY. All the land outside of 100 feet on each side of the canal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does it cover any buildings?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There may be buildings on it now; I do not know; I expect there are some buildings on it. It is all the land outside of 100 feet on each side of the canal for its whole length through the Sparks estate. I do not know what the width on each side is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not any property in regard to which we have parted with the title?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; it still remains in the Crown.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand it, the Sparks Estate do not claim the land within 100 feet each side of the canal bank, but the excess.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is as I understand it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What have you done with respect to that? Has it been leased?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A very small portion of it is in my department, the bulk of it being under Railways and Canals.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In case the suit should go against the Government, are we likely to be let in for more than the value of the land? Is it a case in which numerous leases have been granted by the Government, which might involve counter litigation on the part of tenants of the Government, or is it simply an attempt to get hold of some vacant land still in the hands of the Government?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not in a position to answer that question. I will obtain the information.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see there are payments to a person named Wilson, made for commission for

collecting certain amounts. How is it this man receives this commission?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Commission is paid to land agents who collect amounts due for ordnance lands.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do you anticipate spending as large an amount for legal expenses next year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We are asking $2,500. We are also asking $250 for commissions. It is proposed to sell some of the property at Grand Falls, Fort Erie, and elsewhere.

Mr. McMULLEN. The legal expenses are very high.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The cases are very important, and this sum is principally retainers to Mr. Christopher Robinson, in both cases $1,000 each.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Government have an item of $1,000 for survey of Logan's farm, at Montreal. I should like to know what the area of the land is, and what we propose to do with it? Has the land been sub-divided into lots, or what is the policy of the Government with respect to it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I forget the total acreage, but there are 400 or 500 lots. They have been surveyed and staked out on the ground; $1,000 represents the cost of that survey. A portion of the land has been sold, and the balance will probably be sold this fall.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Are all the sales of ordnance lands made at public auction?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; they have to be so; the law provides for that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. My information is that some ordnance lands on the Rideau Canal have been sold at private sale.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a provision that after lands have been leased for a certain number of years they can be sold at a valuation.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Have any sales of ordnance lands been made on the Rideau Canal lately by private sale?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No sales have been made on the Rideau Canal to my knowledge since I have had charge of the department—yes; I think a sale has been made of a small strip during my time, three or four miles out of town—I think a triangular strip.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Near Billings Bridge?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It was in that direction.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. On what terms was the sale made?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It was made on a valuation at the rate of about $175 per acre.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who was the purchaser?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think Mr. Wallace.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Mr. Wallace, a member of the House?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. A brother of Mr. Wallace, a member of the House?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know; he might be.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. My information is that the sale of the property was made to Mr. Wallace, a brother of Mr. Wallace, the member for West York, and that a private sale was made of the property. If this is a fact—I do not say it is a fact, but I am informed it is so—that a valuable strip of land was sold to Mr. Wallace on the Rideau Canal near Billing's Bridge in order that a piece of land he had there might be rendered complete, I think we are entitled to some information with regard to the price paid for the land, and the reason why the Government saw fit to depart from the usual course and make a deed for this ordnance land at a valuation for this Mr. Wallace, and take it out of the ordinary course of business. Why did they not put it up to public competition, as was done with other public lands?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is not an unusual occurrence. I recollect it is a small strip of land, at one end about 150 feet in width, running down to a point, stretching in front of property which had been purchased by this Mr. Wallace from the owner. The owner had leased this little triangular piece between the road and his property. This is the piece which was sold. I do not think there was an acre. There was nothing unusual. Other sales of similar character have been made where long leases have been held.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How much was contained in the piece, and the price?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not recollect, but I do not think it was an acre. At one end it was 100 odd feet, and at the other end about nothing; what the length was I do not recollect.

Mr. McMULLEN. Surely, the Minister does not pretend to say that $175 is the price of an acre of land at Billings' Bridge, at the boundary of the city, and close to the electric cars.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know whether the land was at Billings' Bridge, but the price was considered a very fair price.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who made the representation and fixed the price?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Mills, our agent for ordnance lands.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was there any information given to the parties owning property in that vicinity that the Government desired to sell that particular property?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; it was of value to nobody else except to the owner of the land.

Mr. McMULLEN. It may have been of great value to Mr. Wallace, and no doubt it is, because it bears to his piece of property the same relation that a man's nose does to his face, according to the description the Minister has given, and it was highly desirable that he should have it. It is rather singular that an exception should be made in the case of this particular property, and it being sold to the brother of the sitting member bears rather a suspicious aspect all through. I think we should know the extent of the property and the actual value of it. The Minister says a person from the department made the valuation, but that, in my opinion, would be a one-sided valuation, knowing the fact of Mr. Wallace's interest, and everything connected with it. It would hardly be a satisfactory valuation to the country, anyway.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can get you the full particulars. There was about three-quarters of an acre in it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Could the Minister say when the sale was made?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That I do not recollect; but I think it was made last fall.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That makes the sale a little more noticeable, because you see the electric railway runs quite close to this property now, and it makes the property much more valuable than it was before.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think it was known that the electric railway was going to be built when this was bought. I did not know it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The electric railway has been in contemplation for the last year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think so.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think if I remember aright negotiations were entered into about a year ago with Mr. Howland, of Toronto, and when he failed to complete the negotiations the present company got it. I think the Minister should bring us down all the particulars with regard to this sale, because it has a very suspicious look. It may be all right, but at the present time it has a very suspicious look.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will bring all the information down.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister says that the ordnance lands can be disposed of in this way, provided they are first put up for sale by auction.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I said that where long leases have been held of property they are sold on valuation.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who held the lease of this land and when did it expire?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The leaseholder, as far as I can recollect, was a man called Williams, and he had it for a good number of years.

Mr. McMULLEN. Had his lease expired?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is Mr. Wallace in possession of the property now?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know. I do not know whether the title deeds have been issued.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was it sold subject to the existing lease?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think not, because it was sold out and out.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then there was no person in possession of the property when it was sold.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; Mr. Williams was.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the Minister bring down the information as to whether the lease had expired or not?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Perhaps it may not be in order, but I think it is as well that we should know what the party paid for the adjoining property. No doubt when the Minister arranged to sell this property to Mr. Wallace he made enquiries as to the price of the adjacent property, and this being the closest property to the ordnance land sold to Mr. Wallace, he would no doubt instruct his officer to enquire what Mr. Wallace had paid for this land, so as to fix the price on the ordnance land sold to Mr. Wallace to complete his property. If the Minister has that information I would like him to bring it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know anything about the transaction between Mr. Wallace and the party who sold the property adjoining. If I can, I will get the value of the adjacent property, so that you will have a guide in that way.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Could the Minister state if the party who held the lease on the property was given the refusal of it before it was sold?

Mr. DEWDNEY. My recollection is that the leaseholder did not apply to purchase it at any time. However, I will bring down all the information with regard to it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The reason I ask the question is that if there is such a clause in the Act, that ordnance land which has been held under lease can be sold without being submitted to auction, the intention of the Act has evidently been not to disturb those who are in possession of the land, if it can be avoided. That could be the only intention when the Act was passed. In this case it seems that the man who held the lease and was in possession of the land was never given a refusal of the land.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think he ever asked for it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The chances are nine out of ten that he did not know the land was going to be sold at all, and he, perhaps, was not aware of what the law was in respect to it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He had a lease of it for thirty years.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That does not alter the condition of the matter in the slightest. The intention of the law evidently is that the man who holds possession of it by lease should have a chance of buying the land, if it is for sale. In this case it was sold to a man who had never held it under lease, and, under the circumstances, it ought to have been put up to auction.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to enlighten the hon. gentleman a little on the point on which he wants information. The man who was the original lessee of the land was offered the land by the Government for one-fourth the money that was actually paid for it later on.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When?

Mr. WALLACE. I think a few years ago. His statement is that the offer was open up to the time he sold the land, and the offer was about one-quarter of the price that the Government afterwards charged. He did not purchase the land, because it was of no use to him, but he paid a small rental for it each year, and assigned the lease which he held over to the person who purchased the land from him. He assigned his lease from the Government of the land in front that he was offered for one-quarter the amount that the Government valuator placed upon it, and which was paid for it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Will the member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who seems to know all about the matter, state how much was paid for

this strip of land, how much land there was, and what was paid for the adjoining property?

Mr. WALLACE. I think how much was paid for the adjoining property is not any of the hon. gentleman's business.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Probably not.

Mr. WALLACE. I might say that the property that was purchased from the Government is a narrow strip of land, perhaps 500 or 600 feet long, coming to a point at one end and reaching 30 or 40 feet in length at the other. It was not worth a dollar to the Government for any purpose whatever. The Government had offered to sell it to the original owner, Mr. Williams, and he refused to buy it. He had it fenced in, and I think he paid $1 a year, or some nominal rent for it. He refused to buy it, but he says he will make an affidavit that he was offered the land lately by the Government, and the next purchasers who came in proposed to buy that piece. Some parties were appointed to fix the value, and they valued it at about four times the original amount asked for it from the occupant; and that amount was paid for it without question.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to say to the hon. gentleman that I had no ulterior motive in asking the question I did. The reason I wanted to know the price of the adjacent land was to ascertain whether the Government got a fair price for this strip or not. I asked the Minister to give the explanation, and when the hon. member for West York commenced to speak I thought he was going to answer the question. But I think the hon. member might give us a little more information in regard to this matter. He might tell us when the purchase of this strip of ordnance land was made, how much was paid for it, and who valued the property for the Government?

Mr. WALLACE. I understood from the Deputy Minister that he got some competent parties to value the land—I cannot tell whom. That value was paid without question.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What was the amount?

Mr. WALLACE. I cannot just remember the amount; it was not very large, because the quantity of land was not very large. The land was entirely useless, so far as the Government were concerned. It was a narrow strip between this property and the road; it was fenced in, and it had been occupied for thirty or perhaps forty years by the previous owner, Mr. Williams.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It may not have been of great value to the Government, but it may have been of great value to the man who owned the adjacent property. The hon. gentleman knows the price that was paid, and if he does not choose to tell us the Minister will give us the information, and if the Minister does not give us the information we will get it in some other way.

Mr. WALLACE. I say I do not remember the exact amount that was paid. I think it was at the rate of about $125 per acre. Perhaps that is not accurate, but it is very close to it. There was a fractional part of an acre, and it was somewhere about that value.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for West York says that the purchaser purchased the right of the lessee as well as the land. Was the right of the lessee purchased before the land or after?

Mr. WALLACE. At the same time, I think. He mentioned that there was a strip inside the fence owned by the Government, of which he had a lease, but of which he had not paid the rental for perhaps three, or four, or five years; but he paid up the rental and transferred the lease and all rights.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Do I understand that this strip of land runs along the canal bank?

Mr. WALLACE. No; it runs between this property and the canal road.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It does not run down to the water?

Mr. WALLACE. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to know from the Minister at what he estimates the value of this Logan's farm property which is now sub-divided, and how much has been realized from the sale that has already taken place?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I gave that information last session, and it is in *Hansard*. I do not now recollect exactly, but I think it is estimated that the whole property would realize between $60,000 and $70,000. But this triangular piece is only a very small portion of the Logan farm proper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You are not selling the whole of the Logan farm?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; only this small triangular piece.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that you are selling at Point Pelee. You had a survey made there.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I understand that at Point Pelee a number of squatters have been on the land for some time and incurred some expenses. There was some difficulty with them, and the deputy went up, taking a surveyor with him, and had the lots surveyed, and came to some understanding with the squatters, but I do not recollect what the result has been.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you going to sell any of that land?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think some offer was made to those parties that by paying so much for the survey, and so much for each lot, they would get the title, but I do not remember exactly what it was.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not certain of the extent of land which the Government own there; but I should think, unless there are stronger reasons than I have heard or can imagine, that it would be an improvident thing to part with the ownership of that land to these squatters. Give them leases if you like, but I think the ownership should be retained. I would like to know the total extent of the Government property there?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is a small strip along the water.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was it not held as a protection to the harbour?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It runs out into the lake. I think it is occupied by fishermen. I fancy that it has no special value.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you sure, because it is not likely the ordnance would have

selected it without some special reason? I would not at all object to the Government leasing these lands. That is often done with ordnance property; but, as a rule, where ordnance property of this kind was directed to be reserved, it was for some special reason, either for the purpose of controlling some harbour of refuge or some other reason, and the property is usually of some value, and should not be disposed of without good cause.

Dominion Lands—Commissioner's salary. $5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this question of expenses in connection with Dominion lands wants a complete overhauling and thorough criticism. I knew this expenditure existed when the Minister took office, but he has not made any very decided effort to reduce it. I have always stated that I believe the Land Board at Winnipeg is altogether unnecessary. From our experience with regard to the settlement of claims by that board, when a third party is dissatisfied and appeals the appeal is sent to Ottawa. It is like sending a case from one court to another. I think the salary of $5,000 to Mr. Smith is an extravagant salary. If the hon. gentleman will take up the receipts and expenditures on North-West lands last year he will find that the expenses amounted to $440,000, and the entire receipts to $465,000, including the receipts from ranche grants, coal mines, timber limits, &c. All these receipts have been actually consumed, with the exception of a few thousand dollars, by salaried officers in the North-West, by the Land Board at Winnipeg, by the outside service, and the officers in the City of Ottawa. When we consider the fact that we were promised by the High Commissioner that by the year 1891 we would be receiving something like $58,000,000 from our lands, this result shows a very miserable contrast, and affords a very poor prospect of our ever getting out of the country the money we have expended on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. I entirely disagree with the hon. gentleman regarding the Land Board at Winnipeg. Every hon. gentleman who has been in this House for a number of years past must know that before that Land Board was established there there was a constant stream of letters coming from that country to members here asking to have claims settled, and owing to the distance and other circumstances it was almost impossible to get a claim finally adjusted. Now that the Land Board has been established we hear no more of these claims, but the people deal directly with the board. There is not one application sent here now for every ten that used to be sent previously. I have not received one for three or four years, whereas before the Land Board was established they came to me by the dozen, and I could get little or no satisfaction. On writing to parties who have had anything to do with the Land Board, I have been told by them that it has given the greatest satisfaction, and that it was the most important change the Government had made in connection with the management of land in that country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to give a little idea of the expenses in connection with this matter. I hold a statement prepared from the Auditor General's Report, which shows the following expenditures in the year 1889-90:—

Salaries, Interior Department, at Ottawa	$ 77,771.01
Outside service	36,765.56
Contingencies, at Ottawa	17,419.52
Dominion Land Board at Winnipeg, officers of the Crown Timber, Registry officers	152,699.01
Dominion lands—Capital	133,998.45
Banff Springs	19,767.93
	$438,521.48

Adding the Minister's salary of $7,000, makes a total of $445,521.48. The entire receipts from all sources, including sale of lands, timber limits, coal mines, &c., last year, is shown on page E—106 to be $462,322.26. That leaves about $16,800 of a balance to the credit of Dominion lands, and that is a very poor showing when compared with the promises that were made as to the receipts from this department. There are some of these men in registry offices who are not receiving in fees one-fourth of their salary. I observed that there was one man receiving a salary of $1,200, and the entire fees of his office, according to the Auditor General's Report of last year, only amounted to $250. The entire fees collected in the North-West do not anything like pay the expenses of the registry offices. There are a number of officials there that I think could be well done without, and if the Minister would make a thorough investigation of the offices which are filled by people sent up from here I have no doubt he could make a great reduction in the expenditure. That country was described by the leader of the Opposition, some years ago, who is not the leader at present, as a happy hunting ground for friends of the Government who could not find any other resting place for the soles of their feet. I know many who are there virtually doing nothing but drawing their salaries.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I would like to disabuse the hon. gentleman's mind in regard to the amounts received from the registry offices now. It is true that in one of the districts, Battleford, the salary paid is larger than that paid on any of the other districts, but Mr. Scott, who was the original registrar, there and who was the only one in the North-West for a number of years, has had his district reduced in size by the opening of other districts. The receipts for East Saskatchewan were $928.79 in 1889-90, and $2,021.37 in 1890-91; in Assiniboia, $4,657.42 in 1889-90 and $5,353.56 in 1890-91; in North Alberta, $443.86 in 1889-90 and $633.83 in 1890-91; in South Alberta, $4,185.36 in 1889-90, and $5,548.58 in 1890-91.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the expenditure in North Alberta?

Mr. DEWDNEY. $1,600 for the registrar; that is the total expense there. In South Alberta the expense is $3,060, leaving a balance of over $2,500 there. So the revenue there is increasing, and is very largely in excess of what the office costs. As to the general revenue, there is no douht that it has not come up to our expectation, but there is one reason for that which I can give and for which I am to a certain extent responsible, because it lies more or less within my power to enforce the payments for pre-emptions. The amount now owing for pre-emptions is something over $3,000,000, upon which 6 per cent. is being drawn. For the past two or three years especially very small amounts have been paid upon pre-emptions, and I have not felt justified in forcing the settlers. I

have no doubt that, after the crops which we anticipate this year, the returns from that source will astonish even the hon. gentleman himself, because these people are willing to pay if they have the money, and it is understood that, with the good crop we have anticipated this year, they will be called upon to pay without fail. If I had pressed them, no doubt I could have made a better showing, but I thought it better to deal leniently with them, rather than, by closing on them, to drive settlers out of the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why is it necessary to give the man at Battleford $2,000, when the others only get $1,200?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Scott was the first registrar in the North-West, and he was appointed by Mr. Mackenzie's Government at that salary. When we came to divide up the districts he was retained, and we felt that we could not reduce his salary.

Mr. McMULLEN. When he was appointed, I suppose the cost of living was much higher there than it is now. I do not care who appointed him, they gave him too much. Now, I suppose he can live as cheaply there with the railway facilities there as he could anywhere else, and when the duties of the office are reduced his salary should be reduced also to the amount paid to the others.

Mr. FRASER. The question of salaries is a small one compared with the other matter, and I would ask the Minister how much he expects to receive for lands during the year which has just closed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The revenue will be $454,185.19.

Mr. FRASER. Will that amount be largely on sales made previous to the year just closed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is the revenue on account of Dominion lands, including sales of lands and timber dues.

Mr. FRASER. I want to know the revenue from the sale of lands to actual settlers for agricultural purposes?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have got the return here, but I cannot give it without adding it up.

Mr. FRASER. It seems to me that the amount expended for surveys is out of all proportion to the amount of land sold, and the amount of money received. While it may have been necessary to make all these surveys, I am bound to say there appears to have been more attention given to surveys and to paying surveyors than to settling the country. It is a serious question, in view of the census, as to what can be done for people in that vast country. The Minister ought to know whether anything can be done more than has been done. But the amount of money expended in proportion to the results is out of all conscience. There has been an extraordinary amount of surveying for the result. How long is this to go on? How much land is yet to be surveyed? The sum chargeable to income this year is $145,000, and the sum chargeable to capital $100,000, within a fraction of a quarter of million dollars. Are the results commensurate with the expenditure? Are we to look forward to no better results in the future? If the immigration policy has failed, then there should be a curtailing here, until such time as we adopt some better method to get settlers to the North-West. I know it may be a question on which there may be a good deal of difference of opinion as to the methods to be pursued, but there ought to be no difference of opinion as to the amount of money we are now spending for the results. The idea of spending $250,000 when the income is only $400,000, and that upon sales made long ago, is absurd. I suppose the amount actually received from lands sold to *bonâ fide* settlers does not amount to $250,000. For my part, I think that if there is no other method of peopling the North-West we had better give the lands to anybody and everybody who go there. *Bonâ fide* settlers are worth more than the money we are receiving to-day. Let the Government throw the whole country open, and invite settlers from every part of the world, and give them the land.

Mr. SPROULE. We have been doing that for a long time.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are millions of acres waiting now.

Mr. FRASER. Millions that nobody can get, because they are so much tied up by corporations. If the whole country was thrown open settlers would go there.

Mr. TROW. On page D—136 of the Auditor General's Report I notice that the homestead inspection is costing very high. There is J. J. Arsenault, who has a salary of $1,200; living allowance, 266 days, at $1.50; horse, 361 days, at 50 cents, total, $579.50; harness and whip, $24.10; buck-board cushion, $3; horse hire, $8.50, besides many other articles for his office.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Arsenault is a homestead inspector, and his business keeps him continually on the move; in fact, it is with difficulty that the homestead inspectors we have now are able to keep pace with the work. At one time we allowed them to find their own horses and paid them so much for their keep. Now we provide them with horses, and $1.50 a day for living expenses for the homestead inspector, and 50 cents a day for his horse. After a good deal of experience, we came to the conclusion that that was a very reasonable allowance.

Mr. TROW. I am surprised at the charge of 361 days for the horse. He must have been working over hours, or nights. Or are the years longer out there than here?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I fancy he got in a few days on the previous year.

Mr. WATSON. If the hon. gentleman was acquainted with the facts he would know that this inspector had his own horse, and charged the Government for his keep all the year round.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That might have been the case, but if it had been a Government horse he would have been allowed 50 cents a day for keep, just the same.

Mr. WATSON. Do not some of those inspectors furnish their own horses?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; we find all their horses.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the expenses incurred by these homestead inspectors are altogether more than is necessary. I know something of the way they act. A homestead inspector in the North-West goes to make inspection of a property; the

party that is on it is very glad to see him, and will treat him to the best in the house, and will feed the horse, and all that sort of thing, without its costing the inspector a farthing. They do that in nine cases out of ten, and every inspection they make costs them little or nothing. In my opinion, it is absurd. I know perfectly well that some of them put in the year spending but very little. Their $2 and their salary are almost clear gain, because it does not cost them anything to drive around through the country. The people for whom they inspect land are very glad to see them. I myself, when in the North-West, travelled considerably with one of these inspectors—a very decent, respectable man—but still, I know it was his experience, because I was along with him, and had an opportunity of learning how they got along.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend must be aware that every homestead inspector in the North-West has not a companion so fascinating as my hon. friend. If every homestead inspector was accompanied by a companion such as my hon. friend, I have no doubt he could travel gratis. But he mistakes the North-West settler very much if he thinks that every homestead inspector can go around the country for nothing. I have been looking at these rates here: I know something of the expense of travelling round the country, and I think the rates are moderate. Take this horse, for which we pay him 50 cents a day. I do not see any difficulty in a horse travelling during 361 days of the year. If the men who travel long distances get horses to go around the country at 50 cents per day it is very cheap, because one of the common incidents of our life in the North-West is that of finding your horse, when on the open plain, far away from a veterinary surgeon, with an attack of colic, and you soon find him on his back with his hoofs to the stars. In regard to this item, I think the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is super-hypercritical. Generally he is hypercritical, but he has surpassed himself to-night; his chief fault was that he was too modest, and he did not know the benign influence that made that homestead inspector travel at such a cheap rate.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Speaking of the number of days, there is a lady out there who worked 365 days. She was not paid as well as the horse.

Mr. WATSON. I do not agree entirely with the member for West Assiniboia. The inspector receives $1.50 per day and 50 cents for his horse, and he can make a little money out of that allowance of $2 per day. As a rule, the inspectors are well treated by the settlers in the districts through which they travel, and the allowance is a liberal one. How many inspections were made last year by the inspectors? What are the returns from the inspections? I am aware the inspectors made a charge of $10 for an inspection; it was formerly $5. I have yet to learn that any person has received a receipt for the $10 so paid.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman does not pretend that the homestead inspectors put the money in their pockets.

Mr. WATSON. I am asking for information.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is paid into the treasury.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) must be mistaken. I should like to ask the Minister, for my own information, if the inspector takes the fee? As I understand it, the fee for the inspection is paid at the office.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The fees all go into the office. The fees have over-paid the inspectors $9,000 this year.

Mr. WATSON. Is the fee not paid to the inspector when he inspects the land?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; and every week he makes a return to the head office.

Mr. WATSON. Are receipts supposed to be given for all moneys paid to the Government?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I suppose so.

Mr. WATSON. I am informed the inspectors do not give a receipt.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Can you give me the name of any?

Mr. WATSON. I think I can. I want to know the system that is followed in regard to this inspection fee.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If the parties go to the office they pay the fee there. If they go to the inspector they pay the fee to him. He accounts for every dollar he gets. I presume no man who asks for an inspection and pays $10 would do so without taking a receipt. If anything of the kind suggested had happened, we would have had it reported, and it would have come under the eyes of the head office.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think it follows that the hon. gentleman would hear of it either from the head office or from individuals. If an inspection was made, and a patent was recommended, the person receiving his patent for his homestead would not care whether he got a receipt or not. My information came by correspondence this session, and the party complained bitterly at the Government exacting $10 instead of $5, the former fee. The hon. Minister has stated that the fees more than pay the cost of inspection, and I would therefore suggest that the fee be reduced to $5 as formerly. I was also asked if I would find out how the returns were made and if the inspector was supposed to give a receipt, because the person communicating with me was under the impression that when the inspector charged $10 instead of $5 he pocketed the $5.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We cannot prevent people having suspicions of that kind. When an inspection is made it is for the purpose of ascertaining if an entry can be given for that particular quarter-section. There is a practical check, because the head office knows if the inspection has been made and the fee paid. The inspection has to be made before the entry can be given.

Mr. WATSON. A person may go to an inspector and invite him to inspect his homestead before communicating with the head office. The inspection is made. The inspector might report the inspection or not. In a good many cases reports were made which were not favourable, and still the fee was charged.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman should know that no result would come from the inspection if no report was made. The object is to make a report to the land agent, who would send to his office the application for a patent. There

would be no object in making an inspection, if there was no report made to the land agent. There is a check on the inspectors.

Mr. WATSON. That is what I am complaining of. He pays $10 for his inspection, and his inspection may not be approved of, and he does not get his patent. He probably has to wait two or three years, and, when he wants to know the reason why the patent is not forthcoming, he communicates with the department. Sometimes the settlers are not anxious to get their patents, and they make their application to the inspector when he comes around that way.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They cannot do that. They must make their application to the land agent.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice at page D--135, of the Auditor General's Report, that T. H. Aikman, homestead inspector, gets a salary of $1,200 a year. He also gets living allowance, 264 days at $1.50; horse, 349½ days at 50 cents; two horses, $305; horse hire, $54, and horse feed and stabling, $48.75. How is it that he charges for horse keep, and afterwards for horse hire and stable?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Probably he played out his horse and he had to hire another horse; possibly one horse died and he bought another. I will look up the vouchers to see how that is accounted for.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many homestead inspectors have we?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Seven.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that this man Aikman's expenses come to about $4 a day everything counted. It is a pity he did not play out in place of the horse.

Mr. WATSON. Could the hon. gentleman give us an idea of the number of inspections made by these inspectors?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not that return here.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to have that information because I know that very serious delays occur to persons who are entitled to their patents on account of the Government requiring a report from their inspector before issuing the patent, and these inspectors are not able to get around. It appears to me that with the facilities for travelling in that country now, seven inspectors ought be able to report more promptly than at present on the claims of the applicants.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Sometimes there is a great pressure of work and the delay is accounted for by the small number of inspectors we have. I know that the inspectors are on the road day and night, and that the inspectors are very hard worked men. Complaints may have been made to the office in Winnipeg, but I know that no complaints have been made to me down here. I have known persons to want inspectors to go out in the winter time when it was impossible for them to do so.

Mr. WATSON. Are inspections made in winter?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; in Southern Manitoba, when there is no snow.

Mr. TROW. I notice that W. H. Allison charges $80 for exchange on a buggy, and that the Government had to pay it. That is the price of a buggy altogether.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I suppose he gave $80 and another buggy in exchange.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is right that we should draw to the attention of the Minister the enormous charges for the Land Board at Winnipeg which amounts to over $25,000 altogether. You commence with a janitor at $600 a year; then you have T. R. Burpé, secretary, at $1,800; A. F. Crowe, extra clerk, one year, $850; Dixon, another clerk, $1,050; Dolbear, another extra clerk, 365 days at $3 a day, and the commissioner, H. H. Smith, receiving $5,000 a year. In all you have 26 officials there. Then you have a large sum for contingencies. We have the superintendent of mines, $3,200 a year, and a forestry commissioner, Mr. J. H. Morgan, who gets $2,000 a year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He has been off for a year, and no person has been appointed in his place.

Mr. McMULLEN. I give the Minister credit for that, and I hope that next year he will report a number more as being off. Is the half-breed commissioner still engaged at $2,190 a year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; he has a good deal to do yet.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman agrees to part with his services we will let this item pass now.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That will be hard on the half-breeds. The inspector has a good deal to do yet.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think we have a number of officials there that we could well spare. How many registry offices are there?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Five.

Mr. McMULLEN. You have recently appointed an inspector of registry offices.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He was appointed at the time the Torrens system was put into operation.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is his salary?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He was getting $1,600, and I propose to increase his salary this year to $2,000. He is a first-class officer, his position is a very responsible one, and he has a great deal of work. He not only inspects, but in case of the sickness of a registrar, of which we have had every year more or less, he goes and takes charge of an office, and he is the only person who can do the work of a registrar in case of necessity.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot understand how it is necessary to have an inspector of five registry offices. The Minister admitted to-day that some of them do not pay their own expenses, though I admit that others pay considerably more; but it seems absurd to have this official, whose salary started at $1,400 and is afterwards increased to $2,000 a year. Who is he?

Mr. DEWDNEY. P. M. Barker. He comes from Ontario.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think he is a brother-in-law of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy).

Mr. DEWDNEY. I did not know that.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, I know it. I do not know whether he got the appointment on that ground or not. I see that we paid his travelling expenses from Orangeville to the North-West.

Mr. DAVIN. There is no doubt that this officer is a hard-worked officer. I know him well. He

is an energetic and capable officer, and as the Minister has stated, if one of the registrars becomes ill he has to go and take off his coat and do the work: I have known him to do it. The responsibility is very great, and I do not think $2,000 is too much.

Mr. TROW. On page 132—B, I notice a very remarkable item: "Moving safe, $55; freight and charges, $7.86."

Mr. DEWDNEY. If that is for the commissioner's office, it was in the old post office building at the south end of the town and it was removed to the upper story of the new post office. That is only a surmise of mine.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister will find at page D—134, the following:—P. M. Barker, instructor of registrars, Orangeville to Regina—packing furniture, $10; cartage of furniture, $13; fares, $51.80; Pullman, $16; board of family, $15; freight, $87.50; balance refunded in October, $86.70; in all, $280. So that we paid not only his own expenses, but those of all his family.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think that is the custom, when officials first go to the North-West to take up their permanent residence in the country.

Mr. WATSON. Could there not be agents secured in that territory, without removing them from Orangeville?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know. He was appointed three or four years ago, before my time.

Superintendent of Mines' salary..... $3,200

Mr. McMULLEN. Are you going to continue this man in office?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Oh, yes; Mr. Pierce is a very valuable man.

Mr. WATSON. What are his particular duties?

Mr. DEWDNEY. When the appointment was first made the mining strip along the British Columbia railways was administered by us, and he gave his attention to that as well as to the work of the Land Board in the North-West Territories. That is why he was styled superintendent of mines, but he is used for inspections and all classes of difficulties in the North-West. He is now in the Lake La Biche country settling half-breed claims.

Mr. WATSON. I think the term superintendent of mines is a sort of farce in this case. About how much of his time is occupied in inspecting mines?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know that he has made any inspections of mines last year, nor since we have handed over the property to the British Columbia Government. There are some mines east of the summit of the Rocky Mountains.

Dominion Lands Agents' salaries..... $19,295

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention to have a land agent in the Lake Dauphin district?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We have sent an officer there from the Minnedosa office, and his place is being taken by a clerk from the Winnipeg office.

Mr. WATSON. I think a permanent agent should be located in the Lake Dauphin district, as it is there the homesteaders are now going. The work done at Minnedosa and Birtle and other points is very much reduced, and it would be well to reduce the expenditure in these old places and establish new offices where they are more required.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have looked into the Lake Dauphin matter and may have a permanent agent there.

Mr. McMULLEN. How comes it that there is an increase in this item of $3,800?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is not a real increase. The salary of Mr. E. F. Stephenson, who was Crown timber agent and is now also land agent at Winnipeg, is included in this. We moved Mr. Whitcher from Winnipeg to the office here to do special work here. He was receiving $2,400 and came down at a salary of $1,700. We amalgamated the land office with the Crown timber office and are charging Stephenson's salary to the land office, whereas last year it was charged to the Crown timber office. Stephenson's salary is $2,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many sons has Mr. Rufus Stephenson in the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot tell. The salary of Mr. Stephenson last year was the same, but it was given him as Crown timber agent only. Mr. Nash, who is attached to the land office at Winnipeg, was appointed Dominion lands agent at Kamloops, and his salary is attached to this vote. Then the salaries of Messrs. Hiam and Stephenson were increased $300 each.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. gentleman really think that, in the face of the receipts from the North-West and the enormous expenditure, he is justified in increasing the salaries of officials from $1,400 to $2,000 each?

Mr. WATSON. Are Crown timber inspectors entitled to any portion of the fees from people cutting wood and hay without permission on public lands?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; but there were officers of an inferior grade who got very small salaries and were entitled to some of the fees for cutting hay, &c.

Mr. WATSON. I know of one or two cases where settlers complained of having been fined and their hay seized, after cutting on lands that had been actually homesteaded, but the inspector, not knowing the bounds of the locality, seized the hay and inconvenienced the settlers to a great extent. It was some of the Crown timber inspectors who made the seizure, and I understood that when they made a seizure of that description they got a portion of the fees.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; they do not.

Mr. WATSON. One of the Crown timber agents complains that he has been unfairly treated. If his statement be correct, he has a grievance. Mr. W. B. McLellan, the officer in question, was summoned to give evidence in connection with the St. Catharines milling suit in which the Government were interested. While in the west, on public service, he was paid the regular allowance for travelling expenses, but while residing in Ottawa his claim was refused. Why were his expenses not paid here when he was summoned as a witness, he being a Government officer? Was one of these forest rangers to be summoned here and not to be allowed the fees he would get in the North-West?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He would be entitled simply to witness fees.

Mr. WATSON. These men get $800 or $900 a year and they receive their travelling allowance while they are in the North-West. If they are summoned here, of course their salary would not cease, but why should they not receive their travelling allowance when they are here as witnesses in a case the Government is interested in?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are entitled to the witnesses' allowance. A man is subpœnaed in the cause, and his fees are taxed by the officer of the court.

Mr. McMULLEN. Where did Stephenson live before he went to Winnipeg?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know. I never saw him until he came to Winnipeg.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see we have another Stevenson in Regina.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is an old man of 80 years of age of another family altogether.

Mr. DAVIN. He spells his name with a "v" like Sam Weller.

Crown Timber Agent's salary, New Westminster.....$1,800

Mr. CASEY. In reference to the Dominion lands agent's salary I have something to say.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DENISON). That was carried before the hon. gentleman came into the room. The item now is the Crown timber agent's salary.

Mr. CASEY. I say we are on the other item.

The CHAIRMAN. That was carried before you entered.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister stated that the apparent increase in the Dominion lands agents' salaries was caused by the transfer of an agent from the Crown timber office which would cause a corresponding reduction in the expenditure of that office. Will he explain that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I gave every item of that before the hon. gentleman was in the House.

Salaries of clerks in outside service, forest rangers and land guide service..... $40,827.50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood that the land guide service was to be dispensed with?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; that should be intelligence officers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the intelligence officers?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The only one we have is Robert Doull, of Medicine Hat. He takes settlers around and locates them. As the hon. gentleman knows, there is no land agent between Regina and Calgary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many members of the local Opposition of Ontario are you paying under this head?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Not any of them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What about my friend Metcalfe?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are none paid now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you mean to say that this important official has been dispensed with?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He has been, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to the case of Mr. Black, of Minnedosa, who for some time occupied the position of forest ranger, but his services were dispensed with. He writes me that for some time afterwards he made collections for timber cut in that locality and made returns to the department, but he was never paid anything by the department from the time they ceased to recognize him as an officer, though they continued to receive the moneys collected by him, and he claims he is entitled to some consideration for having made those collections. I would be glad if the Minister would look into his case and make him some allowance for his services.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will look into the matter.

Mr. WATSON. Would not that come under the head of the local gentlemen entitled to a percentage of the fees?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I should think so.

Mr. CASEY. I understood the Minister to say that the land guides had been done away with, and intelligence officers had taken their place, and then that there was only one intelligence officer. How is it that there is no greater reduction after the whole staff of land guides has been dispensed with? How much was paid for the land guides last year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not got that. That would be in the Auditor General's Report of last year; but I think there must have been three or four thousand dollars last year.

Mr. CASEY. I see that Mr. Metcalfe, for the six months that he was employed as immigration agent, received $150 a month, making $900; and as intelligence officer, he received $90 a month, evidently for the same period, because the time during which the intelligence officer is employed, is the same time during which the immigration agent is employed. Mr. Metcalfe was not there in the winter months, at any rate, he had other duties elsewhere; but he has received $1,380 for filling two positions which were incompatible with each other if he discharged them properly. An intelligence officer is not supposed to be bound down to one spot. As immigration agent he ought always to be accessible at his office. An intelligence officer or land guide could go around and show people the country, an immigration agent should be at his office to receive fees, make entries, and all that sort of things. Besides that, I find that Mr. Metcalfe received $98.80 for travelling allowance, and $10 for Pullmans, and living allowance, $5. During those five days that he was away from home, he spent $108 on railway fares, making $1,460 that he received for the six months.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In respect to Mr. Metcalfe, were you in the habit of paying his expenses to and from Kingston?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On what principle was that done?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think he went up once or twice for us. I do not know whether his expenses were paid both summers or not.

Mr. CASEY. I object to the Government coming down east to get men to do work up west and paying their travelling expenses. Now, we have got just as good men in Manitoba to occupy positions as Mr. Metcalfe.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. WATSON. I say yes; men who would be just as attentive to their duties as Mr. Metcalfe; men who know just as much, and probably more, about the country. I say that the Government should not go to the expense of paying travelling expenses of men from Ottawa or Kingston to fill fat offices in the North-West, when just as good men can be found on the spot. I see Mr. Metcalfe was paid for his trip to Winnipeg, $108; living allowance, $12.50. Now, that is one of the needless expenditures, for which there is no excuse.

Travelling expenses of Inspector of Agencies, Homestead Inspectors and Superintendent of Mines; Contingencies of Superintendent of Mines, Land Board, Dominion Lands and Crown Timber Agents, Inspector of Ranches and at head office; special service account, stationery and printing, and Half-breed Claims Commission—expenses	$42,780

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. These seem to be mixed up in all directions.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is the estimate: Travelling expenses, inspector of agencies, $1,800; travelling expenses, superintendent of mines, $1,800, same as last year. Then travelling expenses, land board inspectors, $7,000; contingencies of land board, $2,000. Last year it was $2,700. Contingencies Dominion lands agencies, $8,000; last year it was $9,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you mean by contingencies? What does that cover?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They cover telegrams, stationery and like contingencies. The $1,500 saved in contingencies for Dominion land agencies was on the cost of heating and lighting the land offices in the Department of Public Works. We were in the old post office then, and we had to pay for our own heating. The Public Works Department pays for the heating now in the new post office where we have our offices. Out of this vote it is usual to pay the expenses of transferring clerks from one office to another, according to the volume of business. Travelling expenses are heavy, because our officers are required to be on the move, and they are estimated for separately.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you mean by special service accounts?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is out of this vote for paying the expenses of transferring clerks from one office to another. They are contingencies for Dominion land agencies at New Westminster and Kamloops, in British Columbia, stationery, printing, outside service, Half-breed Claims Commission expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are sitting on the Half-breed Commission?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is only one commissioner, Mr. Goulet. He takes affidavits and declarations with regard to any stray ones that come in.

Mr. WATSON. There is an item here for travelling expenses for E. A. Nash, which appears to be a fair sample, from Banff to Winnipeg. Mr. Nash appeared to go back to Kamloops and the total amount of travelling expenses and cost of moving from Banff to Winnipeg and from Winnipeg to Kamloops, was $607.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Nash was apointed to Banff before I took charge. I found there was very little work for a land agent there, and I moved him back to Winnipeg, where assistance was required. Mr. Bovill had been appointed agent at Kamloops. After receiving the appointment he changed his mind, and when the inspector went over to place him in the office, he refused the position and left the country. Then we sent Mr. Nash, who was one of our old land agents, over to Kamloops.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Bovill was paid $200 expenses to Kamloops, and for 57 days in Ottawa.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He was called here and remained some time to receive instructions. He received his appointment here, and after he went to British Columbia changed his mind.

Mr. CASEY. Was he made to refund the money?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. WATSON. In regard to the inspection of ranches, has the inspector made any report to the effect that some of the ranchmen are not complying with the regulations, and that certain lands held by ranchmen should be thrown open? I am informed that some ranchmen are not complying with the regulations, and are not keeping the full number of cattle on their ranches. In some cases the ranchmen have left the country, and homesteaders are wishing to make entries for some of those lands. When the twenty-one year leases were given, a homesteader wishing to go on some of the lands could not get an entry because he had to get permission of the ranchmen.

Mr. DEWDNEY. All those who do not carry out the conditions have their ranches thrown open for homesteads. I have been continually carrying out this policy, and have been cancelling leases for non-payment of rent, not fulfilling the regulation as regards stock, &c. I have cancelled 30 or 40 leases and thrown the lands open. Settlers are even asking that some of our most important ranches be thrown open. We cannot, however, do an injustice to those men who were induced to come to the country and open up a very valuable and important business, but the whole question of ranches will have to be settled in the near future.

Mr. WATSON, There must be a case which has escaped the hon. gentleman's memory. Within the last three or four weeks I have received a letter from a man who has certainly performed settlement duties—I do not remember the man's name—and he has made repeated applications to the ranchman for permission to make an entry. He is entitled to a patent, I believe, but he cannot get it because the lease has been granted, and the ranchman has left the country. The ranche was taken over, I believe, by another ranch-

ing company for a time. Under the lease given to ranchmen during the last few years, at any time a homesteader can take up land on a ranche.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Under a new lease.

Mr. CASEY. This whole item is of such a nature that it is impossible to discuss it properly. It includes travelling expenses of inspector of agencies, homestead inspector and superintendent of mines, contingencies of superintendent of mines, land board, Dominion lands and Crown timber agents, inspector of lands at head office, special service account, stationery and printing and Half-breed Claims Commission expenses. When the Minister was asked to explain these items in some detail, he was not able to make them clear.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I gave every item.

Mr. CASEY. The statement was read in a very indistinct manner, and the explanations were such that they did not explain. Not only is there a mixing of a great many items, but the heads are given in such a way that it is not possible to trace the expenditure in the Auditor General's accounts. There should be separate items for inspector of agencies, for homestead inspection, and so on. The explanation and statement have not been given with the intention of facilitating enquiry into the accounts for last year and making comparison with the Estimates for the present year. The Minister made one item clear. He estimated this year $1,500 for travelling expenses of superintendent of mines. That gentleman only spent $1,020 last year, and he is probably as economical as anyone could be. I do not see any reason for increasing that estimate. This is not an intentional offence on the part of the Minister, but it is an offence against the propriety of asking for money in this way.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is the same way that the amounts have been voted for years.

Mr. CASEY. This is no excuse. I do not think they were in such a muddled state before. The hon. Minister is supposed to have a special familiarity with the affairs of the North-West, and he no doubt has, and he should be in a position to straighten these matters up and to lay the estimates before the House in a clear and intelligible fashion. It may not be an intentional offence on his part—and I do not think it is—to put an item of this kind before the House, but to ask a large sum of money in this vague way is an evidence of neglect and carelessness.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I gave the information for every single item before you got up to speak.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister seemed to be stuck in the middle of his information and dropped it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I gave you every item.

Mr. CASEY. We cannot take in all those things spoken across the floor of the House *viva voce*. These matters should be put in print and under the same headings as the accounts for previous years, so that we can compare the account for two expenditures.

Mr. DEWDNEY. You will notice there is a saving of $5,000.

Mr. CASEY. I think that a man having the acquaintance with the North-West that the hon. gentleman has, should put the estimates in proper shape.

To pay salaries of extra clerks at head office, Ottawa, advertising, copying, &c... ..... $13,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice there is a large reduction there, but at the same time we are spending too much money, even so.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The saving this year is $22,440. I explained that on the Civil Government Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know there was a considerable addition there, if I mistake not.

Mr. CASEY. There is only a decrease of $14,000 on this item, and not $22,000. If the business of the department in selling lands and so on is increasing so rapidly as to require a large staff of extra clerks, possibly the work could be done more economically by permanently engaging the staff.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The decrease of $22,440 is on the whole item. We are doing away with the extra clerks. There are very few temporary clerks in the department now. There are only about twelve. I think there were about thirteen appointed permanently.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me to have 100 men engaged in the work of the Department of the Interior, is an enormously excessive clerical staff.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That includes the survey branch.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Even so; we are selling very little land now, and, looking at all that we get for it, to have 100 men employed seems an enormous staff.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have reduced the number by 41 since I have taken charge of the department. By using type-writers I have been able to dispense with a number of clerks. We have got rid of our extra clerks. We have kept our best clerks and have got rid of the most worthless ones, and they are all kept at fever heat work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There seems to be a perfect brigade of these people.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a good thing it is perfect.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Judging of certain matters that occurred in another place, a good deal of doubt might arise as to that.

Mr. CASEY. How many of these clerks come under this vote?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There are only thirteen temporary clerks now. Part of this vote is for copying, advertising and so on.

Mr. CASEY. I suppose the hon. gentleman proposes still further to reduce the number by putting some on the permanent staff?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; the change made some time ago has been completed, and all the most worthy of our temporary clerks have been placed on the permanent list, and until vacancies occur we cannot appoint any more.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention of the Minister to make any change in the system of paying the temporary clerks, some by the hour and some by the day?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know that there any work going on at the present time.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention to stop that altogether?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No: we cannot stop it altogether, because it is necessary to be done, and if outside persons are employed, there is no fairer method of paying them for copying than by the folio.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention of the Minister to adopt any system with the view of preventing irregularities such as those that have lately taken place?

Mr. DEWDNEY. As the hon. gentleman is aware, a committee has been appointed to make an investigation, and we have not yet completed our labours; but the matter is under consideration.

Mr. CASEY. I think it would be preferable that all the necessary officials should be placed upon the permanent staff. Some I know have been employed for five or six years as extra clerks, and some of them would be better to be nominally as well as really on the permanent staff of the department.

Mr. WATSON. The Minister stated just now that a Committee was sitting on the irregularities of the Interior Department. I would like to ask him who compose this Committee?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is a sub-Committee of the Privy Council.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 9th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ISLE BIZARD BRIDGE.

Mr. BRODEUR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that he has not answered the question which I put the other day, as to whether the Government were ready to give to the corporation of Isle Bizard the right to erect a bridge on the river there.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I can state to the hon. gentleman that a decision has been arrived at to comply with the request of the petitioners.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH, PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. LANGELIER. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to a very important fact. The term of the Court of Queen's Bench, for the Province of Quebec, is to commence on the 10th of this month, that is to say, to-morrow, and I wish to know if the Government will have appointed a Chief Justice by that time. Two of the judges are on leave of absence, there is no Chief Justice, and it will be impossible for the court to proceed to business to-morrow unless a Chief Justice is appointed.

Mr. OUIMET. The term opens on the 15th; not on the 10th.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I believe that a Chief Justice will be appointed.

Mr. LANGELIER. For to-morrow?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was under the impression that the term opened on the 15th. He will be appointed in time for the opening of the term.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 146) to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose that the Committee should rise now and report the Bill as finished yesterday, without dealing further with the subject which was mentioned just at six o'clock, in reference to the date of declaration. It seems to me that the difficulties are very great in the way of definitely fixing any date for that purpose.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You now have it fixed two weeks after the polling.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no date fixed now.

Mr. OUIMET. I beg to bring before the House the amendment of which I gave notice about a month ago. The purpose of the amendment is to declare that it will be a misdemeanour and corrupt practice for any elector to ask for a bribe. The amendment is as follows:—

(*f*) Every person who, directly or indirectly, by himself or by any other person on his behalf, on account of and as payment for his having voted or agreed to vote for any candidate at an election, or on account of and as payment for his having assisted or agreed to assist any candidate at an election, applies to such candidate, or to his agent or agents, for the gift or loan of any money or valuable consideration, or for the promise of the gift or loan of any money or valuable consideration, or for any office, place or employment, or the promise of any office, place or employment.

The law as it stands now provides that it will be a corrupt practice and punishable as such, for any person to offer money or other consideration for the vote of an elector. It is declared now to be a corrupt practice for any candidate or his agent to offer a bribe to an elector. The House will, I hope, agree with me that from a moral point of view it is as bad to offer a bribe as to ask for one. Every one knows that candidates and their agents, anxious as they are to obtain the support of the electors, find themselves in a very awkward predicament, when they find themselves in the alternative of losing a voter who is sure to go against their candidate, if his demand for a bribe is not acceded to. This is often resorted to, because of electors themselves offering their votes or their influence in return for money or other valuable consideration, and during the canvass we very often find an elector refusing absolutely to take part in an election, until some valuable consideration is offered for his support. Besides, this clause will prevent the practice, of which perhaps some of us might testify that they have come very near being the victims, of electors attempting to entrap the candidate or some of his agents, in order to secure the nullity of the election. This is

the worst form of blackmail that is now used in elections. A man who is not a supporter of a candidate goes to him and says: "I am willing to work for you if you promise me such a situation, or if you give me such an amount of money;" and all the time he is only acting in the expectation that the candidate may perhaps be tempted to bribe him, so that he will be able to subject him to the penalty of the law. I think it is time this kind of practice should be stopped, because it is not only immoral, but criminal in the extreme. For these reasons, I would propose that the amendment which I have read should be inserted as section 8a of the present Bill.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Would that apply to young professional men going out to assist in an election? The clause is very wide.

Mr. OUIMET. That brings up another point. An elector often comes to the candidate pretending that he has a very large influence over other voters, and in that way attempts to get money from him.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that the difficulty would be met by inserting the words "unduly and illegally," before the word "assisted."

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I quite admit that the whole law in respect to elections requires amendment. I ventured to introduce a Bill during this session codifying that portion of the election law referring to corrupt practices, in which I covered almost everything that could be considered an offence against the purity of elections. My Bill was referred to a select committee, and I was informed that the Government opposed any amendment in relation to corrupt practices being made this session, and proposed themselves dealing with the question next session. I, therefore, agreed very reluctantly to strike out those portions of the Bill referring to corrupt practices. It is a large question, and if this amendment is to be carried, then of course the other amendments ought to be fairly considered by the House. I do not oppose this amendment if it is properly worded; but I doubt very much if, worded as it is, it carries out the hon. gentleman's views. But there are other amendments far more necessary to be made in our election law than this; and if we are going to change the law in that respect, the whole question ought to be dealt with. My Bill proposed some fifteen or twenty amendments on that particular subject. I do not think the Government should have assented to it without giving an opportunity to discuss the question. The Bill was referred to a committee, and I understood the Government would not deal with the question this session and abandoned my Bill. Otherwise I would have forced my Bill upon the attention of Parliament. If the Minister of Justice proposes to deal with the question, I shall have to ask the House to consider the other amendments I proposed in that Bill, which I look upon as far more important.

Mr. McCARTHY. I also would suggest that the matter should not be pressed this session. It appears to me it is not much in keeping with the portion of the Election Act to which the hon. gentleman proposes to add it. It creates an offence in a person asking to have what he claims to be a promise carried out. But suppose a person makes such a promise, and we declare it to be a corrupt practice, in what way does it affect the candidate or the sitting member, or any person at all, except the individual who makes it? It is, therefore, a matter to be added rather to the general criminal law than to be dealt with specifically in the Election Act. The Election Act declares that certain acts are election offences, and it holds the candidate and his agent responsible for such acts. How can you make them responsible because some person approaches them and they reject that corrupt approach? Nothing would follow from the introduction of the clause, although it may be very proper to suppress all these things, so far as the election law is concerned. I trust the matter will not be pressed, especially as the hon. gentleman's subject is to be dealt with next session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think there is a good deal in what the hon. member for West Huron says, and I would commend it to the consideration of the hon. member for Laval. I did not observe, until he called the attention of the House to it just now, the number of provisions he had on the subject of offences in connection with elections: but I see that his Bill (No. 9), which we did ask should not be pressed, contains provisions to the number of twenty-seven with regard to offences. The clause moved by the hon. member for Laval, I am entirely in favour of, subject to the modification the hon. gentleman suggests himself.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Though personally I would be in favour of a repeal of the whole Act, I am strongly in favour of the principle of the amendment of the hon. member for Laval. I believe, if the Act is ever to have any effect among the electors, this amendment should be adopted. I never could see that the Act would have any good effect unless some such amendment were made. If we are to have an Act which will be effective we should pass this amendment. It will go far towards making elections pure and guarding against bribery and corruption. I believe there is a feeling among the members of this House, from practical experience, that, if this Act is to have any effect, the principle of the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. EDGAR. As there is a likelihood of a good many elections taking place between this and next session, it would be a great pity if the House could not put this Act in force, improved as it can be with very slight change. Because we cannot get the whole loaf we should not refuse to take something. I do not think that the House or anybody else will be taken by surprise if we consider this amendment. As the leader of the Opposition has suggested, the point raised by the Secretary of State would be met if the word "illegally" were inserted.

Mr. OUIMET. With regard to what the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has said, true it is that the election law has been enacted in order to assist us in arriving at a conclusion as to what constitutes a legal election. That hon. gentleman says that this new corrupt practice will not have the effect of voiding an election, and should not, therefore, be in the Election Act, which only has to do with acts that affect the result of an election. I understand that this would form part of a general penal enactment with relation to the carrying of elections; but since the principle of it seems to meet with the approval of the House, and will have the effect of preventing practices most

discreditable in themselves, and which have the effect generally of promoting corruption, the principle embodied in my amendment should be accepted by the House.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Has the Minister of Justice considered the effect of this amendment? If a friend assisted me in an election, there being nothing corrupt about it, and years afterwards he says: I assisted you in your election some years ago and you can give me that office which is vacant; according to this amendment that would be a corrupt act. I go as far as anyone in desiring to make elections pure, but if this clause is adopted the law must be recast. My reading of the section as to its meaning is that any person who, on account of his having assisted at an election, applies for an office, is guilty of a corrupt act.

Mr. McCARTHY. My objection was that, putting this clause in now in the middle of the Bill, one is unable to judge what its effect may be. I agree with what the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has said. It is not necessary to do this corruptly in order to bring the person within the provisions of this section. Every one who either in person or through an agent, has voted or agreed to vote, or has assisted in an election, and afterwards applies for an office, is guilty of a corrupt offence punishable by fine and imprisonment. Surely we do not propose to enact that. I think what the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) is driving at is that anyone who tries to exact, under a corrupt promise or the pretense of one, the fulfilment of that corrupt promise is guilty of a corrupt practice. If there is no corrupt promise made, I do not see why we should want to be protected, and if a corrupt promise has been made, it is pretty hard to put the law in such a position that the candidate may say: I promised you an office if you supported me, but, though you supported me, it would be a corrupt practice for me to get you that office. I think we had better be careful before introducing this provision.

Mr. OUIMET. As the amendment stands in English, it does not precisely carry out the meaning I have given to it in the French notice as written by me. Instead of being:

"As payment for his having voted or agreed to vote,"

It should be:

His having voted or agreeing to vote;

And later on it should be:

As payment for his voting or having voted, or for agreeing or having agreed to vote.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If this is analyzed, you will see the absurdity of it. Every person who, on account of having assisted or agreed to assist a candidate, afterwards applies for an office is made guilty of a corrupt practice. Does the hon. gentleman propose to go so far? Any canvasser or public speaker, or friend, or agent who assists a candidate in an election, and afterwards applies for an office, is liable to be punished under this clause.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The words "having unduly and illegally" have been put in to meet that case.

Mr. McCARTHY. That does not meet the case.

Mr. LAURIER. There are different kinds of assistance. There are cases where a friend may come and speak for the candidate in an election, and that is quite proper; but if some one is engaged to unduly canvass the electors, that is not legal assistance, and that is covered by this amendment.

Mr. FRASER. This moves on the supposition that no man asks for an office. Of course we know that offices are given and not asked for.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think that amendment should go no further than to prevent the making of an agreement previous to an election. The words "having voted or having assisted" are very wide.

Mr. OUIMET. The amendment as I propose it would read thus:

Every person, who, directly or indirectly, by himself or by any other person on his behalf, on account of and as payment for voting or having voted, or agreeing or having agreed to vote for any candidate at an election, or on account of and as payment for his having unduly or illegally assisted or agreed to assist any candidate at an election, applies to such candidate, or to his agent or agents, for the gift or loan of any money or valuable consideration, or for the promise of the gift or loan of any money or valuable consideration, or for any office, place or employment, or the promise of any office, place or employment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the word "unduly" is too vague.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). What difference does it make? It is agreed on all sides that if a man assists properly and within the law no objection can be taken. If he assists illegally, he must violate the election law which is on the Statute-book now.

Mr. CASEY. The punishment is there now for having violated the law, and I understand this is a proposal to punish him further for asking to be paid for that illegal assistance.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It appears to me this clause does not meet with the sympathy one would expect from the House, especially from some hon. gentlemen who are always introducing Bills of a high degree of stringency, not alone for the enforcement of the law, but regarding what constitutes a violation of the election law. It does seem to me that if there is anything wrong in the wording of this clause, the Committee ought to be able to amend it in such a way as to make it workable. I would suggest to the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) that the principle applies to any promise for abstaining to vote, as well as for voting.

Mr. McCARTHY. Any corrupt promise.

Mr. CASEY. The object of the proposed amendment is good enough, but I do not think it goes far enough; I think this is only a part of what should be added to the law. I think it should be followed up and continued so as to provide a specific and severe punishment for any candidate or member-elect who enters into such corrupt agreement with any person to procure him employment or to use his influence for the purpose of procuring such office or employment, at any time after the election, and whether such candidate has been elected to Parliament or not; because we know that the defeated candidate who has run in the interest of the Government of the day, still controls the patronage of his county, and will be able to make a corrupt bargain with applicants for office, to use his influence with the Government to get them appointed. He may make such corrupt bargain on the promise from the applicant of his support in future elections, or in consideration of his undue and illegal support in past elections, or in consideration of a cash payment, or some other advantage

derived from the applicant by the person having enjoyed it. I think the hon. member will not object to continue his amendment in this strain, and to make it also a penal offence for any man who has been a candidate at an election, whether he be elected or not, to make any corrupt bargain thereafter with any person to use his influence with the Government in favour of an application from that person. I think it is necessary and proper, and it will be shown before this House prorogues to be necessary, to make this addition to the law. There may be means of punishing members who so err now; there does not seem to be any provision for punishing the unsuccessful candidate who still retains the patronage of his county, for making corrupt bargains for the use of his influence. Even as regards members who are successful and have seats in the House, it is not very clear what the effect upon them will be of the disclosure of any such action on their part. But there is no provision for punishing the man who controls the patronage of his county as a defeated Government candidate. I think both these clauses should be included in the hon. gentleman's motion.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. I wish to ask if there are any provisions in the Act whereby all the clauses regarding corruption have to be published or posted up at the same time as the proclamation before the election? It will be perfectly useless for us to pass the most stringent clauses in the Act, or to amend the Act so as to make it more rigorous than it now is, if the clauses are not known by the parties who are exposed to be prosecuted under the new law for acts which they may not know to be illegal. In some of the provincial laws, the returning officer, at the same time that he sends the proclamation to be posted up in the several electoral divisions, also makes a synopsis of the law containing those clauses referring to corruption, and has it posted up with the proclamation, so that everybody who takes an interest in the election may not only see what their duties are, but may also see what the law is in regard to the exercise of those duties. I believe that if we make any change in the law it should be known by all those who are called upon to exercise their rights under that law. I think such provision does not exist in the Act. I was under the impression it did, but I cannot find it. I think, therefore, that there should be a clause whereby the returning officer would be bound to post up all those provisions regarding bribery and corruption, so that the candidate would not be compelled to tell the voters their duties or the penalties to which they are subjected for violating the law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is always done. The amendment to section 84 preserves all those penalties for corrupt practices, and they will be embodied in the instructions to the returning officer.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. Do I understand that it is already provided that these clauses regarding bribery and corruption at elections, are to be published?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will look at it in a moment. That was the intention.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. If there is no such provision, there should be one. Too much publicity cannot be given to these clauses.

Mr. LAURIER. I would draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to a statement which he made a moment ago, that he wanted to fix a delay within which the declaration should be made. It will follow then, that the subject is left altogether in the hands of the returning officer. He has to judge and act according to circumstances. I see the force of the objection of the hon. gentleman in fixing a delay, because the delay may vary a good deal according to circumstances. If there are no irregularities, and everything goes on smoothly at the polls, and if all the returns are brought in, the declaration will take place at once. But I can conceive that under some circumstances the delay may be extended, because the returning officer may be obliged to hold an investigation, or to find evidence as to the circumstances under which the boxes may have been destroyed or lost, and if there is no evidence at the moment, he is not able to ascertain the result of the polling. But the hon. gentleman will admit that he leaves in the hands of the returning officer a very great power; he leaves him not only *quasi* but actual judicial powers. The objection to this is that at present there is no qualification whatever required from the returning officer. But we have not been able, so far, to convince the Government that it would be preferable to have permanent returning officers, and the present system is to select returning officers for the occasion. I do not, however, think it is a power which the Government care very much to possess. I rather believe that on every occasion the life of the Minister of Justice must be rather a burden to him from having to answer the numerous applications made by almost every candidate to have a returning officer appointed. I would suggest for the consideration of the hon. Minister that if he will not take any of the officials who are now specified by the law, such as the sheriff, or clerk of the court, or the registrar, whether it would not be advisable to have the returning officers made permanent officials, and selected by the judge of the court and the warden. This principle was adopted some years ago at the time of the liquor licensing Bill introduced by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The license commissioners were to be appointed by commissioners appointed by the Government and the warden of the county and by another party. I suggest for the consideration of the hon. gentleman that before we come to the third reading, whether it would not be preferable to have permanent returning officers, who would be appointed by the judge of the court, by the warden of the county, and perhaps by another person.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The proposition to have permanent returning officers is one well worthy of consideration, and I shall be very glad to ask my colleagues to consider it. The proposition which the hon. gentleman makes as regards the mode of appointment is, however, somewhat complicated.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps the Minister of Justice before the third reading of the Bill will alter the first sub-section of section 6, in which an appeal is to provide in the Province of Ontario to a judge of the Court of Appeal, and provide that the appeal be made to a judge of the High Court of Justice. The judges of the Court of Appeal are merely appellant judges, and it would be better to take from that court election trials, because they are not judges of first instance, but simply sit as appellant judges.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to move an amendment, which I consider a necessary corollary of the amendment that has just been carried. I move the addition of the following sub-section to section 4 as amended :—

Every person who is or has been a candidate at any election for the House of Commons, who agrees to procure or to attempt to procure for any other person any office, place or employment, in case of such voting or such illegal assistance or valuable consideration as suggested in the next preceding sub-section (*f*).

The amendment just adopted proposes to punish the applicant for a situation who makes a corrupt bargain with any member or candidate. My amendment completes the principle by providing for the punishment of the member or candidate in case he should make such corrupt bargain with the applicant.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is already provided for.

Mr. CASEY. Not in regard to candidates who do not get elected.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The unsuccessful candidate is liable to the law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see that by section 84 every person who directly or indirectly by himself or by any other person in his behalf, gives or procures, or agrees to give or procure any office, place, or employment to or for any voter or any other person in order to induce such person to vote or refrain from voting, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour and shall forfeit $200 to any person who makes the charge.

Mr. CASEY. I am quite aware that such is the law. That applies to any person who during or before an election, offers an inducement to a voter to refrain from voting. What this amendment covers is the case of an unsuccessful candidate who at any time after the election, on the basis of any corrupt or illegal consideration, bargains to procure or attempts to procure an office for any person. The cases covered are quite different.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the amendment relates to an election it is provided for in the Act now. The section from which I quoted is not limited to offences committed before the election. It is a corrupt act whenever it is completed. For instance, a man may have given a vote at the election in March last on an understanding that he would receive an office now, and it may be corruptly given now. There is ample ground for controverting an election on that score and setting the election aside. If the amendment does not refer to an election, it does not come under this Bill.

Mr. CASEY. It comes under the Act as much as the amendment already made. That amendment proposed that any man who either during or after an election applies to a candidate or member-elect to secure for him some reward on the ground of services previously rendered illegally, shall be punished. That is to say, the applicant shall be punished. My amendment is to punish the other party to the proposed contract, if he should agree to it. I cannot illustrate the matter without referring to matters that would not be in order, except by supposing that after an election, one, two or three months after, some supporter of the member-elect or defeated candidate should come to him and say : I offer you for your own use or for political purposes, or for the payment of old scores, $150 or $200—or he might even propose to give the person in question some live stock—if you will secure for me a position under the Government. Under the amendment just passed, the person making that proposal to the member would be very properly punished. But supposing the application was successful and the person applied to did this act, I want to punish him also, and I do not see that the words of the Election Act, as at present framed, would apply to the case. The Minister of Justice has pointed out truly that the person who bribes or attempts to bribe another is guilty of a misdemeanour, and if a candidate, his election may be voided. But this, although a matter arising out of the election and out of the fact that he, a member or candidate procured for the person applying to him an office, it might not arise during the election itself but afterwards. Besides, there is no provision in the law as it stands now for punishing a defeated candidate who has control of patronage after the election is over. Suppose any member supporting the Government were compelled to go to his constituency again and were defeated, he would still retain the patronage of the county in his hand. He might make any corrupt bargain he chose with any of his supporters or any other person to get him an appointment in exchange for such consideration, and I do not see how you could get at it whether he is a member of this House or not. It seems to me that it comes quite logically and properly under the heading of the election law, and it is certainly quite as much so as the amendment of the member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) which we have adopted. His amendment relates to the application, and my amendment to the granting of the application.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that it is applicable to the Elections Act, but this is the state of the case : The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) moved an amendment which we carried a few moments ago, to punish a person who solicits a bribe or an office, but he did that because the present law punishes the person who promises the bribe or the office, and contains no punishment for the person who sought such bribe or office. The hon. gentleman proposes now, as he says, to get at the other side of the case which is already met by the present law.

Mr. CASEY. That is what I cannot see.

Mr. LAURIER. Even if the party who, under such circumstances succumbs to the temptation i not already punished by the law, perhaps it is jus as well to leave the law as it is, because the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) seems to defeat the effect of the amendment moved by the member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet). If the party who solicits the bribe and the party who gives the bribe are equally guilty, no one would have an interest in informing, and both would be silent upon it. But, on the other hand, if you leave simply the tempter to punishment, then, of course, the other man will have no interest in keeping the matter concealed. I remember very well in former times under the liquor laws when it was equal guilt for the party who sold and the party who purchased liquors, and the consequence was we never could obtain a conviction. I am very much afraid we will have the same result here.

Mr. CASEY. It is not very often that I have to differ from my leader, but in a matter of opinion such as this I am compelled to do so. He says that if you punish equally the tempter and the man who has succumbed to the temptation there is nobody to inform. Such cases have come to light already, and in hardly any case that I am aware of has either the tempter or the tempted given the information. Neither are likely to give information in any case. Suppose the temptation is successful, and the person tempted yields to the solicitation of the applicant, is he likely to give it away? He is not a bit more likely to inform in that case than if he were subject to a penalty, because in any case he is subject to the penalty of public opinion, and he is not going to submit himself to that by confessing unless he has to. The information will have to be sought in all cases from other parties, and I think we should not omit to provide for the punishment of the other party for fear that on that account he might not be willing to confess. There are many other crimes punishable by our laws which neither party is likely to confess, although only one of the parties to the transaction may be guilty in the eye of the law, and we have to depend on the ordinary sources of evidence for convicting such persons. There is certainly force in what my hon. friend says, but I cannot go so far as to agree with his views. The hon. Minister states that the law as it now stands provides for this case, but I contend that the law now refers to transactions which have at least their beginning during the election campaign, because no person can induce another to support him unless the offer is made before polling day. A man is not going to pay another man for supporting him after the poll unless he has previously agreed to do so. This amendment refers to a class of cases arising after the election, and it only comes into effect if the candidate or member-elect is in a position to grant these favours.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the law goes further than that, and punishes the act although it has no connection with anything incident to the election. It goes on to say:

"Or corruptly does any such act as aforesaid on account of any voter having voted or refrained from voting at any election."

That is:

"Gives him money or offers or promises to him any such, by virtue of the voter having voted or refrained from voting at an election."

Mr. CASEY. That punishes the candidate for bribing the man for voting for him, but I want to cover the case of a man who comes afterwards to the candidate or member and says: I offer you certain valuable considerations to give me an office which you can do in virtue of your influence with the Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I wish to call attention to another objection made to the amendment of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey). It would punish the neighbour of an applicant for office, who recommends him to the member for an office, on the ground that he has voted for his party and ought to receive any consideration that that gentleman can give in the way of recommending him for office. I do not see anything immoral or improper in that. The amendment says:

"Every person who is, or has been, a candidate for any election for the House of Commons, who agrees to procure, or attempts to procure for any other person, any office, place, or employment, in consideration of such voting, or illegal assistance, or valuable consideration, as specified in the next preceding sub-section."

Then it comes to this: The member who says that A. B. is perfectly fit for the office he is seeking, is a good reliable man and has voted for me, and has, therefore, a claim on my recommendation; that makes the member guilty of an indictable offence.

Mr. CASEY. In consideration of such voting as mentioned in the last sub-section. The hon. gentleman's objections, if they apply to my amendment, apply equally to the last sub-section. By the last sub-section a man is punished for asking for an office on the ground that he has voted or assisted, and the words of my motion specifically refer to that sub-section. I do not see how the hon. gentleman can possibly read into that amendment the meaning that it would prevent a man urging his party services as a reason for his appointment. If a judicial construction of my amendment would imply that, I wish to change it so that it will not imply that; but I wish it to mean that there shall be no corrupt bargain between a candidate and a voter for an office or other valuable consideration in return for support at an election.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understand that the motion of the hon. member for Laval is simply that the bribee as well as the briber shall be punished. I agree with that. Of course it takes two to constitute the offence, the man who gives corruptly and the man who receives corruptly. My Bill made express provision in a general clause for the punishment of both the person who bribes and the person who receives the bribe. The hon. gentleman's amendment is limited to the cases of a gift, or loan, the promise of a gift, loan, office or employment, or other valuable consideration. If the law as it now stands provides for this, then the hon. gentleman's amendment is not required at all.

Mr. CASEY. My amendment is not intended to refer to the class of cases spoken of by the hon. member for West Huron. It is chiefly intended to cover the case of a member giving an office or employment or money as a bribe, as well as the man who receives the office or employment or money. To put it in plain English, it is to cover the case of a member who sells his patronage, and I think that the member who sells his patronage is as guilty and should be as severely punished as the man who applies for the purchase of that patronage—the man who says: I have given you my vote and influence in the past, or I will give you my vote and influence in the future, or I will give you valuable consideration if you get me an office. We have already agreed to make that a criminal offence, and I say, go on and make it a criminal offence on the part of a member to accept the offer. I am not dealing with the question of a candidate bribing a voter, but I want to get at the candidate or member who takes a bribe for using his influence with the Government. If the Minister of Justice is positive that the words of my motion as it stands would include the case of a candidate who urges proper considerations in favour of his recommendations, it is easy to change that by inserting the word "corruptly" before the word "agrees." I would ask the hon. Minister to give my amendment his serious consideration,

because it is more important than the one we have just passed. The latter punishes only the poor man who applies for a position in which to make his livelihood; this is to punish the man who holds the power as trustee to confer that position, and who might be mean enough to sell his patronage.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It seems to me that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Elgin is entirely out of place as an amendment to the election law. If proposed at all, it ought to be proposed as an amendment to the common law. It does not refer to elections at all; it has no connection with elections. It is intended to punish a crime that may be committed after the election is over.

Mr. CASEY. Both before and after; there is no limitation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It applies during a man's whole lifetime, if he has ever been a candidate.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It says any person who has been a candidate; that means after an election is all over; so that it has no reference to the election. It is an amendment to the common law of the land, and if I am not mistaken the common law makes provision for that offence now.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister of Justice rules that it does apply to the election law.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Has the hon. Minister of Justice decided to propose an amendment fixing the time of the declaration?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I stated when the House went into committee that I was unable to make any proposal on that subject this afternoon, as I thought it would be dangerous to fix any limit of time. The leader of the Opposition made a suggestion, which I promised to consider in connection with a new measure, as to appointing returning officers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am sorry the Minister of Justice has not arrived at a conclusion on that subject, because I think it would be the most important provision of the Bill.

Amendment of Mr. Casey negatived on division.

Mr. LAURIER. Before you report the Bill, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to a subject which perhaps is not exactly germane to this but comes under the heading of elections. There are to-day one or two vacancies in this House, and it is quite possible there may be others, as there are many election petitions now pending. I would suggest that it would be advisable to defer any elections for vacancies until the new lists come into force, which are now in preparation. Of course if a vacancy occurred through some one accepting office, that would be a different matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am very glad to receive the suggestion and will give it all possible weight. I will concur in it unless some reasons appear to the contrary, which I am not aware of now.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to make a suggestion with regard to the declaration. I would suggest that the Minister should consent to have all protests fyled within thirty days from the date of the election; and if the returning officer has not made the return within the thirty days, then the party protesting could apply to court for an order extending the time to protest.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will take that up in the Bill relating to controverted elections.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand the Minister is disposed to consider my suggestion favourably. I hope he will be able to give a more definite answer.

Mr. McCARTHY. I must protest against the doctrine laid down by the leader of the Opposition. It seems to me extraordinary that the House or Government should have the power at their pleasure to leave a constituency unrepresented for any length of time. We have had Kingston unrepresented for the last two months, and this House has not thought fit to order the issue of the writ, and the Government have not thought fit to take any action. In England the system is exactly the reverse. The writ issues automatically, one may say, upon the death of a member or when a vacancy occurs, and it is not in the control of the House to postpone the issue of the writ for party or other reasons. I think we ought not to part with the right of the people to have for every constituency a representative on the floor of Parliament.

Mr. LAURIER. It is said the French are logical and the English practical. It seems to me on the present occasion the rule is the reverse. The hon. gentleman is logical but not practical. There are one or two vacancies, and everybody, on either side, knows that the present is not the best time to consult a constituency as to its choice of a representative to fill the vacancy. There is certain preparatory work going on, and the hon. gentleman must admit that until that work is completed there is no likelihood of the people being represented as they should, and we are not desirous to have an election on a list five years old.

Mr. McCARTHY. If we have the power to do that in one case we have it in all, and we are leaving to the discretion of the Government or the House to say when writs shall issue.

Mr. LAURIER. We are not, but we ask that an understanding should be come to. The law may be amended, and the hon. gentleman has the right to ask that it be amended in the direction he suggests, but we merely ask that it be understood on both sides that vacancies will not be filled until the new lists are completed, except where vacancies are created by the acceptance of office. Of course, if the hon. gentleman were taken into the Cabinet, there should be an election immediately, but in the other cases the necessity is not so immediate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know that I would have the faintest objection to carry out the proposition made by the hon. member for North Simcoe, that writs should issue automatically, as he says, but I may remind the hon. gentleman that at any time in the last ten years or more have the writs for bye-elections been systematically delayed for two, or three, or four, or five months, simply at the caprice of the Government, and so long as that continues to be the case, the suggestion made by my hon. friend that the elections should take place after the revision of the lists is a good one.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am merely protesting against the practice.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The law should be amended so that the voters' lists would be revised before general elections, and not disfranchise a large number of the people.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CASEY. I asked for some information, and the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue promised to bring it down yesterday. I would like to ask if the hon. gentleman can give me that?

Mr. FOSTER. I may inform my hon. friend that yesterday the Minister read the letter from the Auditor General in reply to that.

Mr. CASEY. I beg pardon. I was not here at the time.

SLAUGHTERING OF AMERICAN CATTLE IN CANADA.

Mr. McMILLAN. I should like to ask the Government to give us some information in regard to the proposal to bring cattle into Canada from the United States to be slaughtered here. I know there is considerable excitement among cattle dealers and farmers, and I think the country ought to be informed as soon as possible what the Government propose to do.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government have made no relaxation of the law, and have given no permission for the importation of cattle.

Mr. OUIMET. I hope in the meantime the Government will seriously consider whether it might not be in the interest of the Province of Quebec, and of the whole of Canada, to grant such permission, provided the Government see their way to prevent all danger for our own cattle and to preserve the privilege we enjoy in the British market. It is going abroad that because this industry is to be started in our province, some prejudices have been aroused. I am sure that it is not so, and I emphatically say so here, but the idea goes abroad, and it would be injurious to the Government and to the country that, on account of the prejudices of one part of the population or of one province against another, an important industry which must be advantageous to one part of Canada, or to the whole of the Dominion, should be stopped in consequence of these prejudices being fanned by people who have no proper interest in the country.

Mr. DAVIN. I am sure that there is no prejudice in this instance, but I know that all over the West there is great anxiety in regard to the action of the Government in this matter. I cannot see why, if it pays the English importer to take our cattle—and if he can take our cattle at an advantage to himself—the Quebec speculator in dead meat should not be able to take the live cattle from the West. I have no objection to this, if such safeguards are taken as will satisfy the mind of the British farmer in regard to the danger from pleuro-pneumonia and other diseases, but one industry is a small matter compared with the vast interests which are involved in the export of our live cattle to the British market, and the advantage which we there enjoy. I consider that any interest, no matter how minute it is, if you can yield to its demands safely, should have its demands yielded to, but to imperil a staple trade of Canada because of a problematic industry would be a very suicidal course to pursue. My hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Ouimet) knows that the man who is now speaking has no prejudice in regard to the Province of Quebec or the French people anywhere, but it is a thing of great importance that the position we occupy at the present minute as exporters of live stock should not be in any way imperilled.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that, considering that this matter must have now been nearly five weeks or more before the House and under the consideration of the Government, we ought to know definitely what decision the Government have arrived at within a day or two. There is no doubt whatever that a great many persons engaged in this cattle trade are under very considerable anxiety as to what the course of the Government may be, and, although I should be the last to ask that they should decide hurriedly or hastily on a case of this kind, still, seeing that so many weeks have elapsed since the matter was brought to their attention, I do not think it is asking too much to ask the Government to state definitely within a week what their decision may be. I hope that the Minister of Justice, or whoever represents the department will let us know, and will say now when they will let us know, what their decision is.

Mr. HAGGART. I may inform the hon. gentleman now that the Government have come to a decision not to allow the company to manufacture American dead meat in Canada at present.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Sault Ste. Marie Canal..... $935,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this canal, I would be glad if the Minister in charge will give the House what information he has as to the progress of the work and the ultimate cost, and generally what is likely to be done with respect to this. I think I understood that some considerable alterations had been made in the original design of this canal.

Mr. BOWELL. The cost of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal I gave to the House when the question was under discussion some little time ago, but I did not enter fully into the question of the enlargement of the canal and the extra expense which will be incurred in carrying out the suggestions which have been made by the engineers. I think it is well that the question is asked, and that the Committee should be put in full possession of the facts which induced the Government to change the plan of the canal by adopting a larger lock instead of the one for the construction of which they entered into a contract, and to make the canal of a depth of 19 feet, equal to that of Sault Canal on the American side, instead of making it a 16-foot canal. The difference between the contract price as originally agreed upon for the construction of that lock, and the price of the construction under the present plan will amount to about $100,000. By the changes in dimensions which have been effected, the expenditure is increased by

about $200,000, but by modifications in the original plan in other directions there will be a reduction of cost to the extent of about $100,000, leaving the net increase, as stated, about $100,000. In addition to the additional expenditure which I have referred to, there will be a large expenditure of, perhaps, from $500,000 to $600,000 in deepening the approaches to the canal from the lake or western end, and also from the Sault River. But it will not be necessary to make this expenditure until it is found that the trade of the country demands an extra depth. It would also be necessary, in making the whole navigation a 19-foot navigation, to dredge or deepen the harbour at Port Arthur, which is included in the amount to which I have called the attention of the Committee. I know that complaints have been made in connection with the granting of the contract for the dredging of the entrance of the canal from the east and also from the west, the contract not having been awarded to what was supposed to be the lowest tender. I can place the Committee in possession of all the facts in connection with the letting of these contracts, by reading the report of Mr. Page upon the subject, should the Committee desire it, which is the justification for the Government in the course they have pursued. I think it would be well, in dealing with this subject, that I should also read the report of Mr. Trudeau, and I think it will also be well to read the supplementary report which was made by Mr. Shanly, upon the same subject, in order that there may be no withholding—if I may use that expression—of any facts connected with it. I may also mention that the attention of the Government was called to the necessity that they believed to exist for the increased depth of this canal, and the need of enlarging it so as to make it a fair competitor with the canal on the American side of the line in accordance with the representations of the boards of trade and those who are interested in carrying on the commerce on those lakes. Mr. Trudeau, in his report dated the 14th of May, 1891, says:

"I have the honour to bring before your notice the following observations and suggestions with regard to the canal works now in progress at the Sault Ste Marie. Under date of the 2nd of May, 1888, an Order in Council was passed authorizing the construction of this canal, and fixing the depth as sufficient to accommodate vessels of 16 feet draught at the lowest stage of the river. Plans and specifications were prepared accordingly, having in view a canal capable of receiving vessels of that draught, with a lock 600 feet long 85 feet wide, and having 16 feet 3 inches depth of water on the sills at extreme low water. Under authority of an Order in Council dated the 12th November, 1888, a contract was made with Messrs. Hugh Ryan & Co. on the 20th of that month, covering the works of lock and canal construction. Considerable progress has been made by the contractors, including the whole of the excavation for the lockpit on the dimensions indicated above. The question has now been raised by persons interested in the trade of the lakes, whether it is not desirable to increase these dimensions before proceeding further. It is urged by the Toronto Board of Trade and by the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that the depth should not be less than that to be afforded in the enlarged canal now being constructed on the American side of the river. There is no doubt in my own mind but that an increase in dimensions should be made. I consider it desirable that the depth of water on the sills at extreme low water, should be increased to 19 feet, this being the equivalent of the depth now being provided on the American side. Together with the question of depth is that of length and breadth, and having regard to the length and breadth of vessels in use, I am of opinion, the breadth of the lock should be increased to 100 feet (in place of 85 feet) and that an addition of 50 feet should be made to the length, which would then be 650 feet, thus accommodating at one time four vessels of the larger type. The estimated extra cost to be incurred may be set down as about $225,000. In connection with this matter certain collateral points are involved, viz., difficulties which might possibly arise in the event of contingencies barring Canadian vessels from the use of the channel now being deepened in American waters between the canal and Lake Huron, a position which would limit the draught of vessels to that afforded by the Canadian channel, about 16 feet:* also the absence of terminal Canadian harbour accommodation for vessels of the larger draught. These questions, though undoubtedly to be considered hereafter, do not appear to be necessarily involved in the present issue. All that needs immediately to be dealt with, is the point whether by an additional expenditure of $225,000 in a work (the lock chamber and its fittings), the estimated cost of which is about $1,000,000, the Government should make a provision of accommodation which may be called for within a few years, but which can then only be afforded by the construction of a new lock at a very great cost, and after a long delay. The deepening of the canal proper and its approaches can be proceeded with by degrees, after the completion of the present works. I, therefore, suggest a submission to the Governor General of the question of the amendment of the existing plans so as to adopt the following as the dimensions of the canal lock chamber: length, 650 feet; width, 100 feet: depth of water on the sills at extreme low water, 19 feet.

"The further question should be submitted of obtaining from the present contractors, Messrs. Hugh Ryan & Co., an offer for the execution of such extra work, it being understood that no offer will be accepted until it has been submitted to and approved by the Governor General in Council.

"I have the honour, &c.,

(Sgd.) "T. TRUDEAU,

"*Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals,*
"*and Chief Engineer of Canals.*

"*In Lake George, which is an expansion of St. Mary's River, the Canadian channel has, in many places, only from 8 to 10 feet of water."

Upon that report an Order in Council was passed adopting the suggestion for the enlargement of the canal. Mr. Trudeau discussed the matter with the contractors, and made satisfactory arrangements with them for the work. I will read his report, dated 3rd June, 1891:

"SIR,—I have the honour to report to you that in pursuance of the Order in Council passed on the 21st ultimo, authorizing the adoption of certain modifications in the plan of the lock works at the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, I have had negotiation with the contractors, Messrs. H. Ryan & Co., with a view to ascertaining the prices for which they would be prepared to execute the additional work required, bearing in mind the limit, $225,000, of my own estimate, which estimate has been adopted by the said Order.

"I would here observe that the work to be done will necessitate the re-placing of plant, and also the purchase of additional plant, and the excavation will be at detached points, and will be expensive in its execution. These features, added to the risk of encountering water-bearing seams, and the increased outlay that would be necessary for pumping should such seams be met with, have been taken into consideration in arriving at prices for the additional work required.

"As will be seen from the correspondence with the contractors, which I herewith enclose, a basis of agreement, in my opinion, satisfactory, has been reached, under which for a total extra cost of $219,000 the work will be carried out by the present contractors, extra time to the extent of one year being allowed them.

"While this extra cost will be incurred, a saving will be affected, by the change of details of the work, to the extent of about $119,000, leaving the actual additional cost to the Government about $100,000, the full advantages of increased length, width and depth being secured by this expenditure.

"I have no hesitation, therefore, in recommending that the agreement for the work and prices thus provisionally made with the contractors be submitted for the favourable consideration of the Governor in Council.

"I have the honour to be, Sir.

"Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) "T. TRUDEAU.

"To the Honourable
"The Minister of Railways and Canals."

These arrangements were approved by an Order in

Council, and a formal agreement has been entered into with the contractors to that effect. I have also a long report from Mr. Walter Shanly, which, if the Committee will have a little patience, I will read. I will do so in order that the reasons which were given to the Government for the course they pursued may be placed upon record, and that the Committee and the public may learn the full facts in connection with this matter. Mr. Shanly's report is dated 13th April, 1891, and is as follows:—

"SIR,—As requested by you I have discussed with Mr. Trudeau, chief engineer of canals, certain moot points in reference to the canal and lock now under construction at Sault Ste. Marie, the main question to which our attention was directed having been as to the width of the lock. As planned, and now under contract, the dimensions of the lock are as follows: length of chamber, 600 feet; width of chamber, 85 feet; gate width, 60 feet; depth of water on sills, 16 feet 3 inches. In the St. Lawrence Canal system (including the Welland) the lock measurements are: Length of chamber, 270 feet; width of chamber, 45 feet; gate width, 45 feet; depth on sills, 14 feet. When these (the St. Lawrence) canals shall have been completed, vessels of the extreme size that the locks will admit will certainly be the 'rule of the trade.' Only two such vessels, say 255 feet long by 42 feet beam, could be locked at one and the same time in the Sault Ste. Marie Canal as now planned. Increasing the lock width to 100 feet would allow of four of the same class of vessels being passed through in one 'operation,' that is to say, the adding of 15 feet to the chamber width as at present intended would double the capacity of the canal for accommodating the largest vessels of the Canadian lake fleet of the future. The minor classes would, of course, also benefit in time-saving by the enlarged roominess of the lock. The works now in progress at Sault Ste. Marie, including lock and canal and the dredging of the approaches at either end are estimated to cost about $3,000,000. To give the lock an additional width of 15 feet will probably add 3 per cent. to that amount, or at the most $100,000. I unhesitatingly recommend (assuming that no other or greater changes are to be considered) that the width of the lock chamber be increased from 85 to 100 feet.

"Among the official papers placed in my hands by Mr. Trudeau as bearing on the questions under debate were letters from certain parties, public and individual, urging that the depth of the lock, leaving all other dimensions as at present, be increased to 20 feet, and I asked Mr. Thompson, the Government engineer in charge of Sault Ste. Marie works, to make an estimate of the cost of such a change including the lock proper: the half mile canal through rock cutting above the lock—also of necessity to be deepened—and the dredging to 22 feet on the two approaches, the amount reaches $650,000, to be added to the $3,000,000 involved in the present work. I would not advise the spending of so large a sum of money to gain 20 feet of depth unless we also adopted all the other proportions of the work now being carried out, just opposite to ours, on the United States side of the river. The dimensions of the new American lock are: Length, 800 feet; width, 100 feet; depth on sills, 20 feet. To adopt these measurements for the Canadian lock with corresponding depth in the canal and immediate approaches, would involve an addition of not far from $850,000 to what we have already undertaken.

"That the time will come, and perhaps not in the far away future, when the trade of the Dominion will require that there should be a second and independent lock of the largest proportions is hardly to be doubted, but it should be remembered that what we are now doing (assuming the lock widened to 100 feet) will amply accommodate for a long time to come by far the larger number of Canadian vessels—the size of which will be limited by the size of the Welland Canal; while for vessels drawing more than 16 feet, comparatively few in number, the American lock, open to all comers, will be available. The question of harbour accommodation, too, has to be considered, and unless at Parry Sound (perhaps) and at Windsor, I do not know the port, on the Canadian waters, from the River St. Mary to Port Colborne where a vessel laden to 20 feet could deliver cargo. On Lake Superior our chief port, Port Arthur, would, I believe, need costly improvement to fit it for vessels of 20 feet draught. But it is also to be kept in mind that whatever the capacity given the Canadian canal, Canadian shipping going to, or coming from, Lake Superior, must pass through American waters between Sault Ste. Marie and Port Huron, a distance of 30 miles or more, the River Ste. Marie not affording within the Canadian boundary depth sufficient all the way for, I am informed, even 16 feet draught; for 20 feet certainly not. Nor is the American portion of the river, either, fitted by nature for the greater draught, and consequently, the United States Government is now expending in connection with its new canal works at the Sault very large sums to improve the channel to at least a depth of 22 feet throughout. Therefore, we might build our lock on the scale of the new American one, without, of necessity, having to improve our channel, a much more circuitous one than the American, to corresponding depth—at a probable cost, as estimated by Mr. Thompson, of three quarters of a million of dollars. Our neighbours are now building their third lock at Sault Ste. Marie. The first one, completed upwards of 30 years ago, was then the largest structure of the sort in America, and was supposed surely to be large enough for all probable future requirements of Lake Superior shipping. Trade, however, developed to such unlooked for volume, that within the last 10 years a second lock, of far more than double the tonnage capacity of No. 1 was constructed. It, No. 2, now proves to be unequal to the still growing traffic, though in its 8 months of navigable season there passes through it a tonnage exceeding that of the Suez Canal, open the year round. No. 3 lock, on the vast scale the figures of which are noted above is now under construction by the United States Government at an expenditure, including the deepening of the River St. Marie, of about five millions of dollars. Canadian commerce is as yet but a small proportion of the gross tonnage passing the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, but within fewer years than have elapsed between the undertaking of the two latest of the American locks, the Dominion North-West will have added enormously to the lake trade. The works as at present undertaken by the Canadian Government are to cost about $3,000,000. Increased to the dimensions of the United States new works the cost will be increased by about $850,000, of which the deepening of approaches would absorb $470,000, leaving as due to canal and lock enlargement proper, say, $380,000."

Mr. Thompson and other engineers say:

"The sum of $380,000 might be apportioned as under:

Deepening prism of canal proper.	$126,000
Enlarging lock.....	254,000
Total.....	$380,000

Then the report goes on to say:

"So that for a present outlay of $3,380,000 we would have 'the lock of the future' ready for use when its use should come to be needed, instead of then having to build a wholly new one. The expending of the large sum of $470,000 in deepening the approaches could very well be deferred until the call for 20 feet of depth had become imperative, or the dredging could in the meantime be carried on gradually, over a series of years, so as to make the outlay as little burdensome as possible. Whether it would be prudent to increase intended present expenditure by some $380,000 (about 12½ per cent.), and so be done with it, or, more prudent, to wait some years, and then have to expend a couple of million dollars in the construction of new and larger works is a financial question hardly germane to a report of this kind. Appended is a tabulated statement showing approximate expenditure involved in the several plans, or changes of plan discussed.

"I have the honour to be, Sir.

"Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) "W. SHANLY,

"*Consulting Engineer.*"

The reasons which induced the Government to adopt the report and to incur the increased expenditure, were in order to prevent the necessity hereafter—should the trade, as I have no doubt it will, develop in the future as it has in the past—of expending a very much larger sum in the construction of a new lock altogether.

Mr. McMULLEN. What will be the size of the Canadian lock when finished?

Mr. BOWELL. 650 by 100 feet and 19 feet deep, which I explained to the hon. gentleman a moment ago, as I understand from Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Shanly, equals 20 feet as measured by the Americans.

Mr. GIBSON. In the Canadian canals we measure from the mitre sills, and the Americans measure from the bottom. It is not with a view of criticising the Government with regard to the building of this lock that I rise, but I should like to ask them, if the offer that has been received from Mr. Ryan for that addition to the lock is a satisfactory one? While I am asking this question I would like to say at the same time that I should imagine the specifications would have covered this, as it is usually provided for in all specifications in this country.

Mr. BOWELL. The agreement entered into with Mr. Ryan was considered to be satisfactory to the engineers, and I took the trouble the other day, in consulting Mr. Shanly on this subject, of showing him the agreement into which the Government had entered with the Messrs. Ryan, the contractors, and he assured me that it was a much more favourable one than he could possibly have anticipated, and had he been asked to make a report he certainly would have estimated a larger sum. I told Mr. Shanly that I would use his name in discussing this question, as I thought it was a matter the House should know.

Mr. GIBSON. I would ask the Minister if in the additional width being made to the new lock of 100 by 18 feet, the opening has been increased proportionately? As I understand it the present lock is confined to a 60-feet entrance, and a vessel being towed up by a steamer has to run at a rapid rate in order that she may clear the narrow entrance and take a side berth in the canal or lock, so as to allow the other vessels following after to come abreast of her. The American locks, as I understand, were first built with this narrow entrance, but the locks recently constructed have been built with a full opening. As our Government is going to spend a large sum of money, would it not be well that the engineer in charge of this work should consider the advisability of making the opening full width, even if they had to resort to double caissons. There should be no impediment there and full ingress and egress to the canal should be given. I simply make this suggestion as I see that the Deputy Minister and the engineer are here, and I would like to have their opinion through the Minister.

Mr. BOWELL. The engineers, both of whom are here, tell me that they have not provided for the increased width as suggested by the hon. gentleman. From an engineering standpoint, or rather from a common-sense standpoint, I was of the same opinion as that expressed by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. I thought that the American system in reference to the opening of the gates should be adopted also, by which we would have advantage of the full width of the canal in entering and going up. The engineer tells me that that has not been widened.

Mr. GIBSON. Is it done in the new American locks?

Mr. BOWELL. I believe it is.

Mr. GIBSON. Would it not be well for the Canadian Government to adopt the same principle? The United States Government have made this improvement after an experience of thirty years, since their first lock was built, and would it not be well for us to be guided by their experience and provide for a full entrance to our lock? I say as a Canadian that I am proud of the Canadian Government for the enterprise they have shown in building this highway, and I would like to see it a complete success, which I believe it cannot be unless by the American principle of having a full opening, even if it should cost more money. It is only a question of time when it will have to be done, and would it not be better for the Government to consider this small outlay and have it done now when the lock is under construction?

Mr. BOWELL. The suggestion is a practical one, and one that deserves serious consideration. The deputy informs me that one reason they did not do it, was the fear of changing and altering the contract which might involve the expenditure of a very large amount of money. In deepening the other portions of the canal, it was not so much a change in the contract as adding to the expenditure by deepening and widening.

Mr. GIBSON. I understand the difficulty exactly that the engineer had before him, but I would like to point out to the Government the likelihood of accidents occurring on account of vessels being pulled into the lock at a rapid rate. As I stated before, the vessels, in railway phraseology, have to run and shunt on a siding to enable the succeeding vessels to follow in after them. Would it not be well to build steel gates on modern principles and have a full width to the opening?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Could the Minister or his officers give us any idea of what the cost would be? There can be no sort of doubt, I think, that the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Gibson) is eminently in the interests of all who may use these waters.

Mr. BOWELL. I am quite satisfied that the House and the country will justify any reasonable additional expenditure in making this work as complete as possible, since we are spending so much upon it; and acting upon the suggestion made by the hon. member for Lincoln and by the hon. member for South Oxford, I will instruct the deputy to make a calculation as to the additional cost which would be incurred in carrying out that suggestion. I quite agree with them that it would be a great pity, after we have expended so much money, that there should be any failure in the future as to the adaptability of this work to the trade of the country.

Mr. GIBSON. The only additional expenditure that would be necessary, so far as I can see, would be on the gates, though I admit that would be considerable. I think it would be well that Parliament should now, if it would be proper, authorize the acting Minister to see that this is done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood the Minister to say that there are only two ports on Lake Huron where there would be a sufficient depth of water to admit of our making full use of this canal.

Mr. BOWELL. That is what Mr. Shanly points out. He gives the names of some ports which he thinks would have to be deepened by dredging. The proposed deepening of the canal to 19 feet will cost about $600,000, including the approaches at both ends, and the deepening of the harbours as suggested by Mr. Shanly would cost $400,000 or $500,000 additional; but he points out that this might be done gradually as the trade

developed, and as vessels drawing that depth of water would be brought into use.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, if the canal is deepened to 19 feet, the strong probability is that that expenditure must be incurred within a moderate space of time. The total expenditure, then, as I followed the Minister, would amount to about $4,000,000; that is, $3,000,000 for the original project, $600,000 or thereabouts for the deepening and for the approaches, and $400,000 or $500,000 for deepening the harbours.

Mr. BOWELL. That is about right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Supposing there are no extras. Have the St. Clair flats been deepened sufficiently to allow of the passage of vessels drawing 19 feet?

Mr. BOWELL. No; the channel is only 16 feet at present.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take it for granted that for a considerable time to come the trade we are to deal with will be almost, of necessity, confined to that of the two upper lakes, Lake Huron and Lake Superior.

Mr. BOWELL. I think so; unless by transferring the cargoes to smaller vessels which would pass down the St. Lawrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that the channel of the St. Clair flats is being deepened by the United States Government, although it passes through our waters. Shall we be liable for some expense in connection with that?

Mr. BOWELL. In the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal we are following the example of our neighbours on the other side of the river, who meet with the same difficulty as we do in regard to reaching the waters of Lakes Erie and Ontario. As the hon. gentleman says, the dredging on the St. Clair flats is now being carried on by the American Government, and it is also true, as the maps which I have examined indicate, that a portion of the channel which is being dredged is in Canadian territory. However, that is a matter in dispute; but as these waters are common to both countries under treaty, I suppose that the American Government have considered it more in their interest to expend the money than to ask us to assist, which they have not yet done.

Mr. McMULLEN. The dredging of the St. Clair flats raises a very serious question with regard to the ports on both sides of Lake Huron. I suppose the hon. gentleman and his engineers are aware that within the last few years a serious fall has taken place in the water of the several harbours on the Georgian Bay. For instance, the water in Owen Sound harbour has fallen 3 feet within the past few years. It is hard to account for this, but it is supposed to be due to the dredging of the St. Clair flats which makes a readier outlet for the waters of Lake Huron. I would like to know if the engineers of the department have taken this important subject into consideration. If the water in those ports is going to be so lowered as to only permit vessels of 12 to 15 feet trading in these waters, it will seriously injure the entire navigation of the upper lakes. Have they taken notice of the fact?

Mr. BOWELL. We do not see how the result pointed out by the hon. member for Wellington could follow the deepening of the St. Clair flats, unless the water were lessened to the extent of 3 feet on Lake Huron, and the same effect would be seen in Lake Superior, as the one feeds the other. I cannot understand how the harbour at Owen Sound could have a less depth of water by 3 feet, owing to the dredging of the St. Clair flats, unless the whole of Lake Huron was lowered to that extent.

Mr. McMULLEN. This has been going on for some years. I was told by a practical man about this difficulty. He deplored the fact that these harbours had been injured, and could not explain it in any other way. The hon. gentleman says that the dredging of the flats could not so drain Lake Huron as to lower the water, but the continuous increase of outflow from the flats by opening up the river, causing an increased drain on Lake Huron, might be the reason.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I do not think there is any danger of the water being lowered by the dredging of the flats at all. Old residents know that the water rises and falls in periods or cycles. The water in Lake Superior will rise steadily for about seven years and gradually fall again. The water is lower now than it has been for a number of years, and I have no doubt this is the end of one of the cycles, and that the water will begin to rise again.

Mr. GIBSON. I must give the Government great credit for their foresight in making this canal at the Sault 19 feet 6 inches deep. Whether the harbour at Owen Sound or any other place is deepened or not is of secondary consideration, and I give the Government credit for making adequate preparations to carry the trade of Lakes Huron and Superior. We are all aware that the Welland Canal has only 14 feet of water at the mitre sills and that only vessels drawing 14 feet can pass through. In the upper lakes many vessels draw from 18 to 20 feet, and no fault can be found with the Government for making the depth of water at the mitre sills 19 feet 6 inches.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think there is the slightest disposition to quarrel with that principle. All we desire is to ascertain what we are committing ourselves to. That curious question of the rise and fall of water in the various lakes is one that has never been scientifically or satisfactorily explained. I do not know whether the theory my hon. friend from Wellington has advanced will prove correct in an engineering point of view; but I presume if you excavate the channel to a greater depth you will probably draw off a considerably greater quantity of water, and it would be a question for engineers to decide whether it would be possible to lower the level of the lakes by any such process. I do not know whether Mr. Trudeau, who is here, could give an off-hand opinion on this point.

Mr. BOWELL. In answer to the hon. member for South Oxford, Mr. Trudeau says he agrees with him that the question is a complicated one, and, with his usual caution, does not care to commit himself.

Mr. WATSON. With regard to the lowering of the water, experience in the smaller lakes shows it is caused by dry seasons.

Mr. BOWELL. Whatever the cause may be, there is no doubt the water rises and falls in cycles, as the hon. member for Algoma has pointed out, and possibly the rise may begin shortly.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman will enquire he will find that the water has been going down for the past nine or ten years. I mentioned this with regard to the St. Clair flats because the Minister said that the United States were doing that dredging. If they are so dredging that river, that they are seriously injuring our harbours along Lake Huron and in Georgian Bay, it is a matter of very serious moment whether the Government should not remonstrate with the American Government and see if some other course could not be adopted, such as, for instance, putting on a lock and thus prevent the lowering of water in the harbours, now so valuable, and which will carry on much larger commerce when the lock at the Sault is completed. We hope that the development of our mineral interests along Lake Superior will some day equal that of the United States, and it is of the greatest importance that our harbour accommodation should be preserved. If by the dredging carried on by the Americans on the St. Clair flats our harbours are going to be injured, the Government will have to see that it is not carried to the extent of ultimately ruining property that has cost such an enormous amount of money.

Mr. TROW. If the falling of the waters as predicted by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) takes place every seven or eight years, the result may be what he says or it may not, but he might stretch his imagination further and show that it is by the wear and tear of the Niagara Falls, and he might even go still further and predict that in the course of time Lake Huron will be a good farming country.

Mr. WATSON. To my own knowledge the water of Lake Manitoba has fallen 6 feet between 1880 and 1888, and since that it is commencing to rise again. There is only one outlet to that lake, the Fairford River, and a great tract of country drains into the lake, so that in wet years the drainage from the surrounding country fills up the lake and there is only one outlet, whereas in dry years the one opening allows the water to fall. The Government will have to pay some attention to that matter in the very near future, because there is a large tract of land around Lake Manitoba which will be submerged by the rising water. I know that some farms are now being cultivated which in 1880 and 1881 had two or three feet of water upon them. That may occur again, and the Government should take an early opportunity to widen the outlet into the Fairford River.

Tay Canal—completion..... $30,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We want to hear a little more about the question of freight on the Tay Canal. I dare say the Committee will recollect that the Postmaster General gave us some statistics as to the volume of trade passing through the Tay Canal, and the amount saved on freight. My recollection is that the Postmaster General stated that the saving amounted to $1.50 per ton on all the freight taken from Perth. I suppose he meant taken from Perth to Montreal or some such point as that. I may point out to the Committee that, if that is the case, the Tay Canal has performed a rather remarkable feat, because, as that involves a saving of freight amounting to 1 cent per ton per mile from the good town of Perth to Montreal, they must have been tremendously fleeced before if they have got a reduction of $1.50 a ton in consequence of the construction of the Tay Canal.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has evidently misunderstood the tenor of my remarks. I was not making out that the saving to the people there was altogether in reference to freight that travelled along the Tay Canal, but I said that, owing to the construction of the Tay Canal, the people were enabled to make better terms with the railway companies, and as a result of that they saved $1.50 per ton on their freight. That was the information furnished me by those interested in freight in Perth. The total trade passing through the canal amounts to about $40,000 a year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, it is growing. It was $30,000 last time.

Mr. HAGGART. Between $30,000 and $40,000. That is the information given to me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The rate is about 1 cent per ton a mile.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not 1 cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You say there is a saving of $1.50, and the distance from Perth to Montreal cannot be more than 150 miles, so that would be 1 cent per ton a mile. You mean to say that the construction of the Tay Canal has saved $1.50 on every ton that goes into or goes out of the town of Perth.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then they must have been enormously fleeced before. The Tay Canal can only put you in connection with Kingston, because it connects with the Rideau Canal, and the Rideau Canal does not carry freight for nothing. The vessels are small and the charges considerable, and it is a very far fetched idea that the saving is as much as ought to convey from Perth to Montreal every ton of freight, and coarse freight at that. Yet that is what the hon. gentleman stated.

Mr. HAGGART. That is what I stated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, as I have said, the people must have been very heavily pressed before.

Mr. HAGGART. That allowed the people to get their freights coming into Perth and going from Perth at $1.50 less per ton. The people at Smith's Falls, on the bank of the Rideal Canal, had the advantage all the time of a competing line. The building of this canal has not only given Perth a connection with Kingston or with Ottawa, but connection with all parts of the country. There are boats loaded in Pennsylvania with coal, that may come up that canal and may come to Perth.

Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice on page B—301 of the Auditor General's Report, the money that has been expended during the last year; I would like to enquire whether the sums so paid are under schedule rates as contracted for? Are those rates arranged by schedule prices, or is there competition in the letting of that work?

Mr. BOWELL. There was competition in schedule prices, and I am informed the contract was given to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me in some cases the prices are very high. For instance, earth excavation, under water, dredging, there are 16,000 yards at 30 cents a yard.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know the nature of the work. That is the contract price given to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice very high charges for timber for cribbing, and so forth. For instance, timber in sides and ends of crib, 17 cents a square foot. That is a very high price; also, pine or cedar in superstructures, 25 cents a square foot. I do not know how such prices can be got there. I know these prices are not paid in my section of the country for square timber.

Mr. BOWELL. The price here paid for timber, as I understand, is for the timber in the work as it is completed. Of course the price of timber after it is worked up may be higher than the first purchase price. But it is all done under contract at schedule prices, and the timber was bought from the lowest tenderer.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see we pay for spike nails and cut nails, 6 cents a pound. Certainly there must be some peculiarity about these nails. You can buy them over the counter at 3½ cents or 4 cents.

Mr. BOWELL. The Committee will understand that the hon. gentleman is asking questions affecting the expenditure under a contract which has been completed and paid for last year. The deputy informs me that this item completes the whole work, including the extension and the swing-bridge.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Postmaster General some time ago said that a considerable saving of freight was effected owing to the construction of this canal. What are the railway freight rates from Perth to Montreal?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understand this is to complete the extension up to Haggart's mills. In a former discussion it was stated there was a balance left over from the old grant. Can the hon. gentleman tell me what that balance was?

Mr. BOWELL. $16,000 or $18,000.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The complete work will cost $48,000.

Mr. BOWELL. The item is for the completion of the work, and the deputy informs me the amount includes everything in connection with it. $14,000 of it is a revote.

Carillon and Grenville Canal—Rebuilding masonry..... $14,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Why is this amount required?

Mr. BOWELL. It will be remembered the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) made some calculations, from which he came to the conclusion that $14,000, the full amount asked, was more than was necessary to complete the work. Since that time calculations have been made, and the amounts are as follows:—Earth excavation, 1,325 cubic yards at 25 cents, $331.25; rock excavation, 150 cubic yards at $1, $150; masonry and walls, 1,575 cubic yards at $6, $9,450; removing dry wall, &c., 1,530 cubic yards at 25 cents, $382.50; coffer dam, approximate, $2,000; removing coffer dam, $500; total, $12,813.75. Contingencies, 10 per cent., making in all, say, $14,000. The hon. gentleman will understand that in removing old works where leaks are likely to occur, it is impossible to calculate to hundreds of dollars the exact sum required.

Mr. GIBSON. I received that information on the night I asked the question, and I made no objection to the item being passed. I am perfectly satisfied with the information.

Repairing Carillon Dam..... $15,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the necessity for this expenditure?

Mr. BOWELL. The works have become weak, and it is necessary to strengthen them. There is a very large body of water in the dam and frequent repairs are necessary.

Land damages and services of valuators. $1,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Who are the valuators?

Mr. BOWELL. This is to pay Mr. Winan's claim of $300 for damages done to his lot at Hawkesbury. He was tendered $60, but declined to accept it. The land will have to be examined again.

Mr. GIBSON. In what part of the canal was the damage done, and was it done by water?

Mr. BOWELL. It was at Hawkesbury, at the foot of the canal.

Rideau Canal—Dredging plant..... $5,000

Mr. ALLISON. Is this the same dredging plant that I have been enquiring about for the last two or three weeks, and which the Minister of Finance said he would give me the information I desired about?

Mr. BOWELL. No; this is not the same.

Mr. FOSTER. I will get that information for you.

Towards deepening the Basin at Ottawa. $2,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Could the hon. gentleman tell me, is the tonnage on this canal increasing or decreasing? Of course, if it is increasing this would be a justifiable expenditure.

Mr. BOWELL. My impression is that the tonnage passing through the canal is increasing. This work is done on the recommendation of Mr. Wise, the superintendent of the canal, and it has been asked for by the forwarders.

Towards settlement of several claims for damages by water to lands bordering on the drowned lands of the Rideau Canal in the Townships of Kingston, Storrington and Frontenac $1,000

Mr. McMULLEN. When are we going to get through with these claims? It appears to me that they have an almost eternal existence. I would like to know from the Minister if this would settle for every claim that would possibly arise?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think I would like to give an affirmative answer to that question, because these new claims are constantly cropping up. In the settlement of these claims lately we have adopted the plan of paying the sum for damages past, present and future. For the reasons suggested I put these words in the settlement of the claims and recommended their adoption to Council. I am in hopes that this will cut off these almost eternal claims that are constantly cropping up.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish some person with foresight had been in the position of Minister at the inception of these claims, because it would have been a grand thing to have some provision of that kind when we started out first to pay them; however, it is better late than never. Perhaps a great many along the canal will now think that they have some claim when this provision is adopted for damages in the future, and they may be inclined to put in their claims. It would be a good thing for the country if this provision had been put in the claims at first. I want to draw the Minister's attention to another thing. When a man makes a claim for damages and is allowed even a small sum, his neighbour thinks he is unjustly dealt with unless he gets something too, and there is no end to these claims. Therefore, I am glad that the Minister has adopted the system of closing out everything at once, so that when a settlement is made, a man cannot present any further claim.

Mr. DAWSON. I would like to ask the Minister if anything has been done in regard to a claim sent in by the township council of Bedford to the department for damage to a bridge, caused by the raising of the dam on the West Rideau Lake. I believe the township council put in a petition asking an engineer to be sent to assess the damages. I would like to know if that was done.

Mr. BOWELL. The deputy has no recollection just now whether he received the petition referred to or not. I will make enquiry and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. DAWSON. I called at the department a couple of months ago, and was told there that it had not then been done, but that the matter would be looked after. I have heard nothing of it since.

St. Peter's Canal—Towards reconstructing whole of west wall..... $37,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We want some details of this.

Mr. BOWELL. The timber of the present wall is more or less decayed, and the back of the wall more or less out of order, and a large portion of the wall must be rebuilt as early as possible. The work will be done by day's labour. The estimated excavation will be 50,250 yards, at 60 cents a yard, $30,150; repairs to the swing bridge, $1,175; repairs to the lock gates, $350; painting the buildings, $150; repairing the road, $50; replacing fenders, $150; iron bolts, &c., $33; other contingencies, $4,000 or $5,000.

Cobourg Post Office, Custom House, &c.—To complete payments..... $1,500

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the original contract for this work, how far was it exceeded, and what was the estimated cost to complete it?

Mr. FOSTER. The building is all completed, and this vote is for payments due and waiting to be made.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are rather suspicious of post offices, as they generally cost a great deal more than the original estimate. Does the contract provide for a clock on this post office?

Mr. FOSTER. This is not for a clock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We will give the hon. gentleman this item if he will put in the Cobourg item.

Mr. FOSTER. If I find it necessary I will put it in.

Immigration..... $197,025

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Judging from what we have seen of the value of the services rendered by this department, it would greatly improve the Estimates if this item were struck out. I have had occasion frequently to remark that I doubted extremely whether the calculations made by that department were of the slightest value; and in view of the fact that while they reported 886,171 persons to have settled in Canada within the last ten years, the total increase of population is about 400,000 less, it appears the time has come when we should consider carefully whether we should go on spending $250,000 a year in the attempt to bring out immigrants to the country. It is possible these immigrants may have come, but it is very certain they have not stayed. I doubt myself if one man in ten, looking at the returns of the census of those alleged to have come into this country by the Department of Agriculture and Immigration, has stayed, and I am very sure not more than one in four has. My own impression is that any immigrants who have come here and whom it is desirable to retain would have come without the aid of this vote at all. Those we do bring and who have stayed with us, to a great extent, practically exclude certain trained people from occupation in this country. Until we find means of retaining our own people here, we are simply wasting our money in voting this quarter of a million for immigration purposes. I, therefore, advise the Minister of Finance to improve the aspect of his Budget by striking out this $135,000 *in toto*. The whole system has been thoroughly wasteful and useless to us during the past ten years. It would be much better, looking at the results we have obtained, if the Minister insists on keeping up this expenditure, to hand this sum over to be administered by the people of the North-West, who have a real and live interest in bringing people to the country. I do not see that any value at all has been received by us from this expenditure.

Mr. DAVIN. I am very sorry to hear the suggestion made by the hon. member for South Oxford. That suggestion is one we have often heard from the Liberal benches, and I think the attention of the Liberal party in this House has been called to a

powerful article which appeared in the Liberal organ at Winnipeg a few weeks ago, in which, after reviewing the speech made against giving money for immigration, I forget whether by the hon. member for South Oxford or the hon. member for North Norfolk, the Winnipeg *Free Press* said that if that was the policy of the Liberal party, they need never hope for any support in the North-West or Manitoba. It pointed out that the Liberal party might have fairly hoped to have got support in Manitoba, but how could they expect it when they gave utterance to such sentiments in regard to immigration? I will concede that the results of our efforts in the way of immigration have not been as satisfactory as we should have liked, just as in our country and in other countries the increase in population has not been what was expected or what we should have liked, but I say that the fact that our spasmodic efforts—and I shall speak in a moment in regard to their spasmodic character—have not been more successful is due in great part to the extraordinary policy which has been pursued from the Liberal side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. gentlemen cheer derisively, but for nineteen years I have been watching what has taken place in this House from the gallery, or through the columns of the press. Ever since the Conservative party came into power, I have been watching what has taken place on the Opposition benches, and what has been the invariable cry? The invariable cry has been to decry Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear; not so.

Mr. DAVIN. I say it cannot be contradicted——

An hon. MEMBER. It can.

Mr. DAVIN. It can be contradicted by someone who does not care what he says. It cannot be contradicted by anybody who wishes that his public expressions should have credence all over the country, but the tone taken on the Opposition side of the House has been invariably this doleful song every year at the time of the Budget debate. They take a series of figures tending to show great prosperity in the United States and great adversity in Canada, and, although one cannot see how a syllogism can be made out of the bringing together of such figures, it is easy to understand how the impression goes abroad that in some way or other Canada is not so inviting a country to live in as the United States. Again, what has been the character of our immigration policy? Has it been a steady immigration policy? No; in consequence of the very criticisms to which I have referred, and of such criticisms as to-night have fallen from the hon. member from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), our immigration efforts have been spasmodic. A sentiment has been created throughout the country against immigration efforts. A sentiment has been created in the towns, especially against spending money on immigration? And what has been the result? The result has been that pressure has been put upon our own Government to curtail the expenditure, until at last they brought down the amount expended on immigration to the beggarly sum of about $50,000 a year. That $50,000, to deal with so important a matter as immigration to this country, was, as everybody knows, entirely inadequate, and it was only after pressure had been brought to bear on this Government that they took it into their heads to place a sum in the Estimates somewhat commensurate, but not wholly commensurate, as some of us believe, with this great function of the Government of Canada; for we may lay this to our hearts, looking at the history of the United States and other countries, looking at the history of Australia, if we want to build up Canada, if we want to make Canada rich, if we want to make the men who are in Canada rich, if we want to bring about prosperity here and to create a higher level of life and property, the best way in which we can do this is to bring in fit immigrants. How can that be done? Mr. Dyke, in Liverpool, if you speak to him, will tell you; Sir Charles Tupper, if you speak to him, will tell you; those who are conversant with these matters will tell you, that immigration, like other things, is a commodity. Here are a certain number of people who desire to emigrate; here are countries who want the immigrants; and the country that bids the highest gets them. In order to avoid our immigrants going across the line, the manner of spending money voted last year and the money to be voted this year has been and will be of that character that not one cent of that money can be paid out until the settler is firmly settled in this country. That was suggested, not from the Government benches, but from one of the humble members of the Conservative party, in order to meet, and properly meet, the jealousy of those who felt we were spending money with the result of sending immigrants across the line, and also to meet the objections of the labour party. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) made a suggestion which I hope the Government will pay some attention to. He said, jocosely, I think—but sometimes a man unwittingly speaks truth in jest, and it is possible in this House for a gentleman to blunder into statesmanship—at least, let us hope so—he said that he hoped this money would be given to the people in the North-West, who had most interest in attending to the bringing in of immigrants, in order that they should administer the funds. I can only say that, if it is given to us, we shall not object to taking the responsibility of administering it. If the $150,000 were given to us, it would be found that at the end of a year we should give a good account of it. However, I do not suppose that we can persuade the hon. the Minister of Finance, or my hon. friend who represents the Minister of Agriculture in this House, to give us all this sum, but I hope that, in regard to a part of it, they will listen to the suggestion of the member for Oxford. Let them place a part of that sum at the direct disposal of the North-West Territories. You have our lands; you administer our lands; we are really under your Government; but I agree with the proposition which is behind the statement of the member for Oxford, which is that you cannot here in Ottawa attend as well to the pressing on the attention of the emigrating world the attractions of Prince Albert, of Alberta, of the Saskatchewan, of Assiniboia, as we could ourselves. We do not want a very large sum. Suppose you put $5,000 for each district in the Estimates, that would not be a large sum. I venture to say if you put $15,000 or $20,000 in the Estimates yet to come down, to be entirely

at our own disposal for immigration purposes, that at the end of a year or a couple of years we shall give a good account of it. It has been said that we have not made as much progress, from a census point of view, as we ought to have made. Very well. We have not. Neither has the United States, neither has England for that matter, nor any country on the continent; but we have to ask what would have been the progress of our population if no efforts had been made at all in this direction? If no efforts had been made at all in the way of immigration, instead of having close on to five millions, probably we should not have more than four millions to-day. What is the reason that we have not made such progress in population as we should like? As a fact, we have made progress in population, but some of our population has gone away from us; and you cannot prevent, in a country like this, with so enterprising and so migratory a race as we will have in Canada, you cannot prevent the young men going across the border and taking their chances in that country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The National Policy has driven them out.

Mr. DAVIN. There is a smile of derision on the hon. gentleman's face as he utters those words, as much as to tell me he is joking. He himself does not believe the National Policy has driven them out, because before having a National Policy they went away. One of the first times I spoke in this House I mentioned that one of the reasons why many of our population go away is this: Our education is so well organized, we educate our young men so highly, that they become discontented with the plough, and we have more men of education and of professional ability at the present moment in Canada than Canada can support. That is the reason those men of professional ability go elsewhere, and they have to do it. It is the same way in England; there is a class in England that are actually forced to emigrate, and if they do not emigrate they have to starve. You have doctors by the score, you have barristers by the score, you have architects by the score—all of them starving on the high education they have received. Now, we have something like that in Canada; we have a certain portion of our population educated above the capacity of Canada to meet. Of course, I know this happens in every profession; no matter how crowded the profession is, if a man be a first-class man he will force his way; you cannot keep first-class ability down—it will up. Now, I suppose there is not a greater friend of education than I am, yet I will say this, that the greatest curse that can befall any young man of mediocre talent, fairly respectable talent, is that his fond father, or his fond mother, or his own fond vanity, should send him to a university. There is no such waste in a wasteful world as to bestow a first-class education on second-class brains. When you do that you produce a class of men—and what are they fit for? They cannot work, and to beg they are ashamed. They cannot plough, they cannot do mechanical work, and the consequence is they go across the line. But there are others who are of a different class from that even; there are men that go every year, for instance, to our Military College at Kingston; they go there and get an engineering education. Have we scope for their engineering ability here? We have not, and the consequence is they have to go elsewhere. They go to the United States, they go to South America. Just as you find Irishmen, Scotchmen and Englishmen all the world over, so you will find enterprising young Canadians all the world over. These men will go away, and if you are not supplying the drain by bringing in the kind of immigrants, the kind of workers, that we need in a new country like this, the result is that we die of inanition; we should not have a progressive population at all. But, Sir, I hold that the efforts that are being made now are of a wholly different kind from the efforts that were made in the past in respect to immigration. In the past a most wasteful system was adopted by whatever Government was in power. They did not understand the conditions of the country, in fact they did what is the curse of mediocrity, whether in Governments or in anyone else, they were mere imitators; they asked what other people did, and they did it. They found that other people gave bonuses to immigrants, and gave free passages, and they said: We will do the same. They never considered that there was a difference between Canada and Australia, that whereas Australia was sphered by the sea, Canada had a vast border line dividing it from a country in some respects more highly organized than herself—although not in the higher qualities—but in some respects in advance of herself. They never considered that, and they went on from year to year, to some extent, I admit, pouring water into a sieve, and, as a matter of course, the sieve never ran over. But I think the plan that is adopted now of paying only for results will be successful; at all events, we cannot now pay for an immigrant coming here who leaves us, we only pay when he has settled down, we only pay when it is shown by the man who has brought him in, that he has taken up his homestead, and we know very well that once he has taken a position like that, it is very unlikely he will leave the country. Now, instead of placing a vote of $150,000—it has been cut down since last year, and I think that is a retrograde step—I think we ought to spend $500,000 a year on immigration. A sum of $500,000 a year would be well spent on immigration, if it were spent in a fruitful way.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend from Wellington says "hear, hear," in a doubtful manner. Why, he himself is a business man, he is a man of ability, he is a man of tireless energy, and if he were as far-seeing as energetic, he would know that the more he crowds this country with population, the more rapidly he develops the North-West Territories, the higher in value will his own property become, and the richer this country would be for himself and his children.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What would be your plan to get better results?

Mr. DAVIN. The other evening I asked the leader of the Opposition what he would do under given circumstances, and he said: "Wait until I am responsible." And I heard the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when he was asked to explain one of the most difficult problems, I think, that was ever placed before a rational assembly—he said: "We are not yet called in." I do think that in the midst of a plea for more energy in immigration, more wisdom, also, in spending the money, it is hardly rational to ask me for my plan.

Besides, I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet; I am only the humblest soldier in the army of the Conservative party. I am not a person to propound great policies, I am not a profound individual who sits down and cogitates great plans for enlarging the bounds of freedom and enriching the country; I am not one of those heaven-sent individuals that you can pick up like grasshoppers on hedges wherever you go. In fact the plan has been for some time in this country—I do not say it has actually occurred in this House—but I think myself I have seen something like this: I have seen a great Minister entrenched in power, who could do almost anything he pleased; I have seen him take a rat and cut the tail short and the ears short, and put a collar of gold around its neck, and say to his party and to the country: "Gentlemen, this is a bull dog." And all the party papers said next day it was a bull dog. If it turned out that a small terrier attacked it and worsted it they declared that he fought most splendidly, and that the terrier was utterly crushed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Name, name.

Mr. DAVIN. Is it any wonder, let me ask in all seriousness, when that has been the way by which Cabinets have been recruited, that money has gone like water through a sieve? Is it any wonder that when money has been spent unwisely on immigration it has been found difficult afterwards to get the sanction of the House of Commons to a proper expenditure? I do hope the day has gone when the people of Canada will sit quietly by and see one of the most fatal things that can be done for the nation, especially for a young nation, namely, great trusts placed upon narrow shoulders and narrow foreheads. I did not want to go into those deeper explanations as to why it was that the immigration policy was not more successful; but I say this, that be the Government Liberal, or be it Conservative, that Government which refuses to spend money on immigration, and refuses willingly to spend large sums on immigration, is not a statesmanlike Government. The Government that knows what is in the interest of Canada, what is in the interest of enriching the eastern provinces, enriching Quebec and Ontario, as I could show if I did not shrink from taking up the time of the House, is one that will spend money in crowding immigrants into the North-West and developing that great country. An hon. gentleman says something about the Regina *Leader*; there is no doubt that it has been a most successful immigrant. I am talking in favour of a larger vote instead of a lesser vote. I utterly repudiate the suggestion of the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I say that the Government will increase the confidence with which it is regarded in this country, especially in the North-West; will increase the confidence with which it is regarded by all who take an intelligent view of the conditions on which the future of Canada depends; if, instead of listening to such a sinister suggestion from the hon. member for Oxford, they take the suggestion of the *Free Press* of Winnipeg, the suggestion of every man who knows anything whatever about the history of a new country, and spend wisely as much money as they ever can obtain in bringing first-class immigrants into this young Canada of ours.

Mr. FRASER. After the able effort of my friend from Assiniboia, I feel as if the commonplaces I am going to utter on this question will fall very flat on the House. I thank the hon. gentleman very much, he being a Conservative, for his close and accurate analysis of the present Government—a Government of mediocrity—that is bad enough: a Government of narrow foreheads; a Government that contained a rat that passed off for a terrier. That was the unkindest cut of all. I do not wonder the census has developed the results we have, if we are governed in that manner. It was bad enough to say the Government was an old sieve through which the immigration money poured so that none of it remained to keep immigrants in the country. But to have those narrow foreheaded hon. gentlemen to lead the Government—I am not sure some of them have very narrow foreheads—I am certainly of the opinion that some of them are not wanting in cheek if they are in forehead.

Mr. DAVIN. I was not personal.

Mr. FRASER. The very lack of saying anything personal tended to strengthen the hon. gentleman's remarks. When such an indictment against the present Government was fyled by my hon. friend, I felt it was time I should rise, although opposed to them, to say something in their behalf. It is well the country should understand the real condition of affairs. They will know exactly what the true state of things is if they learn the spirit so aptly displayed by the hon. gentleman when he discussed the present Government, its methods and its expenditures, and, if they learn his views, there ought to be no mistake among the electors as to how we are governed. I agree with the hon. gentleman that this country can never develop, never will develop, and no country of the size of Canada with all our resources ever did develop, except by immigration. You may talk about our wealth as much as you please, and about amassing large fortunes here. It is all no good; heads count in this new country, and nothing else. What the hon. gentleman did not say, I am bound to say, namely, that for the last 10 years we have had simply a system of shout, buncombe and brag. We have been talking about this great country. That is all right. We have been talking about its development and how it is filling up. The fact is, the country has not been filling up. Immigrants who came here found that all this buncombe and brag displayed by hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to this country were not true; they simply got disgusted and left Canada. I will show hon. gentlemen how you can bring immigrants here. There is only one way, and that is by making this country a better country to live in than any other, and that never can be accomplished with the National Policy in force. It cannot be done by advertising. The hon. gentleman thinks that if he had $15,000 with which to advertise the North-West would be filled up. We have advertised; we have had agents going up and down the country, not only in Canada, but in Europe; and with what results? Wretched results. Why is it? We have been attempting to reverse the doctrine, not only of political economy, but of common sense, that in this country, if we are going to build it up, we must make the conditions of life so favourable that when a man comes here and takes up land he can live cheaper and freer in this Dominion than elsewhere. We have reversed this condition of affairs. We want to build up kings who will take from the wealth of the poor and add

it to their own wealth; and then we are surprised that immigrants are not coming here. A nice condition of affairs they find here when they come. They discover that the very necessities of life are taxed so that they cannot live here. Why are they leaving the country? There was a time, a few years ago, when I would have been met with a chorus of shouts and I would have been told that the country was prosperous. The hard, dry facts of the census have proved that hon. gentlemen opposite were wrong and we were right. When we come to understand, not by buncombe and brag, that no laws shall be placed on the Statute-book giving a better opportunity to one man than another we shall get immigrants to come here. We must understand that this matter cannot be managed entirely by money. We have commenced at the wrong end. We legislated for the few when we expected the many to come in; and when immigrants did come in they simply left us. We have spent three or four dollars for every man, woman and child who came into this Dominion, and we have spent about five dollars for every individual in our increase of population, natural and by immigration, in the last ten years. Is that a result to be brought about simply by voting money? The truth is that we have been paying agents everywhere all over this country, and in other countries, to try and bring immigrants here, but they cannot succeed in doing it. We sent a man down to Dakota, and gentlemen opposite declared that there was a tremendous exodus from Dakota into the North-West, but we found by the census that Dakota had increased its population 300 per cent., while we have only increased by 11 per cent. We have not taken the proper method of government in this country, and that is the reason why our population has not increased. Look at the results in the Maritime Provinces. We have always been thinking, and I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) in that, that the North-West is the place for settlers to go, but we must not forget that there are large tracts of land in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and in the older Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, which might become the homes of happy and contented people. Immigration to a country must be voluntary. Men who leave a country to come to another must be allowed to choose their surroundings, and men are intelligent beings and will always select the country they will come to. You cannot drive them in herds and say they shall live in a certain place. Their impressions and their ideas of a country must form a prominent part in their deciding to settle in that country. In the census for the last ten years the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have gone far behind. Take, for example, the Province of New Brunswick. Will any man say that the intelligence and enterprise of the people of New Brunswick are not equal to that to be found in any part of this Dominion, and yet the saddening sight is presented to us that on the basis of population New Brunswick will lose two members in this House. That fertile province increased only by 61 of a population in ten years; not any more than we ought to expect under natural and proper circumstances from the gentlemen who represent the province in this House. It does seem like the irony of fate, that a province that produced a Finance Minister; that had no more backbone than to inaugurate this present system, and subsequently a Minister that was too weak—although I know his better judgment tells him now as it has always told him, he being a student, that it is wrong to continue the wretched system—to abolish that policy. Again, in the Province of Nova Scotia we lose one member. Where is the immigration to that province in the last ten years, or where is the natural increase in population? We are told on the floor of this House, that we must expect that the people will leave this country. Must we expect that more people will leave the country than come into it? Have we come to that sad condition? My hon. friend here (Mr. Davin) discovers that the whole difficulty is, because we are educated too highly. He says we have too many professional men. Perhaps we have, but it is the first time I have heard in this country that an educated man cannot be a good farmer. What are our common schools for, but to educate the people? I agree with him that we are educating men for the United States, but that is because in this country we are not giving our young men the opportunities that they elsewhere find. Why is that? Is not our country as rich as the United States, and have we not all the advantages that are to be found in that country? Yes, we have, and greater advantages. I agree with any man who says that in this Canada of ours we have a better country in every respect than they have in the United States. Take any province in the Dominion of Canada, and put it side by side with any state of the Union situated similarly and you will find that it is superior to any state in the Union under similar circumstances. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are ahead of Maine or any of the New England States, and I am sure that Ontario is as fertile and as productive as any part of the United States. Is Quebec not as good as any state in the Union? Is her land not as rich, and are the people of the Province of Quebec not as industrious as the people of the United States? Are they not as frugal: aye, they are far more frugal than the people of the United States. Why is it that the people are leaving our rich and fertile provinces? Is it because we are educating our people too highly, and not spending half a million dollars to bring immigrants into the country? No; we must look deeper for the root of the evil than that, and the quicker we understand the real cause the better. Do you think that while we are placing a barrier on the importation of goods, and while we are making it harder and harder every day for the poor to live, that we are going to get immigration into this country? You may blow the horn louder than Gabriel's horn to call the people to emigrate to this country, but they will not come until you change your policy and your system of government. Does any man think that the class of men we want from England, Scotland, and Ireland, are not well educated? I tell you that the ordinary men in Great Britain are better educated to-day than they were twenty years ago, and through labour unions and other agencies that are at work, they understand just exactly the kind of country they are coming to when they leave England. We sometimes hear that the classes which emigrate from England are not educated. I can tell you that they know more about our country from reading books, and they enquire about our country more than our ordinary farmers and mechanics in this country do. They know all

about it, and they know how to reason about the policy in force in this country, and how hard it makes it for the workingman to get a living. I spoke in this House some time ago, and I said that in the three counties I was well acquainted with—Pictou, Antigonish and Guysborough—that the condition of the farmers and fishermen was nothing like as good as it was ten years ago. I was laughed at then, but when the census returns came down, we found that the County of Pictou, the county in which I live, a county that is noticeable all over Nova Scotia for its enterprise and intelligence, a county that has given as many men to public life, to the professions, and to industrial pursuits, as any county in the province, has actually, under the beneficent effects of the National Policy, where it was supposed to work a great deal of good, retrograded by 1,000 in its population. In the County of Antigonish, inhabited by sturdy Highlanders, a county with a rich and fertile soil, where twenty years ago you would find wealth and contentment everywhere; that county, represented by a Cabinet Minister, went back 2,000 in its population. In the ordinary work of making the roads in the Counties of Pictou, Antigonish and Guysborough, I know there are three-mile districts where there is not a single man to perform the statute labour on the roads which has to be done by every citizen, because the few men who live in the districts are over sixty years of age, and they are exempted from that work by law. The sad thing about the fact that we are not getting men and women into this country is this: that the best part of our population is going away; our young men are leaving, and only the old people remain behind who are not able to work the farm. I want to remind my hon. friends opposite that they pretended—it was only a pretense I am sure, but they led the people to believe it—that when they inaugurated this National Policy there would be a different state of things in the country, and instead of showing 17 per cent. increase as we did during the ten years from 1871 to 1881, they would show during the last decade an increase of double that number in the population. They promised that, and we hold them to their promise. We knew very well they could not do it. We knew that, even without having the description so eloquently given of the character of the present Government by the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). We knew that if their foreheads were wider, their heads larger, their shoulders broader, and they had no terrier in the shape of a rat among them, they would not have been able to do it. No man in this House respects the gigantic intellect and the ability of my hon. friend from Assiniboia more than I do, but even if he were in the Government he could not with this National Policy give us the results we would like.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order. The Government that I was describing was the Government of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie.

Mr. FRASER. Why, the hon. gentleman has spoken of this Government as a Government of antiques; he has spoken of their policy as the green-grocer policy; and he cannot go back on them now. But I was going to say that even he could not make this country prosperous under such a policy. No, Mr. Chairman, a Government cannot make a country; a policy cannot make a country; nothing can make a country except making the laws of such a character and so easily workable that the common people will not only appreciate them, but gain the results of them. You cannot make laws such as we have been making without having these effects. The day has gone by, I repeat, for bluster. We must deal with facts just as they are. The most amusing thing I have heard in this House, as to the state of our country as shown by the census, was the speech of an hon. gentleman who endeavoured to show from the census that the country was in an excellent state, increasing in population everywhere. Why, in the City of St. John the other day the Board of Trade met, and what did they say? They said that the census of the city was not properly taken, and the suggestion was made that they should take the census over again to show that the Government were wrong. One distinguished gentleman came all the way from St. John to Ottawa, and all the way he was protesting that his name was not taken at all. When he arrived here he went to search for himself, and he found that after all his name was taken, and now he does not think it would do any good to take the census again, because the Government census is correct. If there is anything wrong about it, I think it represents the population as fully greater than it really is. This is not a matter for congratulation, and I believe that I am joined by every hon. gentleman on this side of the House when I say that every patriotic Canadian feels this. I feel it, because our neighbours to the south, who are so anxious to lord it over us, who have so much to be proud of, and are often prouder than they have reason to be, will say that this country has been retrogading. We are building immense railways, which is not a bad thing under certain circumstances; but I notice, for instance, that in Great Britain the only thing they think in regard to our railways is that they will be of use in case of war, to enable them to send their soldiers quickly to Asia. That is no reason for us to build railways, and if the English people want our railway for that purpose, they should help to build it; but all the railways we may build in the North-West will not bring immigrants into the country unless they find that it is a better country and that the conditions are more favourable than they will find elsewhere. There is no country in the world today with a fertility equal to that of the North-West, the approaches to which are superior to those to the North-West. A man can leave any country in the old world and come to Montreal, and there take the Canadian Pacific Railway, and go straight to the North-West. But why do people from Europe not go there? I am sure that my hon. friend from Assiniboia has done his share; he says that the paper with which he is more or less connected has done its share, and I believe it; then, why is it that immigrants have not gone into the country? The truth is you cannot always keep all the people in any country. Our race is so vigorous, and its love of adventure so great that it moves from place to place. The difficulty of any nation is in keeping its people at home. Heads count in any country. I would rather have a large population with small means in a country than a few wealthy men and the great body of the people poor. You can never make a country where there is a small body of wealthy men living on the rest of the people

and making them pay tribute to them. This is worse than any taxes which exist in Great Britain, because it has the sanction of a Parliament elected by a free people, enabling a few men to put their hands into the pockets of the poor and make them poorer. I was amused at one hon. gentleman opposite saying that it was only in Grit districts we had retrograded. I was very much surprised at that, because I find, for example, that five counties represented by members of the Cabinet have shown a decline. That is not the way to meet the difficulty. We must meet it fairly and squarely, and this Parliament will be derelict in its duty if it does not now or very soon meet this difficulty as it ought to be met. I tell you that all the speeches made in this country as to the greatness of our country and the immensity of our resources, will not bring immigrants into the country. You cannot bring immigrants here merely by praising the country; the only way you can bring them is by making the conditions of life attractive. I was surprised that the hon. member for Assiniboia did not rise to a position of true statesmanship when he said that it was not for him to make a suggestion. I submit that it is the duty of every member of Parliament to make a suggestion, more especially when we have a Government in power of the character he describes. It becomes the hon. gentleman and myself, small as our quota of suggestions are, to offer to assist such a Government to promulgate proper views with reference to immigration. But I submit that weak as they are and mediocre as they are, it is all the more incumbent upon the hon. gentleman, who represents their views, to make such suggestions to them as will enable them to do better. However, I think the Government are acting wisely in not voting a larger sum of money this year. I think they are beginning themselves to understand that this is a wasteful method of spending money, and that they must devise a better method before they spend much more. I understand that this vote is only for the purpose of retaining in their positions the gentlemen who do the immigration business of this country. That business has been very badly done, surely. I do not know, because I am not on the ground, what is best to be done in the North-West Territories. My hon. friend suggested for it, a vote of $15,000—a very modest sum. I was surprised at the modesty of the request, and I could only understand it as coming from a man who felt himself that we were meeting grave issues just now, and that the money could be better spent by peopling the North-West than in any other way. I, for one, would vote $15,000 every day in the year if the magnificent results which the hon. gentleman described were achieved in the North-West. But mere votes of money will not people the North-West under our present conditions. We must change those conditions. And now let me say something in answer to what I have heard some hon. gentlemen opposite say, that this country is less popular with immigrants because of the facts brought to light by members of the Opposition in this House. I suppose they would say that it is our fault that the people are leaving the country. Some of them are bold enough to say it, but it will not do just now. Do these hon. gentlemen not understand that, in saying that, they are declaring that the people of this country can have no confidence in the Government? The Government are the stronger, and yet these hon. gentlemen say that the Opposition, which they profess to look upon with contempt, are the parties who are depopulating the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite hold power. They hold it with a varying majority, it is true, but still sufficient to carry on the business of the country. They have all the wealth of the country at their back, they take from the people between $30,000,000 and $35,000,000 every year, and the result of all their labour is that the people have no confidence in them and are leaving the country. Some time ago I saw the suggestion made by a gentleman who lives on the Government, who receives a large amount from the Government every year for advertising in a small country newspaper, matters relating to the North-West, a paper which no man reads, that the editors of Grit papers should be sent out of the country. What a glorious country it would then be for the party in power, with nobody to find fault, and with full liberty to do what they liked! It will not do for the Government to say that the Opposition are to blame. The fact stares us in the face that our population has not increased. If this vote is not going to do, if half a million is necessary, let the Government spend it and try every method; still I believe they will not succeed unless they adopt a common-sense policy—a policy of so carrying on the business of the country and so arranging our fiscal laws as to give opportunities, not to the few, but to all the people to prosper. We have a country which can be made prosperous, in which there are willing hands and hearts to build it up. I will be charitable enough to think that even hon. gentlemen opposite have some desire that this country should prosper; but so long as we legislate so as to exclude from a proper participation in the wealth of the country the class of all others that will make it prosperous, the farmers, fishermen and artizans, so long will we go begging for immigrants and not keep them. Open our doors, give us better laws and wider intercourse with the world, and you will see every province start into new life. We have faith in the intelligence and energy of our people and in their ability to compete with any people in the world. We are not the miserable dwarfs the Government policy would make us out to be. We have the hands and the brains and the hearts to compete with any people in the world. Give us the chance, and in the next ten years you will find this country filled with an industrious population, filled with people who stay at home and are contented with their lot. No man wants, no man ever did want to leave the country if his condition here were such that he could obtain in it a happy home and moderate wealth; no man wants to leave it so long as he is able to do that which every good citizen should be able to do, live at peace with his surroundings, meet his bills, and be contented and prosperous.

Mr. TISDALE. Unlike the hon. gentleman to whom we have just had the pleasure of listening, I had not prepared any remarks for this occasion, but still I could not forbear addressing a few remarks to the Committee in reply to the hon. gentleman. I had some hopes of the hon. gentleman when I first heard him speak in this House, and I have yet hopes of him if he will only allow the patriotic sentiments he expresses to control his arguments and his actions. I like patriotic senti-

ments, but I like better arguments consistent with them. I am glad to be able to say that if there has been on this side any bluster, brag and buncombe in discussion, it has not been bluster, brag and buncombe to the detriment of the country and against our faith in the country. I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that the different provinces of this country were greater than Maine, Vermont and the other eastern states; that we were prosperous and ahead of those states. But while doing that, the hon. gentleman took occasion to decry the country he admits is superior to these states. Let me ask the hon. gentleman opposite to quote the statement of any public man in Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, or any of these states, in their newspapers or on the floor of Congress or the Senate, detrimental to those states which even hon. gentlemen opposite admit are behind ours? When I hear a gentleman uttering some of the sentiments the hon. gentleman did, and coupling them with other statements he sends broadcast to the country, I cannot help coming to the conclusion that he allows his desires of a party nature to overpower his better sentiments. He says the National Policy is the root of all evil, and finds fault with the Government because they do not pass laws to remedy the state of things he complains of; and in the next breath he says it is impossible for any Government or party to pass laws to regulate or affect trade. If the latter is his view, I do not agree with him. I appeal to the history of the country, since the National Policy was inaugurated, to prove that this country has prospered.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Look at our population.

Mr. TISDALE. I take strong grounds in opposition to the hon. gentleman when he says he prefers a poor country with many people to a rich country with few people.

Mr. FRASER. I said I preferred a country with a large number of people in moderate circumstances to a rich country with rich men and few people.

Mr. TISDALE. You did in one part of your speech; but in finding fault with the fact that the census had not evidenced such an increase in our population as you desired and we all might desire, you said you desired many heads, that the heads counted, and the other considerations of the country were of secondary importance.

Mr. FRASER. I beg your pardon. I said I preferred many heads as the only basis of wealth in the country.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman said so many things that I think he forgets several, because some of them were completely inconsistent with others. I have challenged him on this, and, if I am incorrect in challenging him, so much the better for him and so much the worse for the remarks I am about to make, but I believe the country will understand him in that sense. I prefer to see a country such as Canada is. Though the population has not increased as we might have desired, the country is prosperous and the different classes, some rich but not many, some poor, some in medium circumstances, but none suffering, all prospering, and in the crisis from which so many lands suffered, not even the mother land escaping, which is supposed to be the richest of all, no country went through that crisis so well as this Canada of ours. When the hon. gentleman complains against the National Policy, I would ask him how he proposes to remedy it? If it is true that there is an exodus, where is it going? It is going to a country with double the National Policy that we have. The hon. gentleman referred to Dakota and the western territories. The hon. gentleman is from the lower provinces, and perhaps he is not posted in the history of the Liberal party in the western provinces. Who helped to fill Dakota and the western territories, when we were bidding against them for the immigrants to the North-West? It was not the Liberal-Conservative party or the followers of the Government, but it was the teachings of many men who were his predecessors on that side of the House, and it was just such speeches as he has made to-night that tended to bring about that result. I am not saying this to hold up the side of politics I belong to, but, as one of the citizens of Canada, as a native-born Canadian, I am deploring that in this country political partizanship has become so strong on every occasion, even on the floors of Parliament, the attempt is made to decry the country because hon. gentlemen opposite think they will dissatisfy the people with the actions of the Government. Let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to recent occurrences in Dakota. What happened in Dakota when our immigrant agents, the agents of the railway company and all those who were attempting to further immigration from that place to the North-West, went there? Did they allow them to open immigration offices there, as we do here, and as all civilized countries should do? No; when they found the people were getting information from reliable sources and that that information was undoing the effect of certain information which had been given to them before, they tarred and feathered them if they would not leave and shut up their offices in the territory and go back to Canada. These are the forcible arguments which our neighbours apply when they find it necessary to prevent the people from acquiring valuable information in regard to Canada. The hon. gentleman says we do not give our young men an equal chance with those in the United States. I am surprised to hear that. I challenge the hon. gentleman on that. I say that in Canada our system of education is not second to any in the world, and I can prove that by the record he refers to, by the United States itself. We all know who read, and I know something of it by personal experience, that young Canadians who go to the United States, having been educated under our system, at once get places in preference to their own young men, owing to the excellent system of teaching we have here. I think the hon. gentleman's remarks were almost all wide of the item we are discussing. He evidently had prepared himself, and for what? Not to discuss, as my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) did, the question of immigration, but to make an attack upon the Government and upon the country. I do not propose to follow him further on that, but, as representing one of the oldest ridings in Ontario, the first settled part of that country, I desire to add my voice to that of the hon. member for Assiniboia in declaring that the Government ought not to be afraid to make a liberal appropriation to assist immigration. As an hon. gentleman has well said, that is the efficient way in which the United States and the countries in South America are encouraging immigration. It is a pleasure

to let the people of the older provinces know that the member for South Oxford opposes that. He wants this item struck out altogether. His riding is also an old one, and I am sufficiently near to it to know the feelings of the people there pretty well. I do not believe that the old farmers of Ontario, the bone and sinew of Ontario, are afraid to see a fair appropriation made for the purpose of filling up that new country in the North-West, which will react upon us in the near future when we get it filled, as I am sure we will. I am satisfied that is the feeling in Ontario. They do not want money wasted, neither do I, nor my constituents, but having entered into the system of Confederation, having made an arrangement to acquire that territory and having acquired it, having undertaken the duty of seeing this country united from the Atlantic to the Pacific by the great system of public works which we have constructed, it would be absurd to say that we shall not pay a dollar to encourage people to go into that great country, this heritage the responsibility of which has been given to us, which offers free homes to tens of thousands of people, which is the hope not only of the people of this country but of the older countries which are filled up in the way the hon. gentleman says he believes in, by too many people with too little to live on. It has been said that this is a dream. It was said so very often in the early days. I have heard hon. gentlemen decry the Canadian Pacific Railway. They were afraid of that enterprise in 1874. I remember the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had a set speech on that subject in which he counted the number of bushels of wheat and the carloads of silver that would be required to build that road, and described it as an unsettled country only fit for bears and Indians. He also referred in similar terms to the north shore of Lake Superior, where we are now discovering such great mineral wealth. Now, while we have not progressed as we had hoped to progress, still there is this pregnant fact that satisfies me, namely, that in this country to-day and during all this time there are no people suffering. People who are willing to work, people who are enterprising, people who are undertaking new enterprises or sticking to old ones, have abundant opportunities to exercise their energies and ingenuity in getting a good living, and prospering, and advancing to wealth. I say again that we are not building up a monopoly of rich men. The hon. gentleman talks about a few rich and a great many poor. I say that in proportion to our capacity, in proportion to the wealth in the country, we have no greater proportion of rich men compared with the well-to-do—and not as great proportion compared to the medium classes—as other countries. It is all very well to get up and make such statements. We have not heard one hon. gentleman quoting statistics to prove that was true. He talks about brag and bluster. They talk about monopolists getting rich, about wealthy manufacturers, and they say that is the cause of our people going into a country where those conditions are a thousand-fold greater. Sir, we are not afraid of the responsibilities that have been cast upon us if we stand up and protect the life of our nation, if we protect our union, first of all, with the mother country, sticking by the institutions that the wisdom of the ages has confirmed, under which actual liberty, and freedom of conscience, the rights of the person and the rights of property, are better protected than in any other country in the world.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why don't you imitate the English policy?

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman wandered into those questions, and I am giving him a little dose of his own medicine. I say frankly that I am getting tired of hearing it said that we cannot answer the arguments that are presented by the other side, and that are not relevant to the question at all. The hon. gentleman has taken the opportunity to make an attack upon the country and upon the Government, holding it to be the fault of the Government that the population has not increased; but he has not proven it in any way except by showing that the figures are not so great. He has endeavoured to make out two things, first, that the country was in a distressed state, and secondly, it was the fault of the Government because they did not provide some kind of legislation to improve the condition of things. No hon. gentleman can understand the fairness of that sort of argument, from his own standpoint, better than the member for South Oxford, because in days gone by when he was sitting on the ministerial benches, he said the Government could not legislate to benefit the country. He agreed with the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) who said that the Government was not capable of doing so. I say I am prepared to support a full measure of expenditure for immigration in order to fill up the North-West.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have never opposed any reasonable effort to secure immigration. During all the years I have had a seat in this House I have never once voted against grants in aid of immigration. If I were sure that the money would be wisely expended, and if I were sure that the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) would have charge of expending it, I might be inclined to take his advice and vote for half a million. But, Sir, we have tried the half million experiment, within my recollection, and we see to-day, by the census, the results of it. Now, I think it is time for us to consider seriously whether we are on the right road, or whether we have been going astray all the time. It seems to me that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) hit the nail exactly on the head when he said that the fitful system we have been living under during the last dozen years is the cause which is preventing immigrants from coming to settle amongst us. I believe the hon. gentleman is perfectly right. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt) says that the country has prospered since we had the National Policy. Well, Sir, the country was prosperous before we had the National Policy, and after we got the National Policy there was a seeming spurt of prosperity in manufacturing. It was something like the hectic flush of fever, and it was succeeded by a stage of great depression, of great weakness, and the country is in that state of weakness now. That has been our experience of protection. Now, Sir, I hold that until we get back to a correct fiscal policy, until, as the member for Guysborough says, we can make all the conditions of life in this country equally favourable, if not better than the conditions in other countries, we cannot expect to attract immigration in rivalry with these other countries. Under our National Policy this country does not present a favourable field for immigration. This may seem

a startling assertion. I said just now that under the National Policy, while we had had a period of seeming prosperity in manufacturing during the first few years of its existence, we have had a corresponding period of depression since. The natural result of all such means, of all such fiscal systems, has come upon us, and we are now in a state of exhaustion, with over-manufacturing, and our manufactories are standing idle. Sir, I am giving no imaginary picture. If it were necessary I could state hard, dry facts to substantiate what I say. I have only to point to the fact that there is a factory in the town of Dundas that, before we had the National Policy, was in a thriving state, was paying good dividends, and in constant work. It has cost, with the plant, $800,000, and the other day it was sold under the hammer for $150,000. In my own City of London, before we had the National Policy, there were three very large and thriving manufactories of agricultural implements, and three men—before we had the National Policy at all—had made good snug fortunes in them; and where are they to day? Two of them had sense enough, when the National Policy came, to sell out and get out of business. Not a dollar has been made in either of these two factories since. One of them is standing idle.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the reason of that?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The National Policy is the reason. One of them is standing idle, and the other has been turned into a factory for making ploughs. Then, as regards the other one, the man who owned it before we had the National Policy, is still trying to do something in it, although it has passed out of his hands. He had made a snug fortune before we had protection, and he has lost every dollar of it since the day that we got it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the reason of that?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The National Policy. Can't you understand it? You are not an ignorant man.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is it because there is too much competition?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Now, with these factories standing idle all over the country, do you want to bring operatives from the old country to take the place of the few that can find work in this country? If that is what you want, it is an idle dream. It is more than cruelty to the people that you bring here. A few of our operatives in this country can get work, but the great bulk of them have to try other occupations. They have gone to the United States, because they have been driven there by the National Policy. What kind of immigrants do you want to bring to the country? We certainly do not want pauper's children. Let us begin at the Maritime Provinces. Do you want to bring men in there to help the people to work the farms and carry on lumbering operations? The people already there cannot obtain sufficient work and are going across the line to find it elsewhere, as the census shows. Do you want to bring in men to work the mines in the Maritime Provinces? The National Policy was to foster mining there. Here is the way we have done it: We have almost doubled the price of iron to the consumer throughout the Dominion, and we have taxed him to pay a bonus to the men producing it. Yet, instead of our manufactures of iron increasing, they are decreasing under that wasteful system. Do we want to bring in men to work at coal mining? We have been trying to fight against geography in the matter of coal. We have been endeavouring, with the aid of the Government railway carrying coal at less than cost, to compel the people of the west to buy coal from Nova Scotia. But hon. gentlemen opposite cannot fight against geography, and the people of Ontario buy their coal where they can get it most handily and most cheaply, namely, the United States. So there is no class of immigrants wanted in the Maritime Provinces. We next come to Quebec, and what do we find? The manufacturers there are in the same position as those in Ontario and elsewhere, they have hands more than enough for the factories. Do you want immigrants to help the farmers of Quebec to carry on their operations? The operatives in factories, and the farming population too, cannot get enough work at home and are going over the line and looking for it in another land, and are becoming citizens of another country. Then, we come up to Ontario. What sort of immigrants do you require there? Are you going to bring out tradesmen from the old country, carpenters, blacksmiths and others? There are more there now than can find work under the debilitating influences of the National Policy. On account of its disastrous results there is scarcely any building going on throughout the whole province, expect here and there among the farms, or in one, two or three cities at the most. The other towns are going backward instead of forward and no operations are going on there. Do you want to bring farm labourers there? Men fit to go on the farm and work there are not men who want to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the rest of the community. I say without hesitation that the only class of immigrants we want are men who can come here and become farmers and help to develop the resources we have in the land. That is the only class we have work for. Talk about mining, so long as we keep up the National Policy we place it beyond possibility, it is utterly hopeless to talk about manufacturing our minerals. We will be told we have a great country in the North-West—we have been told that to-night—and that we ought to have immigrants to fill up that country. Would to Heaven we had them. It is the strongest wish of my heart that that country should be filled up as rapidly as possible, and the only hope of Canada is to get that country filled up by a happy, prosperous and contented population. Why has it not become filled up? In 1870 the country came into our possession, as fair a heritage as the sun shines on in this world of ours. What is it to-day? Anyone who was here in 1874—the Chairman of the Immigration Committee who was here, will know I am speaking the truth—will remember the glowing accounts we had from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture of the thousands and hundreds of thousands of immigrants who were going into the North-West. Had the statistics at the Committee meeting to prove it. It was said we were decrying the country and doing a grievous harm because we questioned the accuracy of those figures. But the census pricked the bubble, and showed either that the figures were false and misleading, or else that the people had been driven out of the country. I believe a great many people did go in there, and I believe they were driven out of the country by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. You

may ask how it was done? It was done in this way: Anyone who has been raised in this country knows that it is hard enough for a man without means to make a settlement on new land and make a living, without being highly taxed to pay for the land on which he is going to make his living. We have been discounting the whole future of the country. Instead of making it easy for immigrants to settle there and make a new start in life, we have done everything possible to make it hard for them to start and to deter them from making the venture.

An hon. MEMBER. How?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Have we not handed over more than the settled part of the Province of Ontario into the hands of soulless corporations and speculators, and have not speculators drawn the life-blood out of the country? That is a fact which no hon. gentleman opposite with any regard for truthfulness will dare to deny. What did we do? A road was laid out for a Pacific Railway. It was laid out all through the fertile part of the country where it would do most good as a colonization road. By some means or other to gratify the railway company the Government allowed the road to be carried south into the desert part so as to run it 400 or 500 miles through a country in which no man could settle, because he would be starved out.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How much?

Mr. DAVIN. There is a certain portion of such country through which the land runs, but I do not think it is over 150 miles or 200 miles.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. From Moose Jaw.

Mr. DAVIN. I know what I am speaking about, and I say it is not more than 200 miles. It is the spur of the American desert that runs up to about forty miles west of Moose Jaw. When I say the American desert, the denudation, as is well known, is not nearly so much as it goes north as it is down in the midst of the desert, and even that land with irrigation could be made fertile.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, if you took the waters of the Rocky Mountains for irrigation.

Mr. DAVIN. The distance is not more than 200 miles.

An hon. MEMBER. Nearly 300 miles.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thought so. The other route would have taken the line through a fertile country. What did the Government do? It was agreed that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were to take their average land along the route. Although they carried the line through this desert, they did not take one acre of land there, but took the land in Manitoba.

Mr. DAVIN. They could not get an acre in Manitoba.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do you mean to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company does not own an acre of land in Manitoba?

Mr. DAVIN. Not of land acquired as part of the land grant. They took it elsewhere in the North-West.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Did they not get land in Manitoba as well as in the North-West?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, for the line in Manitoba.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. They got it through Manitoba, and when the road entered the North-West, instead of taking it where the road ran, they were allowed to take the best in the territories.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They have taken nine-tenths of it along the road.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Along the fertile part of the road. Then we have handed over to every railway corporation that has asked for it, grants of land in the same way, and what is the result of it? The result, as I said before, is that there is a whole province there locked up in the hands of corporations and speculators. If we wanted to make the best of our resources we would have tried to get the immigrants in as cheaply as possible, and to have given them the very best chance to settle in the cheapest way, and to live most cheaply afterwards. If we had done that we might have hoped to prosper. I know it is customary to say that there is plenty of free land through the country, but, when the settlers find that all the land anywhere near the railway worth settling upon is handed over to these corporations and that they must pay a ruinous price to get it, when they find that if they take these free grant lands they must go away from neighbourhood, railways, and everything that makes life comfortable and agreeable, and convenient, when they find all that they leave the country and go where they hope to find better conditions. That is what we have done to retard immigration. Our fiscal policy and our land policy together have driven the immigrants out of the country, and, worse than all that, they have driven our own sons and daughters out of it. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) said that if the Americans would come over here we could teach them something about farming and matters in general. Well, Sir, unfortunately, it is not necessary for them to come over here, because we have driven over, to teach them in their own homes, our most intelligent and best educated sons and daughters. Then we hear that old story again about decrying the country. I have scarcely ever heard a gentleman on the other side of the House speak on the state of the country that has not brought in that old chestnut and charged that the Opposition has been the cause of driving the people out of the country.

An hon. MEMBER. So they have.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman says so they have. Well, now, friend, are you serious in saying that? Do you mean to tell me that these immigrants that come from Europe to go up to the North-West, before they settle there, send down to Ottawa and get the *Hansard* to see what my friend on my left said about the country? Ah, nonsense. I do not mean to say that the gentlemen wilfully falsify, but the fact of the matter is they have told the story so often that they are beginning to believe it. Gentlemen, ask yourselves are there any other reasons why our best and most intelligent people are leaving the country? I do not want to dwell upon it to-night, but there is another reason, and it is a potent one, too. I know the young men of this country of ours, for I have mixed amongst them as much as most men have. I know their noble, manly aspirations. I know that they look upon this country of ours as their country, and they want it to be something, and like myself—for I am a native-born Canadian—we

look upon it as our own country as the first and best country on the earth, and we believe it is to our own country that we owe it our first and highest allegiance. Now, Sir, when you tell these intelligent and patriotic young men that they must reverse their national aspirations, that before they allow any such feelings to sway them they must submit them to gentlemen on the other side to see whether they are right or not, or they must send them to a country some 3,000 or 4,000 miles away to see if they are approved of there or not; when you tell these young men that they must repress their noblest feelings after national greatness and nationality, you have done everything you can to crush everything manly and noble out of them, and you have actually compelled them to go to a country where these feelings can find vent, where the best interests of the country they have chosen may be advanced in the people if the country may think best. Sir, I do not wish to do anything to prevent a single immigrant coming into this country. If it can be shown that any result can be accomplished by the amount asked for to-night there is no man who will support it more heartily than I will, but I do want to say, that after twelve years of trial, the utter folly and falsity of the system we have been working under is apparent, and the absolute necessity is clear that a change should be made in our policy.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) expressed a very strong desire in the beginning of his speech that the immigration policy of the Government would prevail much better than it had, he has also given his reasons why it has not prevailed and why there are not more immigrants in the country, and he repudiates the idea that they have done anything which would retard immigration. I have only to say that if any intending immigrant should have read the hon. gentleman's speech before he left the old country, he would be loth to come and settle in Canada, because the speech of the hon. gentleman tended to show that the conditions of life here were entirely against the immigrants' chances of success, although he afterwards expressed the hope: "Would to Heaven that we could convince them to come." The hon. gentleman also told us that the country in the North-West is locked up in the hands of railway companies, and that is the reason immigrants did not go there. He forgets that there are millions of acres of free lands there open for settlement to immigrants, and that the conditions of life for settlement in our Canadian territory are as favourable, perhaps much more favourable, than they are in any other country in America, or perhaps in the world. The hon. gentleman told us that the land was locked up by the railway companies and that the settlers could not get a chance; but he did not tell the House nor the country how much land his friends of the Liberal party proposed to give for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He seems to forget that there were only 25,000,000 acres of land given for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway by the Conservative Government, that his friends proposed to give 50,000,000 acres, just double the amount. If it is so injurious to immigration that 25,000,000 acres of land should be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company how much worse would it have been if the policy of himself and his friends had prevailed, and if 50,000,000 acres were given away for the same purpose, and, as he is pleased to call it, locked up from settlement? The hon. gentleman referred to the conditions of life in this country; but I can assure him that if we compare the conditions of life in Canada with the conditions of life in any other country to which immigrants are going, there are very few who will not admit that the conditions of life here are more favourable than they are in most other countries. Is it because we have not the means of conveyance and transit, and the conveniences of civilized life for the people who come to settle in this country, that we have not more immigrants? Surely, the policy of the Conservative Government has been to develop our highways of commerce, build our railways, our canals and our telegraph lines. Why, we are blamed by gentlemen opposite for the expenditure which has given all these conditions of life to the thousands who are invited to come to our shores. We are opening up that great country in the North-West, we offer the settlers there cheap homes, in fact free homes; and the railways are built so as to give the people all the conveniences of life. I can tell the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) that in Canada the conditions of life are not only equal but are superior to what may be found in any other part of North America. He says we are in a state of exhaustion in this country, and as an evidence of that he says that the Dundas cotton mill has gone down and has been sold at much less than its cost. In other words, the country is in a state of exhaustion because the overproduction of manufactured goods has brought down the prices until there is not a remunerative profit left to the manufacturers; and in the next breath he condemns the Government because the prices of goods are so high in this country that immigrants will not come here. If the prices are so low that it does not pay the manufacturers to produce, it must follow that the consumers do not pay high prices. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that the products of the cotton mills are not lower in price when we have seven mills in the country than they were before the National Policy when we had only three? I do not think the people of this country will agree that the conditions of life are more unfavourable now, when increased competition has brought down the price, than they were before we had that large increase in the number of the cotton mills of the country. The hon. gentleman might have been fair enough to tell the people that it is not because the cotton mills are not paying a fair dividend to-day, it is because the machinery in that mill is old and out of date, which caused it to be sold for the small sum it was. The hon. gentleman says that we are in a state of stagnation—why? Because there is no building going on in the country. Does he forget that $600,000 has been spent this year on building in Winnipeg alone? Does he forget that the City of Toronto has more than doubled in population in the last ten years, and that the building in that great city has been greater than that in any other similar city on the continent of America? Does he forget the increase of population in the City of Montreal, in the City of London, and in other cities during the last ten years? He must if he says that we are in a state of stagnation, and that there is no building going on except a few scattered houses and barns. The evidences we see

on every hand in travelling through the country are strong arguments to the contrary. The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) says he has never opposed a vote for immigration, but he would like to know that it is properly spent, and then he goes on to condemn the expenditure of the money. But he did not give any details to show where the expenditure was wrong. Does he think we have too many agents or that we advertise the country too much? No; he does not. The hon. member who preceded him said that we have agents all over the country, and he condemned the Government for having so many. Does the hon. gentleman know that we have only five agents in England Ireland, Scotland, France and Germany, these great countries with their millions of population from which we expect to draw our immigration? Is that overdoing the work or advertising our country properly? I think it is the very reverse, and it would be wiser to double the expenditure on immigration. If the speech of the hon. member for Guysborough meant anything, it was that heads and only heads in a country counted. Therefore, if we would increase three-fold the number of agents in foreign countries, we would be acting in the best interest of the country. Will the hon. gentleman tell me that two agents in Ireland are sufficient to look after immigrants there? Will he say that four or five are sufficient to advertise the country in England and Scotland? I say that this is the most meagre expenditure for immigration that any country could make which has so great a need of it as Canada has to-day. It is the fault of our Government that it does not keep double the number of agents employed in trying to advertise and direct people to this country. If the speech of the hon. member for Guysborough was notable for anything it was for its inconsistency. He says that no Government can make or unmake a country. If so, the Government is not responsible for immigrants not coming into the country. Then he says we want the necessaries of life cheap; and then he goes on to prove that the necessaries of life are dear here because of the National Policy. The hon. member for Middlesex says that the necessaries of life are dear because the competition of the manufacturers is so great that they are breaking down on account of the small profits they are receiving. Is there consistency in that? The hon. member for Guysborough says that we have the best country in the world to live in, but that no Government can make or unmake a country. Then, why hold the Government responsible for what he pleased to call the exodus, or for the small number of immigrants? I say that his speech was a medley of inconsistencies from first to last. He says that any province in Canada is better than any portion of the United States; and yet he says that the people are leaving these provinces because the necessaries of life are made dear in them by a protective tariff, and where are they going? To a country that has a much higher protective tariff than Canada; so that if the hon. gentleman's argument is worth anything, the necessaries of life must be much dearer there than they are here. Then, the hon. gentleman holds the Government responsible because the increase in the population shown by the census is not as large as it was generally expected it would be, and he says that the result is that the Maritime Provinces must lose two members — why? Because the reduction in population has been going on owing to the policy of the Government; although he told us in the same speech that a Government could not make or unmake a country. He tells us that our people are going to the United States because the conditions must be better there, the necessaries of life cheaper and the taxes lower. Yet every comparison we draw shows that the taxes are lower, the necessaries of life cheaper, and the conditions of life more favourable in Canada than in the United States. If the hon. gentleman's argument was worth anything, he would not expect to find similar conditions in the United States to those we have in Canada regarding decrease in population. You would find a gradual increase going on in the population everywhere, and no diminution anywhere. I have here a clipping from an American paper, and what story does it tell? There were 2,781 counties in the various states, and in 405 of these there has been a decrease in population during the last ten years. During the previous decade only 138 counties indicated a decrease. This decrease, beginning in the east, covers Maine, the central portion of New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, northern New Jersey, a considerable part of New Virginia, extensive districts in Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Tennessee, Kentucky, eastern Iowa, Wisconsin, and southern Michigan. This is a problem for these hon. gentlemen to solve, showing, as it does, that exactly the same condition of things is going on in that country where the conditions, they say, are much more favourable than here. If the same rules apply to those sections with regard to the number of representatives, there will have to be a decrease in the number there as well as here. These sections stretch from the eastern parts of the states away across to the west, and comprise the oldest and most fertile parts of the country, and in some cases the newest parts. That indicates to me that there are other conditions which account for the decrease of population besides the policy of the Government, that it is due to different causes entirely from those the hon. gentleman represented as the cause of the decrease, and that our Government are not responsible for it any more than are the Government of the United States for the decrease there. It is due to circumstances over which the Government have no control. We find those people coming into the manufacturing centres, on account of fewer hands being required in the agricultural centres, owing to the use of improved machinery. The hon. gentleman was not warranted in his contention that if we had a different Government we would have a larger increase in immigration. He forgets that every year, for twelve years back, the immigration policy of the Government has been attacked by hon. gentlemen opposite, and that the expenditure has been gradually cut down, and that at present the Government propose to spend $50,000 less than last year. The hon. member for South Oxford would be better pleased if we did not spend a dollar on immigration. He tells us that the constituencies in the north-west of Ontario are being depopulated, and yet he does not want people to come and take the places of the inhabitants who have gone, and the whole tenor of his arguments would be to make people leave. The Government have during the last few years followed a very injudicious policy. With millions of acres of productive land lying open for homesteaders,

they have failed to adopt a liberal policy on immigration. I regret to find the Knights of Labour all over the country opposing our immigration policy and advising that the Government should not bring men from the old world to compete in their trades, and we have been confined almost entirely to agriculturists and labourers. That is a mistake. Some of the most successful farmers on the continent of America to-day were the weavers of Scotland of by-gone years. We ought to invite all classes of people to our shores, as we have openings in every line of life for them. I believe the great need of the country is a larger expenditure on immigration, so that we may obtain those immigrants who are only waiting to come as soon as they know the conditions of life are so favourable. We have spent a great deal in building railways and making other highways of commerce, and we have everything necessary to enable settlers to earn a good living. We have a fruitful soil, a healthy climate, free homesteads, railways built wherever necessary, and all that is necessary is to let the people of the older countries know what advantages we can offer them, and that can only be successfully done by having more agents and spending more money in advertising our country in foreign lands. The hon. gentleman said that what we want is a large population and not a wealthy one, and that the number of heads was the best test. If his argument amounted to anything it would mean that China would be the finest country in the world. But will he tell the people that China, with its ignorance, and slavery, and other drawbacks, is a superior country to this. There is an over population there; in our country we have not sufficient population, and as long as we are in that condition we will be justified in spending every year a large amount to bring out immigrants.

Mr. DAWSON. I am sure we are surprised to hear the hon. gentleman opposite advocating immigration from China. He says that China is overpopulated and that we are under populated, and that the policy of the Government was to bring in these people.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not want the hon. gentleman to misunderstand me. I did not speak of immigration from China. I said, applying the hon. member for Guysborough's arguments, that the number of heads was the test of the best country, China ought to take the lead, because in China there was an overflowing population.

Mr. DAWSON. And that we wanted them here. The hon. gentleman has been very courageous in advocating the National Policy, considering the facts presented to this House in the census returns. He says there have been large building operations in Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, London and other cities, and that the country is prosperous. Certainly wealth has increased in our cities during the past ten years, but it would be interesting if some of the hon. gentlemen opposite would tell us how much of that increased prosperity is due to the fact that vast sums of borrowed money have been expended in the country during the past ten years. Millions of dollars have been expended in the construction of railways and canals, and no doubt this expenditure has very largely contributed to the prosperity of our cities and tended to increase the population there. But in spite of this increase of prosperity in our cities, the results have been discouraging in the extreme. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) also lauded the National Policy. It required singular courage on his part to do this, in view of the fact that his constituency has lost 1,239 of population during the past ten years. He advocates an increase in the grants to immigration. Doubtless he knows it is required in his constituency, and he hopes that, by the expenditure of larger sums of money, some of those who have left his constituency within the past ten years may be induced to return. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) was accused of saying that legislation could not better the condition of the people. I think what the hon. member wants is for the Government to quit tinkering with our trade policy by legislation, to remove legislation which is shackling our trade and to allow our trade to flow into natural channels, instead of forcing it by legislation in unnatural directions, with the disastrous results which have flowed from that policy. Those hon. gentlemen join the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in saying that the Liberals are continually decrying the country. They seem to confuse the country with the Liberal-Conservative party. They think they are the country, and, if any one dares to criticise their policy or that of the Government they maintain in power, he is said to be decrying the country. Liberals have pointed out year after year the fact that the policy of the present and the late Administration was not in the interests of the country at large, but was legislation in favour of the classes and to the injury and detriment of the masses, and that the result would be the depopulation of the country, and these prophecies or criticisms of the Government policy have been borne out by the results. In all these years I do not know that any Liberal has made a more slashing attack upon the policy of the Government than the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He says, if it had not been for the large sums which have been spent on immigration, the population would by this time have dwindled to four millions of souls. As a result of the immigration policy, I am told by the Government returns that 886,000 people have come to our shores, while our population has only increased by half a million, showing that 386,000 souls and the whole of our natural increase have departed from our shores. The hon. gentleman well expressed it when he said our country had become a mere sieve through which the immigration poured into the country to the south. I do not think the people whose sons have gone to the United States will thank that hon. gentleman for saying that none but those of second-class brains go to the United States. Two years ago I heard the hon. member for Algoma say that in home after home in his constituency you would hear the cry go up that the young men were leaving, and that one young man cradled in the home of our pioneers would do more towards the development of this country than six of the immigrants. Evidently his opinion of the classes of our young people going to the United States was different from that of the hon. member for Assiniboia. It has been shown by these hon. gentlemen, in their advocacy of a larger grant, that the present policy of the Government is so rotten and so disastrous to this country that the Government must offer a bribe to the immigrating classes to come to Canada. I think nothing has been said by any Liberal which

speaks in terms of such severe criticism of the policy of the Government. In filling up the North-West, I would advise the Administration to keep faith with the settlers there, to issue no more pamphlets offering second homesteads, and then, after the settlers have been secured, withdraw the grant, and teach the people that they are not willing to keep faith with the settlers. I think it would be well to pause and to consider whether it is advisable to expend any further sums in trying to induce immigrants to come to this country until the Government revises its policy. I think, if the Government would adopt a policy which would be in the interests of the great mass of the people, and would cease their class legislation, we would have no difficulty whatever in securing immigrants to this country and retaining them when we got them here.

Mr. McMILLAN. Coming from one of the best agricultural counties in the Province of Ontario, I hold that the statements which been have made with respect to the Liberals decrying this county are untrue. I believe the Liberals have told the whole truth about the country in every respect. We have always held that Canada is one of the best countries in natural resources, and if all the other conditions were equal, of any other country on the continent of America for settlers to succeed in; but when it is made one of the dearest countries to live in, it is impossible that we can succeed. I have been astonished to hear hon. gentlemen opposite comparing Canada with England in regard to the increase of population. Do they not know that Britain is a country which is throwing off thousands of her population every year and sending them to all the countries in the world, while Canada is a young country, taking in population and which ought to be increasing rapidly in population? Yet they compare the increase in population in this young country with that of an old country, which is overcrowded, so that its people have to emigrate in order to better their condition. Take the Northern Atlantic states and see the increase in population there compared with Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. While these provinces gained only 1·17 per cent. the eastern states had gained 19·45 per cent., showing that even in that country, with all the disadvantages we have heard described, with all the misery existing among the people and with the great emigration to the west, the increase is greater than it is in even the populous Province of Ontario. Take Ontario and compare the increase in population with the states of Michigan, New York and Minnesota, taking into consideration that Ontario is larger by 38,000 square miles than those three states. The State of Missouri is also one that we may make a comparison with. We have heard that described as the state of storms and blizzards, where people live in dug-outs and could not have a comfortable house to live in. In that state the population has gained 510,804, or more than the whole Dominion of Canada, and yet hon. gentlemen tell us we have gained fairly in population. The State of Minnesota has gained in population 521,053, or more than the whole Dominion of Canada, and yet we believe that state to be inferior to Manitoba and to the North-West Territories. There must be some potent reason why people will flock into a country with all the disadvantages we have heard hon. gentlemen describe as existing in the north-western states. We have heard that Dakota was a country of blizzards, a sterile desert, where settlers could not live, and yet Dakota has gained 300 per cent. or 376,352, while all our provinces west of Port Arthur have only gained 172,169. The hon. gentlemen tell us that we want to spend a large sum of money in immigration. We have spent very large sums of money in immigration; we have spent over three million dollars in immigration within the last twelve years, and they now ask us to spend still further large sums. We were told by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that two immigration agents in Ireland were not sufficient properly to represent Canada in that country. But, Sir, what we want is something in this country that will retain the population that we have here already. We find that in the North-West Territories, by the census of 1885, there were 48,363 of a population: we find in Manitoba, in 1886, we had 108,640, or a total of 157,003. Then we find by the immigration figures that from 1881 to 1886, 166,002 came into the North-West, and we had by the census of 1881 a population of 122,400. Add 122,400 to the 166,002 that went into the North-West, and you should have a population of 288,405. But when we came to get the true population, what did we find? We found by the actual census that we have only 127,003 in the North-West, leaving 131,399 unaccounted for. Will hon. gentlemen tell us that immigrants do not go to the North-West? I say they go, but they do not remain there. They find the conditions are unfavourable, they find a large tariff is imposed upon them in that country, and this is what has driven the immigrants out. Sir, let hon. gentlemen look at the report of the Minister of Agriculture on immigration, and let them look at the report of the immigration agent in Winnipeg, who says that a great many immigrants came from the old country to settle in the North-West, and he found that after visiting the North-West and going through it they perceived that the representations that had been made to them by the Government and their agents were not verified. They went to British Columbia, but they did not remain there, and they went into the United States. He states that over ten thousand had gone into the United States in one year who had left Europe with the expectation of settling in Canadian territory, in the North-West and in British Columbia. But it did not end there. What was the fate of this immigration agent who dared to give a correct statement with respect to the immigration of that country? He was notified by the Government to hand in his resignation, else his dismissal must follow. It is not the policy of this Government to have the truth told on any occasion by one of their employes, when that truth does not satisfy their purposes. It is true that the misleading statements of the Government and their action in imposing such a high tariff upon this country have driven the immigrants out of it. Let us look at the North-West. Farmers going in there pay 35 per cent. upon their implements, and we have been told time and again across the floor of the House, even this session, that implements are sold in the United States to go into the North-West cheaper than they are sold in the United States to the farmers of that country. I saw a statement in the New York *Tribune* last week that an investigation had been held in the

United States into this very question, respecting agricultural implements being sold cheaper out of the country than they are sold to the farmers of the United States. The implement manufacturers themselves were called upon to give evidence, and they stated that they had a better profit upon implements sold to go out of the country than they had upon implements retained in the country and sold to the farmers of the United States, and that as a rule they got the cash for the implements they sent out of the country, while the implements sold at home were sold on credit, and they had not the same profit upon them. So I hold that the tariff has had a great deal to do with the fact of immigrants going out of the country. When we look at the United States, is it not a fact that Minnesota has gained in population more than the whole of Canada west of Prince Arthur? Let us go into the County of Huron, which I hail from, and I hold that we have in that county as industrious a population, as intelligent a population, and as independent a population as lives on the continent of America, and what do we find? Why, Sir, we find that in 13 out of 15 townships belonging to the three ridings of Huron there is a loss of 9,032 in population during the last ten years, and we find that these parties have gone to the United States. Many of them, to my knowledge, went into the North-West and settled there; but when they found the condition of things that existed, and when they ascertained the superior condition of things across the line, in Dakota—a country that we have heard decried by hon. gentlemen opposite and in the Immigration Committee, as suffering the very lowest depth of misery—yet we find that large numbers of people went from the North-West and settled in Dakota, simply because they found the conditions for settlement more favourable. In the first place, they found in our own North-West that for a length of time there was a great monopoly in the shape of a land corporation, who held a vast amount of the most available land for settlement, and had laid it out in alternate sections, and no settler will ever settle in a new country where a large monopoly holds a large quantity of land. Then we find that in the County of Huron the villages are not prospering. In the village of Seaforth we only had an increase of 160 inhabitants during the last ten years, and yet we have a furniture manufacturing establishment that employs over a hundred hands, showing that if it had not been for this one industry Seaforth would have lost in population. Then we have the town of Goderich, which has lost over 700 within the last ten years, one of the most beautifully situated towns on the shores of Lake Huron. It is a resort for Americans who come there to spend the summer holidays. Yet, with all these natural advantages we find that under the policy of the Government our harbour is nearly deserted, and the town of Goderich has almost completely lost its prosperity. We find that up to the time that the McKinley tariff was adopted we had a line of steamboats plying twice and three times a week between Goderich and Sand Beach, in the United States, but during this summer that line of boats has been laid off. I believe if we had reciprocity that within a very short time the town of Goderich would become as prosperous as any town in the Dominion of Canada, on account of its natural advantages. Now, I will try and recount a few of the reasons that this country is not prosperous, and that we have not gained in population. In the first place, let me say that as regards the Province of Ontario there is not a state of the Union that can compare with Ontario in point of fertility, and there is not a state in the Union that can compare with it in the industry and intelligence of the agricultural community. We find that in fall wheat Ontario is four bushels per acre ahead of the very best states of the Union, and in spring wheat also Ontario is four bushels per acre ahead of any state of the Union, on an average, during the last ten years. In barley we are over three bushels per acre ahead of the most fertile state of the Union. When we come to oats we find we are more than one bushel beyond the most fertile state in the Union. So we have a country which I believe to be second to none in the world. It was well described by Mr. Wells, an American who visited the Province of Ontario, when he said that the Canadians possessed one of the fairest heritages on the face of the earth, one of the finest countries that God Almighty had ever given as a gift to the human race. He said it was the home of long-woolled sheep, that it was the home of Durham cattle, where they could be raised to the greatest perfection, and that it was to Ontario that the farmers of the United States must look to recuperate and renew their stock, both in sheep and in cattle. Let me state some of the reasons why the country has not prospered. I will first take the iron industry. We were told when the duty was increased to $4 a ton on iron, and when the duty was taken off anthracite coal, that there would be an increase of 20,000 workingmen and 100,000 in population. What are the results? In 1878 we manufactured 18,000 tons of iron, and neither duty nor bounty was given. I find that $300,330 have been paid in bounties to iron manufacturers. And the duty that would have been collected if that iron had been brought into the country was $835,758, or nearly one million dollars have gone into the pockets of the iron manufacturers of the Dominion. And yet we find by the last statement that the increased manufacture of iron was only 4,000 tons per annum. There are reasons why the farmers do not remain here, because of the very high prices to which iron has been advanced, and on account of the prices of agricultural implements, which can be purchased very much cheaper in the United States. There are other reasons why they go across the line. I found a comparison between the prices of wheat in Rochester and Toronto, and while the price was $1.20 and $1.22 in Rochester it was only $1.12 and $1.13 in Toronto. A farmer was left his father's estate in equal shares with his brother. By-and-bye one brother went to Michigan and bought land. The brothers met annually, and they found at the end of ten years that the brother in the United States obtained from 18 to 20 per cent. more for his farm products than did the brother who remained in Canada. As the one who remained here found that the tariff was increasing the burdens of the settlers he pulled up stakes and went to the United States, although, as he told us, it grieved him sorely to find he had to leave his native country in order to get a better living on the other side. The National Policy has impoverished the farmers both in buying and selling. If we had reciprocity with the United States I hold that every

farmer would be benefited, as between buying and selling, to the extent of $150 annually. The farmers of Ontario and other provinces know this, and so long as the National Policy is continued in existence just so long will it be foolish to spend large sums to bring out immigrants in order that afterwards they may go to the United States. So much is this the case, that I was very much amused at a statement I saw with respect to an examination which took place in a school. A little girl was asked to name the exports of Canada. She replied: "The exports of Canada are young men and young women to the United States." Perhaps that was one of the most characteristic answers that could be given under the circumstances. I hold the policy of the Government has injured the farmers by placing large tracts of land in the North-West in the hands of companies, and further by imposing a tariff that makes this a dear country to live in. Let me give a single instance connected with a young man with whom I am acquainted. After he had been twelve months here his father sent out a watch as a present. It was taken possession of by a Custom house officer, and before he could obtain it he had to pay $5 duty. I heard the young man say he would never remain in a country where such a demand was made, and he went to the United States, and a number of other young men followed him. If immigrants are to be encouraged to come to our shores they must be liberally dealt with. These results are due to the action of the Government, not to the speeches of the Opposition. We contended that the number of people in the North-West in 1886 was not the number the Government represented. When the census was taken they found that the Opposition had been telling the truth, while the Government had been misleading the people. Now that the census has come down we find that in 1886 the Government published to the world that we had within 29,000 the population which the census of 1891 gives for the whole of Canada at the present time. These conditions imposed on settlers are sufficient to keep down our population, and until the Government makes this a cheap country to live in, and one equal to any other country for settlers, they will not get settlers to come here. Many of the people in the old land have relatives in Canada and in the United States, and they are constantly comparing notes. A gentleman visited my own place this last summer; I was not there at the time and did not see him, but he remained a long time in Canada. He then went to the United States and examined the condition of affairs there, with a view of sending his son to this country. He wrote me from his home and stated that if he had ten sons to send to America to settle he would send them all to the United States; that our cursed tariff was enough to deplete any country and prevent any young men from coming to Canada. He was an intelligent individual. He said the United States was very different to Canada; that it was a whole continent within itself; that it had all the conditions a country required; that it had free trade from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Mexico to Canada, whereas Canada was only a long narrow strip. He has visited the Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific and has also visited the United States, and his opinion with respect to Canada was, that no man who expected to flourish should come to it so long as the tariff remained as at present.

Mr. SKINNER. Even at the risk of trespassing for a few moments on the attention of the Committee at so late an hour, I wish to say a few words, principally with respect to the arguments or rather the speech of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) as to the Maritime Provinces, and as to the result, so far as information is concerned, of the census we have taken. I am not going to speak for the purpose of saying that that hon. gentleman desired to run down the country, or anything of that kind; but I must say that the remarks he made were calculated in a remarkable degree to misrepresent that position which the Maritime Provinces hold. Speaking first of Nova Scotia, outside of the question as to whether her population has decreased or not, I do not think there is a more prosperous commonwealth in America, at all events, than is the Province of Nova Scotia. If any one wished to go into statistics to show the resources of that country and the development of them, and gave a true picture of the way the people live, their great prosperity, the large amount of wealth to the individual person, and the conditions they enjoy, he would draw a true picture of a people who are more prosperous, at all events, than any people of whom I have knowledge. I think myself that they are more prosperous in Nova Scotia in that sense than almost any country of which I have any knowledge. If the gentlemen cross the Bay of Fundy from the City of St. John, and strike in at Digby and Annapolis and go up the great valley of Nova Scotia they will find for a distance of over a hundred miles the evidences of prosperity in a most marked degree. The people have every facility for rational enjoyment, their houses are good, their carriages are good, and there is a general display, if not of great wealth, of, at least, every comfort belonging to prosperous people. If you go to the cities and towns of Nova Scotia you will find the same evidences of prosperity spread out before you everywhere, and with the development of her mines, minerals and fisheries you will find that Nova Scotia is one of the best countries we have in connection with our Dominion, or that has been developed in America up to the present time. It may be said that Nova Scotia has lost a great many of her people. That is true, but the reason that Nova Scotia has lost people is not on account of want of prosperity. It is not on account of the want of development of her resources, but on account of the desire manifested by people everywhere to get into the great cities and towns. In the United States, the cities of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore are so attractive that the young people go there and mingle into the business life of those great cities to a very large extent. Therefore, the emigration from our country is not the result of want of prosperity, but it is the evidence of the determined and go-ahead spirit of the young people, which has been built up in them by education. As I said before, if you go into the Province of Nova Scotia you will find there a prosperous and successful community. The hon. gentleman has also sought to say that because the Province of New Brunswick has not increased in population it has also been destroyed, and its business depleted, and all that sort of thing. He is entirely mistaken

in that. In order to ascertain the position of New Brunswick with reference to the general trade of this country, you have got to cast your mind back for some time. Up to the time that the development of iron shipping came to such a perfect state in Great Britain there was no province in this Dominion that built so many ships, calculating on their sea tonnage, as the Province of New Brunswick did. It was a ship-owning province. Around all its shores and in its harbours the people were largely engaged in the ship-building business, and when the iron ships pressed that business out of existence it was said: What is the Province of New Brunswick going to do; its great business has been destroyed; it has no future before it; its people will have to leave. Well, it was a great blow to our province, and the City of St. John, which I more particularly represent, was largely engaged not only in ship-building, but our people were large owners of ships as well, and it was supposed when the great shock would come upon us, as it did come, that we could not stand up under it. But we have borne the shock. If we have not gained in population we have held our own, and you will find with reference to the people engaged in ship-building that they changed their business, developed other lines of trade, and have fought the fight, and are doing well, notwithstanding what may be said with reference to them. It is said by the other side of the House that the National Policy has brought about these injuries. I say that is not the case. The National Policy, at all events, from the very lowest standpoint you view it, has done no harm to our ship-building and ship-owning business. It was not the National Policy that affected our trade, but it was the aggressiveness of the iron ship-building industry that brought that about. If our people had not had the benefits of developed manufactures under the National Policy what would they have done? Why, we could not have got over the crisis at all. It was the National Policy that came to our assistance, and that enabled our manufacturers to sustain themselves against the competition of the United States. When hon. gentlemen opposite talk about these things they talk as if we had something to do with the American tariff. Had we anything to do with the repeal of the reciprocity treaty? Had we anything to do with the high tariff the United States put on after the war? Had we anything to do with reference to the McKinley Bill? No; the United States have made themselves a protective country, because they thought they could keep our trade out. They intended to do that, and to some extent they have succeeded; and when it is charged against us that we have something to do with that, the charge is mistaken, and the facts do not warrant any inference of that kind. One of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House stated that the immigrants would not come into this country because we have a high tariff. He says that when an immigrant has made up his mind to come to America he wants to come to that part of America where the tariff is the lowest, and the hon. gentleman's argument is that the immigrant chooses the United States, where the tariff is higher than ours. I do not believe that any immigrant who ever left the shores of Europe to come to America was ever influenced one way or another by the tariff of either country. It is a mistake to say that Canada is a hard country for the immigrants to live in. There is no country in the world where living is cheaper than in Canada. Where can the emigrant get cheaper vegetables, cheaper meat, or cheaper clothing along the line of clothing manufactured in this country than he can here? No place can the immigrant or any other person secure the means of livelihood cheaper than he can in Canada. Why do not hon. gentlemen opposite publish that fact to the world. We heard the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) state to-night that few people here could get employment, thereby throwing out the idea that the masses are unemployed. Do not statements like that injure the country? The hon. gentleman from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) spoke about our taking a hopeful view of the country, as if we were deceiving ourselves and those who come here. Nothing of the kind is warranted by what has been said and done upon these lines. We do say that this country is great, and we believe that it is very likely that if the hon. gentlemen opposite get into power they would soon change their tone about this country. But it will never help them to get into power to run down this country and to say that it is a dear place in which to live, that it is not prosperous, and that there is no hope for the country unless we can get free trade with the United States. The United States can do what they like about free trade, and we cannot compel them to take action one way or the other. I do say that we can build up this country even if the United States shut us out altogether and keep us shut out. Let it be known throughout this country that whilst we want freer trade relations with the United States that we are not dependent upon them for these things and that we can develop our country without them. I say that if we have added a half a million of people to this country during the last ten years we ought to be proud of it, and although we had hoped to have added more, we have no reason to be disappointed. If you travel up and down Canada you will find that the Canadian people are as prosperous as the people of the United States, and I believe the time will come when our own people will see more and more that the true place for them to stay and live and develop is in Canada. But they will not be encouraged in that way if this strong argument of hon. gentlemen opposite is continued, that the country is going to the dogs. I say it is not. Although we have not developed population as fast as we had hoped, either by immigration or otherwise, yet in the last ten years the country has shown marvellous development in the material prosperity that comes with the creation and ownership of wealth. We must remember that the spirit is abroad among people to crowd into cities; but that is not going to continue always; it will pass away, and the people will be more inclined to remain on farms. Therefore, I say to the hon. member for Guysborough that when he stands up here as a representative of the Maritime Provinces, and attempts to persuade this Parliament that because the Maritime Provinces have not increased in population they are not prosperous, he makes a mistake. If he would go to the Island of Prince Edward, although its population has not increased, he would find a country whose prosperity is not equalled anywhere.

Mr. PERRY. How do you know?

Mr. SKINNER. Because I have been there.

Mr. PERRY. When?

Mr. SKINNER. I have been there a good many times, and I know of what I speak. There is no place where you will find more men, not of large, but of proportionate wealth, than in Prince Edward Island. The farmers of that province are prosperous; many men have made money by handling agricultural produce; and the people are contented and happy. It is a fine place to live in, notwithstanding what any man may say against it. I know of what I speak, from what I have seen and heard, and I stand here to say that the people of the Maritime Provinces, numbering together, as they do, 800,000 people, are as good, as prosperous an 800,000 as are to be found anywhere in Canada or in the United States.

Mr. WATSON. This is a matter in which, as a representative of the North-West, I feel very much interested. I regret that the Government have seen fit to reduce the vote this year. I regret, moreover, that I cannot agree that the Government have judiciously expended the immigration votes of past years; and I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that Canada is as prosperous as it should be.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. WATSON. Hon. gentlemen appear to dissent from this view, but I think they ought to listen attentively to any person who makes any suggestions for the improvement of our condition. We have been attempting to bring people to our shores at the public expense for years, and we have made a miserable failure of it. We have not retained our natural increase. To say nothing of our natural increase, we have not retained one-half of those reported by the Department of Agriculture to have come to our shores. Therefore, hon. gentlemen opposite, instead of standing up to defend the policy of the Government, should be ashamed of the policy they have pursued. We know that we have a fine country, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to quote the words of any hon. gentleman on this side of the House who has decried the natural advantages of Canada, either in the Maritime Provinces or in the North-West. We have always spoken well of our country. We know its natural advantages, but we know that it would have a larger population if it had not been misgoverned. We have been told that we have our schools; but we educate our young men, and they leave us, because, as the hon. gentleman who spoke last has said, they want to go to the larger cities. Why do they leave the rural districts? Because they cannot make a living there; because the policy of the Government has been opposed to the interests of the great mass of our people, the agriculturists, and they leave the country because they cannot make a living in the industry which is most natural to our country. We are asked why the people leave. I believe they leave to better their circumstances; a great number of them go to the United States, and I believe they do better their circumstances. Notwithstanding all our natural advantages in Canada, what do we find? In the past ten years our population has only increased 11 per cent., whereas in that highly-taxed country which hon. gentlemen opposite so often speak of the population has increased 25 per cent., or more than double the increase in Canada. I claim, as a Canadian, that we have better natural advantages in Canada than they have in the United States, and with such advantages Canada's population should increase more rapidly than the United States. But what is the fact? The fact is that to-day we are not only not retaining our natural increase, but Canada is simply a breeding ground for the United States. We are educating our young men to become citizens of a foreign country. I regret more our losing our natural increase than I do our not retaining the immigrants who come to our shores, because I believe that one native Canadian is as good as any two immigrants from a foreign country. We produce a better class of people than any other country in the world, and our own people are better adapted to our country. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), though not a native Canadian, will bear me out when I say that the best settlers we have in the North-West are the young Canadians from eastern Canada. I regret that it should be possible for a gentleman to advance as a reason why our young people are leaving the country, particularly the lower provinces, that they want to go to the larger cities. Why have we not those large cities in Canada? The Government promised to build up large cities and great industries by the National Policy. But it has proved a miserable failure, even to the manufacturers, simply because they have not a market for their products. They view with alarm the census returns which have been presented to them in the last few days. They know that they have established their businesses, but they have not an adequate market; but I venture to say that with unrestricted reciprocity with the United States our Canadian manufacturers would be better off than they are to-day. You have been taxing the masses for the benefit of the classes; but even the classes are not now prosperous, because while you have put increased taxes upon their products you tax at the same time their raw material. While they do not prosper, at the same time you impose heavy taxes on the agriculturists on their behalf. Why, we find that the farmers of Manitoba have had to import within the past few weeks 120 tons of binding twine, on which they were obliged to pay a duty of 25 per cent.; and will any hon. gentleman tell me that it is made cheap by that duty? Owing to the magnificent crop which has been raised there this year they require three pounds of binding twine to the acre, which means 10 cents an acre of increased cost for binding twine, on account of the duty upon it, merely for the benefit of some half-dozen ropewalks in Canada. I say that the National Policy, along with the Government's land policy, with its railway policy and its policy of monopoly, are the causes of our not having more people in the North-West. I have been accused of decrying the country, simply because I have said that the statements made to this House by the immigration department were incorrect. That department wished to spread throughout the country the opinion that people were coming in and settling and remaining in our North-West, and were happy, contented and prosperous, when such was not the case. When we had the miserable showing of 1886, what was the answer of hon. gentlemen opposite? Look to *Hansard* and you will find who were decrying the country. What was the excuse they gave for the people leaving? They said it was because we had suffered from summer frost. That

was not the cause. The whole secret lay in the fact that the people reported to have come into that country were incorrectly reported and never came there; but the Government, for the purpose of showing that they were bringing immigrants into the country cheaper than the previous Government, at so much *per capita*, doubled the figures; and in 1885, when the census was taken, we found a loss of some 175,000 people in Manitoba and the North-West. We find to-day, according to the census, that Manitoba and the North-West are the only provinces which have increased in population, and they do not by any means contain the people who are reported to have gone there. The policy of the Government is against the settlement of the North-West. An hon. gentleman asked to-night what about the Mackenzie Government, and he said they wanted to give double the amount of land which the present Government have given the Canadian Pacific Railway. Why, Sir, the times and the circumstances were different, and the Mackenzie Government were allotting the land under a different system. This Government has given the Canadian Pacific Railway 25,000,000 acres of selected land; the Mackenzie Government intended giving them 50,000,000 acres in blocks of alternate townships. I would ask any hon. gentleman, I would ask the hon. member for Assiniboia, if he would not rather have 25,000,000 acres of selected land than 50,000,000 acres in alternate blocks? But we are not here for the purpose of discussing that now, but for the purpose of discussing immigration. We are told that the Government have only seven agents; we are told that they have not enough agents in England, Ireland and Scotland. But I say they are not following the proper policy. The system adopted last fall and winter, a portion of the expenses of which was paid by the Government and a portion by the Canadian Pacific Railway, of sending prosperous settlers from our North-West to the old country to instruct the agricultural classes there as to the capabilities of our North-West, was a good system. Under the present system, we find one agent getting $4,000 a year, and in seven or eight years sending out one immigrant. Is that the proper way to spend the money we vote for immigration? It is not. We want results. I want to see a large amount of money expended on immigration, but I want to see it judiciously expended. The best immigration agent is the contented settler. Make the people contented, remove their grievances and they will advise others to come. We have the natural advantages in the North-West, and all we want is for the Government to pursue a proper policy. We have been told that the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford retard immigration, but we all know how absurd is such a charge. Talk about prosperity in this country! What could any one say which could compare with the sworn evidence of several witnesses, given before a Committee of this House, that for the sake of securing situations worth $1.25 per day men will give a bonus of $150 or $200. That is the kind of evidence that hon. gentlemen opposite provide for the people in other countries, that employment is so hard to secure in Canada that men will give $200 of a bonus to secure a job at $1.25 a day. That is the kind of advertisement the Government are holding out to the people of other countries. Talk of the tariff of the United States; notwithstanding their tariff they have a great country within themselves which they can serve, and it is not fair to compare Canada with the United States when speaking of protection. If we were situated north and south as we are east and west, we might possibly thrive under protection; but, as we are, it is impossible for us to do so. We are so situated that it is natural for us to trade with the people of the south and we want their trade.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Do you want to supply them with wheat?

Mr. WATSON. Yes; and I venture to say if we had had unrestricted reciprocity last fall wheat would have been worth 10 cents a bushel more in Manitoba than it was, not only on account of our grain going to Minneapolis, which is the hub of the milling world, to be ground, but on account of the freight rates. We have to-day no competition, as we have only one line of railway, which is a monopoly. That road benefits by protection as trade is forced over it, simply because there is a tariff wall at the international boundary. Hon. gentlemen will say that is not our funeral, that the Americans put it there, and that we cannot take it down; but I believe that if we approach the American authorities in a proper spirit, as business men, a treaty could be arranged which would be beneficial both to them and to us. The barrier between us is an unnatural one. The hon. member for Leeds asked if we wanted to take our wheat to the United States. I believe that in the near future, instead of the United States exporting grain they will be importers. Several of the states which exported millions of bushels a few years ago are to-day importing breadstuffs.

Mr. O'BRIEN. When they want our wheat they will take the duty off.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; and I believe they would take it off to-day if we would take the duty off agricultural implements. It is an unnatural barrier. Up at Sarnia, in a few days, a tunnel is to be opened below the St. Clair River. For what purpose? For the purpose of encouraging trade between Canada and the United States. And what do we find? We find a Customs officer at each end of the tunnel to restrict trade. We have nothing to fear in Canada from the people of the United States. Our natural wealth is greater than theirs, and it is surprising to find that in ten years we have not retained our natural increase. People abroad will naturally say: Why should we go to Canada, when that country cannot retain her natural increase? Of what use is it asking strangers to come to a country when we cannot keep our own people at home?

Mr. INGRAM. There are a large number of people in this country opposed to a system of immigration of any kind.

Mr. WATSON. I am sorry to know that there is any class of people in this country who are afraid of competition. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, defends combinations. I am a mechanic myself, and I say we want everyone we can get to come to this country, and the idea of these trades unions asking this Government not to allow artisans to come to this country is a great mistake. Artisans make the very best class of people we can have in the country. I regret that any view should pre-

vail that, because a man knows more than an ordinary agriculturist in the old country, because he has had the ability to acquire the knowledge of a trade, he should be debarred from coming to this country. I almost regret that the Government place a tax on Chinamen. We condemn the Chinaman because he works too cheaply; we condemn the Indian because he does not work at all, and the trades unions complain that artisans are allowed to come to the country, for fear, I suppose, that they will work too cheaply. I admit that it is necessary for the artisans to band themselves together for self-protection, but it is protection all through, in consequence of the system which was inaugurated by hon. gentlemen opposite. The mechanic says, if the manufacturers are to be protected the mechanic must also be protected. But take down the barriers of trade, and the trades unions will not require to petition the Government to prevent artisans coming to this country. We will be able to live more cheaply and will be better in every way as an agricultural and also as a manufacturing country. At this late hour I do not propose to occupy the time much further. I regret very much that the Government and the Department of Agriculture have not made more progress in inducing people to settle in this country. We find that the returns which are made to us from year to year by the Agriculture Department are incorrect. We have not the people here. I was called to task on one occasion by a note from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, stating that he would appear before the Immigration and Colonization Committee to correct a statement I made in the House similar to that I have made to-night. When he appeared before that Committee, not even the member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) had the face to stand up and defend the Deputy Minister. The statements I made then were true, and the statements I have made now are true, that the figures we get from year to year from that department are not borne out by the census, and that we are not getting value for the money we expend. Until you remodel that Agriculture Department and put live men at the head of it you cannot expect anything else.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be better to remodel the Opposition.

Mr. WATSON. After what I have heard from the would-be Minister of Agriculture to-night, the member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), I do not think they will get any better results by elevating him to that position.

Mr. McMULLEN. He will never get there.

Mr. WATSON. I hope he will not.

Mr. SPROULE. Your hopes or fears will not affect me much.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think it matters, for the hon. gentleman has no chance. I think this vote should be increased, and should be judiciously expended, and that live men or a live man should be placed at the head of that department to see that the money is judiciously expended. We are going on in the old slow-coach style while other countries are securing the immigrants. We have nothing to fear from the United States. Our natural advantages are better than theirs, and we are getting people from the Western States into our North-West this year.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). That is not possible.

Mr. WATSON. We have removed some of the barriers. We have removed the railway monopoly, at least in name. The Northern Pacific have a few miles of road there, but they are not really a competing line, in consequence of the restrictive policy of the Government in not giving them the same franchises they give to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Last year the Department of Agriculture were not energetic enough to spend even the amount voted by Parliament. That is sufficient evidence that they are incompetent men when they cannot use the money voted, because they do not know how. You want a live man at the head of that department, who will at least properly use the money which is voted by Parliament. I am not going to refer to the different provinces, but in Manitoba we have an increase in ten years from 62,260 to 152,442. While that is an excellent showing in comparison with the other provinces, it is a miserable showing when we consider the great field for immigration we have in our Canadian North-West. I hope the Government will adopt some of the views at least which have been thrown out from this side of the House, and will change their policy in such a way that in the near future we will have, not only our miserable population of 154,000 in Manitoba, as we have to-day, while as I contend, if a proper policy had been pursued by the Government, we would have had at least a million and a half. We have not 10 per cent. of the population we should have. We have the country: we have the land. It has been properly stated that large tracts of land were locked up in that province. That was true. In the years 1881, 1882 and 1883, when we would have expected the largest number to settle in that country, it was almost impossible to secure a homestead at any land office in Manitoba on account of the colonization companies and the railway reserves. The whole of the country south of the Canadian Pacific Railway was reserved and many of our settlers and intending settlers left the country in consequence. In 1885 we had the rebellion, which stopped immigration for a year or two, and I will not say that was not also the result of the policy of the Government. Outside of that, the policy of the Government has not been to encourage the settlement of the North-West. They have been throwing obstacles in the way of that settlement ever since they came into power, and to-day we have the miserable result before us.

Mr. INGRAM. I did not intend to offer any remarks on this question, but I wish to explain some of the reasons why I believe this item has been decreased. There are a large number of men in this country who are opposed to assisting immigration at all. They believe that those who have money enough to bring them here should be welcome, but they are opposed to assisting them in any way at all. Now, having that pressure brought to bear upon the Governmant, and the Government feeling the pressure, on the other hand, of those who are in favour of immigration, I can understand the reason why this item has been made so small. For my own part, I am in favour of a thorough immigration system, that will encourage immigrants to come to this country, immigrants of a class that will become good subjects and good citizens. I say that the very class who to-day are finding fault with the encouragement

given to immigration are willing that a class of people should come to this country who will assist in building it up, and making it a country worth living in. Now, as regards the National Policy which our friends find fault with, speaking in a local way, I have this to say: That in the riding I have the honour to represent, it is owing to the National Policy that we have had an increase in population. The hon. member for South Oxford admitted during the campaign that this was one of the ridings that the National Policy had done something for. I know that in the town of St. Thomas, were it not for the National Policy, we would not have the factories there to-day that we have; so that their arguments with respect to the National Policy do not hold good. I, as one of the supporters of this Government, support it chiefly because I believe in the National Policy I believe it is the true policy for this country; I believe that in course of time it will make this country one of the greatest and most prosperous nations of the world. I believe we are as good a people, and just as able to hold our own, as any other nation on this continent. We want a fair field and no favour; we do not want to give the Americans any undue advantage over us, but if the policy hon. gentlemen opposite are advocating were adopted, then the Americans would have an undue advantage over us. Now, as respects immigration, I would be willing to see a million dollars placed in the Estimates for that purpose. I would suggest to the Government, as has been suggested by the hon. gentleman who spoke last, that more vigour should be shown in our immigration policy. What has been the case in the Dominion of Canada? Every town and every city in this country have been visited by American agents, trying to induce Canadians to go to some of the western states. I think the Government should place a greater sum in the Estimates in order to put men in the different towns throughout the Dominion to counteract the influence of the American agents. Who would find fault with the Government for doing so? It is not the supporters of the Conservative party, but I can name you supporters of the Reform party who never lose an opportunity to call attention publicly to any little thing of that kind done by the Government, to any little means they may take to counteract American influence. I say to our friends opposite that if the Dominion of Canada has not increased in population to the extent it should have done, a great portion of that blame rests with those hon. gentlemen and their friends, and not with the supporters of this Government

Mr. GILLMOR. I had a desire, when the senior member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) spoke, to make a few remarks with reference to this question, but it is late now, and I do not feel that it is important that I should say much. But with regard to immigration, I have been surprised that people are inclined to leave Canada so much as they do; I have been surprised that emigrants from Europe are not as much inclined to come to Canada as to the United States. I cannot account for it, except on the supposition that they do not like monarchical institutions, and they are rather inclined to have a change and to go where there are republican institutions. There may be something in that, because, everything considered, Canada is a very desirable country to live in, a desirable country to which to emigrate. I do not agree with our friends in the North-West, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who want a very large appropriation to encourage immigration. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Ingram) would like to see this $150,000 increased to $1,000,000. That sort of talk is absurd. I think we have done quite as much as we can afford to do for the North-West. I remember not many years ago, when the late Mr. White spoke of the North-West as being a spoon-fed people. He never said a truer word. I say that Canada has done for the North-West all she ought to have done, and more too. I say, when you look at the older provinces and see what they have done for the North-West, and consider the opportunities and the advantages in the North-West, it is nonsense for them to come and ask the older provinces to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars annually to get people to go there, after that country has been bought by the older provinces, and paid for, and a hundred million dollars put into railway operations there, and the Mounted Police kept up, and the Indians fed; and I say that, after we have done all that, if these people in Europe and in Canada, in civilized society, do not know the advantages of the North-West without being bought, and hired, and paid to go there, I say, let them stay away. There is nothing in the condition of the older provinces of Canada to-day to warrant us in voting a single dollar to bringing out immigrants to Canada. Here is Canada, and it is a good country. It is not such a country as both Liberals and Tories talk about; it is not the Garden of Eden; it is not the best country in the world. But it is as good as the majority, and it is better, I think. But I do not think this country is prosperous at present; I do not think this country has progressed. I do not think the policy that has been pursued for the last twelve years is calculated to give prosperity to any country. That is the way I look at. Talk of the National Policy making the country prosperous! In my opinion, we might as well expect to gather grapes off thorns, or figs off thistles, as to get prosperity out of protection. You have had twelve years of experience, and your boasting has been all in vain. You never got such a "sockdologer," you never got such a knock-down as the census has given you.

Mr. FOSTER. Explain.

Mr. GILLMOR. The Minister of Finance feels the blow, and the only argument he makes, now is: Oh, you are running down the country; you are a miserable minority against whom the people have pronounced whenever they have had an opportunity. And yet, notwithstanding that they have got the majority in Parliament, and that they are sustained by a majority in the country, somebody makes a speech on this side of the House and thwarts the whole of their policy, and prevents people from coming here. It is said that we on this side of the House are preventing people coming here, that we are running down the country in our speeches and that the people believe us, and absolutely leave this country. That is all negative. Where is your positive benefit? And where is the progress this country has made? The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) spoke of

comfortable homes. There are many comfortable homes in Canada, and there is very little want; but there is no progress in this country commensurate with that which you would expect from its broad acres, its natural resources, its soil and its climate. As the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, we in Canada are simply marking time. But in a great part of this Dominion I hold we are in a still worse position. I remember reading that Sir Edward Parry, one of the great Arctic explorers, got on an ice floe on his way to the north pole, and day after day he kept marching northward without taking an observation, and when he did take one he found that while he was marching 10 miles a day to the north the ice floe was floating 12 miles to the south, and at the end of each day he had lost two miles. So it is with us. We are further back than we were some years ago. We are living in a state of advanced civilization. There never was a period of civilization so advanced as that in which we are now living. But I do not give the Government credit for inventing the electric telegraph, for the steamboat or steam engine, for the numberless inventions of labour-saving machinery. I want hon. gentlemen opposite to show me where this country has prospered from the policy of the Government. I do not give the Government credit for building the Canadian Pacific Railway. It required a small amount of brains to tax the people and build the road. It never requires much ability to tax the population and spend the money. I want hon. gentlemen opposite not to burke the question, but to show me where their policy has benefited this country and given us anything like progress or advancement. It has not done so. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) spoke about New Brunswick. That province is my home; and what showing has she made? The hon. gentleman spoke about shipping. What is the condition of shipping? The tonnage in New Brunswick in 1881 was 333,215 tons, in 1889 it was 218,873 tons, or a loss in 8 years of 114,342 tons. That tonnage at $40 per ton would amount to $4,573,680. The hon. gentleman says that iron ships caused that decline. If so, why did not those marine men put their money into iron ships? The truth is, that $4,000,000 of money have been lost, and we have nothing to show for it. Again, with respect to the population of St. John and the trade of that port. You need not talk to me about progress when the importations into a country are falling off. Under those circumstances there is no progress, because the people will buy all they want if they are able to do so. What is the use of talking about progress when the real estate market is flat, and real estate is not worth half as much as it was twenty-five years ago? That shows that the young men who should be occupying the land are leaving the country and no other young men are coming in, and it is impossible for the country to be prosperous under these circumstances. Hon. gentlemen opposite need not talk about this town or that town increasing. It would be a curious policy if some people did not get rich under it, if some locality did not benefit by it; but, taking the whole of the country, there is not only no progress and advancement, there is an absolute retrogression, and all the people have to congratulate themselves on is the present advanced state of civilization. Every scientific man who discovers something for the benefit of his race, every ingenious man who invents something has, in a certain sense, made a contribution to Canada, and the Government have injured rather than assisted in these contributions. I do not blame the Government for a great deal for which perhaps some other people blame them. I do not believe a Government can prevent the people coming and going, but the supporters of the present Government must be astonished when they look back to the time when those hon. gentlemen declared they would keep the people in the country, when they charged the Administration that preceded them with having driven the people out of the country, and yet the exodus to-day is greater than it was then. The most cowardly thing to be said is that we on this side of the House are driving the people out of Canada, that we are decrying the country as one not fit to live in. No one makes that assertion. The attacks are not made on the country, but on the Government and on its policy and practice. This country is a very good country. I have lived here all my life, and I expect to spend the balance of my days here, and it should be the home of millions of people. There should be ten millions of people here now, and I believe that if we had a free trade policy—and this country needs a free trade policy above all other countries—we might have had that population. With respect to our neighbours, I think well of them. I do not fear so much their legislation as I fear our legislation. God Almighty never allowed one nation, unless they went to war, to be ruined by another. They cannot fill their coffers by placing a tax on their own people, and although the McKinley Bill may injure us as a protective policy injures the world, yet it injures the nation and people who produce it ten times as much as it injures any other people.

An hon. MEMBER. The United States tariff is 61 per cent.

Mr. GILLMOR. Those arguments are stale, commonplace, worn-out, absurd and silly. Every old woman has got them. The United States is a great country in spite of protection, because protection never, under any circumstances, helped the prosperity of the people. The nation I want to copy is the mother country, and yet I never felt I was bursting with loyalty, that it was oozing out at my fingers, as is the case with hon. gentlemen opposite. I admire Great Britain for her institutions, because she has set an example to the wide world, because she fought the best battle for the race when she threw down her tariff walls and declared against protection and defied the nations, and she leads the van to-day. I admire Great Britain because she sits the queen of nations, and she has set an example to the world. I admire our neighbours across the border, and I feel that instead of this war-like attitude and this disposition to retaliate and fight with them we should treat them as brothers. They started 120 years ago on their march to nationality, and we started at the same time. We had the mother country, with all her wealth, at our back, but where are we now and where are they now? Where are they compared with us, even though we have our fertile provinces and our vast resources of fisheries and of mines and of agriculture. Why, the State of New York has got a good deal more people than the Dominion of Canada, and I believe, also, that

the State of Pennsylvania has a more numerous population than our country. I have been informed that there is one wholesale house in the States that sells more dry goods than we import into Canada altogether. I do not want to be dependent, but this sort of independence that I have heard about to-night is an independence which the lowest conditions of human life are found in. It is living within yourselves, and growing for yourselves and making all you want and buying nothing. Is that the way, for the Lord's sake, to get rich? That is the way you tell us to get rich, but it leads to the lowest condition that the human race has ever been found in. I remember well, when you first introduced the National Policy, the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) was a great protectionist. He told us how independent we were going to be, and that the good wife could spin, and weave, and knit, and the old man could shear the sheep, and the wife could lay the good little boy on the floor, and take a piece of chalk and make out his own trousers, and that was to be our independence. If you expect to get wealth you have got to get it by trade, and if you want this country to grow prosperous you have to take the ligaments off trade. If you tie ligaments around the limbs of a child and stop the circulation of the blood you cannot expect him to grow, and it is just as ridiculous to expect a nation to grow by placing ligaments and obstructions everywhere on its trade. I say to you gentlemen: Go to Washington on the 12th October; go, and you have my best wishes; go there and make a treaty and get all you can. If you cannot get anything more than reciprocity in natural products take it, and get the rest as soon as you can; but if you cannot get free trade come right back home and have free trade yourselves. Look down in my own county and look all around the borders at how people are going away from the country. Why do they go away? It is because you have put on your tariff, and then you go to work and appoint an army of brigands and freebooters to follow every man, woman and child who is buying a dollar's worth, or half a dollar's worth of goods, and you keep these brigands to prevent what you call violation of the law. Do you know what I think about this matter of violating the law? I think the law is wrong. I do not think that buying and selling is wrong, but I think it is wrong for a law to fine a man for buying his goods wherever he pleases, and it is wrong to put a lot of brigands all over this country to watch and persecute men who are doing what ought to be a lawful trade. Of course you say: Here is a man who advocates smuggling. Well, I do not advocate smuggling; but I do not condemn it very much, because it does not violate any moral law. I think the law is violated by putting that law in the Statute-book, and I think the time is coming when it will look just as ridiculous to people to fine men for buying and selling as the Blue Laws of Connecticut appear to people now. As I stated the other day, under the Blue Laws of Connecticut, a man kissing his wife on Sunday would have a split stick put in his tongue, and I suppose that in the eyes of the Puritans of that day the offence for which the punishment was awarded was considered a terrible sin. Now, you have had twelve or thirteen years' experience of the National Policy, and you know that the ordinary average of human life is only thirty years, so you ought to be convinced in these twelve years that your National Policy is a failure. Further than that, I charge on the National Policy the political corruption of Canada. I charge that the National Policy is immoral, that it leads to immorality, and that it is the beginning of all the evils we are contending with now. Your corruption began when you commenced to legislate for protected industries, when you commenced to legislate for a few at the expense of the many, and to disregard the many for the few. The sore began then which has grown to such proportions now. Take any session you please since the National Policy was inaugurated, and what has been the character of the legislation in this Parliament? There has been no legislation for the people. The legislation has been for some protected industry, or some monopoly or some corporation, or something of that kind, but the interests of the great mass of people are never considered. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) wants a half a million dollars for immigration, and he wants to have it sent to the North-West and he will take charge of it. He does not think of all the people who have got to contribute that. I am opposed to any more money being expended for immigration. I believe the experiment is too costly. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Skinner) may talk about the comforts of the people as he likes. Of course, they have some comforts, and why should they work from generation to generation without a little comfort. I will tell you of a little incident which happened during the last election, and will show you how the National Policy benefits these protected millers by its duty of 75 cents a barrel on flour, and how it injures the poor people. I know a widow with two or three little boys who wanted a barrel of flour last year, and she got them to cut a little soft wood and send to Eastport to get the flour. When she got it home on the sea shore she was travelling through the snow to find a Customs house officer. For fear one of those brigands would come down on her and take her flour she managed to get 75 cents to pay the duty, and she said to my son, whom she met: "I hope, Mr. Gillmor, you will do all you can to have this frightful system stopped, by which I cannot get food for myself and children without going to all this trouble and expense." Can you think of a system that would be so bad as that? Talk about direct taxation. Under direct taxation you would not make a few men rich and take the money out of the poor people who are struggling to keep body and soul together. No; you would go to the rich men who are able to pay, and you would not tax those who are suffering destitution. We know that the rich man never goes to bed without his supper, but the poor often do. Now, I have spoke long enough.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. GILLMOR. I listened to the speech of the hon. member for West Assiniboia, and I never heard more nonsense. He is adapted to it. He talked for ten minutes about putting a first-rate education into a second-rate brain; but how could you get it in? Now, the Government are showing a good degree of economy this session; they are beginning to haul in their horns, and I think they are wise. I hope they will hesitate before they do any more for the people of the North-West. Some

of them are no better than hermit crabs ; they cannot make a shell for themselves, and they crawl into some shell that has been abandoned. My constituents have not any such advantages ; they have not the soil of the boundless, rolling prairie, neither have they so much frost in August. Then the cheek of these men, to stand up here and ask the Government to give them more. Do not give them any more, and I wish you would conclude not to give them that.

Mr. HAZEN. I will not trespass at any length on the patience of the House at this late hour of the evening. In fact, my excuse for rising is that the speech which the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) has just delivered has put the House in such good humor that I feel sure that they will not mind wating while I make a few remarks. As everyone knows, free trade has been a part of the hon. gentleman's political religion since he has been in public life, which has been for a great number of years. But I cannot understand how a gentleman who is honest in his views of free trade could approve of his party when they enunciate a policy which is not free trade with the world, such as the hon. gentleman approves of, but with a country having the highest protective tariff on the face of the globe, when that policy necessitates the adoption by this country of a similar tariff or the assimilation of our tariff with theirs. The hon. gentleman has charged that protection is immoral, and that the National Policy has led to immorality in all branches of the public service. If that is the case, if a tariff of 35 per cent. makes people immoral, how does he think we are going to get clear of that immorality by joining a country which has a tariff of virtually 60 per cent., and adopting that, as we should have to do under unrestricted reciprocity. If the National Policy tends to make this country immoral, then the logical sequence of the hon. gentleman's argument is that the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity and the tariff of the United States would tend to make this country twice as immoral as it is at the present time ; and I have always failed to understand how gentlemen who believe in free trade as a political doctrine can see a cure for our ills and an improvement for our condition in a policy which would necessitate our adopting the American tariff ; because they all know that the time has not yet come for the United States to lay aside a policy of protection which nine-tenths of the people of that country believe has made it prosperous and brought it to its present condition. Now, I have never, on the hustings or anywhere else, made the charge against the party to whom I am opposed that as a party they are disloyal. No matter what opinion I may entertain of some individual members of that party, no matter what I might feel, I would hesitate to make the charge against any great body of people of this country that they were disloyal to British connection or to the interests of the country. I could not bring myself to believe that such was the case. But it is a fact that frequently in their newspapers and occasionally on the floor of this House they allow their partizan feelings to so run away with them that they utter speeches which must do great injury to this country wherever those speeches are read. In the speech delivered by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) this evening, I think he furnished one of the strongest arguments that could be placed in the hands of any intending emigrant in the old world, who desired to take up life in the new world, why he should not come to Canada. I would venture to say that if an intending emigrant was divided in his views as to whether he should go to the United States or to Canada, and the speech of the hon. member for Middlesex were placed in his hands, he would at once say that Canada was not a fit country to settle in, and he must go somewhere else. According to the hon. gentleman's speech, there is nothing but blue ruin and stagnation in Canada from one end to the other. He commenced with the Maritime Provinces, where, according to him, there was no opportunity for labour, in our mines, on our farms or in our lumber woods ; he came up to Quebec and Ontario, and there everybody was going to destruction, and nobody was wanted in the factories ; and when he got to the North-West the conditions were so terrible that there was no chance of employment there. So, while these hon. gentlemen do not wish to make disloyal utterances, the fact remains that they do make utterances which are calculated to do irreparable injury to Canada in the minds of all people who read them or become acquainted with them. The hon. gentleman differed to some extent from the views of his party. When the National Policy was introduced in 1878 it was said, time after time throughout this country and in this House, that it would have the effect of building up monopolies and making the few rich at the expense of the many. That has been said in this House this session. The hon. member for South Oxford, the financial critic of the Opposition, has referred to the manufacturers not only as monopolists but as vile monopolists. One would suppose from his remarks that the manufacturers of the country were growing rich, that they were rolling in wealth, and that the labourers of the country, the artizans, the miners, the farmers—in fact, all other classes—were paying such tribute to the manufacturers that the manufacturers were growing rich whilst the others were growing poor. Yet the hon. member for Middlesex tells us that the manufacturers are going to ruin, that they are making no money, that in common with all other classes they are in a state of collapse, blue ruin and stagnation. Let me ask hon. gentlemen opposite in all sincerity, not desiring to charge against them disloyalty to the Crown or the country, do they think that it is fair or proper to send abroad such exaggerated statements as these ? We know that what is stated in this Parliament is spread broadcast by means of the electric wire over the United States and Great Britain. I verily believe that if a change of Government took place, even though there should be no improvement in the condition of the country, we should never hear any such speeches from the hon. gentlemen. It is a fair charge to make against them that their partizan feelings overcome their better judgment, and force them to make statements which are not warranted by the facts, and are calculated to do an immense amount of injury to this country which they, as well as we, are interested in seeing prosper. If I had the view of affairs in this country, which is entertained by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) and the hon. member for Middlesex and the others, I would not stay here twenty-four

hours. These gentlemen prophecy that there is no future for this country, and yet they have lived in it all their lives and have made money in it, and are well supplied with this world's goods. The only fair inference to be drawn from their remarks, and I extremely regret having to draw it, is that, interested as these gentlemen must be in the development and progress of this country, no matter what their political feelings may be, they are so blinded by party feeling as to make statements they must know are not correct. I, as a rule, do not admire the methods and devices of politicians and statesmen on the other side of the border; but there is one quality I admire in them, and that is, no matter how much they may berate the Government of the day, you will never hear one among them, be he in opposition or supporting the Government, say a word in depreciation of his country, or that will tend to lower it in the estimation of the world. In fact, their tendencies are the very reverse. Wherever they are they exalt their country, they lavish praises on it, and inspire in others the belief that it is the greatest country on the face of the globe. But if in the United States, there were gentlemen opposed to the administration of the day, making speeches, year in and year out, with regard to their country, such as we have heard Liberals for the last ten years make with respect to this, the United States would not have progressed as they have done during the past fifty years. It is but fair that we should ask hon. gentlemen opposite, when they present so gloomy a picture, what remedy have they to suggest? But first of all, with regard to the census returns, which have been spoken of as very disappointing, it must be admitted to a certain extent they are disappointing, when we see the increase in ten years is only 500,000. Still, that is a fair and substantial increase; and the true question is, are the people remaining in the country to-day prosperous, happy and contented with their lot? Now, Sir, very naturally a good deal of reference has been made to the Province of New Brunswick, and especially to the City of St. John. Well, I would say this, that in St. John to-day there is a great deal of discontent at the way the census has been taken. No man who lives there to-day and who knew it in 1881 will say, no matter what his party feelings may be, that there are fewer people there to-day than there were in 1881. All the facts point to the reverse. Since 1881 over seven hundred new houses, and houses of a substantial character, have been erected there. There are more pupils attending the public schools there to-day than there were in 1881, under the very same system of education. There are hundreds more voters on the lists to-day than there were in 1881, men who have votes in the federal and provincial elections. And if the census of 1891 had been taken on the same basis as the census of 1881 the population of St. John would show a marked and substantial increase. In 1881 there were reasons why the population of the city should have fallen off. First of all, the city, as has been pointed out by my colleague from the city and county, enjoyed a large industry in shipbuilding, and it was not unusual to see a large number of ships on the stocks at the same time, giving employment to a large number of people; but that industry became destroyed by iron and steel taking the place of wood. The National Policy had therefore nothing to do with its destruction. In the second place, there had been a depression for some years in the lumber trade, and in 1877 the city was swept from water to water by the great conflagration of June. When the census of 1881 was taken people were put down as being in the country who did not happen to be there at all. For instance, after the fire and depression in shipbuilding a great many people were forced to leave the city, yet in the census of 1881 they were counted as residents. Under the system of 1891, although there are unquestionably more people in this city than in 1881, only those who were away for less than a year were marked down as residents, and consequently the result shows differently from what it would have shown had the same plan been followed as in the census of 1881. Had the census of 1891 been taken on the same principle as that of 1881 the population would have shown a substantial increase. Take the material wealth of the people: there are millions of dollars more in the St. John savings banks to-day than there were in 1881. The deposits in the chartered banks of New Brunswick to-day are millions of dollars more than they were in 1881. All these point to the fact that from the census figures of 1891 a correct conclusion cannot be drawn, and it is not a fact that the province is less prosperous than it was ten years ago. It is said that the cost of living is greater and that the National Policy is responsible for the increase. I reply that if it had not been for some of the industries created in St. John by the National Policy our population to-day would be much less than it is. These factories have to a considerable extent taken the place of the shipbuilding industry, and given employment to our people. In the elections of 1878 one of the main reasons which induced people to adopt the National Policy was that we were alongside the United States, and that no matter what might be the correct theory of free trade and protection, if we sent anything to the United States we had to pay a heavy duty, while they could flood us with their goods and pay hardly any duty. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite will call that free trade, or desire a return to that system, by which our markets were opened to the Americans comparatively free, while we could send nothing into theirs without paying a very high duty. Hon. gentlemen say that it has increased the price of living. In the first place, they will admit that the cost of tea, coffee, sugar and other necessaries of life is less to-day than it was in 1878 or in 1881. I have here a statement taken from the *Journal of Commerce* of January or February last, showing the price of goods in Canada in 1878 and in 1891, and also the price of farm produce in those years. I do not wish to weary the Committee by reading the columns of figures, but they go to show that most of the articles that the farmers have to buy were dearer in 1878 than in 1891, and that on the other hand the price of what the farmer had to sell was less in 1878 than it was in 1891. I am not afraid to discuss at any time with any hon. gentleman opposite the question that the National Policy has not increased the price of living, or reduced the price of produce to the farmer. No one can deny that there is a tendency amongst the young men of our country, especially in the rural districts, to leave their homes and crowd into the cities. I believe as firmly as any man in this House that education is a blessing. I believe in the freest pos-

sible education. I believe that the land of the country should support the schools of the country, and that the son of the poorest man should receive his education by the side of the son of the richest man. Still, there is some force in what has been said by the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) as to the effects of education. The boys are better educated than their fathers were; they read more, newspapers are brought within their reach, and at last they find that they do not want to stay on the farm. Perhaps they have the example of some young man who has gone from the same section to a large city and has amassed wealth, and they decide not to remain on the farm, but to go to a big city in order to make money in the same way. But that is not a fault particular to Canada. It exists the world over. It exists in Australia, and it exists in the United States. In Great Britain you find the agricultural class leaving the farms and going into the cities, and I venture to assert that, but for the National Policy, the census of 1891 would have shown a greater falling off in the agricultural districts than now appears, because the farmers would not have had the home market they now have, and the cities would not have shown the great increase they have now. The increase in the great State of Illinois has been referred to, but that increase is almost entirely in the cities. The city of Chicago alone has six-sevenths of the whole increase, and in the whole of the American Union the tendency has been for the young men to leave the farms and go to the cities. Take the New England States. Go from Maine down to Massachusetts, or to New York, if you like, and you find the same tendency. It is a favourite argument of hon. gentlemen that, if we had access to the market of 65,000,000 people, forgetting that we could only reach a fraction of that population, our farmers would get rich. The same argument would apply to the New England States, and do those farmers get rich? Take Vermont, for instance. Vermont has unrestricted reciprocity. It has the advantage of the market of 65,000,000 people, but the commissioner of agriculture of that state, in his report for 1889-90, draws this picture in regard to the farmers of that state, which could not be drawn without gross exaggeration in regard to any of the Maritime Provinces of the Dominion:

"It is shown that there are more than 1,000 farms in Vermont, formerly under cultivation, which are now abandoned for farming purposes, one-half of which have buildings thereon in fair condition. These farms represent an aggregate of 118,000 acres.

"In addition to this, facts will warrant the statement that many towns did not report lands of the character above mentioned, where they are known to exist.

"It is safe to say that of the lands under consideration there are 500,000 acres, or about ten per cent. of the arable acreage of the state. There is no account made in the estimate of lands once cultivated but now grown up to forests.

"Of the lands once cultivated, but now unoccupied for farming purposes (not including the timber lands and those attached to other farms alluded to), the official reports show that a large portion are of good soil, not worn out and can be made as fruitful as lands near by.

"In 29 towns 101 school-houses are standing without teacher or pupil, or have gone into decay.

"The fact that our lands have been left uncultivated and our population during some decades has decreased is not entirely without its bright side; and we do not alone suffer from the causes mentioned, as our sister states have experienced the same decline in population and farming interests."

Now, if the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite were correct, that unrestricted reciprocity would make the farm lands of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia valuable, how can the farm lands of Vermont and New Hampshire not be made valuable, but depreciate in value and numbers of them become deserted? The same state of affairs, in some respects, exists there as exists in the Maritime Provinces. A young man without capital hesitates to put his axe over his shoulder and cut a farm out of the virgin forest. He prefers to go to the west, to a prairie country, where there are no trees, but where he has simply to put his plough into the prairie and commence his farming operations. That is the influence which has operated both in the New England States and in the Maritime Provinces, and I am proud of the policy which has opened up our own western country, so that when our young men are leaving home and seeking to make one in the west, they need no longer to go to the other side of the boundary line, but can take their lands in our own country, where they will remain citizens of the Dominion and members of the great British Empire. I see hon. gentlemen smiling, and I know they say that they have not gone to our own west to the extent they should. I ask hon. gentlemen to bear this in mind, that the Northern Pacific has been running through the northern states for many years past, and the people there have had the advantages of railway communication and other civilizing influences, while in Canada it is only a few years since our west was opened up. This year, 1891, was the year when the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be completed, and, whatever hon. gentlemen may say as to the wisdom and policy of the course which has been followed in relation to that railway, they must bear in mind that the Government of Alexander Mackenzie grappled with the problem of constructing that work and did not succeed, while the Government of the late Sir John Macdonald entered into a contract for the completion of the road in 1891, and we find in this year that the mails have been carried from Japan to London over this route in the unprecedented time of 21 days. Besides this, we are all aware that people going into a new country, with which they are unacquainted, with a new climate and new conditions, may easily make mistakes, and that it may take them some years to know how to labour to the best advantage. But this year, with the reports we have from the North-West, from the golden harvest with which it has been blessed, with 20,000,000 bushels of wheat for export, as I believe it has been reported, I believe that the more direct attention of the people of the old world will be called to that great country, and that the possibilities of our North-West will attract thousands of settlers, who will make their homes there. No doubt there is truth in the remarks made by the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), that emigrants leaving the old world are more attracted to a republic than to a colony of Great Britain, because they have an idea that a republic is the freest form of government in the world, and they may, perhaps, have grievances against the institutions of the country they are leaving.

Mr. DAVIN. Will my hon. friend permit me for one moment, before you go away from the 20,000,000 bushels that would be exported, to point out to the Committee that the money that will come into Canada for that wheat would more

than pay the interest on all the sums expended, or alleged to have been expended, leaving aside altogether the value of property that has accrued from that expenditure.

Mr. HAZEN. I am obliged to my hon friend for having saved me the trouble of stating that to the House. I was saying that emigrants from Europe have an idea that a republican form of Government is the freest form of Government. It cannot be expected that people in Europe should know that Canada is the freest country on the face of the earth, that its system of government is infinitely freeer, and superior in every respect, to the system of government in the United States; that our system is more directly responsible to the people than the American system. Now we must remember that the land fit for settlement in the United States is fast being taken up, and hon. gentlemen opposite who have followed the discussions in the American magazines for the last few years cannot fail to have noticed that one topic of discussion in those reviews is the fact that the land fit for settlement in the United States will very soon be all taken up. I believe that time is very near, and I believe that Canada, with its magnificent wheat fields, that produce two or three, and sometimes four times, as much per acre as do the wheat fields of Minnesota, will then secure the great tide of immigration which is now flowing into the western states. I believe the time is near at hand when the population of our North-West will increase with great rapidity, owing to the fact that the settlement land in the United States will be soon all taken up. In the meantime, I believe that the five millions of people in Canada to-day enjoy as great liberty, enjoy as great comfort, and enjoy, on the average, in as great a degree all that tends to make life happy, as do any other five million people on the face of the globe.

Mr. KING. I cannot allow the remarks which have fallen from the member for St. John City and County (Mr. Skinner) to pass unnoticed. I am sure it must be very gratifying to the Government to find that the two members representing St. John City and County are prepared to back up and support their policy in the way they have done to-night, notwithstanding the condition of things which exist in the city from which they come, as appears from the census returns. I think it is but proper to say that I feel it comes with bad grace from the hon. gentlemen who have exercised the patronage of appointing census enumerators in the City of St. John, as soon as the census returns are announced to the House to stand up in their place and charge the gentlemen to whom was committed the duty of taking the census in the City of St. John with blundering or incapacity. Now, I have no means of knowing what has caused the decrease in the City of St. John as shown by the census. I have only to say that since Confederation I believe the census has been taken at least three times, and on every occasion by a Conservative Government, and by the appointees of that Government. I believe further that if the census were honestly taken in Canada—and I am not now finding fault with the system adopted—it would show that the actual number of the resident population of New Brunswick, instead of being 321,000, would fall as low as 300,000. Notwithstanding the difference in the system under which the last census was taken and the system adopted five years ago, it is an actual fact that there are a great many people in New Brunswick, and I believe elsewhere in Canada, whose names appear upon the list twice. But I wish more particularly to refer to the argument which hon. gentlemen opposite are continually making use of when they say that we are unpatriotic. They point us to the people of the United States as being a patriotic people. Well, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that I think there must be a difference between the people of the United States and the people of Canada in this respect, and I desire to point out wherein that difference lies. Hon. gentlemen in this House, on previous occasions as well as to-night, have thrown into our faces the reports published in the United States setting forth the condition of the agricultural interest in the New England States, and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Hazen) has instanced the State of Vermont. I would like to ask that hon. gentleman where he got that information. Did he not obtain it from the report prepared by a commission appointed by the State of Vermont? Now, I submit that if the State of Vermont is honest enough to set forth the facts before the people and to publish them to the world, and if they are not denounced for so doing, as decrying their country, then I would like to know why the Liberal Opposition of this House should be denounced as unpatriotic for stating the truth in regard to the position of this country as concerns the population. The hon. gentleman made another allusion to the United States, and said there was no inducement for the people to leave the Province of New Brunswick to go to the states to farm. I may tell the hon. gentleman that there is a county bordering upon the Province of New Brunswick, the County of Aroostook, in the State of Maine, and I make the statement on the best authority—that the people who have been leaving the County of Carleton within the past decade have largely gone across the line into Aroostook County, because they find that they can carry on farming there with greater profit than they can in the Province of New Brunswick. It is a fact that a large number of people in the County of Carleton are selling out their farms and going across the line and investing their money in the County of Aroostook. I may also mention the fact that only last year the County of Aroostook sent through New Brunswick to the City of Boston more potatoes and more potato starch—the product of potatoes—four times more than the whole export of the agricultural products of New Brunswick. This proves that farming is much more remunerative in the State of Maine than it is in that portion of New Brunswick lying alongside of it. Again, I do not think the hon. gentleman, knowing New Brunswick as he does, he being a native of the province, does the province justice when he attempts to institute a comparison between it and Vermont as a farming country. New Brunswick stands far ahead of Vermont as an agricultural province. And it is well known that in our province, which has an area of 17,000,000 acres, only 6,000,000 acres have passed out of the hands of the Government, and that during the past ten or twelve years scarcely any one has been found willing to buy 100 acres from the Provincial Government and settle on it. This condition did not always exist. If the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) is satisfied

with the condition of affairs in that province it simply shows that he is very easily satisfied, more so than some of his constitutents will prove to be. It is all very well for that hon. gentleman to point to the North-West and tell the Committee how many million bushels of wheat have been produced there this year; but I should like to see the hon. gentleman discuss the affairs of his own province a little more. The hon. gentleman in his speech spoke of Nova Scotia, but little of New Brunswick. I admit that the National Policy has not so directly injured Nova Scotia as it has New Brunswick, and that is no doubt the reason why the hon. gentleman directed the greater portion of his remarks to the former province. I am not surprised at his position, because it is well known that the hon. gentleman has been on both sides on that question. Only a short time ago he was a candidate of the Liberal party, and it is a well known fact that in a speech delivered at St. John he complained of the working of the National Policy, and said that the effects in New Brunswick were worse than the effects of a frost on a field of buckwheat in the autumn. I believe the hon. gentleman made a true statement. There is another matter that needs attention, and that is the loss of representation to New Brunswick. Our province in all probability will, when a redistribution of seats takes place, have to submit to the cutting down of its representation from sixteen to fourteen members, and the very county in which Mr. Hazen first saw the light of day may be deprived of its representation. Yet the hon. gentleman is satisfied with the condition of things in the city he represents. I repeat that, if he is satisfied, the majority of the people of New Brunswick will not be satisfied. It is not worth while discussing the National Policy, for we have the answer as regards New Brunswick in the census. I admit that in some counties of the province there has been an increase, notably on the north shore. I attribute it not to the good effects of the tariff, but to the overflow of immigration from the Province of Quebec. Take St. John, and the City and County of St. John: instead of an increase under the National Policy there is a decrease. If there is a decrease, it is in the class of manufactures carried on under the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite have attempted to mislead the House, I will not say wilfully, for they may themselves be misled in thinking that we have larger manufacturing establishments established by this policy. Such is not the case. We have in St. John two bankrupt cotton concerns. We have invested a good deal of money in manufacturing under the National Policy. If there is a province in Canada where the people were ready to take advantage of that policy and endeavour to work it out to a successful issue it was New Brunswick. With one or two exceptions, almost every dollar invested under the National Policy in manufacturing in New Brunswick has been sunk, and the hon. gentleman must know it. The hon. gentleman has sought to leave the impression that the lumbering interest was a waning one, and that therefore a decrease of population might be expected. I am perfectly safe in stating that the lumbering interest in New Brunswick is not a waning one. During the last ten years the exports have been quite as great as during any similar period in its history, and therefore the lack of increase of population cannot be charged to the falling off in that industry. I am safe in stating that there were as many people engaged in manufactures in St. John before the National Policy as there are to day. If such is the case, how is it possible that the farmers have a larger market for their agricultural produce than prior to the introduction of that policy. The hon. members who spoke did not agree even with regard St. John and the benefit of the National Policy. One hon. gentleman said it had benefited the farmers; the other gentleman took the view which will please his constituents, that meat and vegetables are cheaper than formerly. One says the farmer's market is a great deal better than formerly, and the other declares that meat and vegetables are cheaper, and therefore the labouring classes can live more cheaply. I agree with the latter view, that many lines of farm produce bring less prices than before the introduction of the National Policy.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). Even at half-past one in the morning I venture to delay the Committee with a few remarks on the question of immigration, which is such an important one to Canada as a whole, and especially to the western portion of the Dominion. Fortunately for this House, the hon. and eloquent member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has so thoroughly exhausted the question that there is very little for me to add to what he has said; consequently, I can be very brief. I cannot, however, refrain from expressing my regret, which I share with the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), that the Government has seen fit to reduce the vote for immigration purposes, for I believe that the people of this country would more heartily endorse the expenditure for immigration than for almost any other object. I say that, notwithstanding what has fallen from the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to night, for although I am aware that the people in the older and more thickly-settled provinces do not attribute so much importance to this question of immigration as we who come from the sparsely settled region of the west do, I hold that even in the older provinces the thinking men are not inclined to under-estimate the importance of this great question, on which the future of our country depends. Of course, I am aware, as we all are, that a year or two ago representations, and very strong representations, were made by the trades and labour organizations of our towns and cities against the system of assisted passages then in vogue, and I confess I sympathize very strongly with those who made those representations; for I think if I were in their place I would think as they did, and would remonstrate most strongly against the system which had been adopted of bringing to our shores artizans from England and other European countries, who, in many instances, flocked to the towns and cities, where the labour market was already over-stocked, and so throwing out of employment many who had families to support and who had paid taxes for many years. Besides, their arrival here would have the effect of causing a reduction of wages, a thing that the human soul abhors. I think the Government acted wisely in listening to the remonstrances made by the trade organizations and in stopping assisted passages to mechanics coming from the mother

country and other European lands ; but I am inclined to think that the Government listened a little too eagerly, and in their anxiety to do away with that which they believed to be a grievance, went too far, for I believe it was a mistake on their part to cease aiding immigrants who are not mechanics, and who wish to seek our shores with a view of making homes for themselves. This class of immigrants is not only desirable from the standpoint of the country, but they increase the wealth by increasing the market of the very persons who were remonstrating against assistance being given to them. I trust that in the near future the Government will find the finances of this country in such a shape that they will be able to restore the vote for immigration, not only to the figure at which it stood last year, but to a very much larger sum. I trust that they will see their way to adopt a much more active and energetic immigration policy than we have seen in the past ; for they must remember that Canada is not the only country on the face of the globe in which immigrants, desirous of leaving the old country, can find homes. They must remember that the United States, and our sister colonies of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, not to speak of Buenos Ayres and other South American countries, are eagerly competing for immigrants, and that in order to induce them to come to our shores we have to offer at least as great inducements as do these other lands. We have in our western country a land fit to be the home of millions, and I expect that long before many of those who are at present in this House pass away from the earth they will see that country, perhaps not the home of millions, but the home of hundreds of thousands, all of whom have improved their position by coming there, and all of whom have become happy and contented settlers in this Canada of ours. Mr. Chairman, although I do not agree with the policy the Government are at present adopting in cutting down the vote for immigration purposes, I by no means wish to see them change sides with the gentlemen on your left, for I feel that if those at present in Opposition once got the reins of power I could well say : God help the North-West ; because ever since 1878 no measure has been proposed which would advance the interest of Manitoba or the western country that has not been opposed by the gentlemen sitting to the left of the Speaker. I presume that that is caused to a great extent by the fact that the representatives sent to Parliament from that country have mainly supported the Government of the day, and that that has raised the antagonism of the gentlemen who wish to oust the Government and take their places. The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) in his speech this evening blamed the Government very much for granting lands to aid the building of railways in the North-West. He is not in his seat at present, but if he were I should like to ask him how he expected that western country to be filled up without railways. The settlers could only have settled along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and when settlement extended back from that line as it has already done, and as it did many years ago, the settlers would at once cry out for railway communication to enable them to reach the market. The Government would then find itself in the position of being obliged to build the railways out of the public funds or to give the aid which they have already given to railway companies, either by granting lands or in the shape of a money bonus. I do not believe that the settlers of the North-West grudge the aid that has been given to any railway which has been carried on and built and has enabled the settlers to get their grain cheaply and readily to market. The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) also sneered at the remarks which have fallen from many members on this side of the House with regard to the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite having had the effect of inducing immigrants who had come to this country to leave it, and also of persuading our young men to move across the border. He said that he did not believe that either the immigrants who had arrived here, or our own people, would send down to Ottawa for a copy of the *Hansard* to read the speeches of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. Well, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt he is perfectly correct in that, but that is not the way that speeches delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite have done harm. Some four or five years ago when I was travelling on the Chicago and Milwaukee Railway from Chicago to St. Paul, I myself saw a pamphlet got up by that railway company in which a number of quotations were contained from speeches made by the Hon. Edward Blake at that time leader of the Opposition. The pamphlet had a photograph of that hon. gentleman on the first page and that was being distributed to immigrants who were passing through, many of whom were heading for the North-West, by agents employed by railway companies who held land grants in the states. You can easily understand what effect that would have on the minds of incoming settlers, when they saw that the leader of one of the great parties in this country had spoken so highly of the wheat fields of Dakota and had painted our own wheat fields in such disadvantageous colours as compared with theirs. I think, Sir, that in acting as they have done in this case, the members of the Opposition have allowed their love for party to overcome their love for country, and I do not think that we would have anything to hope if we fell into their hands. I trust, as I have already said, that before the next estimates come down, the Minister of Finance will be able to advise the Minister of Agriculture that he has plenty of funds at his disposal, that he can adopt a bolder and more vigorous immigration policy, and that he can apply more money to secure those immigrants which this country so much requires.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he recollects ever reading any portion of any speech of any member from this side of the House, that claimed that there were better natural advantages in any portion of the United States than in any part of our North-West ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). You mean natural advantages of soil ?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I cannot say that I do, but I have read speeches which tried to show that the settler there occupies a very much better position than the settler in Canada ; that here the Canadian Pacific Railway is such a grinding monopoly that it was impossible to live under it, whereas that monopoly did not exist in the United States. I may state that in none of these

speeches which told against our country were the advantages which it contained ever alluded to. For instance, there was that celebrated speech by Mr. Edward Blake, then first lieutenant of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), in which he described British Columbia as a sea of mountains. I do not care a rap whether that was an original remark of the hon. gentleman, or quoted from Principal Grant or any one else; but I would call the attention of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) to the fact that that description of the Province of British Columbia, though it might be eminently calculated to attract tourists on the look-out for scenery, was not calculated to induce immigrants to seek British Columbia as a home, particularly as the hon. gentleman who made the speech forgot to mention that between the mountains scattered through that country there were some of the most beautiful and fertile valleys in the world, and that many of the mountains themselves were filled with minerals.

Mr. FORBES. I wish to say a few words in reply to the remarks made by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald). I cannot agree with him that there is anything in the policy of the Government advantageous to the settlement of the Dominion as a whole. As regards Manitoba and the North-West Territories, their policy may have been advantageous to the settlers to a certain extent, but their policy in relation to railroad development and grinding monopolies has been entirely antagonistic to the opening up of the country for settlement. But I rose simply to make a suggestion to the Government that occurred to my mind while listening to the hon. gentleman's speech. That is, that a portion of this large sum of money which they are asking this Committee to vote, might be expended in enlarging the bureau controlling the immigration system, by opening up some branch in which every farm or lot owned by any person in the Dominion would be recorded, and a price put upon it at which the owner would be willing to sell the property. From such a record incoming settlers would be able to ascertain the price at which an acre or fifty acres or a larger portion of land could be obtained. In that way thousands of acres in the older provinces might be taken up by immigrants. We have hundreds and thousands of acres in the Maritime Provinces that are not cultivated, and it can easily be seen how quickly the province would be opened up under that system. As a Nova Scotian I have to express my regret that the province from which I come has lost not only its share of immigration, but a large portion of its natural increase within the past ten years, and that it has only increased in population in that time to the extent of about 9,000. The county which I represent has increased only thirty-three souls. In these progressive days this is a fact which one can consider only with serious regret. It touches us representatives of the Maritime Provinces most keenly. The result will deprive the Province of Nova Scotia of one representative; but if the Government could strain the law so as to save that province that member, I would support them in so doing. The result of the census will probably be that when another Parliament is elected the eastern provinces will lose four members and Manitoba gain two, making a reduction of two in the number of members of this House. I agree with those who attribute the loss of our population to the policy of the present Government, and it is greatly to be regretted. I ask the Government to consider the suggestion I make. I believe that the Local Governments are about to consider the possibility of adopting some system whereby the vast stretches in those provinces which are now unoccupied shall receive their share of immigration.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 10th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE CUSTOMS ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved third reading of Bill (No. 155) to amend the Acts respecting duties of Customs.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Before the Bill is read a third time, I desire to make a few remarks and to offer an amendment to the House. It will be remembered that item 3 of section 1 of the Bill provides:

"All sugars above number 14 Dutch standard in colour, and refined sugar of all kinds, grades or standards, and all sugar syrups derived from refined sugars, a specific duty of eight-tenths of a cent per pound."

I propose, Mr. Speaker, to offer the following resolution for the consideration of the House:—

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the whole House to amend item 3 of section 1 of said Bill, so as to provide that all sugars No. 16, and under, Dutch standard in colour, shall be admitted free of duty, and that the duty on all sugars over No. 16 Dutch standard in colour, be reduced to one-half cent per pound.

It will be noticed, Mr. Speaker, that I propose two changes. The tariff fixes the standard below which sugars may be admitted duty free at No. 14, Dutch standard of colour. I propose that the House, if it sees fit, should amend that by raising the standard to No. 16. That, I think, will be of very material benefit to the people of this country, and it is so reasonable a proposition in itself that I think the House should not hesitate to sanction it. I do not desire to take up much of the time of the House, because this subject has been pretty fully discussed at previous sittings. At the same time, as I suppose we are to have a vote upon the question, it will be just as well for us to recognize the position in which we stand in reference to sugar. The Finance Minister in his Budget speech announced that he was about to give the people free sugar; but that was scarcely a correct description of the change he was making in the tariff. He has given free sugar to the refiners of the country; he has given them their raw material free; but I think that it cannot be truthfully said that he has given the people of the country free sugar, because sugars of No. 14 and under are not sugars that can

be or will be used to any appreciable extent by the people of the country. In fact, fixing the standard at No. 14 is, in my view, absolutely prohibiting the free importation of all sugars that can be used upon the tables of the people of this country. My first proposition, then, is to change the standard at which sugar is admitted free from No. 14 to No. 16 Dutch standard. While with the standard fixed at No. 14, scarcely any free sugar would come into the country at all, if it were fixed at No. 16 I think considerable quantities would come in, and they would come in to the great advantage of the people of the country. This change would also have a beneficial effect upon a trade which the House has expressed its great desire might be cultivated and enlarged, namely, the trade with the West Indies. We have had in previous discussions, and it is not necessary to review the matter now, full proof before us that if the standard were fixed at No. 16, a very large and profitable trade might be done with the Island of Jamaica, whereas with the standard fixed at No. 14 we had the absolute proof that it simply meant the impossibility to develop any trade with that Island. We know that the cultivation of that trade was deemed so important that the Finance Minister himself went to the Island of Jamaica on purpose to promote it; and if a change such as I propose can be made that will bring about a marked extension and development of that trade, it will be only carrying out the expressed desire of the House; and if my resolution is voted down, I wish hon. members to recognize that in voting it down they are demonstrating that they desire to kill off not merely a possible but a probable profitable trade with that Island, which they have hitherto expressed the strongest desire to cultivate. Now, with reference to the second portion of my resolution, I propose, in addition to raising the standard at which sugars may be admitted free to No. 16, to provide that all sugars over No. 16, instead of paying a duty of $\frac{8}{100}$ of a cent per pound, as the Bill provides, shall pay $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent per pound. I might remark that the law at present in force in the United States fixes the standard for the admission of free sugar at No. 16 Dutch standard in colour, and the duty levied by the United States upon sugars over No. 16 Dutch standard in colour is $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent per pound. Hon. gentlemen opposite avow that the reason they are putting this duty on refined sugar is to carry out one of the principles of their party, which they contend the country has sustained at every general election, that is, the principle of protection to the manufacturers of this country. It is alleged by the Minister of Finance that it is necessary that there should be $\frac{8}{100}$ of a cent per pound of duty levied in order that they might exist in the country. Well, if we take that as a fact that the $\frac{8}{100}$ of a cent a pound is necessary in order to maintain them, then we have it as a fact, announced by the Minister of Finance, that it requires $1,800,000 of the people's money to keep them alive. It is replied by hon. gentlemen opposite that they are not exacting the full amount of protection, that they are not charging $\frac{3}{100}$ of a cent a pound more for sugar than any other country. If we grant that proposition, it only establishes the fact that it is not necessary, in order to maintain them in existence, to give them that amount of duty; and if it be not necessary, why should they be put in a position to enable them, if they choose, to exact that amount from the people. Now, I propose to quote an authority from their own side, because in appealing to them, I should arouse hostility in their minds if I were to quote the statement of an opponent of their National Policy and principles. Let me take them on their own ground, and give them the arguments and statements of the official organ of the manufacturers of this country. Let me give them the views of the National Policy organ as to how this matter of the sugar duties, as arranged by the Minister of Finance, stands, even when viewed from the standpoint of an authority which hon. gentlemen opposite will certainly admit is most friendly to them. I find in the issue of that journal of 7th August several articles dealing with this very question of sugar, and in one of the articles that journal goes on to state that American granulated sugar has been sold in England at $3.70 per 100 pounds, that the Americans at the same time were charged in their own country $4.25 per 100 pounds. The argument of the writer then is, if that sugar could be sold profitably at $3.70 in England, it was evident it could be sold at that price in the United States, and that the difference between the price in England and that which the American people paid was the burden imposed upon the American people. So that when I compare our prices with the American prices, it must be remembered I institute a comparison with the prices of sugar in a country where the prices are raised higher than they would be were that country not working under a protective system and extending the benefits of protection to their manufactures. The article goes on to say:

"If a protection of 50 cents per 100 pounds on refined sugar is unnecessary for American refineries; if it involves the loss of a large revenue from raw sugar, without any corresponding advantages to the consumer, and along with this, affords to the refiners a means of exacting exorbitant profits from the public, what can be said in favour of the higher rate of 80 cents per 100 pounds, under the Canadian tariff? The Canadian consumer is not only placed in a worse position than his neighbours across the border by the higher rate of duty, but he is further debarred from obtaining that relief which is afforded in the United States, where fair qualities of domestic brown sugars can be imported free of duty, sugars No. 14 to No. 16 D. S. being subject to prohibitory duties in Canada. If 60 cents per 100 pounds covers the cost of the labour, cooperage, management, interest on capital, insurance and repairs of buildings and machinery, and all the money expended in Canada in refining, and this is the only part of the cost which should be protected, then about 40 per cent. on this amount, or say 25 cents per 100 pounds, should be ample protection. Under this rate, refiners would have a fair margin for profit, and the consumers of Canada would save 50 cents per 100 pounds, or about $1,250,000 per annum on the 125,000 tons of sugar consumed annually. From a careful consideration of the surrounding facts we have been forced to the conclusion that the present sugar policy of the Government is not in accordance with the principles of the National Policy, and that it has not been framed in the best interests of the people."

That is the argument of the *Canadian Manufacturer*, the organ of the protectionist party, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite will find it rather difficult from their own standpoint to justify the position the House has previously taken with reference to fixing the sugar duties, when they find their own organ taking that view. We can account for this plain writing in the organ of the National Policy party by the supposition that the advocates of that policy see that the arrangement of these sugar duties is so iniquitous in its nature, is so calcu-

lated to arouse the highest indignation of the people, that it will injure the whole fabric and structure of the National Policy. It is too glaring, it is not to be defended on the ground of maintaining manufacturing industries in our midst, because that journal shows conclusively that these industries would be maintained if there was a million of revenue put into the treasury by way of levying part of this duty on the raw sugar which the refiner uses, or if we give that amount of money to the consumer by giving him cheaper sugar. I will read another article in the same issue, for in it there are no less than three or four articles devoted to these sugar duties, so that hon. gentlemen opposite will see how indefensible they are when the organ brought into existence to maintain the policy of protection is forced to speak in the way it does:

"Mr. Foster was induced to place raw sugar upon the free list chiefly because the United States had done so; for without such a change there would have been such a wide difference in the prices of sugar in the two countries as would have induced much smuggling of the article in Canada. We are accustomed to regard the McKinley tariff as the acme of protection, and when the American Congress places the duty upon refined sugar at one-half cent per pound it may be safely inferred that that amount of protection to the American sugar refining industry was quite sufficient to secure the manufacture of refined sugar to American refiners. That this matter was well considered and digested is evident from the fact that in debating the question in Congress it was contended that even a lower duty—four-tenths of a cent per pound—was sufficient for the purpose; but the McKinley spirit prevailed and the rate was fixed at one-half cent per pound. If, then, $10 per ton duty is high enough to protect American refiners, why should not that duty be high enough to protect Canadian refiners? Canadian refineries are new institutions. They have been, generally, in successful and profitable operation for many years, and it is to be supposed that as far as their management, their machinery and their appliances go, they can be operated quite as economically as American refineries. Why, then, should they be protected by the tariff to the extent of $6 per ton more on their products than American refineries? This is not according to the ethics of protection.

"We illustrate our contention by the presentation of a few facts. Mr. Foster stated in his Budget speech that in 1889 the consumption of sugar in Canada reached the enormous amount of 223,841,171 pounds, or, in round numbers, about 112,000 tons. If this quantity of sugar were refined in the United States the protection upon it there would be, at $10 per ton, $1,120,000 representing what the refiners would obtain for their services. But being refined in Canada the protection now offered by Mr. Foster would be, at $16 per ton, $1,792,000, or $672,000 more than the American refiners, under the McKinley tariff, would receive for the same service."

I hope the House grasps the statement that we are giving to the four sugar refineries of this country $672,000 per annum more than the manufacturers of that country need under the McKinley tariff, which is supposed to be the acme of protection.—

"Why should Canadian refiners receive 60 per cent., or $6 per ton more for their services than what the McKinley tariff gives the American refiners? On June 19, 1889, the London *Times* published a letter from Mr. James Duncan, chairman of the British Sugar Refiners' Association, in which he stated that in the previous year 740,000 tons of sugar were refined in the United Kingdom in twenty-six refineries, employing 4,260 men. An average distribution of production and labour in this British industry would give 28,450 tons to each refinery working with 164 hands. There are said to be four refineries in Canada, and it is supposed that they have capacity to manufacture all the refined sugar required in the country. This being the case an average distribution of production of 112,000 tons of sugar among them would be 28,000 tons each, a little above the average to British refineries. On the same basis only 164 hands would be required to each refinery, and the whole number of hands required to operate these four Canadian refineries, manipulating 112,000 tons of sugar per year, would be only about 650 men. Allowing that, as in the case of the American refineries, a duty of $10 per ton is sufficient to maintain the industry, afford fair remuneration for capital invested, and guarantee employment to labour, we find that the higher Canadian duty of $16 per ton represents an opportunity to the Canadian refiners to further benefit themselves to the extent of $720,000 per year. This is not according to the ethics of protection. Surely Mr. Foster must have viewed this question in this light when considering the duty he proposed levying upon importations of refined sugar. The high duty of $16 per ton will effectually shut out all importations of refined sugar, and therefore the revenues cannot possibly be benefited by it; and he may be sure that the refiners—after the adjournment of Parliament—will govern their business according to the unique advantage he has placed within their reach."

They do not anticipate that within the time of the sitting of Parliament, they will take full advantage of it, but when Parliament rises, no further interference can take place.

An hon. MEMBER. What paper is that?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is the *Canadian Manufacturer*, which is the special organ of the manufacturers of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the same you read before.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is the same paper, but it is not the same issue, and I have other copies of the same paper in which it returns to the charge, showing that, whatever explanations hon. gentlemen may have been able to give, they failed to convince the able editors of their organ that their position was wrong. There is another article in the same issue which says:

"In a former article we contended that, if the Government had preserved a duty of 40 or 50 per 100 pounds on raw sugar, and put the duty on refined at 80 cents, the country would have derived a revenue of over a million dollars, and consumers would have obtained their refined sugar as cheaply as they do now. The revenue so derived would have enabled the Government to aid many public works which it is now unable to assist; and a very small portion of it appropriated for the encouragement of the beet sugar enterprise, would have secured its rapid and certain success. We believe an error has been committed in this matter, which, in its results, will tend to cast discredit on the National Policy, which may suffer far more severely from this mistake of its leaders than it can from the assaults of its opponents.

"Owing to the radical change in the sugar policy of the United States, we expected that a large reduction of the sugar duties in Canada was inevitable. He did not believe, however, that there was any political necessity for such a radical change as has been made, not that the financial position of the country warranted the abandonment of over $3,000,000 of annual revenue; nor could we have imagined that nearly the half of this loss of revenue would be allowed to fall into the hands of three or four refining companies. The maintenance of the former policy would have been attended with less harm than the present one. Government has already been compelled to abandon some public works, and to refuse its accustomed assistance to others, whose utility it has acknowledged and whose claims it has admitted, for the sake of an empty cry of 'free sugar'—and still sugar is far from being 'free.'"

The Finance Minister thought we were trying to rob him of the glory of giving the people free sugar, but the organ of his party says that he has lost three millions of revenue by his action, and has not given free sugar, but that one-half of that amount has gone to four sugar refineries in this country. Before denouncing anyone on this side of the House, let him begin with the friend of the hon. gentleman, whose utterances I have been reading, and whose statements and arguments I think he will be unable successfully to controvert. Hon. gentlemen thought I was reading from the same paper that I have read from before, but I did not desire to repeat what I have already read, and I have issue after issue of that paper here constantly

returning to the same charge. On 21st August he says :

"Under the new Canadian tariff the domestic consumption of sugar is restricted to refined sugar, for no sugar not higher than No. 14 Dutch standard is suitable for domestic use. In the United States under the McKinley tariff, all sugar not higher than No. 16 Dutch standard is admitted duty free, and this includes centrifugal and similar sugars which are well suited for domestic use, and which is largely used there, because they are about $1.50 per 100 pounds cheaper than refined sugar. If the Canadian tariff had placed the limit of free sugar at No. 16 Dutch standard, so that the masses of the people could obtain sugar that they could use for domestic purposes, and costing them a cent and a-half less than refined sugar, the *per capita* consumption of sugar in Canada would be greatly increased, and at the same time this consumption would probably be twenty-five per cent. or more of all the sugar used in this country. Another view of this sugar question is this :—If the consumers of sugar in Canada were to receive the benefit arising from the removal of the duty upon refining sugar, or even a considerable portion of it, no objection could be raised to that removal, but as we have before shown, while the Government stands to lose the whole duty, the refiners are the only ones who are benefited, for this so-called free sugar is not suitable for domestic use, and the duty upon such sugars as are suitable, afford the refiners the opportunity to force consumers to pay very much more for their product than was ever intended by the upholders of the National Policy.

"As we have shown, American refiners can compete with European refiners in the British market, and while operating under almost precisely and quite as favourable circumstances, one-half the protection now offered by Mr. Foster would enable the Canadian refiners to continue to heap up riches. But if the duty must be kept at 8-10 of a cent per pound, where Mr. Foster thinks it should be kept, he should have allowed the Government to divide the profits with the refiners by imposing a light duty upon refining sugars. This would not have closed the refineries nor yet have advanced the price of refined sugar, but it would have afforded a revenue of a million dollars or more to the Government. If the Government could find no other use for so large an amount of money, it could have been applied to the payment of the public debt."

The hon. Minister of Finance will see that it states he would have a million dollars to use, and if he could not employ it in necessary works, he could apply it to the redemption of the public debt. But his own organ states that instead of doing that he has so arranged it that he gives that sum to four sugar refining companies that we have in this country, that they get the whole benefit of it, that the consumers of sugar do not get the benefit, and the revenue is lost. He will not wonder, then, that I have felt it necessary to submit this proposition to the House, that will enable the House to see whether it would not be wise now, while there is yet time, that we should revise this item in the tariff. I do not ask him to leave the refiners without protection ; my resolution allows the same protection to the refiners that is given to the refiners in the United States, where they are working under a protective system, where they are working under the McKinley tariff ; I propose to reduce the duty to the same extent and leave the refiners ample protection, as this argument clearly shows, while at the same time it will give to the people of this country the benefit of a million dollars of cheap sugar. As the Finance Minister rested his whole contention in this matter upon the necessity of maintaining these four refineries which, according to these figures, only employ 650 hands, I am directing my remarks from their own standpoint in reference to this matter, and I say that his policy is unwise, that he can accomplish all he proposes in the maintenance of these refineries, and still, either place the duty on the raw sugar of the refiner or give to the consumers their sugar a million dollars a year cheaper. But he may say, perhaps, that this able writer may not be a manufacturer, that he does not thoroughly understand the sugar question, that that there are some points, at least, that he does not understand, while he may think that the refiners could refine sugar with half a cent per pound protection and that is what they would have if the duty on refined sugar was half a cent a pound, provided they had their raw material free. If he says that the writer does not understand the business, I will give him, and I will give the House the authority of one who does know what it costs to refine sugar, an authority that I think even he will not dare to controvert—I propose to give him the testimony of the Hon. Mr. Drummond, the head of one of the largest sugar refineries in this country, and I call his attention to what Mr. Drummond says in reference to this matter. Mr. Drummond, speaking from his seat in the Senate in 1889, on 12th March, in a discussion that was going on there, used this language :

"Before closing, I would like to give one other fact. I have known gentlemen having come from England being struck with the cheapness of sugar there as compared with the prices of sugar in this country. They ignore entirely the fact that the refined sugar which is sold in England is manufactured from raw material, upon which no impost of any kind has been imposed by the Government ; and not only that, but probably manufactured from raw material artificially cheapened by the operation of bounties on the continent of Europe. The company to which I have referred before, and of which I am an official, contributed to the revenue of this country last year some very considerable sums of money. We paid in duties on our raw material very nearly $1,500,000. In all the discussions which have taken place on this subject this fact has been entirely ignored."

Now, I ask the Finance Minister's attention to what follows :

"Now, as a manufacturer, I say that my preference is distinctly to be placed in the position of the manufacturer of cotton, and have my raw material duty free. If that were so, I honestly believe that I could supply the trade and the country with sugar as cheaply as in England ; but as a manufacturer it is perhaps stepping out of my province to suggest it."

Now, there is what a gentleman, who has been at the head of one of the largest refineries in this country, states in his place in the Senate, as reported in the Official Debates, that if they had given him his raw material duty free he believed he could manufacture and sell sugar as cheap as they do in England ; and yet the Government solemnly propose, on the consumption of 223,000,000 pounds of sugar per annum, to give the refiners the benefit of $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent per pound. Why, Sir, the proposition, when it is looked at in the light of what this gentleman states himself, I think, ought to convince the House that it is the absolute duty of this House to revise this item in the tariff—not to wipe out the manufacturer, not even to do as Mr. Drummond suggests he would do, when he says : Give me my raw material duty free and I will manufacture without any protection at all—for that is virtually what he says. But my motion is to reduce the duty to half a cent a pound, which means, on 223,000,000 pounds of sugar per annum, over a million dollars—instead of $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent, as is proposed here, or $1,800,000. Why, Sir, what did the leader of this Government say in the Senate in the same year, speaking on the sugar question ? He was pointing out the protection the sugar refiner had at that time ; and he said :

"Has anyone ever heard it stated that the taxation of raw sugar for refining purposes, which does not affect in any respect the manufacturers of refined sugar, except to compel them to raise the money to pay the duties, and which does not protect them in the slightest degree, is nearly as great as the duty on refined sugar."

That is what Mr. Abbott, the leader of this Government in the Senate, states, that under the old tariff the duty on raw sugar was nearly as high as the duty on refined sugar. Now, what does the Finance Minister propose in this Bill before us? Why, that there shall be $\frac{8}{100}$ of a cent per pound more duty upon the refined sugar than there is upon raw sugar. I think the House will see at once that the amount of protection, as given by the Minister, is so excessive in its nature that it cannot be defended; that the organ of the party, speaking specially for it, in article after article, has pointed out that that proposition is so monstrous in its nature that it will tend to bring discredit upon the whole system of which these hon. gentlemen opposite are the exponents. Now, my proposition is not a proposition that sugar be placed upon the free list all round; I am proposing that they shall alter their tariff, and in the alteration of that tariff that the refiners of this country shall have the same amount of protection, or as large an amount of protection, as the refiners have in the United States. From the articles I have quoted it will be seen that the manufacturers in the United States are exacting in part the protection they have from their own people, as proved by the fact that they are able to sell their sugar at 40 and 50 cents per 100 pounds less in England than they do in their own country, where they are doing a profitable business. The facts of the case to-day are that the sugar quoted in Canada is about 30 cents per 100 pounds higher in Canada than it is in the United States, where they are taking the benefit in a great measure of the amount of protection that they have there. If you compare it with the prices of sugar in England where sugars are free, it will be found that a large part of this $\frac{8}{100}$ of a cent per pound is being taken by the manufacturers of this sugar upon the product of their manufacture, and the article I have read from the *Canadian Manufacturer* says there is every probability—that is the assurance given to the Finance Minister by that writer that when Parliament rises—they will take the full benefit of the unique advantage that he has placed within their reach. An argument was made by hon. gentlemen, when the subject was discussed in Committee, in which they pointed out that, with respect to low grade yellows in this country, the proportion was very much greater than in the United States. There was some force in that argument, and it was the only argument that seemed to carry any weight as against placing refined sugars under No. 16 on the free list. But hon. gentlemen opposite who are acquainted with the subject will agree with me that, while that might have been the case when we had a very high duty on sugar before, now, with the raw sugar for the refiner free, there will be an increasing amount of granulated sugars, white pure sugars being sold in proportion to yellows, that yellows will decrease and granulated sugars will take their place. So there will probably be no difference in the relative consumption of these sugars in this country and the country to be south of us. I will occupy no more time of the House,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

but I beg, Mr. Speaker, to submit the proposition which I have placed in your hands.

Mr. STAIRS. Before the amendment is put to the House, I should like to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and also upon the general question of the sugar-refining industry in Canada. I may say, I only wish I had the good voice and pleasant manner of that hon. gentleman, for I feel sure, if I possessed them, I would present my case more effectually to the House than I can do now. However, I ask the House to bear with me, for I feel the arguments I can put before the House this afternoon, and the facts and figures I can give, will completely convince every impartial hearer that the case as put by the hon. gentleman should not receive the sanction of this honourable House. I have followed, as closely as I could, the remarks which that hon. gentleman has made and the quotations which he has given to the House, and I will deal with them as fully as I can, one by one. The first important question the hon. gentleman raises is one that affects this tariff in its bearing on the West India trade. Every hon. gentleman in this House is convinced that it is in the interests of Canada to encourage the West India trade as much as possible, and it is partly on that account that we, on this side of the House, support the Bill to be read the third time this afternoon. I feel convinced that, if the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, which is embodied in the amendment of the hon. gentleman, were adopted, it would not have that beneficial effect which he anticipates on the West India trade, but, instead, would do a great deal to injure it, as I will show a little later on. If I understand the proposition of the hon. gentleman it embraces two main features: first, that the standard of colour at which sugars shall be admitted duty free shall be raised from No. 14 to No. 16; and that the duty on all sugars upon which duty is charged, namely, all above No. 16, is to be reduced from $\frac{8}{100}$ of a cent to $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent per pound. First, we have to consider the effect raising the standard from No. 14 to No. 16 would have, especially as regards its bearing on the West India trade. The hon. gentleman said that if the standard was fixed at No. 16 a large trade would be done with the Island of Jamaica, and in voting down his resolution hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are demonstrating that they wish to vote down any attempt to encourage the West India trade. I desire, in reply to that remark, to point out to the hon. gentleman, what I am sure he is not aware of, that in that Island very little sugar is made over No. 14 Dutch standard. A reliable authority from the Island itself has said that this quality of sugar does not constitute more than 10 per cent. of the whole output. If my recollection serves me, the whole product of sugar in Jamaica is in the neighbourhood of 25,000 tons. If 10 per cent. of that sugar is over No. 14, the hon. gentleman will see that it only leaves about 2,500 tons which the adoption of the policy of that hon. gentleman would enable to be brought into Canada free of duty that can not come now. This applies not only to the product of sugar in the Island of Jamaica, but also, in a general sense, to the product of all the West Indian Islands, as I will show more fully a little later on; and, therefore, there is nothing in

the argument put forward by the hon. member for South Brant this afternoon that the tariff as embodied in this Bill will do anything to injure or curtail the trade with the West Indies. I shall now proceed to show, not only that this tariff will not have the effect of curtailing it, but that its real effect will be to maintain the import trade Canada now has, because I assert, and I defy contradiction, that a trade between Canada and the West Indies cannot be conducted unless you have a profitable refining industry in Canada. That is evident from the fact I have stated, that but a very small portion of the sugars made in the West Indian Islands, in all the islands, are of a colour light enough and suitable to go into consumption directly; or, to put the matter in other words, nearly all the output of the West Indies is a class of sugar that has to be refined to make it suitable for the larger number of consumers in all civilized countries. Then there is another reason why it would not be wise for this House to adopt the amendment of the hon. member for South Brant, and it is because it would apply not only to the raw sugars coming from the country of production, but it would let in a very large quantity of dark refined sugars running from No. 14 to No. 16, which would very seriously interfere with the working of the sugar refiners in Canada. This would be the case to a much larger extent, and it would have a more serious effect upon refining in Canada than the proportionate consumption of those sugars in Canada would lead one to suppose, because the output of those low grades of yellow sugar in the refineries of the United States and of the United Kingdom, especially those of the United Kingdom, are to a certain extent waste products—perhaps that is a rather strong expression, but they are products which the refiners find it difficult to dispose of, and they, therefore, sell them at prices very much less than their real cost, and if these sugars are allowed to come into Canada to compete with the low grades of yellows made by our refiners, it will have the effect not only of reducing the price of those yellows, which is not by any means the most serious effect, but it will also take from the refiners the chance of disposing of their low grades at prices which enable them to manufacture fine grades at moderate prices. Every hon. gentleman will see that if they had to dispose of a considerable proportion of the output at exceedingly low prices, much below cost, they must, in order to carry on their work, put a higher price on the better grades of sugars. I now come to consider what will be the effect of reducing the rate of duty from $\frac{8}{100}$ of a cent as it stands in this Bill to $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent, as proposed in the amendment of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson). Before doing so I wish to state the general fact that the present tariff and the late tariff, so far as the protective part is concerned, did not increase the price of refined sugars to the consumers in Canada at all. If that is the case it does not make very much difference to the consumer whether the duty be $\frac{8}{100}$ of a cent or $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent per pound, except that if you make the protection too low you allow the same effect to take place that I said would follow if you raised the standard from 14 to 16. That is, you allow the importation of a large quantity of low grade sugars which could not otherwise come in, and that would affect seriously the market of our own refiners for the low grade sugars. A little later on I propose to give the prices of refined sugars as they exist in Canada to-day, and as soon as I state them the House will be convinced that it is utterly impossible that the refiners are taking advantage of even the small protection of a fraction of $\frac{8}{100}$ of a cent per pound which exists under this tariff. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) said that when we maintained this protection of $\frac{8}{100}$ of a cent per pound, it requires $1,600,000 or $1,800,000 of the money of the people of this country to support the refiners of Canada. I deny that emphatically. Even if the hon. gentleman's figures had been correct, and I presume he did not understate them, according to his own statement this evening that the prices of sugars were only 30 cents per 100 pounds higher in Canada than in the United States, it shows it would be only taking $600,000 instead of $1,800,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is over and above what the American refiners take. Take it by the English figures.

Mr. STAIRS. I will take them both in a little while. I will show the hon. gentleman, from the prices in England and the United States, that the prices of refined sugars in Canada are not increased by the $\frac{8}{100}$ of a cent per pound given as protection, by even 1 cent per 100 pounds. I will consider for a few moments the very full and lengthy extracts which the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) read from *The Manufacturer*, a newspaper in Toronto which he called the National Policy organ. I have not the pleasure of knowing the gentleman who conducts that paper, nor have I hardly ever read it. When he says it is a National Policy organ, I presume he has some good ground for stating so, but I affirm most strongly that the editor of that paper, or whoever wrote those articles was not posted on the subject on which he was writing about. In what I stated before, in replying to some of the arguments put forth by the hon. gentleman himself, I have incidentally shown that a great deal of what is stated in that newspaper is fallacious. The hon. gentleman read an extract from that paper in which it said—I do not suppose I can remember the exact words, but I think I can give the sense of the extract, and if I am wrong the hon. gentleman can correct me. The extract was in effect:

"American granulated has sold in England at 3⅜ cents per pound, and if it can be sold profitably in England at 3⅜ cents per pound, they are asking too large a price in the United States at 4¼ cents per pound."

I do not know when that happened, but so far as my argument is concerned it does not make any difference at all. In the first place, neither the newspaper nor the hon. gentleman himself had any authority for assuming that if granulated was sold for 3⅜ cents in England, it was at any profit, or even cost price was obtained for it. I will show him from the prices that have been ruling in the States for raw sugars for many months, if granulated sugar were sold for 3⅜ cents in England, it must have been sold at a loss. The hon. gentleman may ask, why they would sell it at a loss, but the answer is: Simply because there was too large a stock of granulated sugars on hand and as the refiners wished to unload it, it paid them better to send it to England and get rid of it even at a loss, than to le

it go at a loss in the United States. For many months the prices of centrifugal raw sugar has ranged in New York from 3⅜ to 3½. Now, I need not state to hon. gentlemen that no refiner in America or in the world can make granulated sugar out of 96 test centrifugal sugar which costs from 3⅜ to 3½, and pay all the costs of refining, and pay the freight to England, and sell it at 3¾, without a heavy loss. The prices which the paper gave as those ruling in the States, far nearer represent what the cost of the sugar would be, with perhaps a very moderate profit that any refiner would be entitled to take. Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been said in that paper that if the protection of $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent which is given the American refiners under the McKinley Bill is enough, why is it not enough for Canadian refiners? The Canadian refiners, I believe, can refine sugar as cheaply as American refiners: at least, so near it that the difference does not affect the calculation at all. But why is it that they want a little more protection? It is because the market of Canada is not so large.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) thinks he has got a good point, but, if he knew what he is referring to, I am quite sure he would not be so confident. If he knew anything about manufacturing, he would know that it is very often the case that, even when a manufacturer is able to compete with another country in price, if he has to compete with a country where the output is very large, it will be at a considerable disadvantage, though he can manufacture as cheaply as the manufacturers in the other country can. The hon. member knows that the output of sugar in the United States is very large indeed, and it will sometimes happen that the refiners in the United States may want to sell some particular grade of sugar at a low price to get rid of it, because they have too large a quantity of that particular grade of sugar, or, perhaps, for some other reason. It will not affect their business at all if they can sell a small portion of their output in Canada, because they might be able to close up our refiners altogether, and then they might charge whatever price they liked afterwards. You will see that the production of sugar in the United States by the American refiners is so very large that they might sell a percentage of it to the Canadian market at a price below cost, without affecting their profits to any considerable extent. That is a fact which need not be repeated to the House because every hon. member will at once see the force of it. Any one who has had any experience in manufacturing knows that the whole tendency of manufacturing at the present day is to merge into very large concerns. Then, there is another reason why we want a little more protection in Canada than they have in the United States. It is because raw sugars cost our manufacturers a little more than they do the manufacturers of New York. That is something merely incidental to the geographical position of the refiners in the two countries. New York happens to be the great centre of the sugar trade in America, perhaps the greatest centre in the world in cane sugars, and naturally enough the freights to New York are a little lower than the freights to Canada. Therefore, if we have a slightly greater protection in Canada, the refiners do not receive the benefit of it. The hon. member for South Brant quoted from the *Canadian Manufacturer* with regard to the number of men employed in the refineries of this country. Now, I am not going into the question as to whether the number of men given by that paper are correct or not, because I do not need to do so in order to answer the point raised by the hon. gentleman. I only want to point out what any one acquainted with the refining business is aware of, that the number of men employed in a refinery itself form but a small proportion of the whole number who gain their livelihood from that industry. I need only refer the hon. gentleman back to what took place when the Government of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie was in power, to prove that authorities supporting that Government took our view of this matter. If the House will pardon me one moment, I will read what was said by Mr. Workman, the then member for Montreal, who supported the Government of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie. During the debate on the sugar refining interest which took place in this House on the 3rd of April, 1876, Mr. Workman said:

"It had been said that only 300 persons had been employed in the refinery at Montreal, but the Premier had in his possession a petition in this connection, signed by 2,800 persons, who had been directly or indirectly employed by the proprietors of this establishment. Two refineries had formerly existed in Montreal."

And he goes on to say that they had been closed. Those two refineries, which were the only ones in the country at that time, did not manufacture one-fourth of the quantity of refined sugar that is manufactured in Canada to-day. That proves conclusively that the refining industry in Canada is a very important one, as respects the number of men interested in it and obtaining a livelihood from it. I come now to treat what has been stated in *The Manufacturer* and quoted with approval by the hon. member for South Brant, to the effect that if the Government had seen fit to allow a duty of ½, or say ⅝, of a cent per pound upon raw sugar to remain, the price to the consumer would not have been increased at all. A little later on, when I give the prices as they have been ruling in Canada for some time, it will be seen that not one fraction of that $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent per pound is taken by the refiners to-day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. STAIRS. I am glad the hon. member for South Oxford approves; and if that be the case, the assertion of that paper, supported by the hon. gentleman——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you do not want any protection at all.

Mr. STAIRS—that if $\frac{5}{100}$ of a cent per pound had been left on raw sugar it would not cost the consumer any more, is incorrect; because it stands to reason that a duty on raw sugar to-day would have the same effect as the duty on raw sugar had under the old tariff. It would increase the price of sugar to the consumer exactly to the extent of the duty. I am confident that this is the case. The hon. gentleman also quoted from a speech made by the Hon. Mr. Drummond some time ago in the Senate, in which, if I understood the quotation rightly, that hon. gentleman said that if he were placed in the same position as the manufacturers of cotton, that is, with free raw material,

he believed he could supply sugar as cheaply as it is supplied in England. That is probably true, but still it does not disprove the contention of the Government and of members on this side of the House that to maintain the refineries we require the protection that has been given in this Bill, for the reason that I have already explained. If you were dealing with one single article, like granulated sugar, if all the raw material were manufactured into granulated, and only granulated were consumed, then there might be something in the argument put forward by the hon. member. But when it is borne in mind that many different kinds and qualities of sugars are being made, and may be sold at very much less than cost, you will see that in order to maintain the refiners, a reasonable protection is needed, and it has to be settled what that reasonable protection is. If you are convinced that the effect of the protection is not to increase the price to the consumer, but only to ensure the market to the refiners, I am sure that we can agree that our protective tariff as regards this article has not any injurious effect in the line suggested by the hon. gentleman, and we gain all the advantages that accrue to Canada by having the article manufactured in the country. I wish now to say a few words on the general question of the sugar trade, and the benefits that have resulted from the policy put in force in 1879. One of the objects that were to be secured by the adoption of a protective tariff on sugar was to bring the sugars from the countries of production to our own ports, and have them manufactured in this country. As an illustration to prove that that policy has had this effect, I will give, very briefly, some figures as respects the Province of Nova Scotia. In 1878 there was entered in Nova Scotia for home consumption 7,895,733 pounds, on which a duty was paid of $187,825. In 1890 there were entered in Nova Scotia 50,900,000 pounds of sugar on which a duty of $641,000 was paid. In 1879 only 6 per cent. on the total importation of sugar to the Dominion was raw sugar from the countries of production. All the rest of the large quantity of sugar consumed in Canada was refined sugar brought in from the United States and the United Kingdom. Now, the effect of the policy enforced previous to 1878 was seriously to injure the carrying trade and very seriously indeed the West India trade. The West India trade is assisted and encouraged by having cargoes both ways, and it is self-evident to all who have studied this question that you cannot trade with the West Indies and get freights both ways unless you have refining industries in the Dominion, as you have not got the class of sugar to bring from the West Indies which will take the place of the refined sugar and go right into consumption. The policy enforced in 1878 and the few years previous, deprived the Canadians of the opportunity of refining their own sugar, and gave the manufacturers and the labourers of the United States the benefit derived from these industries, whereas at present our own labour receives the full benefit. Some of the advantages which accrue to Canada by bringing raw sugar to the ports of Halifax, St. John and Montreal, and refining it in this country, consist in the fact that the trade thereby gives more work to our pilots, to our tug boats, to our coal miners, to our stevedores, labourers and coopers, that it increases the light dues from vessels and the money spent in port for disbursements. It also increases the railway traffic in carriage of both coal and sugar. The vessels which take West India cargoes from the ports of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are also benefited by having return cargoes to Canada, and thus being enabled to carry the fish and other goods we export to the Islands at a lower rate. The adoption of the policy advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite would, I believe, compel our West India trading vessels to take their return cargoes to the ports of New York and Boston or return home in ballast. Any policy which interferes with the refining industries of this country is certain in time to affect our trade with the West India Islands. I desire to elaborate a little more fully the points I have already touched upon with regard to the importation of grocery sugars from the West Indies. That point has been raised several times in this House during this session, and has been brought up again by the hon. member for Brant in this debate, and I will take the opportunity of referring to it a little more fully than I did, when replying to the observations of the hon. member for Brant on former occasions. We cannot expect any considerable trade in grocery sugars from the West Indies for the reason that the consumers in Canada, as well as in the United States—and I may say practically in nearly all civilized countries—have been trained to use refined sugars. The reasons for this are many. In the first place, the packages in which refined sugar is packed are clean and very convenient, whereas the raw sugar comes in bags and hogsheads and barrels which, in many cases, are very dirty. Further, in dealing with raw sugar the loss in weight is sometimes very heavy, and the dealer can never tell how much he will get out of a hogshead, and for that reason prefers to have the refined. Then, a very small portion of the production of the West India Islands is above No. 14 Dutch standard and light enough in colour to be imported largely. It is said that not more than 10 per cent. of Jamaica sugar is of this description: and I received some time ago from New York, from a gentleman there, a letter in which he says that, as far as he knows, Cuba makes no quantity of sugar worth mentioning above 14 Dutch standard, unless since the change in the American tariff, but it has not appeared so far. Porto Rico, it appears, makes a larger quantity of sugar above No. 14, but not enough to affect appreciably the trade in this class of sugar with the people of the Dominion. For these reasons, because the consumers will have refined sugar, because we cannot get any considerable quantity of raw sugar of a suitable character from the West Indies, refined sugars will always constitute a great portion of the sugar used, and if the protection of refined sugar is so reduced that the refiners cannot operate, we will have to import refined sugar from the United States and England, and will not be able to import grocery sugar, such as has been referred to, from the West Indies. The refineries, therefore, would have to shut down, and the classes to whom I have referred as being benefited by this industry would be thrown out of work, and also—and this I know is a point which hon. gentlemen opposite will seriously consider—the West India trade would be sure to be very seriously handicapped. With respect to the operations of the refineries for some time, and the cotton factories which have been brought into operation by

the National Policy, though the original shareholders may have lost—I am speaking now of the cotton factories and sugar refineries in the neighbourhood of Halifax—both the cotton factories and sugar refineries in Halifax and Dartmouth have spent $1,250,000 in salaries and wages alone since they were erected besides their large indirect disbursements in coal and freights and many other things. Many similar instances, not as regards sugar refineries alone, but all classes of factories, can be given in other parts of Canada. Is it a wonder the people prefer the policy advocated by hon. gentlemen on this side? It is an interesting fact to note that the consumption of sugar under the National Policy increased, in round numbers, 50,000 tons in twelve years. That may not altogether be attributable to the National Policy, but still it is an evidence, first, of the general advantage of the policy, and, secondly, of the prosperity of the people. The population increased only 15 per cent. whereas the consumption of sugar increased about 100 per cent. Let us see how the prices of sugar compare, taking the prices in 1878 and in 1891. In 1878, the wholesale price of granulated sugar in Montreal was from 10 to 10½ cents, duty paid. In 1891, when there was no revenue duty on sugar, the price of granulated in Montreal ranged from 4⅜ to 4⅝. Of course, to find out exactly what the consumer has to pay for manufacturing the sugar, we ought to take the price of sugar in bond in 1878, because if hon. gentlemen opposite had not collected the revenue they did on sugar they would have had to take it out of the people in some other way. The price in 1878 was 10 cents, and the average revenue duty was somewhere in the neighbourhood of 2½ to 3 cents on granulated sugar, so that the price in Montreal, if there had been no duty in force, would have been 7 cents, whereas in June of this year the price was 4⅜ cents. It shows the price in Montreal, if there had been no duty, would have been 7 cents as compared with 4⅜ now. But hon. gentlemen opposite will say that the price of raw sugar was then very much higher. That is a fair argument and the difference must be allowed, for if we want to show the real gain to consumers by the present policy as against that which hon. gentlemen opposite carried out in 1878, and refused to change, we must take the price of raw sugar and of granulated sugar then and now. Take the difference between a standard description of raw, say centrifugal sugars, 96 test, which were worth about 5 cents in New York in 1878, and compare it with the price of granulated sugar in Montreal at that time, which was about 7 cents, or a difference of 2 cents between the cost of the standard raw sugar in New York and the granulated sugar in Montreal. In June, 1891, the price of granulated sugar in Montreal was 4⅜ cents, and the price of centrifugal sugars in New York, testing 96, was 3⅜ cents, or only a difference of 1 cent, being 1 cent a pound less than the difference that existed in 1878. This is a fair and reasonable comparison, and shows that on the present consumption of sugar in Canada, the people are getting their sugar for about $2,000,000 less than they were in 1878, under the policy supported by hon. gentlemen opposite. If they compare the different prices at which sugars are sold in Canada and the United States, hon. gentlemen act unfairly in comparing the lowest refiners' prices in New York with the prices in western Ontario, after a considerable sum has been added for transport. To be fair, let us see how the prices of sugars compare in New York and Halifax. If there is any difference between those ports, the trend of the freight is a little against Halifax. On 30th June, the centrifugals in New York were quoted at 3⅜, and granulated at 4¼, while in Halifax the centrifugals were 3½ and the granulated 4¼. On 17th July, centrifugals in New York were at 3 7/16 and granulated was from 4 5/16 to 4 7/16. On 30th June, granulated was sold in Brantford at 4½, delivered. Any hon. gentleman can see for himself that the price of sugar is as low in Canada now as in the United States. The present prices in New York, as nearly as I can get them, are 3 7/16 for centrifugals testing 96, and 3 cents for Muscovadoes, and 4⅛ to 4⅜ for granulated, the Muscovadoes being a lower kind testing about 89. I will give the contents of a telegram which I have received this morning from Halifax, giving the prices of sugar there now:

"Refined granulated four one-quarter, yellow three-eight to three-half, add quarter cent, these prices for Ontario. Raw centrifugals ninety-sixth, test three-half to five-eights, Muscovado eighty-nine, test three to three-sixteenth, New York granulated four five-sixteenths."

I would ask hon. members to pay attention to these prices. I do not take yellows as a quality that you can compare scientifically, because the colours differ so greatly that you cannot make a proper comparison. You might have one yellow sugar of a bright colour, and another of a dark colour which might test higher, and therefore have cost more to make. But I want to point out how the prices of yellow sugar in Halifax compare with the prices in New York, and you will see that the refiners cannot be taking advantage of the tariff to impose on the people. Muscovado sugars are selling in New York at 3 cents and Halifax at 3 1/16 cents, and low yellows are being sold now in Halifax at 3⅛, and the refiners have to pay the cost of refining, they have to pay for the loss of weight and for the barrels, and have only 1/16 of a cent to do it on. Of course they get some profit on their granulated sugar, and, though it would not be fair to say that the advance on yellow sugar should be the same as that on granulated, there cannot be any excessive profit on either.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman should give us an idea of how many pounds of this low grade yellow sugar could be produced from this high grade raw?

Mr. STAIRS. It is hard to answer a question of that kind, because the refineries are not worked in that way. If you take a high grade sugar testing 96 and attempt to get a low grade out of it, it would be very unprofitable. You might have some gain in weight but not much.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Was the quotation you gave for the raw sugar of the same saccharine strength as that of the other sugar you referred to?

Mr. STAIRS. I think the test of the refined sugar at 3⅛ cents would not differ very much from the 89 test raw which I quoted. I hope I make myself clear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand it, but I am doubtful.

Mr. STAIRS. Now, the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), in the course of his remarks, said that at the present time we were paying 50 cents a 100 pounds more on refined and

granulated sugars than the people in the United States. Now, let us see how that stands. The prices of granulated in New York are about 4 5/16—that was the price given a few days ago. Granulated sugar is selling in Halifax to-day at 4¼ cents, so the House will see that the price of granulated sugar to-day in Halifax is as low as the price of granulated sugar in New York.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is it in Montreal?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then what do you want protection for?

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. gentleman from South Oxford can never be convinced. He does not know enough about the practical business of refining.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Practical robbery, you mean, for your business is robbery.

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. gentleman, I notice, finds the facts so strongly against him that he has to fall back upon his old tactics and talk about robbery. The anger that he manifests is not worthy of him, he should not indulge in it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will hear enough of it before the debate closes.

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. members on this side of the House who are acquainted with this question are quite able to take care of anything that is said on the other side. I will just show that the prices of granulated in New York and the prices of granulated in Halifax to-day are about the same; in fact the telegram I have to-day shows that the price in New York is one-sixteenth higher, but we will call it, for the sake of argument, the same. Now, at the prices which are given in New York and the prices that are given in Halifax, sugar delivered in Ontario will cost practically the same, there will be very little difference indeed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would the hon. gentleman agree to deliver sugar in Ontario at the prices he has quoted?

Mr. STAIRS. I would not agree to deliver. I am not selling sugar just now. I will tell him exactly what will be done. The telegram says that the price in Halifax is 4¼ for granulated; to get the price in Ontario add ¼ of a cent per pound, and the hon. gentleman can make the calculation for himself.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the hon. gentleman prepared to sell sugar at that price, of the same quality as Montreal sugar?

Mr. STAIRS. The quality is identical. According to this telegram the price of sugar in Brantford to-day would be about 4½ cents.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How does it happen that sugar is being sold in Montreal at 4⅝ cents with the freight added?

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. gentleman must remember that the price of sugar is, perhaps, a little lower now than it was a few days ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you want to buy?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, I will buy at that price.

Mr. STAIRS. All the hon. member has to do is to send the order. If the Montreal refiners are a little cleverer than we are in Halifax, and able to get a little bigger price, that is not our fault. It only shows that the buyers in the west are not as sharp as I gave them credit for. But this is the price of the Nova Scotia refinery.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of equal quality to Montreal?

Mr. STAIRS. Quite equal.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is wonderful you do not sell more sugar in the west.

Mr. STAIRS. Now, let us take yellow. In New York, to-day, yellow sugars range from 3⅞ to 4⅛. In Montreal they are quoted at from 3½ to 4 1/16. From the prices I have given of yellows in Halifax to-day it will be seen that really there is very little difference between the New York and Canadian prices; if any, Canadian prices are lower. Now, to prove that the strong language of the hon. gentleman opposite does not apply to the sugar refiners in any way, it is a fair comparison to take the difference in the price of refined sugar in New York and the raw sugar, and the difference in the same classes of sugar in Canada. New York sugar, granulated, is worth to-day, according to the telegram which I have read, about 4·31, and 96 centrifugals are worth 3·43 per 100 pounds, showing a difference of 88 cents per 100 pounds between the price of this standard raw and the price of standard refined; whereas in Halifax granulated is sold at 4¼ net, and centrifugals are costing 3½ net, showing a difference of 75 cents per 100 pounds. Therefore, it will be seen that in refined, in Halifax to-day, they are taking 13 cents less per 100 pounds for manufacturing granulated sugar than they are in New York. Now, both during the continuance of the old tariff and since the present tariff came into force, I am convinced that refined sugar has been as low in Canada as in the United States. And, as respects England, if you take the price to-day of granulated sugar in Halifax, you cannot put English granulated there at any lower price, even if there were no duty upon it at all. The consumer in this country has the advantage of having the factories, and having his sugar in better order, of having less damage, and of getting it more quickly and easily, accordingly as he wants it. Mr. Speaker, from what I have stated upon this subject I feel that I have convinced all who have paid attention to the prices I have given, that the refiners are not taking any more for the granulated and other refined sugars to-day than they are in the United States; and, therefore, I hold that the arguments of the hon. gentleman who has proposed the amendment should have no effect upon this House, and I ask the House not to adopt them. I want to say that I am convinced that as it has been in the past, so it will be in the future, that the refiners will not take any advantage of the tariff to put their prices up after the House has prorogued. It was hinted in the paper from which the hon. member for South Brant quoted, that as soon as Parliament prorogued the refiners would take advantage of the 5/16 of a cent per pound to put their prices up. Now, some years ago I find that the refiners, when they had an opportunity under the tariff as it then existed, did not take advantage of the protection except to hold the markets for themselves. The same would be the case now, and I leave the matter in the hands of the House, and I firmly believe that the resolution of the hon. gentleman will not commend itself to the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Finance Minister, I judge, feels a little difficulty in attempting to justify the policy of the Government in regard to the sugar duties, and so he delegates the defence of his policy to a gentleman behind him. He may, however, have been actuated by another motive.

Mr. FOSTER. We are all equal in this House.

Mr. CHARLTON. The speech of my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Paterson) was perhaps a little fiery, and the hon. gentleman thought it was best to put a wet blanket upon it, which he has most effectually done by a tedious speech. Now, this sugar question, with all the special pleading we have listened to a few moments ago, with the attempts made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) to bewilder the House and the country by his mass of figures, is nevertheless a very important one indeed. The hon. gentleman assures us that we may trust the refiners, that they will take no advantage of us: we need have no fears at all. Sir, we do not need to put ourselves in a position where we will have to trust anybody, where we will have to believe that anybody will exercise forbearance towards the people of this country, when they are placed in a position to do something else. We do not need to take a position where we may trust the refiners: we need to take the position that the refiners shall have simply what is just and right, and nothing more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Government to some extent, is copied from that of the United States, as their policy has been for many years past. The American Government reduced the duties on certain grades of sugars, and the Canadian Government were obliged to follow suit. The action of the Canadian Government is not one they took voluntarily, but it was one which was forced on them by the necessities of the financial situation. The American Government, when removing the sugar duties, exercised that care towards the manufacturing interests which they always do. The refiners of the United States had influence enough with that Government to secure such terms as they chose to demand, and the terms given to American refiners, in my opinion, were as high, the protection as great, as any class of manufacturers could reasonably ask. What were those terms? The American refiner had not the face, the effrontery to ask the Government that a duty should be imposed on sugars that were below No. 16 Dutch standard. They had not the effrontery to ask for a protection of more than half a cent a pound. They well knew they needed no protection at all. Sugars could be laid down as cheap in New York as in Liverpool, and could be refined as cheaply in New York as in Glasgow or Liverpool; and the refiner of the United States had his natural protection, to wit, the cost of the transportation of the sugar from Liverpool or Glasgow to New York and American points. And this protection was sufficient. They asked for more, for what was an unreasonable amount, half a cent per pound in addition to the natural protection. That degree of protection, large as it is, ample as it is, is a degree of protection that the refiner of Canada is not satisfied with, but he must have $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent per pound and must have the limit for admitting sugars free placed at 14 and exclude sugars from the operation of the free law between Nos. 14 and 16 Dutch standard. The hon. gentleman said, in the course of his speech,

that a very small proportion of the sugar of Jamaica is over No. 14, and nearly all the sugar of the West Indies is only fit for refining purposes, and that if we were to attempt to procure sugars in the West Indies up to No. 16 for consumption here, we would find ourselves unable to do so. I believe the hon. gentleman is mistaken. I believe that these classes of sugar, the Porto Rico bright sugars and the classes of sugars produced in Demerara, are fit for consumption in this country, and that if there was a demand for these classes of sugar the production would equal the demand. It is simply because those low grades of sugars are imported for refining, because they answer for refining purposes as well as any others, that they have not been used for consumption. But give a demand for such sugars fit for consumption and that demand will be supplied. I well remember when I was a young man in the grocery trade we sold 10 lbs. of Porto Rico and Muscovado sugars, as they were called, for 1 lb. of refined sugar. The demand was for that class of sugars, and the same class could be produced now. They were a cheaper and actually better sugars, possessing more saccharine matter, than the sugars that are now given by our refiners to consumers. The argument is utterly fallacious that, forsooth, if we have not a supply to fill the demand, we should put on an additional duty to prevent those sugars coming in. The supply is there to fill the demand, and if they permitted the importation up to No. 16, the people would be at liberty to buy direct from the West Indies, and our shipping would have been called into requisition to bring that sugar to Canada for the purpose of supplying the want felt for the use of that sugar.

Then the hon. gentleman told us that the refined yellows would have to be sold cheaper if No. 16 sugar were admitted free of duty. Of course they would. The imposition of a duty on sugars above No. 14 is for the purpose of making the yellow sugars dearer. Whatever may be the amount of the duty, the effect is to increase the cost and value of all sugars, and the imposition of a duty on Nos. 15 and 16 is simply to enable the refiner, as the hon. gentleman in an unguarded moment admitted, to charge more for the yellow sugars he sells. Take off the duty on sugars from Nos. 14 to 16 and give the consumer the benefit of free sugars of a class he could import and use, and would import and use largely, and place the refiner under the necessity of selling the yellows at a lower rate, and we derive a double advantage: we get cheaper sugar from the refiner, and cheap and wholesome sugars imported from the West Indies.

Then the hon. gentleman enters into a long array of figures with respect to the comparative prices of sugars in New York and in Halifax, but he said very little about Montreal, and he told us it did not make much difference to the consumer whether the duty is $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent or $\frac{7}{16}$ of a cent per pound. If it does not make much difference, then place it at $\frac{7}{16}$ of a cent and give us sugars up to No. 16 free of duty; and, if it does not make much difference to anybody, we will accept the altered condition of things and take the sugars at the lower rate at which they will be sold. The claim is made that the refiners in Canada are placed at a disadvantage in competing with the American refiners, from the fact that the freight on sugar brought from the West Indies to Canadian points is higher to

some extent than the freight on sugar laid down in New York. That is true. There is a difference of perhaps 20 cents per 100 pounds, but, if the refiner had a duty simply of $\frac{1}{100}$ of a cent, that would more than compensate him for that disadvantage. As against 20 cents, he would have a duty equal to 50 cents to protect him; and, under all the circumstances, a duty of $\frac{1}{100}$ of a cent is ample to protect the Canadian refiner. We require to bear in mind the fact that the refiner in New York cannot place sugar in the hands of consumers in Quebec and the greater part of Ontario as cheaply as the Montreal refiner; and, while the New York refiner may obtain an advantage on the importation freight of 20 cents, he will lose nearly the whole of this advantage in the increased cost he must pay for transportation to Canada, as compared with the cost of transportation paid by the Montreal refiner. Moreover, he cannot place sugar in the Maritime Provinces in competition with the Halifax refiner, because he is at a greater disadvantage in bringing sugar from the West Indies *viâ* New York than in bringing sugar from the West Indies to Halifax. There can be no question that the general range of prices has been lower in the United States than in Canada. Yellow sugars have been very materially lower, and granulated sugars have been on an average a quarter of a cent per pound lower in New York than in Montreal. To-day, granulated is worth 4$\frac{5}{8}$ in Montreal and 4$\frac{1}{4}$ in New York. With the price on New York at 4$\frac{1}{4}$ I have no doubt that the American refiner is receiving for his sugar $\frac{1}{100}$ of a cent more than the price at which he can afford to produce it; and that the American refiner can and will export his sugars to England or any other country and sell those sugars at $\frac{1}{100}$ of a cent per pound less than in New York and in the home market, where he can put up his price by virtue of the $\frac{1}{100}$ of a cent protection. The fact is that American sugars were sold abroad at $3.70 per 100 pounds when the same sugar was sold in New York at 4$\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound.

Mr. FOSTER. What date was that?

Mr. CHARLTON. This was the statement given by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson).

Mr. FOSTER. Do you know the date?

Mr. CHARLTON. No, I do not know it. It was said to have been early in August. It is certain that the American refiner does sell, can sell, and will sell, in foreign markets at a lower rate than he does in his own market. He does that for the reason that he is protected in his own market and that the foreign refiner is at a disadvantage of half a cent per pound before he can meet him in his own market in competition. The fact that he does sell abroad cheaper than in his own market is proof positive that he sells in his own market at a higher rate than he can afford to sell in a foreign market. We are placing our refiners in a position where they can sell this sugar at $\frac{1}{100}$ of a cent per pound more than they ought sell it for. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) admits the fact that we can refine sugar as cheaply in Canada as anywhere in the world, and therefore this duty places the refiners in a position where they can sell their sugar at $\frac{1}{100}$ of a cent per pound more than the cost of refining, before foreign competition can enter in to regulate the prices they charge. We assert that this gives the Canadian refiner too great an advantage. We assert that the American refiner has an advantage of half a cent per pound over all competitors, under the motion of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and that even that is unjust, but when you give $\frac{1}{100}$ of a cent per pound to our refiners we contend that it is a gross injustice to the people of the country.

We are told by the member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) that American refiners may want to sell some particular grades of sugar in Canada below cost, and that their object in doing this may be to freeze out the Canadian refiners; that they may, in adopting this policy, design to obtain control of this market after freezing out the Canadian refiner. How can they do that? They have got to meet in this market the English and the Scotch refiner, and they have no advantage over either by doing this. It would be of little service to them to freeze out the Canadian refiner, even if they were able to do it, because after having done that, they would meet in Canada the same competition they meet in all other countries in the world. They might as well try to freeze out the refiner in any other foreign country. They might as well try to freeze out the refiner in any neutral market, as to attempt to freeze out the refiner in Canada, and therefore it is all nonsense to talk about that. The American refiners have to meet in Canada foreign competition, and if they are selling granulated and other kinds of sugar below cost for this mythical advantage that is asserted by the member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), they are seeking to obtain, they are labouring under a delusion, for everyone knows that they cannot obtain any such monopoly here.

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) referred to some remarks made by Mr. Workman in this House in 1876 in which he made some observations with regard to the number of men employed in the sugar refining industry in Canada. It seems to be clearly demonstrated that the number of men actually required for refining sugar in Canada does not exceed seven or eight hundred at the very most. Besides these, there are the carters and the sailors and railway men employed in handling sugar, but it must be remembered that if we imported sugar, all these men would find the same employment, because if you do not reduce the consumption of sugar in the country you cannot reduce the amount of labour required in handling that sugar. Therefore, even admitting that the introduction of cheaper sugar would ruin the refining industry in Canada, it is a very high price for the people of this country to pay $1,800,000 a year, which they are obliged to pay by this duty of $\frac{1}{100}$ of cent per pound if the refiners choose to take advantage of it, to procure employment for these seven or eight hundred hands. Even admitting that these men could not find employment anywhere else, it is, I say, a very high price to pay for their employment.

It is said that a policy of putting the duty too low on sugar would damage the West Indian trade, but the proposition made by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) is not to adopt a policy that will prevent our refiners from transacting their business at a profit. He does not seek to close the refineries of this country, he does not seek to place them in a position in which they cannot transact a profitable business, but he simply asks that the Government shall permit the introduction, free of duty, of a certain class of

brown sugar, that the people may require to use, and which they will use if it is admitted free up to 16 Dutch standard. He asks in addition to that, that the duty upon sugar shall be confined to a limit that will enable the refiners to make a good profit, but will not place them in a position to make an inordinately large profit. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) asserts that one-half a cent per pound would be ample protection. As the hon. member for Halifax asserts that the refiners of this country can manufacture as cheaply as the refiners anywhere, then the Canadian refiners need no protection at all; but the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) says: Give the refiner half a cent per pound protection so as to place it beyond all doubt that he can command his own market, but do not give him $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent per pound, which puts him in a position where he can rob the people of Canada at his pleasure; do not give him $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent per pound more protection on sugar than under any circumstances he is entitled to ask.

It is simply a question as between the refiners and the people of this country, as to whether the refiners shall be placed by the Government in a position where they can make the people of this country pay $1,800,000 a year more than they can import sugar for, or whether the refiners shall be obliged to reduce these profits which they put into their pockets by $500,000 a year. The amendment of my hon. friend from Brant allows the refiners to put into their pockets over a million dollars a year more than the sugars can be imported for, and surely that ought to be enough. If these few refiners in Canada can refine as cheaply as the refiners anywhere else, surely they ought to be satisfied with a tariff that will enable them to charge ten or twelve hundred thousand dollars a year on the sugar used in Canada, more than it can be imported for. If they do not accept this, surely their demands are most unreasonable, and the Government are seriously to blame for permitting these men to exact from the people of Canada $1,800,000 a year more than under any circumstances they are entitled to. My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) proposes that they shall be compelled to reduce the tribute that they lay upon the people of Canada by $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent per pound, and that they shall be satisfied with $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent per pound profit above the price of imported sugar. I think that the demand of my hon. friend from Brant is a reasonable one. I think the country will consider his demand a reasonable one, and I think that the country will consider that the Government of the day, in submitting to the terms dictated by the refiners and in permitting the refiners to place themselves in a position where they charge $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent per pound more for sugar than they ought under any circumstances to charge, are false to the interests of the country, and more than loyal to the interests of the refiners.

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) makes a comparison between the prices of raw sugar in bond at Montreal in 1878, and the prices of raw sugar there now. What has that comparison to do with the question? The question is not a question of comparative prices; the question is: Are the refiners of this country receiving terms from the Government which permits them to have an undue advantage, or not? Are the refiners of this country placed in a position where they can exact, if they choose to make a combination, higher prices for sugar than they ought to receive? That is the question, not what was the price of raw sugar in 1878, or in 1858, or any other period in our history. Of course the price of raw sugar was higher in 1878 than it is now. Is the hon. gentleman ignorant of the effect of the bounties granted to promote the production of beet-root sugar in France and in Germany? Is he ignorant of the fact that owing to the operation of these bounties the price of sugar has been constantly declining, and that it has been lower within the last few years than it has ever been known to be in the history of commercial nations? It is this that has reduced the price of sugar. But that has nothing to do with the question whether the refiners shall get $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent per pound more than they ought to receive either here or anywhere else.

Then, the hon. gentleman says that Halifax refined sugar is only 4¼ cents a pound. How does he account for the fact that the price in Montreal is 4⅛ cents a pound? Is Halifax sugar of poorer quality than the Montreal sugar? Is he lacking in the enterprise necessary to enable him to push his sales, as he reasonably could do with the advantage of lower prices by 16 or 20 cents per hundred weight than those of the Montreal refiners? I am rather suspicious of the hon. gentleman's quotations. I cannot believe that in the regular range of prices between Montreal and Halifax the difference is so great as he represents it to be.

No, Mr. Speaker, the Government in this matter has been considering the interests of others than the people of Canada, as is their custom. They have very little regard for the millions who buy sugar or anything else; but they have very great regard for the few hundreds or thousands who are engaged in the business of supplying the wants of these millions. If they can pour money into the coffers of the few at the expense of the many they are willing to do it; it has been their constant care since 1879 to benefit the few, and to rob the many in order that they may do so. This is only a gross instance of that policy by which the refiner is granted the power to increase his gains illegitimately to the amount of over a million dollars; and the Government should be called to account for their action by some such motion as that which has been made. This resolution simply demands that the rights of the people of Canada shall be considered as of as much consequence as the interests of three or four refiners. It demands that the interests of the five million people of Canada shall weigh in the scale as heavily as the interests of the five or six hundred men who work in this industry. It demands that the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number shall guide the Government in their dealings with such questions as this. But instead of being governed by any such considerations, the Government give their ear to the few men interested in one or two refineries in Montreal and one or two in Halifax. These men say: We want such and such terms; we want you to exclude all classes of sugars that are likely to come into competition with ours; we want you to limit the importations to No. 14 instead of No. 16; we want you to prevent the people importing Muscovado and Porto Rico sugars which they can use; then we want you to place a duty of $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent a pound on all sugars above No. 14; and, although we assert that we can refine sugars as cheaply as any refiners in the world, nevertheless we ask you to place us in

a position to rob the people of Canada of $\frac{5}{10}$ of a cent a pound on 230,000,000 pounds a year, amounting to about $1,800,000, and to trust them that they will not take any advantage of the people but will deal fairly by them. It is the duty of this Parliament to deal fairly with the people ourselves, not to trust to a monopoly exercising forbearance towards them. Our duty is to guard the rights of the people there. This House represents five million people, not the four or five refiners, and this House should guard the interests of that five million people and not those of the four or five refiners. This kind of work has gone on long enough. It is time the Government set to work to guard the interests of the many and to let the few take care of themselves. We do not object to a policy which limits the duty to $\frac{1}{2}$ a cent a pound, although I would say that that is as high again as it ought to be. I would say that a duty of 2½ mills a pound is ample to give the refiners all the advantage they require. Five-tenths of a cent is more than ample, and if the Government do not concede so reasonable a proposition, if they are not willing that the refiners shall be given simply what they need to do a fair business, but that they shall be placed in a position to take $\frac{5}{10}$ of a cent a pound more out of the pockets of the people than the American refiners take, the hon. Minister of Finance will see, I am quite sure, if an impartial man and amenable to reason, how utterly indefensible such a policy is. I am sure that he cannot fail to realize that he, as the Finance Minister of this country, is the guardian of the interests of the people of this country, not those of a few men—that his duty is to look after the interests of the great masses, to see that they are not plundered or placed in a position to be plundered by rings and monopolies, as they will be if the policy of the Government in regard to this sugar duty is carried into effect.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to occupy the time of the House at any length upon this question. There are only one or two points to which I wish to call the attention of hon. members before the vote is taken. The arguments of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who has just taken his seat, are, in my opinion, and I think the House will agree with me, a mere repetition of the arguments used by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and by him much more fully discussed and elaborated than by the hon. member for North Norfolk. These arguments were in my opinion so fully met and answered by the facts and figures presented by the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) that I do not feel it necessary to repeat all the statements which have been already submitted to the House, in order to meet these arguments. The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution proposes to reduce the duty on refined sugars coming into Canada from $\frac{5}{10}$ of a cent per pound to $\frac{4}{10}$ of a cent per pound. The only argument which has been advanced to justify this reduction is the fact that this rate of duty has been adopted in the United States. I feel, and I believe the House will agree with me, that this is not a sufficient reason to justify the course of action proposed. Hon. gentlemen opposite make no allowance for the difference in the cost of the raw material, to which the hon. member for Halifax has referred. It is true this is not a very large item, but still it is an item in the consideration of this question; and we all know that raw sugars can be landed in a large market, like that of New York, at somewhat cheaper rates than they can in the markets of the Dominion. Hon. gentlemen opposite also entirely ignore the difference in the character of these two markets. If hon. gentlemen will examine the market quotations in the large cities of the United States or in London and other large cities of Great Britain, they will find that there are grades of sugar in those markets quoted very much above granulated, generally ranging from ½ cent to 1 cent, and in some cases 1¼ cents, above the prices quoted for granulated. The granulated is about the lowest grade of refined sugar quoted on these markets at all, and we very seldom see yellow refined sugar quoted there at all. This indicates that in those markets there is a very much larger consumption of high grades of refined sugar than in Canada. In Canada the proportion in the past, as admitted by the refiners and grocers, is about one-third granulated sugar, which is about the highest grade of refined sugar sold in any large quantity in the country, to two-thirds of yellow sugar. Now, the fact of reducing the duty simply makes Canada a slaughter market for these low grades of yellow sugars which the large refiners in Great Britain and the United States are obliged, to a certain extent, to produce, and for which they have not got a market at home. One object for keeping a protective duty in this country at the amount it is, $\frac{5}{10}$ of a cent, is to protect the refiners in our own market and enable them to meet the large demand which exists for the yellow sugar they are now turning out. There is another point which the hon. gentleman ignores in connection with this subject, but which was referred to by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), and that is the size of the market. We all know that our market in Canada is limited as compared with the markets of the refiners in the United States or Great Britain; and while it is possible for large manufacturers, by slaughtering their goods, to obtain possession and control of a small market, it is impossible for them to obtain control of a large market. This appears to me to be a conclusive argument why our duty in Canada should be higher than that of the United States. If $\frac{4}{10}$ of a cent is sufficient to protect the manufacturers in the United States, it may be very reasonable that $\frac{5}{10}$ of a cent might be required in Canada to protect our markets from becoming a slaughter market for the refiners of Great Britain or the United States. Let me call the attention of the House to this fact. When I speak of Canada becoming a slaughter market, I do not mean that our prices in Canada would thereby be permanently lowered and that our consumers will always receive their sugar at lower prices than at present. The effect, in my judgment, would be that the large refiners of the United States would send sufficient of their goods to this market to be slaughtered to close up our refineries, and, having thus obtained control of our market, they would raise the prices to our consumers higher than they are at present. The hon. gentleman referred to the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax with regard to our trade with the West Indies. The hon. member for Halifax called attention to the fact that a very small proportion of the sugar exported from the West India Islands at present graded above No. 14

Dutch standard. The only answer which the hon. member for North Norfolk made to that was that, if we admitted the higher grades of sugar into this country duty free, they might be manufactured in the West Indies and shipped to this country. The hon. gentleman would appear to be desirous that that state of things should exist. He would appear to desire to substitute for the yellow refined sugar which our people use to-day, sugars manufactured in the West India Islands. If that is the hon. gentleman's object, it is contrary to the policy which this Government believes to be the best in the interests of the country. They believe it is desirable our people should continue to use the yellow refined sugars which are a good quality of sugar and are manufactured in our own country in preference to the high grade of raw sugar which, under other circumstances, is manufactured in the West India Islands. The hon. gentleman appears to me to occupy a very inconsistent position in many respects. He tells us that the effect of this duty is to put $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent per pound into the pockets of the refiners of Canada, and he proposes instead to put $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent per pound into their pockets. That would be a bonus to our refiners, according to his figures, of something like $1,000,000. If the hon. gentleman believes that that is the effect of this duty, he certainly is inconsistent in taking the position that we should impose $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent per pound on sugar at all. If I believed the imposition of this duty increased the price of refined sugar in Canada by the amount of the duty, I confess I would not adopt the resolution the hon. gentleman proposes, but I would adopt one of two positions: I would either advocate the free admission of all kinds of sugar or take the course suggested by the hon. member for South Brant and impose a purely revenue tariff upon all descriptions of sugar which come into the country. The hon. gentleman has called this duty robbery. If he believes it is robbery, how can he justify robbing the consumers of Canada of $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent on all the sugars they consume, and putting the money, as he says, into the pockets of the refiners? This argument of the hon. gentleman has been fully answered by the hon. member for Halifax, who submitted figures and quotations from various sources, which hon. gentlemen opposite have not attempted to prove incorrect, and which prove clearly that the prices ruling for sugar in Canada show very little difference as compared with the prices paid by the consumers in the United States and other countries. His figures show that while this protection has kept our refineries in operation, it has not, as a matter of fact, increased the cost of sugar to the consumers. The position we on this side take on this question is that a certain amount of protection is necessary in order that we may be able to refine the sugar consumed in Canada; and to sustain this position, I think we can appeal safely to the experience of the past. We all know that previous to the introduction of the National Policy, when the principles which hon. gentlemen opposite are advocating prevailed, sugar refining ceased in Canada. We know that our market was filled, not with the raw West India sugars, but with refined sugars brought from the United States and a small proportion from Great Britain. No reason has been given, no reason can be given, why, if a similar policy was adopted at the present time, similar results would not follow, and the effect will be to entirely close our sugar refineries and we would lose all the indirect benefits derived from the establishment of those industries in this country. The figures which the hon. member for Halifax gave show that refiners do not in this country take advantage of the duty to increase the cost of sugar to the consumers. This is proved by a comparison of prices with other countries, and also by the history of the refining industry in this country. We know that a large amount of capital has been invested in these industries, they have been in operation for many years, but they have not derived excessive profits from those industries, and the stocks of the sugar refining industries have often been placed on the market for sale, and they rarely have brought more than par and have often been sold below par. No excessive dividends have been declared by these companies that I am aware of, and in two cases, I think in Halifax, the companies have failed, and the original capital invested in the business has been entirely lost. I think it will be clear to the House that these facts in regard to the experience of the past are a full and sufficient answer to any arguments which hon. gentlemen opposite have advanced in support of the resolution they have submitted to this House, and I trust this resolution will not be adopted.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not intend to take up the time of the House in the discussion of this question but for the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken taken his seat. When the Finance Minister came down with his Budget speech, he led the people to suppose that he was giving the people free sugar. Throughout the Dominion, the Conservative press declared in loud and pointed terms the great advantages the people were going to realize under the changed condition of things as far as sugar was concerned. The Finance Minister said he was going to give the people a free breakfast table, but, when we analyze the condition of things as clearly presented to us by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) this afternoon, we see that, instead of giving free sugar to the people of this country, this proposal of the Government is virtually giving the refiners an advantage which was not necessary and to which they are not entitled. You are simply compelling the people to contribute $600,000 more than is absolutely necessary. It is clear from the remarks of the hon. member from Brant and the quotations he has read from the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite, that $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent would be ample protection for the refiners in place of $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent. It is clear to me, and I think it will be clear to the country, that, if the Finance Minister was honestly in earnest in the statements he presented to this House and to the country, he was sadly misled and deceived. Of course, he is not a practical refiner of sugar, and has no knowledge of what is necessary to give to the refiners of this country the protection they require under the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen interested in the refining of sugar who sit behind the Minister have evidently made statements to him as to what protection is necessary and have in that way secured from him an advantage in the alteration of the tariff which is altogether unfair and beyond the necessities of the case. My hon. friend made some remarks as to the amount of

yellow sugar used by the people of this country. He said about two-thirds of the sugar used was yellow sugar, and that the West India sugar that would be imported would not be of such a quality as to take the place of this yellow sugar made in this country. Any member who will take his mind back to the time when the tariff changes were prepared in this House will remember that two samples of sugar were submitted by a gentleman from Cuba who came here to try and work up a trade between the two countries. He was led to believe that those samples, which were not refined, but only cleaned, were fit to be used in a large number of houses in Canada, but he found that, under the alterations of the tariff, these sugars would be subject to a duty of $\frac{1}{100}$ of a cent a pound. Another statement was made that there was not over $\frac{1}{100}$ of the entire sugar that Island turned out that would come above 14 Dutch standard. I had the opportunity of conversing with a gentleman who had been there for the purpose of trying to establish a trade, and he said that 40 per cent. of their sugar was cleaned and would come above 14 Dutch standard, so that would come in as No. 16. It is clear that the refiners of Canada are not only anxious to shut out that class of sugar, but they want to secure the entire market for themselves. They are not prepared to allow the poorer classes the privilege of buying the class of sugar they largely use on the best terms they can. They not only want to secure the entire quantity of refined sugar made in Canada, but they want also to monopolize the yellow so as to have the entire market for themselves; and the reason why hon. gentlemen opposite want to secure these terms for the refiners under the operations of this law, is that the latter may have the entire monopoly of the Canadian market for all the sugar, whether granulated or yellow. Now, I think that is quite clear. Another statement that was presented by the hon. gentleman was that in 1878 we imported more sugar from the United States than from Great Britain. I have before me the facts which show that the quantity imported from Great Britain was 47,611,106 lbs., while we imported from the United States 40,897,269 lbs., which shows clearly that the statement made by the hon. gentleman is not correct. Now, I cannot see why our manufacturers in Canada should not be able to manufacture under a tariff of $\frac{1}{100}$ of a cent as well as the Americans. Surely, we can lay the raw material down here, say at Halifax, where my hon. friend lives, as cheaply as the Americans can at any of the American ports. I think if we are going to work up that trade between Jamaica and ourselves, of which we have had such glowing prospects presented to us, we ought to be able to lay the raw material down upon our shores about as cheaply as they do at Boston or any other important refining points. Cannot our refiners refine sugar as cheaply as they can in the United States? Is not labour as cheap in Canada as it is in the United States? And is not the living of those who are engaged in that industry as cheap in Canada as it is in the United States? I think it is; house-rent and everything in fact is even lower here. Now, I would like to know why it is that the refiners of sugar in Canada cannot operate successfully with $\frac{1}{100}$ of a cent protection as well as the refiners of the United States for $\frac{1}{100}$ of a cent? It is clear that the hon. gentlemen in this House, who are interested in the refining of sugar, have got the ear of the Finance Minister, and have secured from him, under circumstances of which he was completely ignorant, by the statements they have made, terms far better than were necessary, even for the purpose of carrying out what they call the principles of the National Policy. I contend that the circumstances in which the refiners are now placed, are very much better than they were before; simply because the refiners can operate with very much less money. The capital necessary to operate a refinery under the present system is much less than it was under the former system. Under the former system they had to provide for duties, and a very large amount of money was paid in that way. When they took their sugars out of bond they had to lay out that money for a considerable time, until the sugar reached the consumers and the returns began to come in; they even had to place their sugars in the hands of wholesale dealers for 30 or 60 days at a discount. Under the present system they are not called upon to pay a single farthing; they have only got to buy the raw material, they have no duty to pay, they have simply the carriage to pay, and that is all. When their sugar is refined they can place it upon the market, and there is no expense or outlay connected with it. On the whole, the advantages accruing to the manufactures under the present system are very considerable, and it is quite clear that hon. gentlemen who are in the trade fully realize this fact; and when they got the Minister of Finance to consent to a tariff of $\frac{1}{100}$ of a cent, I am satisfied that in their inner soul they knew that under the operations of that tariff they would be very much better off, and that they would make more money, and make it more easily, than under the old system. Now, my hon. friend said that if you reduced the duty so as to enable the refiners of the United States to send their sugar into Canada, they would at first sell their sugars so low that it would have the effect of shutting up the refineries of this country, and after they had secured the suspension of our refining establishments, they would then put up the price in order to victimize the consumers of this Dominion. I would like to ask my hon. friend who presented that statement as a scarecrow to this House and the country, where would the refiners of England be all this time? Would the refiners of England stand by and allow the Americans to play their pranks in the Canadian market as the hon. gentleman seems to suppose? Would it not be competent for the refiners of England to send their sugar in here on the same favourable terms as the Americans, and to take just as much advantage of the circumstances? Then, supposing that the Americans did send in and slaughter their sugar upon our market, I would like to know, the moment that they attempted to raise the price beyond its normal figure, where would the English refiners be? Immediately the Canadian importers could send across to Liverpool, or Manchester, or Glasgow, and in a very short time they could secure a supply of sugar and put it into the Canadian market in opposition to the sugar of the United States, just as soon as the American refiners attempted to extract out of the people of this country more than the actual value of the sugar. We have heard such statements as these made in this House before. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious to impress upon the people of this country the idea that

if the National Policy is interfered with, if the privileges that are enjoyed under the operations of that policy are at all touched, so as to permit the United States to compete with Canada, immediately we will be subject to an enormous increase of prices. Well, Sir, that argument is threadbare ; we have heard it and answered it so often that it is useless to mention it. But I was amused that my hon. friend, in face of the knowledge that we have in regard to the enormous refining institutions in England, should venture to risk in this House such a statement, when he knows that it could not hold for a moment ; because he knows perfectly well that the moment England had an opportunity of competing, there would be no difficulty in the world in England sending any quantity of sugar to Canada.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) at considerable length reviewed the action of the Government in connection with the increased duty on sugar. He criticized at considerable length the policy that has been recently adopted. He endeavoured to show, and I think he did show conclusively, that the changes which have been made have been largely in the interest of the refiners of this country. I have been endeavouring to point out the fact that, in my humble opinion, the Minister of Finance has been taken advantage of, and I do not wonder at this. Unless he was a practical sugar refiner and able to judge himself of the duty necessary to give the Canadian refiner a slight advantage over the American or English refiner, it was utterly impossible for him to decide fairly in the interests of the consumers. I should like to ask the Minister of Finance when he was in the inner courts of his political sanctum surrounded by the Kennys, Woods and Dickeys, pressing on him the justice of making a change in the direction of more protection for the refiners, who were standing at his other elbow pressing on him the interests of the consumers? No one. Yet the hon. gentleman was supposed to act in the interests of the people ; but, in place of doing so, I have not the slightest doubt he succumbed to the demands of the refiners and gave them all they asked. The result we have to-day. While the hon. gentleman came down to the House and announced that the people which he blessed with the privilege of using free sugar and declared he was giving the labouring classes, the farmers and consumers a free breakfast, he was at the same time placing the refiners in a position so that they could take out of the pockets of the people $1,800,000, not one cent of which goes into the treasury of the Dominion. That money is taken out of the pockets of the consumers simply for the purpose of enabling the refiners to continue the business in which they are now engaged. On the American side, where the people are particularly fond of protection, and where if any country in the world protection has run wild, they have given a protection of $\frac{5}{10}$ of a cent ; but our refiners thought they would not be able to do with less than $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent. If you take the prices of sugar quoted in Canada, you find they are the prices quoted in New York and Boston, with the addition of $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent duty, and with the addition of the freight charges. I am satisfied the refiners will continue to extort from the consumers as much as the tariff will enable them to exact. To present the case in another way : If the Minister of Finance had passed a law which would enable the tax-payers to go to the door of each house and collect a certain contribution for the refiners, they would require from every household of five persons 60 cents to keep the refiners in their present condition. If they went round and obtained contributions for the entire sum they would require to collect from each household of five $1.80. But admitting that $\frac{5}{10}$ of a cent would be reasonable and moderate protection, amply sufficient to give them the market and all advantages necessary to enable them to manufacture sugar, the amount to be collected from each family would be 60 cents. Another change was recently made in the interests of the refiner. When the Minister of Finance made his Budget speech he announced he was going to grant a bounty for beet-root products grown for the purpose of producing sugar. He said that bounty would only be continued for one year ; but he subsequently amended his proposition and made the term two years. That is a decided advantage to the sugar refiner. It is as good as $\frac{1}{4}$ of a cent protection to the refiners. They are now using beet-root, and I understand they have adopted a new process by which they manufacture a diluted sugar of inferior quality to that produced some years ago. Under the operation of a tariff giving $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent protection and a beet-root bounty, to promote the production of beet-root here, which the sugar refiners will be able to purchase at their own price, we give the refiners a glorious opportunity during two years at least of making very large sums from sugar refining. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Stairs) said something with respect to the very great advantage that sugar refining conferred on this country. In my opinion it would well pay our people, although I am opposed to the superannuation system we have in force, to superannuate every sugar refiner and place sugar on the free list. I contend that of all the pernicious laws ever introduced into any country, that law which forces one man to contribute of his money to the well-being and prosperity financially of another is the most unjust. I am glad that some men in the interests of the enormous body of consumers in the United States are about to carry the whole question of protection to the Supreme Court of the United States, where it will shortly be argued with a view of testing its constitutionality, and I hope the protection system will be pronounced unconstitutional, as it should be, in every country where it is introduced. I desire to draw the attention of the House for a few moments to the question of our Jamaica trade. The Minister of Finance went to Jamaica, at no doubt considerable expense, to try and build up a trade, and with the intention of trading as freely as possible with the people of that Island. Judging from his speech, he intimated to the Jamaica people that Canada would be willing to negotiate for the freest trade possible with that Island ; but when the hon. gentleman returned here, and was surrounded by the sugar refiners of Halifax and other places, he found that such trade arrangements would seriously militate against the interests of that particular class, and so he could not possibly carry out the promise and pledge

made to the Jamaica people. If we had obtained control of the trade of that Island it would have been decidedly advantageous to our people. I desire to give an idea of the commodities that Jamaica imports from the United States, and which she might import from us. During the twelve months ending 30th December last Jamaica imported goods to the value of $2,640,000 from the United States, including many articles in which we could compete. These articles include: bread and biscuits, $63,500; butter, $103,000; cheese, $39,000; brine and salt fish, $82,000; herring, mackerel and salmon, smoked and pickled, $35,000; white flour, $875,000; boots and shoes, $46,000; pease and beans, $7,600; soap, $14,000; white pine, $78,000; shooks and headings, $50,000. The exports of Jamaica to the United States during the same period amounted to $3,860,000. These figures clearly show the advantage it would have been to our farming community to have had an additional market, even to that limited extent, opened up in Jamaica for many of the commodities we could very well supply. That trade would have been obtained had it not been for the fact that the Minister of Finance found, no doubt, when he came home, that the refiners of this country could not make the amount of money that they were anxious to make if they permitted him to enter into these trade relations. The result was that, notwithstanding the fact that he led the people of Jamaica to understand that the people of Canada sent him there for the purpose of effecting these trade relations, he had to eat his own words when he came home. The men brought here from that Island who were led to believe that the people of this country were willing to trade with them on fair and equitable terms, had to pack up their samples which they brought here for the purpose of doing business and go back to their Island disappointed and disgusted. After the very able arguments of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) and the quotations he has presented to this House from the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the advantages that the sugar refiners of Canada enjoy under the changes that are proposed by the Bill before the House, it is the duty of the Parliament seriously to reconsider the whole question. Sugar is one of the most important commodities that we have to import into this country; it is used by rich and poor, and the poor contribute more than the rich, because, in proportion to their means, they use more sugar than the rich do. The result is that this tax on sugar strikes harder on the poor people of this country than it does on the rich people. Next to the necessities of life, such as flour, sugar should be placed in the hands of the consumers of this country at the lowest possible price. While we have no desire whatever to interfere with the manufacturers and refiners of sugar in Canada—we would be glad to see them all prosper—we do not want to see millions and millions of money in large fortunes made out of the poor people of this country who are the consumers, nor do we want to see unfair advantages given to the refiners to enable them to produce sugar at an unreasonable profit. It is quite time that we should seriously consider this question and legislate in the interest of the consumers, rather than to give away every advantage to the manufacturers of this country.

As I said before I sympathize with the position that the Finance Minister occupies. I believe that he sees himself that he has been drawn into a trap. I believe that while he is committed to keeping faith with the sugar refiners in the Maritime Provinces and in Montreal, that they have taken advantage of him simply because he does not understand the process of refining sugar. I believe that these men went away from his office laughing in their sleeves at the advantages they were going to enjoy under the tariff they induced him to bring before the House. I contend that this article of sugar is a most important commodity from the farmers' standpoint. While by the operations of this pernicious tariff the Government have placed the farmer in the position that he is restricted in the sale of the commodity he produces, they have also restricted him in the privilege of purchasing whatever he likes and whenever he can purchase to the best advantage. The system pursued by the Government reminds me of the story of the old darkey who used to set his trap to catch a coon, and when some one enquired of him how in the world it was he was so successful in catching the coon every time he set the trap, he answered that he always set his trap to catch the coon "whether going or coming." In like manner the Minister of Finance has set his trap to catch the farmers of this country whether buying or selling. His trap catches the farmer even in the matter of buying a pound of sugar, and it catches him when he goes to sell, by placing an embargo on the commodity that he wants to sell in the best market in the world. The trap catches the farmer both ways, and between the upper and nether millstone of the National Policy he is robbed right and left. It is not to be wondered at that the recent census shows that our population has not been increasing to the extent we have a right to expect it should. Our people have got discouraged and dissatisfied by the extortions of the National Policy; and they decided to try their luck in other parts of the world, and the result is that we have not that population in Canada to-day that we would have had we followed up the honest, upright and British principle of only taxing the people proportionately for the necessities of the country; in place of making the masses the slaves of the few manufacturers, so as to make the manufacturers wealthy and independent. This high tariff law in this country has led to the demoralizing condition of affairs which we have now to deplore. These men who allow themselves and their consciences to get so seared that they can collectively and unitedly join for the purpose of putting a law in the Statute-book that robs the people of this country for the benefit of sugar refiners and implement manufacturers and others, are sanctioning a law that is unjust, unfair, un-British and disloyal. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the Liberal party of this country are disloyal, but there never was placed upon the Statute-books of Canada a more disloyal Act than the Act known as the National Policy. It is disloyal to the liberties of the subject, it is not creditable to us as a colony of the British Empire, and it is not treating the mother country with the loyalty with which we had a right to treat her. I think still that we should reconsider this whole question of the duty on sugar and adopt the amendment of

the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) to reduce the duty from $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent to $\frac{4}{16}$ of a cent per pound. If we give to the Canadian sugar refiners the same advantages that are enjoyed by the American refiners, we are certainly giving them as much and more than the people of this country can afford to confer upon them. If you reduce the duty to $\frac{4}{16}$ of a cent per pound, the refiners will still continue to produce all the sugar that is required by the people of this country, and you will at the same time save to the people of this country $600,000 a year, or to every household of five you will save 60 cents. I hope the House will adopt the amendment of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson), and thereby save to the people of this country a considerable sum of money which would otherwise go into the pockets of the sugar manufacturers.

Mr. KAULBACH. It was not my intention to offer any remarks with regard to the matter of sugar, after the able and eloquent addresses of the hon. the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) in answer to the resolution that was submitted to this House by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), but as it affects the trade of the province to which I belong, and especially the ports of Lunenburg and Halifax, more than it does the trade of the rest of Canada, I feel that I would not be doing myself justice as a representative from that province if I allowed the matter to go without saying a word in reply. It is well known that the industries of Canada have a right to be kept up, and every one should feel an interest in seeing that they are upheld. I do not think the hon. member for South Brant, if he has an interest in the welfare of this Dominion, would calmly submit to see the industry of sugar refining in Canada destroyed. Placed as we are geographically, we are unable to import raw sugars as cheaply as they can be imported into New York, or Boston, owing to the larger importations and the greater competition at these points. Besides, we are compelled to pay a larger freight on all the sugars imported into Canada than is paid upon those imported into New York, or Boston, owing to distance and increased cost of freight; and for that reason our sugar refineries should have a shade more protection than those of the United States. We find that our trade in sugar has increased very considerably since the introduction of these refineries, the four of which employ something like 650 hands. To assimilate our duties on sugar to those of the United States would place us at a very great disadvantage indeed, and the consequence would be that in a short time we would see those refineries closed up. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to say that we can import as cheaply as the Americans. They know right well that if we were to expose our refiners to competition with the Americans, they would soon flood our markets, glut it with sugars at figures far below what our refiners could produce sugars for, and they would continue to supply us only until they succeeded in closing up every refinery in the Dominion; and the moment that was accomplished, they would raise their prices to the old figures. What benefit are these four refineries to this Dominion? Besides employing 650 hands directly, they give employment, indirectly, to the larger portion of the shipping of the Maritime Provinces. Almost every vessel that leaves the port of Halifax or the port of Lunenburg, the two most important shipping points in Nova Scotia, after discharging its cargo of fish and general products, brings back a cargo of sugar. Formerly, before the sugar refineries were established in this country, these cargoes of sugar went to the United States, were refined there, and then brought to Canada for consumption. But after the introduction of the National Policy we found our sugar refineries moving along in a measure successfully. Upon the introduction of that policy we heard the statement everywhere that it was going to enrich a few wealthy men and empty the pockets of the poor. Has that been the result with respect to the sugar refineries? No, Mr. Speaker. I am one who can speak from experience. I had a certain amount of capital invested in a sugar refinery in the City of Halifax, and I lost every dollar of it; and I believe that that was the case with nearly every refinery in this Dominion. But those of us who invested money in this industry did not lack courage; we felt satisfied to place our capital again in the same industry, and though we did not see the profitable results that we had expected, still we felt satisfied if we could get a moderate return on the money invested, we were conferring a lasting benefit on the people of this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we allow these refineries to be closed up by reducing the duties to that of the United States, as hon. gentlemen opposite would desire, we should be deprived of a large and profitable trade. Vessels which are now employed in the carriage of sugars to those industries will be deprived of employment, and the parties who are at present indirectly receiving a living from them will be shut off completely. The hon. member for South Brant referred to the percentage of sugars in Jamaica. I can vouch, I think with some accuracy, that the percentage of sugars from thence averaging over No. 14 Dutch standard is about 10 per cent. But the importers of sugar sustain a certain amount of injury by the present regulation, which I think the Government will endeavour to avoid, or at least correct, when they see the friction that it causes, which is principally on the importations of sugars from Porto Rico. These sugars class more than 10 per cent. over No. 14 Dutch standard. In some instances they run very considerably over that, and also test high, something like 96. But without placing ourselves at the risk of subjecting the sugars coming into Canada to competition with those going to the United States, we could obviate that difficulty by exacting a duty only on such portions of sugar imported into Canada as would be over 15 per cent. on the quantity over No. 14 Dutch standard, and the carrying trade would not suffer. In that way we could provide against our refineries being interfered with. Now, with regard to beet-root sugar, to which the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) referred—I would have considered the reference hardly worth the mention. It is known pretty generally to everybody in this Dominion that the industry of the beet-root is as yet in its infancy, and that the small quantity that is grown in Canada for sugar purposes would not be of enough consequence to the refiners of this country as to be worth mentioning. The Finance Minister is deserving of credit in being able with one stroke of the pen to remove the tax the people were paying on sugar to about $3,500,000 annually, which should merit the unqualified support

of every member of this House, and the duty of $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent per pound over 14 Dutch standard is advisable, providing the Government will admit 15 per cent. over 14 Dutch standard also free, which would enable us to import for refining Porto Rico without inconvenience. I, consequently, will ask the House and the Government to consider very carefully the suggestion I have made with regard to the duty on sugars imported. We will then find that the refining industry will move along successfully and the shipping now employed in the carriage of sugars from the West Indies will not be interfered with. But, on the contrary, if we were to follow the advice of our hon. friends opposite, we would reduce the trade of our shipping ports along the Atlantic coast to the extent, in the course of a very short time, that we would scarcely have a vessel engaged in the West India trade at all, and the trade generally devastated, were we to take the advice of hon. gentlemen opposite. I must ask the House to pardon me for the few disjointed remarks I have made, but I felt it my duty in the interest of the sugar refiners, whom I desire to see protected in the best possible manner, to urge that they should have sufficient protection to enable them to make a fair profit and give employment to their operators, and also benefit the outside trade engaged in the carriage of sugar, which would be the shipping of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. CHRISTIE. It is not my intention to occupy the time of the House at any length. I simply desire to record my protest against the iniquitous system of taxation which now prevails. When the Finance Minister struck off the duties on the lower grades of sugar, I think he should have gone a step further and struck off that portion which goes into the pockets of the sugar refiners. It appears to me that was the most objectionable part of the duties and should have been the first removed. It appears to me unreasonable, not only unreasonable but unjust, that every man who buys a pound of sugar should be compelled to pay tribute to the extent of $\frac{1}{2}$ of a cent a pound, not for revenue purposes—of that I would not complain—but solely for the benefit of the sugar refiners. We all know that the sugar industry is not an infant industry. It has been long established and the refiners are all wealthy men, thoroughly able to enter into competition with the world and take care of themselves, and there is no good reason why the whole Dominion should be heavily taxed for their special benefit. There is no reason why the people should have to pay $1,800,000 a year for the sole purpose of making a few men millionaires. If this was the only industry that was preying on our people, it might be tolerated. But it is not. Our people are being bled at every pore. Millions and millions of dollars are being filched from their pockets annually, under the guise of protection, for the purpose of building up industries from which they derive very little benefit. I hold that it is unjust and unreasonable that the great mass of the people should be taxed for the benefit of a few monopolists, whether sugar refiners or any other monopolists. I believe the day is not distant when, if this vicious policy be continued, our people will revolt against such an iniquitous system of taxation. They are revolting now, but they will rise in their might and emancipate themselves from the tyranny and oppression of the monopolists. I hold that this is a system of slavery in labour and in trade, and that every fair-minded man should protest against it. I would have been glad if the amendment had gone further, as I should like to see sugar absolutely free. I hold that all the prime necessaries of life should be free and that everything else should be reduced one-half to a fair revenue tariff. It is this iniquitous system which has impoverished our people and is retarding the prosperity of the country and driving our people away. Notwithstanding the fact that this amendment does not go as far as I would wish, yet it is a long step in the right direction, and inasmuch as it will lighten the burdens of the people by nearly $1,000,000, I will have pleasure in recording my vote in its favour.

Mr. KENNY. I see that the House is impatient to vote, and I promise to occupy its attention but a very few minutes. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has told us that if the amendment moved by the hon. member for Brant had contemplated the entire abolition of the duty on sugar, it would have commended itself more to his approval. I must congratulate the hon. gentleman on being thoroughly consistent. He is, as regards sugar at least, a thorough free trader. The mover of the resolution and the hon. member for North Norfolk who supported it have contended that the $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent per pound duty would accrue to the benefit of the sugar refiners of this Dominion. My hon. colleague has dealt so exhaustively and fairly with the technical issues involved that I shall not detain the House by referring to them, but I wish simply to point out the illogical position hon. gentlemen opposite occupy. They contend that under the present tariff on raw sugars, the people of Canada are robbed of $1,600,000 for the benefit of the sugar refiners. But the resolution and the argument supporting it are to the effect that while it is highly improper that the people should be robbed of $1,600,000, there can be no objection to robbing them of $1,000,000. The hon. gentleman who moved the amendment made his argument in a business-like, straightforward manner, but the hon. member for South Oxford interrupted my hon. colleague to declare that those amongst us who had invested our money in sugar refineries were "robbers." I am not disposed to bandy words across this House with the hon. member for South Oxford or any other hon. gentleman, especially with the hon. member for South Oxford, who is always aggressive, and has an inexhaustible supply of offensive adjectives. I was surprised to hear such language used by that hon. gentleman with regard to those who are interested in the sugar refining industry, and I must resent it and protest against it. I must say that in the community in which I live many among us took an interest in the sugar refining industry, believing it would be a valuable adjunct to our West India trade, and we invested our money in it in order also to start an industry in our own community which would be beneficial, we hoped, to ourselves and to the West India trade, in which the people of the Maritime Provinces are especially interested, and I do think it is hardly fair for the hon. member for South Oxford—in fact it was most unfair for that hon. gentleman occupying the position he does in this House and country—to apply to the men who have invested their money in that industry the offensive term "robbers." I know that in the

community in which I live there are many gentlemen who usually support the Opposition in this House, who are identified with this industry, and who will be much surprised and grieved to hear that their association with it has warranted the hon. member for South Oxford, according to his ideas of this matter, in applying to them the epithet "robbers." Now, to deal with some of the arguments which have been advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite. If I understood the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), if I remember correctly what he said, or rather what he read from some journal interested, I believe, in the manufacturing industries of Canada, he said that the cost of transferring raw sugars into refined sugars was 60 cents per 100 lbs. In 1889 and 1890, the raw sugars which were bought by the Nova Scotia Sugar Refinery cost on an average $5.14, and the price at which they were sold was $5.74, so that by a coincidence there was exactly 60 cents between the cost price and the selling price, and, therefore, hon. gentlemen will see that, if the statement of the hon. gentleman is correct, we merely received for the refined sugars what the hon. gentleman tells us is the cost of producing them. Hon. gentlemen opposite have also contended that if the tariff permitted sugar between 14 and 16 Dutch standard to be admitted into Canada free of duty a large amount of that grade would come in. My hon. colleague dealt very fully with this phase of the question, and I only desire to point out to the hon. gentlemen opposite that it has been shown in the course of this debate that in the year 1879 only 6 per cent. of raw sugars were imported into the Dominion under the tariff inaugurated by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Sir, from 1876 or 1877 to 1879, of all the sugars that were imported, I assume that fully 30 per cent. were granulated and probably 70 per cent. were yellow sugars, and yet there is the fact that only 6 per cent. of raw sugars were imported in the year 1879, showing that even if their proposition was adopted we could not expect to import any large amount of sugars between 14 and 16 Dutch standard. The hon. member for North Norfolk told us that when he was a young man large quantities of sugars between 14 and 16 or about 16 Dutch standard were imported into Canada, and that these were favourite sugars in the province in which he resides. I have referred to the fact that we were influenced in starting our sugar refinery in Halifax because we believed it would be beneficial to that community as well as to the trade of the Dominion, and I think, when we decided on that course of action, we were only doing what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), when he was a younger man and knew more about 14 Dutch standard than he does to-day, told the people of Canada would be beneficial to the cities and the people in general. Looking over the *Hansard* of 1876, I find that the hon. member for North Norfolk, on 29th February, in the course of a speech on the Budget, said:

"Why is it that we are so desirous of selling in the United States articles of food? It is simply because they have by protection built up manufacturing cities with a numerous population that consumes, not only the vast products of their own country, but also affords a better market for our products than we in the Dominion possess."

It may have been these comparatively early utterances of the hon. member for North Norfolk that influenced us in starting our sugar refinery in Halifax, in the hope and expectation and belief that it would benefit the whole country and that the people employed in that industry would help to improve the home market for Canadian products. In fact, it has helped to develop a home market for the farmers and the producers of the necessaries of life which are grown in this country. When these hon. gentlemen tell us that the present tariff is a robbery—I do not say that the hon. member who moved the amendment has used that expression, but the hon. member for North Norfolk and the hon. member for South Oxford have used it—they apply it to the agricultural as well as the manufacturing industry. It seems to me that the object of this amendment is rather to secure greater uniformity between our tariff and that of the United States. These hon. gentlemen have advised us simply to adopt the American tariff. We know that the hon. gentlemen's policy in regard to commercial union is that our tariff should be assimilated to the tariff of the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. KENNY. Hon. gentlemen say "no," but they cannot honestly and sincerely contend that their policy is not that our tariff should be assimilated to that of the United States. Hon. gentlemen must remember that Mr. Wiman, to whom they are indebted for their commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity fad, stated publicly in the City of Boston that, if the Liberals came into power in Canada, the action of the Government would be changed in relation to sugars, and that the sugars used in Canada would be refined in Boston and New York. In other words, it would result in handing over our refining interests to the factories of Boston and New York. That was the doctrine laid down, if not by the leader of the Opposition, at all events by the New York leader of that party. All of us, who are engaged in any manufacturing industries, know that the abolition of these industries would seriously disarrange the labour market in the different communities in which we live. This was felt and realized by the people of Canada during the last general election, and I am satisfied that the majority by which the present policy was sustained in all the great centres of population, was due to the fact that the people residing there realized that the destruction of any one of these industries, particularly of so important an industry as that of sugar refining, would seriously disarrange the whole labour market and result injuriously to the Dominion of Canada. Sir, I feel it my duty, a duty that I owe to my constituents who sent me here, to oppose every measure, and every movement, and every resolution which tends to commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, or the assimilation of the Canadian tariff to that of the United States; and, therefore, it is that I shall oppose the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Brant.

Mr. CASEY. I do not propose to go into the technicalities of this question in any great detail, more especially because they have already been treated by experts on both sides of the question, by those interested in and familiar with questions connected with the consumption of sugar, and more especially on that side of the House by those interested in the particular tax which this resolution proposes to reduce. It is worthy of notice that the only defence of the existing tariff that has been

made from that side of the House to-day, has been made by gentlemen more or less directly interested in maintaining the present tax upon refined sugar; and two of the gentlemen who have spoken, the gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Kenny), and his colleague (Mr. Stairs), in the representation of Halifax, are admittedly directly interested in the production of sugar, and the other two gentlemen who have spoken are, I understand, also interested financially in the maintenance of the present tariff. So, Sir, all the arguments that have been addressed to us in favour of retaining the present duty, have been addressed to us by persons to whom it is individually and financially an object that these duties should be maintained; they are talking, in other words, for their own pockets, and their arguments, no matter how learned they may seem to be in saccharology—if I may coin the word—matters relating to the technicalities of sugar refining, their arguments must be allowed only the weight due to arguments advanced by interested parties. When a man speaks for his own pocket he is allowed to put things in the most favourable light for his side of the question, he is generally suspected of putting things in a more favourable light for that side of the question than anybody else would put them. We must, then, consider the arguments advanced from the Government side of the House as arguments advanced by people who are talking for their own pocket, talking for their own personal advantage. It makes me wonder all the more that the Minister of Finance, who is nominally, at all events, responsible for the tariff, or is nominally supposed to have evolved those changes in the tariff from the depths of his own tremendous financial ingenuity, with the assistance, of course, of such sources of information as were at his disposal — that this hon. gentleman, so responsible, should have allowed the defence of this policy to rest in the hands of suspected advocates, suspected because of their personal interest in arguing as they do. It ill-becomes that hon. gentleman, who is certainly not lacking in the ability to hold a brief for the sugar refiners or any other class of the community, it is certainly not worthy of him that he should allow the defence to rest in such hands, instead of assuming the responsibility at once, upon being challenged, of defending it himself, and giving us the reasons for which it should be retained. It would be for him to speak for the country, to answer the challenge brought forward by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), on behalf of the country, to show that the country's interests were advanced by the present tariff, and would be endangered by the proposal of my hon. friend. He has not done so, he has left the Government to be defended in the manner to which I have referred, but I am sure that before the debate is over he will find it necessary to his dignity as a responsible Minister to give us a judicial finding upon the arguments that have been laid before the House to-night, and to explain more in detail than he had time to do in his Budget speech, why he disregarded the obvious arguments on the other side. Now, my hon. friend who has just sat down, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), says that the proposition of my hon. friend which is now before the House looks towards assimilating our tariff to that of the United States, that it is an imitation of the Yankees. Why, Sir, do we not know that the proposal of the Finance Minister itself, removing the duty, in part, on imported sugar, was confessedly an imitation of the Yankee tariff, was confessedly introduced simply because a similar change had been introduced on the other side of the line? It is the Minister of Finance who is open to the charge of trying to assimilate our tariff to that of the United States. I know that the hon. gentleman claims credit for having to this extent reduced the taxation of the people, but why did he do it? Did he tell us he was convinced that he should do so on the merits? No; he did not tell us that he was convinced on the merits of the case that the duties on raw sugar ought to be taken off, but he admitted that he had to take off those duties because they had been taken off on the other side of the line, and the people here would not submit to be taxed so much more highly for their sugar than their neighbours across the boundary; therefore the tax had to go. But he did not go far enough. While he went so far as greatly to reduce the revenue derivable from sugar, he did not go so far as to confer upon the consumer of sugar the benefits conferred upon the consumer in the United States by the McKinley tariff. My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) has pointed out how that is so, that while we lose about $3,000,000 of revenue by the changes in the sugar tariff, the consumer is only relieved to the extent of $1,500,000 or thereabouts. In other words we are only relieved of about a million and a half of taxation. Even to that extent is this reduction of duty any real relief to the people? I contend, under present circumstances, that it is not, because the reduction of taxation on one particular article is no relief so long as the expenditure of the Government is not reduced. If we have to raise as much revenue, after reducing the revenue on one particular item of imposts as before, the deficiency must be made up by increasing imposts on other articles, and the Minister of Finance has confessed this by certain imposts which he has proposed and carried into effect this session. He has confessed that the deficiency caused by the removal of certain sugar duties must be made up by increased taxes on other articles. He has not made up the full amount in this way, but he will have to do so. If the revenue of this year does not turn out equal to the deficiency new taxes will have to be placed on other articles; the people will be taxed even more than before, although on different articles, because the revenue is decreased from the duties being removed that were formerly imposed. The hon. Minister of Finance has followed up what is too frequently the protectionist practice. He removed those taxes which produced the most revenue with the smallest burden on the people, and retained the taxes which produced no revenue and yet imposed burdens. He has, in fact, made the hon. members for Halifax, Senator Drummond and other refiners, in a sense, branch collectors of Customs, with the great difference that the duties collected by them do not go into the public treasury, but into their own pockets. I have taken pains to point this out, because it is a most clear and comprehensive example of the general effects of protection. We are able to see very clearly, in reference to this item of sugar, the effect of protective taxation on the consumer and producer. When Major McKinley and the Congress of the United States compelled the Minister of Finance to change his sugar duties, one great

prop of the National Policy was knocked away never to be replaced, that is to say, the theory of hon. gentlemen opposite that the consumers do not pay the taxes. Apart from the fact that the Minister of Finance confessed that the removal of the sugar duties would make sugar cheaper, we find that it has made sugar cheaper to a certain extent, although not yet as cheap as in the United States; but the country has found by actual experience that it is the consumer that pays the taxes, and that the people during all these years the tax on raw sugar continued, which the Minister Finance was unwilling to remove, have paid the taxes and not the producers of sugar. One great prop of the National Policy was knocked away by the experiment tried, and it has been made clear to the people how protection acts. Protection is not intended, in the first instance, to produce revenue. It happens that in Canada high protection has produced a considerable amount of revenue, for several reasons: partly, because the protective system here is not very well conceived, even from a protective point of view, and it is not a very perfect protective system; partly because the Canadian market is so small that, in many lines, no protective tax will encourage home production, since the market is too small to encourage the investment of the necessary capital. The people of the Maritime Provinces are well aware of this from what they have seen of the iron industry, for that is one of our most highly protected industries. There is a tax of $4 per ton on pig iron and $2 per ton bounty on pig iron, or a protection of $6 per ton; and yet there is only one company undertaking to produce pig iron, that at Londonderry, and it has been in a chronic state of bankruptcy almost ever since it was established. The protective duties on iron have not caused the home production of it, and we still import practically all our iron, because the market here is too small to induce capitalists to erect works of such size as to economically produce pig iron. In regard to the sugar industry, the hon. member for the refiners, the refining member for Halifax, has himself admitted that under the protective system of the past the refiners were not making such high profits as the people generally supposed. They must have been making reasonable profits and a little more, or they would not have continued in the business. He appears to consider the present arrangement more profitable than the old one, and for that reason I conclude it affords him larger protection. Referring to the general argument, the facts connected with imposing and removing the duty on sugar make it now patent to every one, however little attention he may have paid to political economy, that the protective taxes paid by the people do not as a rule go into the treasury. In Canada, for certain special reasons to which I have referred, protective duties have yielded a larger revenue than was expected, because they did not encourage home production. We remember in the early years of the National Policy how embarrassed the Government were by the surpluses occurring from year to year; surpluses so large as to give rise to a popular demand for the reduction of the tariff. The Government, being a monopolists' Government and not a consumers' Government, adopted the course of getting rid of the surplus instead of getting rid of the taxes which produced the surplus. They have very effectively succeeded in getting rid of it since those early years, and no doubt the present Minister of Finance will have methods for preventing the occurrence of surpluses to any alarming extent in the future. The Minister of Finance has shown much talent in that direction. In general, the principle is that under protective taxation the excess of price paid by the consumers does not go into the revenue, but into the pockets of the producers. The question arises, why such a system is now maintained? It is absurd to claim that the present tariff system is a continuation or development of what was originally called the National Policy, because, when that was introduced and carried through Parliament, we have the authoritative declaration of its author that it was not a system of protection but a rearrangement of taxation looking ultimately towards reciprocity with the United States. The present system, instead of being a development of that, is a pure system of protection, aping that of the United States as far as possible, though not so scientifically contrived. Why has this change occurred? Why have we drifted away from the policy intended to promote temporarily the prosperity of all industries in Canada, by avoiding undue foreign competition, and ultimately to obtain the advantages of free trade. Notwithstanding what has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are interested in this tax, it has been properly characterized as a system of robbery. Late developments in connection with the public service, showing the relations of the Government as a Government, of individual Ministers of that Government, and of the party generally, to persons who have business dealings with the Government, lead us to believe that the percentage system has extended to the formation of the tariff also. I say, Sir, that this policy is no longer a National Policy, but it is a 10 per cent. commission policy. The Government arranges the tariff in consultation with the manufacturers and the manufacturers put their hands in their pockets and put up cash to sustain the Government at elections. Where is the difference between that transaction, and the transaction between a Minister who calls for commissions payable to an election committee, from those who do business with the departments? In the one case the individual Minister enables the outsider to make a profit, and the outsider who makes the profit contributes to sustain the Government in power. This we have on the admissions of the Ministers themselves, as well as on the testimony of others. It has come to be a well understood thing that it is proper to ask contractors for contributions to election funds. It has come to be an understood thing that commissions should be paid by all who sell anything to the Government, commissions paid in the first instance to the official, although sometimes directly to the campaign committee, and sometimes probably indirectly to the Minister himself, whether for campaign purposes or otherwise we cannot always tell.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When was that done?

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. Minister will ask his *alter ego*, Mr. Dansereau, and ask Mr. Rolland, and Mr. Benoit, and ask others, he might find out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the hon. member means to insinuate that I have been a party to any corrupt practice with contractors, I tell him that his insinuation is mean and false.

Mr. CASEY. Hon. gentlemen say "order," but they must call the Secretary of State to order, for he introduced the subject and asked me a question, and I replied that these people can tell him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CASEY. I am perfectly in order. I am not referring to the proceedings of any committees. It is a matter of general publicity that these people know about these matters. Mr. François Benoit also can probably tell. I can refer the hon. Minister to several others by name, but I am not allowed to repeat their evidence given before a committee, because it has not been reported to this House yet, although it has been reported in the public press, and I learn from the newspapers that these gentlemen know something about it, and I am advising the Secretary of State, who asked me, to ask them where these things occurred.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. CASEY. I am answering the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. CASEY. The responsibility is upon him for the introduction of these names. I am quite aware that his colleagues, and those who sit behind him, think he made a mistake in asking that question, but when he did ask that question I am in order in replying to it in the way in which I did.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sugar.

Mr. CASEY. You need a lot of sweetening, you need a lot of sugar, but I am not giving you taffy just now. I say the transaction between a Minister who should make such a corrupt agreement——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CASEY. These hon. gentlemen who call order do not know what order is, or else they simply wish to break up my argument by interruption. I say that the transaction between a Minister who could make such a corrupt bargain with a public contractor, is exactly parallel to, and exactly of the same nature as, that which is made between the Minister of Finance representing the Government and those manufacturers whom he bonuses by way of protective tariffs, and from whom he receives subscriptions to carry on elections——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CASEY. The two transactions are exactly of the same nature——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CASEY. If the Minister of Finance feels that it is an insult to him to say that the two transactions are of a similar nature, he had better not call the attention of the House to the fact, because he is casting aspersions on his own colleagues.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I rise to a point of order. When the hon. gentleman said it was exactly the same as when Ministers had made bargains and corrupt bargains with contractors, I asked: "When was that done?" The hon. gentleman then mentioned my name and I told him, as I tell him now, these were not only false insinuations, but false utterances in the House, and I say he has not the right to make it.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman must take back that statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In the British House of Commons such a statement as yours would not have been allowed.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman cannot go on till he takes back the statement that I made a false assertion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I submit that an hon. gentleman may fairly take a point of order while another is taking a point of order and that is what my hon. friend is doing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Let us take one after the other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Secretary of State interrupted my hon. friend.

Mr. CASEY. Does the hon. gentleman withdraw the statement that I made a false insinuation to the House?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I say that the hon. gentleman has made a false insinuation if he meant me. That is very plain; but I have not to withdraw that expression, and I cannot do it.

Mr. CASEY. Does he withdraw the statement absolutely and without qualification? Otherwise I will move that the words be taken down and I shall take the usual steps.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CASEY. If he does not take it back without qualification, I move that the words be taken down.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Which words; yours or mine?

Mr. CASEY. The words "false insinuations."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When the hon. gentleman mentioned my name in connection with two other names, I said that that insinuation or that utterance was false, and I cannot withdraw that and I will not withdraw it.

Mr. CASEY. Then I shall have to take the necessary measures to draw the attention of the House at a subsequent stage to the fact that the Minister is out of order, that he has used unparliamentary and ungentlemanly language across the floor of this House and has refused to take it back.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; sit down.

Mr. CASEY. I call upon you, Mr. Speaker, as it is your duty to do, Sir, to order the hon. gentleman to take these words back, and failing that I will have to take other steps.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) has certainly been out of order for the last ten minutes. I may mention that the question before the House is the third reading of the Act to amend the Act respecting the duty on sugars, and the hon. gentleman referred to matters which were connected with committees outside the House. He went too far, and only I thought the hon. gentleman was coming to the end of his

remarks I would have interfered. He even mentioned the names of witnesses who are not yet called before the committee. I think the hon. gentleman was entirely out of order. As far as the words used by the Secretary of State are concerned I will not take it upon myself to say that these words are parliamentary, but I will say this: That what the hon. gentleman has said was certainly enough to provoke the answer which was made by the Secretary of State. I hope that the hon. gentleman will now talk pertinently to the question before the House, or else there will be no end to this discussion.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, you must give a decision whether the words of the hon. Secretary of State were parliamentary or not?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. CASEY. I say, Sir, that the question whether I was in order is one thing. The question now is whether the hon. Secretary of State was in order, and you must rule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My ruling is that if the hon. gentleman takes back what he said when he spoke of matters investigated by committees, I will ask the Secretary of State to take back what he said.

Mr. CASEY. You must rule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am ruling now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you rule? Do you rule that the words used by the Secretary of State were in order or not? That is the point on which we desire a decision.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said that if the hon. gentleman in speaking as he did meant me, his insinuation was false, and he mentioned names which led me to understand that he referred to me, and then he was doubly out of order. He was referring to an enquiry before a committee of which he had no right to speak here, and I said that if he meant me his assertion was false, and I repeat it if he means me.

Mr. CASEY. I am speaking to the question of order.

Mr. OUIMET. Chair, chair.

Mr. CASEY. I am speaking to the chair, and not to the ex-chair. The hon. Secretary of State asks if I meant him. What I said was that if the hon. Minister wanted to know what sort of agreements I spoke of, let him ask so-and-so and so-and-so; and he immediately took that advice as a reference to proceedings before a committee. I could make the same suggestion without making any reference to the proceedings of a committee, and I am not debarred from making the suggestion because of any proceedings before a committee. A criticism of any evidence given before a committee would not be in order, and your ruling is perfectly correct in that respect. But I made no reference to any proceedings or any evidence given before a committee; I referred to gentlemen who have not yet been called before the committee as well as some who have. If the hon. Minister considers that by telling him to ask so-and-so I was insulting him, that the mere request to ask those gentlemen what they knew about such matters implied a slur upon him, why, then, the cap seems to fit him, and if he chooses to infer from my remarks that he was guilty, it is he who says it and not I. It was he and not I who was making the charge, otherwise the words were meaningless as an insult to himself, which they would not be if there was nothing improper between him and the gentlemen to whom I referred. As to the words he applied to me, they are unparliamentary no matter what I have said, and I must call upon you, Mr. Speaker, definitely to rule that his words were unparliamentary. It is not your place as Speaker to propose a compromise; it is your place to rule, Sir, definitely, whether certain words are parliamentary or not.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, as I said a moment ago, has been out of order for some time. Now, I understand that the hon. gentleman wants my ruling on what the Secretary of State said. I may say for the information of the whole House that hon. gentlemen speaking here on the policy propounded by the Government, for or against, have not a right to impugn the motives of any member of the Government. The hon. gentleman has done that, and under the circumstances my ruling is that having heard everything that has been said by the hon. gentleman, the Secretary of State was entirely in his right in answering in the way he has done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very well, Sir, that is a precedent.

Mr. CASEY. I think, Sir, we must have the sense of the House on that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CASEY. If it is parliamentary, as you rule, for one member to say that another member has made a false insinuation——

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). You are out of order now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman may call upon the House to decide whether my ruling is sustained or not, but he has not the right to make reflections upon it. He may ask the House to pass upon my ruling, but he cannot do more than that.

Mr. CASEY. I am not casting reflections upon your ruling, but I merely say that if that is the law we would like it established. But it may not be worth while. I have nothing to take back of what I said, and if the hon. Secretary of State refuses to take back his remark, both can stand so far as I am concerned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would ask the hon. gentleman now as much as possible to speak on the question before the House.

Mr. CASEY. If you keep the hon. Secretary of State quiet, I think I can manage to do so. To come back to the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax, he referred to a speech made by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in 1876 in favour of protection. Now, Sir, I think he should not have referred to that. It is a very old story for one thing, and for another thing, I think it is a confession of inferior intellect or inferior patriotism on the part of those who bring it up. The hon. member for Norfolk was a protectionist in 1876. He has had the intelligence to think differently since; he has been able to learn from experience as well as from theory; and he has had the honesty to avow his change of opinion. It ill-becomes one

who is directly, financially interested in maintaining the protective system, to cast a slur upon another gentleman who was a protectionist at one time, and who has since seen the error of his ways and been honest enough to confess it. I think the instance of my hon. friend from North Norfolk is one of the strongest arguments against protection and in favour of a reasonable tariff that has been brought up to-night. Again, the hon. gentleman refers to Mr. Wiman as the New York leader of our party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. A lot of open mouths on the other side of the House call out "hear, hear," but have they no remembrance? Most of them are comparative greenhorns in the House, of course, but most of them ought to know from the public press that when Sir Charles Tupper wanted to communicate with the American Government on trade questions, it was under Mr. Wiman's wing that he approached them. They ought to know that Sir Charles Tupper wrote to Mr. Wiman and got him to arrange a conference between him and the American authorities — that he presented himself under the auspices of that gentleman whom they now refer to in terms of derision as the New York leader of our party. If they could by any means induce Mr. Wiman to take their view of things, as it is rumoured they are trying to do, if they could induce him to plead their cause at Washington and help it in Canada, we would hear no more about his being an American. We would find the fact emphasized that Mr. Wiman, long as he has left Canada, has not taken up citizenship in the United States, but remains to this day, in spite of his interests there, a loyal Canadian citizen. Now, Sir, we are not responsible for what Mr. Wiman says. We are not responsible for the fad of commercial union which we do not support, but, on the other hand, oppose, and consequently all reference to it by the hon. gentleman fell utterly to the ground. I propose to give a rest to the susceptibilities of a certain Minister by drawing to a close, but wish to emphasize the points from which the interruption of the Secretary of State has diverted attention. They are that no credit was due, in the first place, to the Government for the reduction of the sugar taxes, because that reduction was forced upon them by the action of the United States; and, secondly, that in reducing the tax the portion they have retained produces little or no revenue, although coming out of the pockets of the people, and the portion they have abolished is that which produced a material revenue. The consumers have not been benefited by this change in the tariff to anything like the extent to which the revenue has been reduced. The proposition of the hon. member for South Brant, though it does not go quite so far as I should like, is a step in the right direction, by allowing the importation of the higher grades of unrefined sugars and reducing the toll we have to pay the refiner on the various grades of refined sugar. It is not so long ago when the higher grades of unrefined were in common use throughout the country, and they would be in use again to a considerable extent if we had the duties arranged as proposed in this resolution. For all these reasons I have great pleasure in supporting most heartily the resolution of my hon. friend.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Paterson (Brant):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Guay,
Allison,	Hargraft,
Amyot,	Harwood,
Armstrong,	Hyman,
Bain,	Innes,
Barron,	King,
Béchard,	Landerkin,
Beith,	Laurier,
Bernier,	Lavergne,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Brodeur,	Legris,
Brown (Chateauguay),	Livingston,
Brown (Monck),	Macdonald (Huron),
Cameron (Huron),	McGregor,
Campbell,	McMillan,
Carroll,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mignault,
Casey,	Mills (Bothwell),
Charlton,	Mousseau,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Christie,	Paterson (Brant),
Colter,	Perry,
Davidson,	Préfontaine,
Davies,	Proulx,
Dawson,	Rider,
Edgar,	Rinfret,
Edwards,	Rowand,
Featherston,	Sanborn,
Flint,	Savard,
Forbes,	Semple,
Fraser,	Simard,
Frémont,	Somerville,
Gauthier,	Spohn,
Geoffrion,	Sutherland,
German,	Trow,
Gibson,	Traux,
Gillmor,	Vaillancourt,
Godbout,	Watson,
Grieve,	Yeo.—78.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,	LaRivière,
Baker,	Lépine,
Bergeron,	Lippé,
Bergin,	Macdonald (King's),
Bowell,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Burnham,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Burns,	Mackintosh,
Cameron (Inverness),	McAllister,
Carignan,	McCarthy,
Carpenter,	McDonald (Victoria),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDougald (Pictou),
Chapleau,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cleveland,	McKay,
Coatsworth,	McLean,
Cochrane,	McLennan,
Cockburn,	McLeod,
Corby,	McNeill,
Costigan,	Madill,
Craig,	Marshall,
Daly,	Masson,
Daoust,	Miller,
Davin,	Mills (Annapolis),
Davis,	Montague,
Denison,	O'Brien,
Desaulniers,	Ouimet,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Patterson (Colchester),
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Pelletier,
Dewdney,	Pope,
Dickey,	Prior,
Dupont,	Putnam,
Fairbairn,	Reid,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Robillard,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Roome,
Foster,	Ross (Dundas),
Fréchette,	Ryckman,
Gillies,	Skinner,
Girouard,	Sproule,
Gordon,	Stairs,
Grandbois,	Stevenson,
Haggart,	Taylor,
Hazen,	Temple,
Henderson,	Thompson (Sir John),
Hodgins,	Tisdale,
Hutchins,	Tupper,

Ingram,	Tyrwhitt,
Ives,	Wallace,
Jamieson,	White (Cardwell),
Kaulbach,	White (Shelburne),
Kenny,	Wilmot,
Kirkpatrick,	Wood (Brockville).
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wood (Westmoreland).—102.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Barnard,	Mr. Welsh,
Mr. Earl,	Mr. Fauvel,
Mr. Curran,	Mr. Murray,
Sir Donald Smith,	Mr. Mackenzie,
Mr. Weldon,	Mr. Beausoleil,
Mr. Mara,	Mr. Langelier,
Mr. Jones,	Mr. Tarte,
Mr. McKeen,	Mr. Borden,
Mr. Monerieff,	Mr. Lister,
Mr. Dyer,	Mr. Scriver,
Mr. Dugas,	Mr. Delisle,
Mr. Léger,	Mr. Bowers,
Mr. Ross (Lisgar),	Mr. Bowman,
Mr. Corbould,	Mr. Burdette,
Mr. Macdowall,	Mr. Devlin.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to take this opportunity of bringing to the notice of the hon. Minister of Finance the fact that he must have been misinformed when he made a statement on Thursday night last to the effect that no work was required to be done at the Cobourg harbour. If he will give me his attention for a few minutes, I will show him that additional improvements are very badly required there. In the first place, let me read the resolution passed on the 27th of January, 1891, by the commissioners of the town trust:

"Resolved that the harbour commission be authorized to memorialize the Dominion Government for additional harbour improvements and for the use of the dredge."

A copy of this resolution was sent to the Department of Public Works, and the 17th of April, 1891, its receipt was acknowledged by the secretary of that department. Again, on the 15th of May, last, since this House has been in session, the following letter was written by the secretary of the commissioners of the town trust to the Hon. Sir Hector Langevin, Minister of Public Works:—

"COBOURG, 15th May, 1891.

"Hon. Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, K.C.M.G.,
"Minister of Public Works, Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—The Commissioners of the Cobourg Town Trust would most respectfully draw your attention to the fact that owing to the position of the piers of the harbour of refuge, a large amount of sand is driven by the action of the water into our inner harbour. That has been the case so largely during the past year that it is now impossible for vessels to load and unload at our lumber pier. You have been kind enough, for several years past, to send your Government dredge here and keep the channel clear. It has now become a necessity to again do so, as we have a large quantity of lumber awaiting shipment; and we would respectfully ask you to allow your dredge to come and do the necessary work as before. We think about one month would do what is required. If, however, your dredge is engaged, we have been informed that a Mr. Silcox, of Brighton, has one that could be at once engaged. Time is very important to us just now, so that facilities may be given for the shipment of lumber. We trust that you will kindly order the work to be done without delay and thereby assist in the promotion of trade and commerce.

"Yours very truly.
"JOHN SUTHERLAND,
"*Secretary.*"

Mr. CASEY.

This letter was acknowledged by the department on the 30th of May last, so that since the House has been in session the authorities of the town have requested the Government to do the much-needed work at the harbour there. I was pleased last night to hear the Minister of Finance state that if the work was required, he would place this item of $2,000 in the Supplementary Estimates yet to be brought down. It is not necessary for me to say anything more on this subject, but I hope, after what I have said, that he will see the necessity and justice of replacing this item in the Estimates.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was not very easy to hear the representations which the hon. gentleman made, but I understand he read from a document which had some bearing on the necessities of the harbour at Cobourg. If he will be good enough to hand them to the Minister of Finance, he will see what he can do.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Cattle quarantines and possible expenses for cattle diseases and sheep scab $15,000

Mr. CHARLTON. How many points have we in the Dominion where cattle are quarantined; what is the amount of business at each of these stations; what are the expenses in each case, and what is the number of cattle and sheep quarantined at each station?

Mr. HAGGART. You will find the whole information on pages 6 and 7 of the Report of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. CHARLTON. How many quarantine stations have we in Ontario?

Mr. HAGGART. Only one; at Point Edward.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the point for the North-West and Manitoba?

Mr. HAGGART. There is a depth of two townships reserved along the boundary, from the Rocky Mountains to Emerson, and there is a special station at Emerson and another at Fort Macleod.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the arrangement in British Columbia?

Mr. HAGGART. The quarantine station is at the harbour of Victoria.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it necessary to have a quarantine station there? No cattle would be shipped there to Europe, so as to interfere with our trade.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the principal port for the importation of cattle from the United States to British Columbia. At present there is not such danger of disease from those places, but there might be. The principal danger is hog cholera.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are hogs subjected to quarantine as well as sheep and cattle?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, 21 days.

Mr. CHARLTON. How long for cattle?

Mr. HAGGART. 90 days.

Mr. CHARLTON. And sheep?

Mr. HAGGART. 15 days.

Mr. CHARLTON. What amount of land is held by the Government in connection with the quarantine station at Point Edward?

Mr. HAGGART. It is an enclosure which is rented from the Grand Trunk. It is very nearly 200 acres.

Mr. CHARLTON. Where is the quarantine station for the Province of Quebec?

Mr. HAGGART. At Point Lévis.

Mr. CHARLTON. Ought there not to be one near Montreal? Would it not be more convenient than one at Point Lévis?

Mr. HAGGART. I believe Montreal is only an inspecting port.

Mr. CHARLTON. Have you any stations in the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; at Halifax and St. John.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the cost of maintaining all these stations?

Mr. HAGGART. About $15,000.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I think the Maritime Provinces and the Province of Quebec are sufficiently provided for, but I think the people of Ontario find it a grievance to have to ship stock from Pennsylvania around by way of Detroit and thence to Point Edward. It would be better to have a quarantine station at Suspension Bridge, which is the most convenient point for that province. If anyone is shipping from the eastern states he has to go to Detroit and to Port Huron, and then to Point Edward, and the risk is run of coming into contact with the hogs from the western states which are more likely to be diseased than those from the eastern states.

Mr. HAGGART. It is a matter of agreement between us and the Imperial Government, and they would only agree to one quarantine station in the Province of Ontario. It is one of the conditions by which we prevent our cattle from being scheduled in Great Britain.

Mr. GIBSON. This causes an extra haulage of 367 miles from Buffalo to Cleveland and then to Detroit, and then to Port Huron, and then to Point Edward, and it is a great hardship to shippers.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no doubt of that, but that is the absolute condition.

Mr. GIBSON. Most of this product comes from the west. A very limited quantity comes from the east, but it seems a hardship that shippers should have to send such a great distance.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I think the best stock comes from the south, from Kentucky and Ohio, as well as from Pennsylvania and New York, and all that stock has to go round by way of Point Edward. I think if the Government were to make an effort to have a quarantine at Suspension Bridge, as well as one at Point Edward, it would be a great advantage.

Mr. HAGGART. It may be that it would be more convenient for shippers from certain parts of the states that there should be a quarantine at Niagara Falls. I understand that it was an absolute condition of allowing our cattle to go over to England without being scheduled, that there should be only one port, and that was the port agreed upon.

Mr. FEATHERSON. I asked the question whether the Government would not endeavour to have a quarantine established at the Bridge? I think if they made an effort in that direction we might be able to get one. It would be a great deal more convenient than Point Edward for Eastern Ontario.

Mr. HAGGART. The trouble would be that we might, perhaps, get the permission with a good deal of trouble from England, and it might afterwards be used as a reason for scheduling our cattle. Besides, the department think we could not even get the permission.

Mr. FEATHERSON. I cannot see why there should be any reason for scheduling our cattle at all, because we have no cattle coming through by the Bridge from the United States. Cattle coming from the United States into this country come through either at Detroit or Sarnia *viâ* Buffalo, and there would be no danger of American cattle, by that route, coming into contact with our cattle. All cattle coming from the west go through by Fort Erie to Buffalo.

Mr. MULOCK. It does not seem that the reason assigned was a good one. A beast that is diseased would be just as objectionable whether imported at Point Edward or at the Bridge. It does not seem to me, if cattle are free from disease, that they will endanger the health of Canadian cattle because they are imported at the Bridge instead of at Point Edward. I would like to ask the Minister what provision there is at the quarantine at Point Edward for the segregation of cattle as between themselves?

Mr. HAGGART. There are special provisions for the segregation of cattle at Point Edward in the shape of sheds and special enclosures, and some other precautions.

Mr. MULOCK. How far apart are the sheds?

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I think I can answer the question of my hon. friend. The stables and enclosures at Point Edward are very good. They are located in a sort of bush, and are separated by a very good distance. Different shipments are isolated from each other at a fair distance, and I am satisfied the regulations are quite as good as could be expected. I have never been on the quarantine grounds at Quebec, but I am satisfied from what I have heard that they are not so well isolated as they are at Point Edward. At Point Edward they lay right along the bank at the head of the river on Lake Huron, and nothing comes in contact with them except the air coming off the water. I think it is one of the most healthy places that could be had for a quarantine station. All that we are asking for now is an additional one at the Bridge, and I think if the Government would try they could get it, because there are men living in my own county, men living in Eastern Ontario, who import cattle from New York State and Pennsylvania, and have to go all the way round to the quarantine at Point Edward, whereas if they could come through by the Bridge it would be handier and more convenient for them.

Mr. McMILLAN. At Point Edward it appears that at one time 128 cattle came across in one lot. That is a very large number, and I think myself it would be very beneficial if the Government were

to establish another station at the Falls, so that so large a number of cattle might not be congregated together. Even where they are partially separated there is a good deal of danger. I am certain that the great majority of the cattle that come into Ontario from the other side come from the eastern states, not so many from the west. Hereafter the number from the west will increase, so that it would be necessary to keep up both places. It would be a benefit to the farmers to have a quarantine both at the Falls and at Point Edward.

Mr. HAGGART. The officer of the department informs me that he does not think the British Government would consent to have a quarantine station near Niagara Falls. There is pleuro-pneumonia in that section of New York and part of Pennsylvania, and the Government would be very chary about allowing cattle from that district to come in there. With regard to the segregation of different shipments at Point Lévis, the officer informs me that the precautions there are much better than at Point Edward. He says there is absolute isolation.

Mr. MULOCK. That must be some recent regulation.

Mr. HAGGART. He says it has been so for several years. They had pleuro-pneumonia there some time ago, and the cattle were kept perfectly clear on account of perfect isolation.

Mr. MULOCK. I know in one case a shipment of cattle left a British port on the 8th of July, and was received in quarantine at Point Lévis on the 20th of July. According to the regulations, if they were free from disease at the expiration of 90 days from the time of shipment from the British port, they ought to have been at the disposal of the importer. In this case they were placed in the sheds within 36 feet of a herd of cattle that had pleuro-pneumonia. They did not contract the disease within 90 days, which proves, beyond question, that they were free from disease when they were shipped. They were kept until December in quarantine within 36 feet of diseased animals, and they were allowed to smell diseased animals through a board fence. After about 170 days the cattle were pronounced diseased, and they were all slaughtered at an enormous loss. At that time the sheds were within 36 feet of one another, although there are 400 acres at Lévis—a state of affairs that never should have existed, and I trust does not exist to-day.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows the facts, but the officer of the department states that none of the cattle caught the disease but those in contact, and that the carcasses were burnt.

Mr. MULOCK. He does not know. They came out by different vessels. A herd imported by Mr. McCrae, of Guelph, had the disease, and other shipments by different vessels contracted the disease from Mr. McCrae's herd. Everybody in the business knows that the animals were kept almost in contact. In one case healthy animals coming on different vessels were put in a paddock and were, I am informed, allowed to smell diseased animals through a board fence. I heard that fact from the information of a man who came out from Glasgow in charge of a healthy herd. Enormous loss was occasioned. In fact the board bill and the cost of attendance ate up much of the compensation, and the man practically lost all the purchase money for the cattle.

Mr. HAGGART. The statement of the hon. gentleman may be perfectly correct, that the cattle came on different vessels and were put together. They were supposed to be free from disease. The disease developed afterwards, after a number of days or weeks.

Mr. MULOCK. I saw a communication from the herdsman in charge of the healthy cattle protesting against the distance between the healthy animals and diseased cattle. I saw a telegram sent to the Minister of Agriculture on the subject, and a reply saying that the distance was a safe distance—the distance being 36 feet. The result was that, after the cattle had been in quarantine nearly six months, from 20th July until December, they were pronounced diseased. I heard the opinion of a veterinary surgeon, of whom there is no superior in Canada, to the effect that no animal could have had pleuro-pneumonia on 8th July and not have manifested it until December. That being the case, there was only one way by which the animal got it, namely, being in quarantine.

Mr. HAGGART. The officer of the department states that the longest time for the disease to develop itself is 90 days; that is why the quarantine period is fixed at that time.

Mr. MULOCK. That is just what I say. Inasmuch as the disease, according to all recognized authority, will develop within 90 days, it is perfectly clear that cattle shipped from England on 8th July must have been free from the disease at that time as it did not develop until December. It is, therefore, clear that they contracted the disease in quarantine, owing to the defective regulations in force.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no doubt they must have contracted the disease in quarantine.

Mr. MULOCK. That is why I am asking what is the distance between the sheds, and whether shipments of cattle are kept apart?

Mr. HAGGART. There is 20 feet between the sheds.

Mr. MULOCK. Can healthy cattle be 20 feet from diseased cattle?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. With all due respect to the authorities, it is a wholly insufficient distance for safety. I am aware that cattle in quarantine were 36 feet apart, and, according to the contention of Dr. McEachren, that was a safe distance. But it was not safe, because animals contracted the disease from one another. Why have cattle been put 20 feet from each other when we have 400 acres at Lévis, and the sheds might be remote from each other?

Mr. HAGGART. The officer says that the enclosures were placed at that distance by authority of Dr. McEachren, who is supposed to be the highest authority in Canada, who thought that distance was ample.

Mr. MULOCK. I would not question Dr. McEachren's authority further than to say that Dr. McEachren in the case I have mentioned thought 36 feet ample, and yet cattle contracted the disease

across 36 feet. How many acres have you at the quarantine at Point Lévis?

Mr. HAGGART. 200 acres altogether.

Mr. MULOCK. If that is the case, why should the sheds be placed within 20 feet of one another?

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I understood the arrangements at Quebec were much better than those at Point Edward. From what I have heard, those at Point Edward are much better than those at Quebec. At Point Edward the sheds are over 100 yards apart, and there is a little brush between the two sets of sheds. Where there is a long strip of land, that is the proper way to arrange the enclosures so as to isolate the cattle as much as possible. I am satisfied with the arrangements there, but if the sheds are going to be 20 or 30 feet apart there will be no safety, and animals will catch the disease. In our county this year the hogs have caught disease although one mile apart, the germs being carried in the air.

Mr. HAGGART. All the information I can give is that the sheds at Lévis were placed there on the recommendation of the veterinary surgeon, and the statement of the department is that those diseases are not contagious altogether, that there must be actual contact, and they are not infectious. There is a distinction between these terms.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is very unwise that any risk should be taken, especially where there is ample land. I am surprised that the distance should have been reduced from 36 to 20 feet. The disease having been communicated across 36 feet, it is strange the distance should have been reduced to 20 feet. Why should the department run such a risk when it is not necessary? I desire to ask what is the provision at quarantine for feeding animals; what is the provision for shippers buying food? Is there any monopoly for supplying the food?

Mr. HAGGART. There is no monopoly at all. They can buy it anywhere.

Mr. MULOCK. I will conclude by saying that if there is an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia or other contagious disease in quarantine at Point Lévis on account of the close proximity of the various sheds, the Government of course must be fully prepared to take the responsibility. There can be no doubt about it that 20 feet is an unnecessarily close distance and the Government is running an unnecessary risk. The occurrence to which I have referred had a serious effect on the importation of high class cattle into Canada. It frightened shippers who have taken a very important part in the cattle industry, and there should be no possibility allowed of risk of any such occurrence in the future. I hope the Government will put these sheds so far apart that the danger will be lessened.

Mr. McGREGOR. That may be in Quebec, but at Point Edward the stables are well kept and work very well. They are a long way apart and are fairly well built and well kept. Mr. McDougall who has charge of the stables is a very careful, quiet, nice man, and I am quite sure that any person having cattle there will have them properly taken care of. The caretaker is a man who understands the business thorougly, and is a first-class cattle man in every way. I think in Point Edward the stables are from 100 to 200 feet apart. It is near the shores of Lake Huron, a very airy and a very nice place, and I think the location is well adapted for quarantine.

Mr. McMILLAN. Has each individual to provide his own caretaker in quarantine?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government has a general caretaker to look after single animals, but where the importer brings out a lot he is allowed to appoint his own caretaker.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is a most dangerous thing for the same caretaker to attend two or three small herds of cattle. I do not care what the isolation is, as far as the stable is concerned, the caretaker will carry the contagion along with him if there is any disease. So far as feed is concerned I am satisfied that every person has full power to get his feed on the market and take it there, and I think it is correct also that where there is a large herd of cattle the importer can have his own man to take care of them. Where there is a small herd of two or three or even one animal the Government have a caretaker, and there is great danger in carrying the disease from one to the other. I hold that each herd should be cared for by one individual, and if he goes from one to the other he should change his overalls at each station.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I think the cattle are well looked after at Point Lévis. I had 185 head of cattle there, and I was well satisfied with the way they were looked after. Mr. Walsh, the superintendent, is a very careful man and looks after the cattle very well.

Mr. McMILLAN. I was promised when this item would come up, that I would have an opportunity of speaking on the experimental farm and getting some information about it. There has been some talk about building a sheep pen upon this farm, and I would say that so far as the farm at Ottawa is concerned I do not think it wise to get any more stock upon that farm. The care of a herd of sheep is something that requires a very large amount of experience. A man may be a very good cattle man and a very poor sheep man. There is not one in twenty of those who have gone into sheep raising in Ontario who have thoroughly succeeded, and I am also aware that if the Government buys a herd of sheep it will be ten or twelve years before they can get a herd that will be any good. At all events they would only be following in the wake of the best farmers of the present time, and whenever private enterprise is doing all that can possibly be done in any particular line of agriculture it is my opinion that the Government should not interfere. I am perfectly certain so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned that we have herds of sheep there far ahead of anything that the Government could get for a number of years. I see that $4,835 has been spent on an implement house, and I would ask if the Government applied for tenders to build this house and if the lowest tender was accepted?

Mr. HAGGART. I promised to give the hon. gentleman the information on that subject to-night, and the deputy promised to have it for me, but he has not got it.

Mr. McMILLAN. There may have been tenders called for that implement house, but I am sure there was no advertising, because I am convinced

from the quantity of money spent on that shed that it is an exorbitant price to pay for it, where lumber is so cheap. I never said much about the buildings on the farm before, but I wish to speak about the barn to-night. I have examined that barn carefully, and for the large amount of money that has been spent on it, and for a barn on an experimental farm, it is one of the most inconvenient buildings I have ever set foot in. If the Government had taken Mr. Edwards from down the river, into their confidence, and had asked him to assist them to get up a plan, they would have got a plan from him that would cost only half the money and would have been twice as useful. I notice that the seventy head of cattle there had to be fed by carrying the stuff in a basket from one end of the stable to the other. In a barn got up on proper principles there should be a tramway to take the feed for the animals standing in a row, or there would be a hand cart or a large barrow instead of a man having to go from one end of the building to another which is certainly a very inconvenient system. When we have spent $17,000 on that barn and outbuildings, apart from this implement house, we would have expected more conveniences. Again, there is no common farmer who would allow the system adopted there of carrying off the water used by the animals to remain on his place for twenty-four hours. They have not even put in a pipe to carry the water away and hence the water cannot be taken from the cattle as often as it should be. It is impossible for cattle to thrive properly in a building kept in such a manner, and double the hands are required that would be necessary if the barn were properly built. I saw them cutting corn for food with a straw-cutter the other day. There is a shoot to put it in on the one side, and just for the want of a little care and a little management an extra man had to be employed throwing the stuff to the other side, when any common farmer in less than an hour would have arranged to do the work properly. Buildings put up on a farm like this ought to be arranged so that the fewest hands could attend to the cattle in the shortest possible time and with the greatest convenience; but I must say that above and below I have never seen a barn with so little convenience. It must take double the hands to attend to a full herd of cattle in that barn that it would take if the barn were properly fitted up with the right kind of arrangements for feeding them. Then, in the upper part of the barn we find a second floor, which prevents it being used to the best advantage for storing grain. This prevents the grain from settling, as it would do if there were no second floor. In all properly constructed barns to-day, you will find rack-lifters for lifting the grain; but in this barn, owing to the two floors, there is no chance for a rack-lifter. It takes double the men to put grain into this barn, and then it will not hold half the quantity it should. There are two large stacks outside at the present time, and if the barn were properly constructed it would not be necessary to build them there. In a properly constructed barn when you are storing the grain in the bay, it rises rapidly until it is built to a certain height, when the weight of the grain will cause it to settle, and it keeps settling until it gets pretty solid. But this barn will not hold half the grain that it should. It needs to be thoroughly overhauled, in order that the work about it can be done with the fewest possible hands. Then, the root-house is built at 12 or 14 rods distance from the barn, necessitating the men in the winter time drawing the feed that distance to the cattle sheds. The root-house ought to have been built close to where the cattle are, so that the feed and the cattle would be practically in the same building. Everything on the farm appears to have been arranged on the principle of having the greatest number of hands to do the smallest possible amount of work. I was astonished to find that where the pig pen is built the yards are a few rods distant from it, and when any of the pigs are let out to go into the yard, there must be two or three men there to drive them in. I have never seen a place where so much money has been spent with so little convenience as a result. There is not a thoroughly practical man on that farm to manage it: I do not care who knows it. I have visited some of the best farms in Ontario, and I must say that I never saw so much waste during the days of harvest as I have seen this season on that farm. We were out there on a picnic in July, by the invitation of the Minister of Agriculture. There was some green feed standing ready to be cut—pease, oats and barley. The oats were white on the top, and any farmer would have had this green feed cut forthwith. I was out there again on the 19th of August—I took a note of the day—and it was still uncut, and by that time the straw was perfectly useless, as the heads were getting down to the bottom. Then, I saw a large quantity of ripe grain standing long after it should have been cut. They were ten days if not two weeks too late in beginning their harvesting. Any visitor from abroad going to that farm, and examining it as a model, would go away with a very poor idea of the knowledge possessed by the farmers of Canada from what he saw there. There has been more grain shaken off in the work of harvesting than I have seen in 40 years in Canada. There is a lack of proper management all over the place. I have no doubt that Professor Saunders and the Minister of Agriculture are doing all they can to make the farm a success; but neither of them are practical farmers, and they do not seem to have any one there who has been accustomed to manage a large farm, and to manage it on proper principles. There cannot be any lack of hands on the place, because on one day that I was there I saw no less than 25 men at work drawing in grain. There are enough men and teams to do the work, provided a proper system is followed; but I am afraid that a proper system is not followed there. With reference to cattle, I say that there is not a man on that farm who knows how to handle stock. These experimental farms of ours are established to show what can be done with cattle of various breeds, with the financial power of the country at their back, and with all the skill and knowledge that the Government can secure; and it is the duty of the managers of these farms to exhibit their stock at the coming Ottawa show—not for the purpose of competing for prizes, but as is done in the case of the model farm at Guelph, for the purpose of comparing their stock with the stock of the different farmers of the country. That should be done by the managers of the Ottawa farm, from the youngest animal to the full-grown animal of each breed. Farmers are apt to think they have the very finest animals in the country until they see others and compare theirs with them; and the results

of proper caring for cattle are apparent when they are taken to shows where they can be compared with other cattle. I think it would perhaps have been well if for the present the experiments on this farm had been confined to cows and butter. I think a mistake has been made in attempting to do anything at present with other stock. I speak advisedly when I say that a visitor coming from the United States or from the old country, a thorough stockman, accustomed to breeding, and examining the stock at the Ottawa farm, would have a very poor idea of the stock of the farmers of Canada, if he took the stock here as a sample of what generally prevails throughout the country. On a farm like this we should have animals of the very best description to exhibit, and they should be cared for in the very best manner and on the very best system. But no farm will be successful, I care not what care is exercised, unless it is managed by a thorough agriculturist, possessing a knowledge of the different classes of cattle that should be kept upon it --a man who would be competent to go out and purchase cattle, and to select the best breeds and specimens. A knowledge of that kind cannot be obtained in two or three years, from books or anything else, except from actual experience with the management of cattle ; and it is no credit to the Government to have their principal farm conducted in such a manner as this is. As a Canadian I feel proud of what the country has done in improving the different breeds of cattle : and I hold that if the Government go into an improvement of any description they should take the lead, and not manage their farm in a manner that puts them behind the best farmers of the country. Go and examine the farm of Mr. Edwards ; look at his cattle, and see the conveniences that he has there ; and certainly the Government ought to have been able to get their buildings laid out as well and provided with all the conveniences that he has. Whoever prepared the plans and specifications of those buildings was certainly not a practical man, for the building seems all to be dropped down anywhere, without any plan, except just the barns and the sheds, in a manner I have never seen buildings put up in any part of Ontario that I have visited, and I have visited some of the best farms in that province. It has taken 4 men to attend 70 head of cattle on this farm, and I have been in barns where one man with little assistance could attend to 70 or 80. They cannot do it on this farm, because they have not the conveniences. When we have spent such large sums, it is too bad everything should be in the condition in which it is. Any farmer visiting that farm during the harvest, and seeing the condition in which the grain is, would be disgusted with the system carried on. If that is the way in which our experimental institutions are carried on I do not want to take example from them. I have a farm about as large as this, and take in 140 acres of crop with the aid of three hired men and one son and one grandson during the summer, and the work is well kept up and the grain taken in in good order, but it would not be if it was allowed to stand as it is on this experimental farm. There seems to be no regular system followed there; and unless a regular system is adopted, and some one is there to see that it is carried out, the farm is going to be a huge failure.

Further amount required for plant for Printing Bureau..... $11,650

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This includes a covering machine for pamphlets, necessitated by the great number of pamphlets and special reports issued, as in the case of the experimental farm and the Agriculture Department. This machine costs $2,000. There are also fittings for repair shops and type for voters' list, &c., $3,500 ; and unforeseen expenses, additional forms, &c., $3,700.

Mr. MULOCK. Who has recommended the purchases you have just mentioned ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Queen's Printer, Mr. Chamberlin, and Mr. Gliddon, who is in charge of the Printing Bureau.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total amount we have paid for plant up to date ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think about $180,000, or $275,000 if we include all machinery for printing and binding, and engines, boilers, shafting, &c.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has the building cost ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is not in my department. The estimate of plant has exceeded what I stated should be the cost.

Mr. FLINT. I have seen it stated that a large amount of the plant purchased is not required.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have asked the question myself to my officers, and am informed that everything purchased is, or is likely to be shortly, required. We have 44,000 lbs. of minion in stock for the voters' lists. The result of the revision, so far, shows that very large additions to the list must be made. But, of course, as is always the case in a large printing establishment, a certain amount of the plant would lie idle for the moment. No plant, however, has been bought uselessly. Large quantities may have been bought, but nothing has been bought which is not required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many printing presses have you ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Sixteen large cylinder printing presses and seven Gordon presses. I am not sure of the number. There is no need for any more presses this year, except the ordinary additions to plant, and the appropriation this year is not so much as would be required in an ordinary printing establishment. We have curtailed about $11,000, although more would have been required.

Mr. FLINT. Would the hon. gentleman tell us the number of type-setting machines he has, and their approximate cost, and what success has attended their use ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We have bought four of them. I am informed that they can be utilized with a great deal of profit to the establishment, but we have not yet had sufficient experience of them to say what they will do. Another item may be put in the supplementary estimates for the acquisition of four more. The four we have were bought two years ago at $3,500 each, and new ones may be had at $3,000 each. This question will come up again, and I shall then take the opportunity of giving the House a statement as to the great utility of the linotype in the department.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose proper precautions are taken to see that this money is not to be spent, to any extent, in commissions?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have taken all precautions against that. Any wrong-doing shall not be renewed, if there has been anything wrong done.

Mr. MULOCK. You think it is all right to pay these commissions?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say so.

Mr. MULOCK. I thought you said there was no wrong done.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I cannot speak of what has taken place in a Committee of the House, when the evidence has not been reported, but I am sure that, if any wrong has been done, it will be punished, and precautions will be taken to prevent anything of the kind in the future. I am also sure that there has been no loss to the public treasury.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Are these machines made in Canada?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The linotypes are made in New York. I understand that there will be a manufactory established in Canada before long. We have given an order, which can be filled at once, and I do not know whether it will be cancelled or not, but I have information that so many orders have been received by the manufacturers from printing establishments and newspapers in the United States and Canada, owing to the usefulness of these machines, that probably no orders can now be executed for twenty-three months.

Mr. MULOCK. What is a linotype?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If my hon. friend would go to the Printing Bureau, not only would he be convinced that these machines are useful, but he would see one of the most wonderful inventions of the age.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who is performing the duties of superintendent of the Printing Bureau?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Gliddon is at the head of the department and Mr. McMahon is the acting superintendent. It is the same in the Department of Stationery, where the subordinate officers are acting for the late superintendent. No new officer has been appointed.

Mr. FLINT. I understood these machines were leased by the Government.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; they are bought by the Government with no royalty.

Mr. MULOCK. Are there any tidings of the whereabouts of Senécal?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I thought that belonged to the Printing Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. We have some interest in that.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no tidings, but I have made some enquiries, and hope to be able to give some information on the subject to the Printing Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. Has no one been appointed in the place of Mr. Bronskill?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. MULOCK. He must have been more ornamental than useful.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I can only say that I am very sorry that such an efficient officer as Mr. Bronskill has been guilty of a reprehensible act which caused the Government to dismiss him. I wish I could replace him with an officer as efficient as he was in the practical work of the Stationery Department.

Brandon Post Office—To complete..... $16,500

Mr. FOSTER. We will reduce that amount by $2,500, because a revision of the matter down to a later date has enabled the department to make a closer estimate. The amount of expenditure up to date has been $45,908. The amount of the contract was $31,500. The extras amounted to $1,676. The heating apparatus cost $4,750. That makes $37,926, and there is still due to the contractor $646. The expenditure upon the site was $5,500, which leaves a difference made up of the following items:—Architect's services, $928; clerk of works, $1,826; specifications, $24; advertisements, $141; printing, $31; travelling expenses of clerk of works, $81; box fronts, $94; construction of drains, $250; additional height of rear wall, $228; additional depth of foundation, $418; pointing of external wall, $860. With reference to the statement read by the hon. member for South Oxford made by the Minister last year, making the total cost of the building $45,000, I think that had reference to the building, and not the fittings or anything of that kind.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does that include the site?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the exact figure is $45,908?

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the further amount required?

Mr. FOSTER. $12,350.

Mr. WATSON. Who is the clerk of works, and how long has he been employed?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not his name; his services have been dispensed with.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the Finance Minister taken into consideration the suggestion made the other night with reference to establishing some rule for the Government to follow in the matter of erecting public buildings, fixing a minimum revenue in the several towns and villages below which buildings should not be erected? A rule of that kind would correct certain abuses that have grown up in late years—the erection of public buildings in small towns for purely political purposes, as was the case at Cayuga, in the County of Haldimand, an insignificant village of seven or eight hundred inhabitants. The Government have erected a post office in that place for the purpose of strengthening the member in his seat, and I think it is high time that some rule should be adopted to prevent the recurrence of cases of that kind, governing the action of the department in the appropriations made for public buildings.

Mr. FOSTER. It is pretty hard to get a chance to think of these things in this turmoil, but the matter will be considered.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think I shall propose at a proper time a motion in regard to this matter, to name a sum below which no buildings will be erected.

Mr. FOSTER. I think you will find it very difficult to make a hard-and-fast rule.

Mr. CHARLTON. But you can make a rule to prevent the erection of post offices in a little town like Cayuga. The Government have acted in a way that requires Parliament to step in and fix some rules restraining the Government from spending public money, presumably for purely political pur-

poses. Now, the moneys of this country have been squandered in many instances in a way fully as corrupt as any corrupt practices that our election law forbids. The Government have taken public moneys in large sums and used them for purely political purposes, with no other object than to corrupt and buy ridings, to influence public sentiment thereby.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It is not in order to attribute improper motives.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not attributing improper motives to individuals, but to a collection of individuals. It is perfectly proper to criticise the motives of the Government in making appropriations which can have but one purpose, can be actuated by but one reason, and I repeat the charge, that appropriations have been made by the Government in past years that could have had no other object than to corrupt the ridings and buy their support, and we want to adopt a rule, so far as possible, to put a stop to that kind of work.

Subsidy to steamer between Campbellton and Gaspé, and intermediate ports $12,500

Mr. FOSTER. The contract was entered into on the 7th of November, 1883, between the Government and Mr. Chabot, by which Mr. Chabot was to place a steamer on the route for five years, two round trips per week. The contract differs from most contracts--that is, it is not simply a subsidy for a vessel going and coming, but Mr. Chabot undertakes other work as well. The vessel is the *Admiral*. Mr. Chabot has to unload the cars, as they run down to the wharf; he has to put the goods in store, and put the goods again from the store on board the steamer. All the cost of this unloading from the cars and storing the goods, and putting them on the steamer, and *vice versa*, is borne by the vessel owner. The rates are subject to the approval of the Railway Department. Mr. Chabot is to provide agents, and pay half the cost of advertising. The Government has a right to deduct from the subsidy any sums due for back charges on freight, coal or stores. The number of trips is 55 to 58 per year. My hon. friend knows that under these circumstances the subsidy is not an excessive one. The contract runs until the close of navigation in 1892.

Mr. WATSON. What is the tonnage of the vessel?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

Mr. CHARLTON. Have you any data as to her value?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. LAURIER. When this item was called up the other day I told the hon. Minister of Finance that it should be allowed to stand over until the report of the investigation, now going on before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, should be brought before the House. The hon. gentleman cannot but be aware that this is one of the charges that has been brought forward, and I understand that within a very few days we shall have this report before the House. It will be better to have this item postponed until that time arrives. If, for instance, the report was to show that the value of the *Admiral* was only $16,000 or thereabouts, as I have reason to believe, the hon. gentleman himself will admit that it is an outrageous figure to give such a vessel a subsidy of $12,500 a year. There is reason to believe that such is the fact. Moreover, there is reason to believe, if indeed the fact is not established, that Julien Chabot is not the owner, but another person. Under such circumstances, the hon. gentleman had better do what he agreed to do the other day, and allow the item to stand over until we have that report.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman must not tax me with it. His understanding of the arrangement is quite correct. But when the item was called to-night the suggestion was made by the hon. member for South Oxford that we should proceed with it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was the offender, but I was not aware that the item was for the steamer *Admiral*.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see why the item should not be passed. It is a matter under contract for this season, and three-quarters of the season is over, and the vessel is running, and is performing service under the contract.

Mr. LAURIER. That may be true, but there is another consideration. If it is proved to this House that the contract has been obtained under false pretenses and under the supposition that the owner was Julien Chabot, and if it is shown that the contract was not really with Chabot, but with another party, this would be a reason that would induce the Government to consider whether the contract should be carried out or not. It would be an unfortunate thing in some respects, but at all events the moment it was proved that the Government had been deceived, that while they intended to contract with a certain party they never contracted with him, it would then be for the Government to consider whether the contract was to go on or not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think there can be any question as to Chabot. He is the registered owner, and entitled in every way to make a contract, and the only question is, whether the contract has been made. There may be questions relating to interests other parties have for whom Chabot may have been a trustee. If we wanted the services of the *Admiral*, he was the only person who could contract for them. Not only is there a contract outstanding, but the moneys are due. Before the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections is disposed of all the moneys will have been earned perhaps.

Mr. LAURIER. If Chabot was merely a trustee, I admit at once the force of the reasoning of the Minister of Justice. But if there is more than that—if Chabot was not a trustee, but simply a shield, a person to shield some one else, if he signed the contract, not as trustee, but in his own name, if it turns out that he is not the owner of the boat and never received a cent, that payments made to him were immediately turned over to another person—these are points that deserve consideration. But the whole matter is under investigation before a Committee of this House, and I suggest, under such circumstances, that it is only proper and right that the item should stand over until we have a report from the Committee.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is no doubt of it. We proceeded to consider the item under a misap-

prehension. Now that the House is apprised of the true state of the matter, it is desirable that we should carry out the arrangement made the other night.

Mr. LAURIER. Better let it stand.

Mr. FOSTER. All right.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 11th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an editorial in *L'Electeur* of yesterday, 10th instant, containing the following:—

"IS THERE A CRISIS AT QUEBEC?

"HOW EXPLAIN THE PRESENCE OF MR. MACKINTOSH, M.P., IN QUEBEC?

"The article says: 'It is certain, all the same, that the Federal Government is going to make unheard of efforts to crush Mr. Mercier, because it feels that he is a formidable adversary. That the Federal Ministers are preparing to make war upon Mr. Mercier is undeniable. It suffices to watch their agitation, to be convinced of this fact. Mr. Mackintosh, member for Ottawa, was sent to Quebec; then Mr. Blanchet, the chief of the Opposition, immediately proceeded to the Capital. What does all this mean? We shall see before long.'"

In justice to myself, as well as to the members of the Government individually and collectively, I must ask this House to bear with me while I explain that I was called to Quebec to meet members of my family there on Sunday last; that I neither communicated with Lieutenant-Governor Angers, directly nor indirectly, nor did I see Mr. Blanchet during the day, or any other politician or public man; that I left Monday shortly after noon and on the station platform at Quebec met Mr. Blanchet, who informed me that he was going to Ottawa in connection with an election case. I was not sent by the Government, I could not have been sent; I would not have gone had I been asked so to do, for I am too well aware, as a member of this House, that I have no right to interfere in constitutional issues affecting the provinces, and sufficiently respect my position not to do violence to constitutional usage. Therefore, I must give a flat denial to every statement contained in the article, so far as it refers to me.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When may we expect the evidence taken before the Committee on Privileges and Elections to be placed in the hands of members? It is a good while since the taking of evidence was closed before the Committee, the House has been a good while in session, and we are anxious to get through with the business. At the same time, private members have serious objections to voting on a question until they have had an opportunity of reading and studying the evidence, and I hope it will soon be placed in the hands of members.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The evidence will be placed in the hands of members at the earliest possible moment. The Committee are about to deliberate upon their report, and the evidence is being revised in order to be ready for instantaneous delivery with the report.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it necessary to delay the placing of the evidence in the hands of members until the report is made?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am afraid it is.

Mr. LAURIER. The evidence will be brought down the same time as the report?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 147) further to amend the Controverted Elections Act.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire to move an amendment to the said clause, namely:—

1. The paragraph lettered (*i*) of section two of "The New Dominion Controverted Elections Act" is hereby amended by striking out the words "the Court of Appeal for Ontario" in (1) sub-section thereof, and the words "for Lower Canada" in (2) sub-section thereof.

The principle of this amendment is to limit the hearing of election cases to the courts of first instance, that is, the three divisions of the Court of Queen's Bench, Common Pleas and Chancery. By the judicial system in the Province of Ontario, the Supreme Court is divided into the appellate branch and the branch for hearing cases in the first instance. Hitherto it has been the practice to give the Court of Appeal jurisdiction in election matters, thus casting upon it the burden of trying matters which properly belong to the other divisions of the court; and the practical result is that great delays have resulted in the hearing of the ordinary cases before the court. They should hold two sittings before Christmas vacation, but having now to try a number of election petitions, they will only be able to hold one sitting before Christmas, and after the Christmas vacation they will be loaded down with the cases which it will be impossible for them to get through before the next long vacation. As the ultimate result of a suit depends on the decision of the Court of Appeal, we will be delaying decisions to a degree quite unnecessary by continuing this jurisdiction upon them. I, therefore, move that the election petitions be fyled in the ordinary courts and not in the Court of Appeal.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I merely wish to call the attention of the Committee again to the effect of this amendment, which will be that the judges of the Court of Appeal in Ontario will not be available for election trials. I should apprehend, from the slight knowledge I have of the subject, that with the increased demand which we make on the judges by the provisions of this Bill, which requires that two judges shall sit for the trial of every election petition, this will have the effect of seriously retarding the disposal of such petitions by withdrawing the judges of the Court of Appeal from participation in this work. This is a matter concerning which I have not sufficient information

personally to form an opinion, and the members from Ontario who are interested in it must take the responsibility of forming an opinion on it. I presume that when the matter attracts public notice, we shall have an expression of opinion if the apprehension I entertain is well founded. In the meantime, I do not profess to know enough about it to say that the clause should not be adopted, and must leave to members from Ontario to consider that question, and I feel the more reluctance in expressing any determined opposition to the amendment owing to the information its mover possesses as regards the organization of the court and the requirements of other business which seem in his opinion to call for the change.

Mr. McCARTHY. The judges of the Court of Appeal are *ex officio* judges of the other courts, and can, if necessary, be used in the other courts. Still I do not at all contemplate that can be done, because that would, of course, defeat the object of the amendment; but there are at present four judges attached to the Court of Chancery and three to the other courts. The scope of the Act is that election petitions should not be commenced within six months, and the result is that it is just a choice which business we should disturb. The election trials must be commenced within the six months, and by the three courts or by the four courts, if the Committee think better to leave the four courts. In the one case the business of the first instance might possibly be interfered with, that is the causes in their early stage; in the other case, the causes in their ultimate stage, where, as far as my practice goes to show, a great deal more damage is really done. In the United States the Supreme Court is so loaded up with cases that people enter appeals simply in order to gain time. I believe that cases are entered in Washington which cannot be reached for three or four years, with the result that appeals are entered for no other purpose than to gain time. I know that the opinion of the profession in the Province of Ontario is, that it would be better that this business should be confined to that branch of the Supreme Court to which it properly belongs.

Mr. LAURIER. There are several members from the Province of Ontario who are not now in their seats, and it might be advisable to postpone this discussion until they are here.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no objection.

On section 2,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would call the attention of the Committee to the change which is being made here. Instead of fixing the time at thirty days from the gazetting of the election in Ottawa, we are making it thirty days from the day of the declaration. It was suggested that we should make it thirty days from the date of holding the poll. The difficulty in regard to that is what I have already explained to the House, namely, that in all cases the thirty days would be shortened by the delay in making the declaration, because the petition cannot well be presented until one of the candidates is declared elected. My own preference would be for thirty days from the day of declaration, but if the House is of opinion that it should be thirty days from the day of polling, it would be necessary to give power to some tribunal to extend the time if, in consequence of the weather, or negligence, or death, or sickness or otherwise, a considerable portion of the time should be consumed. I think, however, that it is better to leave the thirty days clear from the time of declaration. That will be an improvement on the present law, which gives thirty days from the time of gazetting.

Mr. CHARLTON. Delays have very often occurred in making declarations, and those delays might occur for a considerable length of time, so that the difficulty complained of under the present system would to some extent still exist. One returning officer might make his declaration within a few days of the polling, and another might withhold it for weeks. I think it would be better to fix some date counting from the polling day. If thirty days are not enough, take some larger number, but fix some date, so that one candidate may not be placed at a disadvantage compared with another. I understand the difficulties to which the Minister of Justice referred, and they might occur in such ridings as Gaspé or remote ridings in British Columbia, but it might be possible to make exceptions in these cases. I think the Minister of Justice would present a more acceptable Bill to the country if he would fix some time from the day of polling, instead of leaving it in the power of returning officers to delay the return of a candidate.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I regret that the Minister of Justice has changed this amendment. The committee to whom the Bill was referred was unanimous upon the point that the time should be fixed within which petitions should be fyled. The hon. gentleman has changed that and left it nearly as bad as it was formerly. Formerly it was quite uncertain when the petition was to be fyled. It depended on the returning officers. Some of them made their returns promptly and some delayed them for weeks. I know that, in the election in my own county, although the returning officer lived only 12 miles from the county town, I did not get my notification for three weeks after the polling day. It does not matter which party is in power; both parties should be treated with absolute fairness in this matter. It was not so under the old law, and it is not so under the new law. A large part of the difficulties remain, and we are dependent upon the will and caprice of the returning officer as to when the petition shall be fyled. Everyone should be placed in the same position, whether defeated or elected candidates. A difficulty in the case of a few counties may arise, but that can only be in a very small number of constituencies, and there can be no difficulty in making it applicable to a large majority of constituencies. If the hon. gentleman does that, he will do what will give general satisfaction to the country. The Select Committee was unanimous on the point. There was not a dissenting voice. The time within which the petition is to be fyled should be a fixed date.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Was it from the day of polling?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). From the day of polling, except in the case of parties elected by acclamation, then from the day of nomination. But in all other cases, wherever there was a poll, it was fixed from the day of polling.

Mr. McCARTHY. Why would it not do to make the time run from the day of the declaration?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many days does that give?

Mr. McCARTHY. The time is indefinite, but before the election there can be no presumption that the returning officer will not fix a proper time, and he has to fix it in his proclamation before the polling. The 16th section of the Act covers the time and place fixed for the nomination of candidates; the day on which the poll for taking the votes of the electors is to be held, in case a poll is demanded; the several polling stations fixed by him, and the time when, and place where, the returning officer will sum up the number of votes given to the several candidates. Now, let the time be counted thirty days from the date that the return ought to be made.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). But we fix no date in the return.

Mr. McCARTHY. The proclamation fixes the date for the declaration. But he might not be able to make the declaration on that day, because the ballot boxes may be lost; but the ballot boxes can always be obtained, and the information given within a week or so. So that if the delay was fixed from that date, I think it would be more reasonable than to fix it from the date of polling.

Mr. AMYOT. Why allow the returning officer to fix the dates? Why not make the same delay for everyone? The returning officer might fix it at thirty days or forty days.

Mr. McCARTHY. That ought to be done in the Election Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would not practically the objection of the Minister of Justice be met, and the object which the Committee desire to attain be effectually attained, by extending the term from thiry days to forty days? I can hardly conceive any possible case, outside of some five or six counties, in which forty days from polling would not be ample time for every possible ceremony to be observed, and due time given for presenting an election petition. It seems to me that a slight extension would meet the views of the Minister of Justice, and it would also attain the extremely desirable end of having an absolutely fixed date. Now, if the suggestion made by the hon. member for North Simcoe would be a good suggestion, that of having only a fixed time appointed by law within which the declaration should be made, it would be practically the same thing as my suggestion. But that is not done as a matter of fact. It still leaves a great deal of power in the hands of the returning officer.

Mr. LAURIER. I would be sorry if the member for Simcoe at all departed from his amendment. The advantage of his amendment is that the petition must be made within a stated and uniform delay. The objection to the present law is that the provision which requires that the petition shall be fyled within thirty days after the proclamation allows invidious distinctions to be made, and the amendment of the hon. gentleman does away with that possibility. Now, the amendment suggested by the Minister of Justice, that the delay shall run from the proclamation instead of the gazetting, is only substituting one form of the evil for another, and the law remains the same thing in principle, that is, the delay within which petitions are to be filed is uncertain; whereas if we fix a date—and if thirty days is not sufficient then let us extend it to forty days—then you have a uniform delay which will apply to all parties. Now, if we adopt the other system of having the date run from the proclamation, you retain the same difficulty, because in one instance the returning officer, through negligence, perhaps, may postpone the proclamation, and thereby give to his neighbour or to some other party an advantage which the party in his own county does not have.

Mr. McCARTHY. What if he does not make the return in forty days?

Mr. LAURIER. He would then be guilty of a violation of duty.

Mr. AMYOT. If he does not make a report within forty days, then he may never make a report. The Government is not supposed to take rascals or fools for returning officers. We want a uniform delay for everyone. Let it be twenty, or thirty, or fifty days, or even a year, if you will, but we want it uniform, so that no undue advantage may be given to one candidate over another.

Mr. McMULLEN. If forty days is not sufficient time for the party to come into court, why not allow the time to be extended upon application by any person who wishes to fyle a petition?

Mr. McCARTHY. To my mind, it makes little difference whether you count from the polling day or from proclamation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Polling day is a fixed day, being the same in all cases.

Mr. McCARTHY. There are some constituencies, like Algoma, where a return cannot be made in twenty days at least.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is proposed especially to except these.

Mr. McCARTHY. They are not provided for yet.

Mr. LAURIER. We could enact that in Algoma and Gaspé the delay should be sixty days.

Mr. MULOCK. A party might fyle a petition even before the declaration day. We know who the candidates are, and any elector might petition, even without a declaration. Suppose there is no declaration made at all within forty days, or any other time, and if any person chooses to make application, even without a declaration, he can fyle a petition claiming that such and such person ought to be declared the elected candidate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Say forty days from polling. There is a provision for declaration to be made.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would adopt the suggestion of the Minister of Justice and say forty days from the day of polling in all ridings except Algoma and Gaspé.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We cannot make an exception like that, because in Gaspé, Bonaventure, Chicoutimi, Saguenay, Algoma, Muskoka and Cariboo, in British Columbia, are all subject to delays. The only argument in favour of a uniform rule would be to make the time long enough to cover all these places.

Mr. LAURIER. If I remember aright, the delays are uniform except in Algoma, Gaspé and Cariboo. In all those places, which are actually excepted under the present law, then you might

leave the same exceptions, but have the general law everywhere.

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose to strike out the word "or" in the clause: "any unlawful or corrupt act by any candidate at the same election who was not returned, or by any agent of such candidate with his consent or privity." If the candidate pays money himself or it is paid with his privity, then an election petition shall be justified, notwithstanding the lapse of thirty days: but not when this is done without his knowledge by some other person.

On section 5,

Mr. DICKEY. I move that in line 11, clause 5, after "examinations" the following words be inserted: "purporting to be signed by the examiner." Sometimes it is difficult to prove the signature of the examiner, and for that reason evidence is excluded. I propose this amendment in order that evidence may be accepted by the courts without evidence as to the handwriting of the examiner.

Mr. McCARTHY. It would be still better to permit evidence to be taken by stenographers, and make the transcript *primâ facie* evidence.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is a clause I submitted to the House that the Minister of Justice should adopt. As the law now stands you cannot receive evidence until the time for the trial is fixed, and you cannot tell when the trial is going to be held. It is well known from the history of election cases that before the date of trial is fixed, important witnesses sometimes leave the country, and you cannot obtain their evidence. I propose the addition of a distinct clause to enable the petitioner or respondent to serve a subpœna on a witness the very moment the petition is fyled. The clause in my Bill is as follows:—

"At any time after an election petition has been fyled and before the day has been fixed for the trial of said petition, a subpœna may be issued and served on any witness on behalf of the parties to the said petition, and the said subpœna shall have the same force and effect as if it had issued after the day fixed for the trial of the petition: and if it is made to appear to the said court or any judge thereof that any such witness intends to leave Canada and cannot attend such trial, then, on application to the said court or judge, on notice to the parties to the petition, the said court or judge may grant an order for the examination of such witness at a time and place and before a person to be named in such order, and the said witness may thereupon be examined touching the matter complained of in the petition, due notice of such time and place being given to the parties to the petition, who may, by their respective counsel, attend such examination, and examine and cross-examine such witness; and such examination shall be reduced to writing and signed by such witness, and when truly returned by the examiner, may be used by either party to the petition on the trial thereof."

Mr. CHARLTON. It strikes me this provision would rather seriously interfere with individual rights. The person is subpœnaed as a witness, and perhaps the day has not been fixed for the trial, but the witness is obliged to wait week after week and month after month, to know when his presence is required. It strikes me that this provision, although in some sense a good one, might interfere with the privileges of the subject.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If the witness wants to remain away until after the trial he can give notice to the opposing party, who may examine him under the section that has just passed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The difficulty about adopting this, is, that the moment a petition is fyled a number of immaterial witnesses can be summoned to remain in the country for twelve months, which would be a great inconvenience to them, and very great expense to the parties to the petition. In the case, for instance, in which petitions were presented last April, I suppose that the day of trial has not yet been fixed in any one of them, and a man might be kept in the country on the service of a subpœna all this time, and for some months yet. I think the clause would be a serious inconvenience to those who would not be material witnesses.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That difficulty can be got over by the person subpœnaed offering to be examined under the clause we have just passed. There is very little danger of immaterial witnesses being subpœnaed, because they have to be paid their witness fees.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am afraid that will not help matters very much, because, to my knowledge, witnesses have gone out of the country after they have been subpœnaed and they may remain away until after the petition is disposed of, and there is no way of dealing with them. There is no doubt that there is a great deal in what the member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) says. I remember on one occasion that the judge had to come back three times, but the witnesses tired out the judge and the judge declined to come any longer and had to close the case without the evidence. While the proposition of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) would to some extent cure the evil, it would not remedy it altogether.

Mr. DICKEY. I think it would be a better provision that when a person is summoned as a witness before the trial the evidence of the witness should be taken, and preserved in that form.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think perhaps on the whole the suggestion of the hon. gentleman is better than the clause of the Bill.

Mr. DENISON. Would not that increase the expense of election trials? You would probably have a great many people examined on the chance of getting evidence from them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think my hon. friend is stealing a march on the member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), in getting him to assent to that as a substitute for his clause, because it is the present law. Section 19 provides for that.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understood the suggestion of the hon. gentleman to be that a subpœna could not issue without the order of a judge, so that there would be good faith in it. If the Minister of Justice thinks my amendment ought not to become part of the law I will not press it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think, considering the present power of examining witnesses, and considering the clause we have just adopted, that we had better not run the risk of going further.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to move the following amendment to clause 10 of the Act:—

Section ten of the said Act is hereby amended by striking out the word "or" and substituting the word "of" in the sixth line thereof, and in striking out the words "or at his or their domicile," in the ninth line thereof.

Clause 10 of the Act now says:

"Notice of the presentation of a petition under this Act, and of the security, accompanied with a copy of the petition shall within five days after the day on which the

petition has been presented, or within the prescribed time, or within a longer time as the court or any judge thereof, under special circumstances or difficulty in effecting service, allows, be served on the respondent or respondents."

My amendment would make it read:

Under special circumstances of difficulty.

Instead of:

"Under special circumstances or difficulty."

In the ordinary case if there are difficulties in service the parties may apply to the judge of the court to get the time extended; but what I submit is that the time should only be extended when there are difficulties in service. In one case that recently occurred the man was served with a petition within five days. The petitioner discovered that he had made a mistake, and then he went to the judge and said: I have made a mistake in my first petition and I want to get an extension of time, and the judge gave him an extension of time under the clause, as he said that was a special circumstance. I propose to amend by re-substituting the word "of" for "or." The word was "of" in the original Act, but in the consolidation it appears to have been changed to "or."

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Why is the time for service limited to five days? I think it ought to be ten days. The candidate may, perhaps, be a business man in the west, and he may be away in Montreal on business, and if service is not effected within five days, and an application is made to the court at Toronto, he may be subjected to considerable expense.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no objection to making the time ten days; but I am dealing with another matter. I wish to provide that the service shall be personal unless the man is evading service. Under the words of the statute our courts have held that service may be effected by leaving the writ at the domicile, without personal service at all. That is not the intention of Parliament, I take it, nor is it fair to the man, who may be present at his domicile at the time of service, and who should be served personally. I desire to provide that if he is not served personally within the prescribed time, the judge may, upon application, direct how the service shall be given, whether by leaving the writ at his house, or giving it to his wife, or his servant, or in any other way.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be better to provide that the mode of service shall be by delivery to the returning officer. A candidate may be elected in a constituency thousands of miles distant from where he lives, and the petition has to be fyled in the province in which the riding is situated.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman wants to prevent domiciliary service in the first instance. Is he aware of any miscarriage of justice having arisen from this clause as it exists now?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am aware of this, that in one case an order was made for substitutional service; the candidate appealed, claiming that the order for substitutional service was given without sufficient ground; and the court agreed with that view, but held that the service might be at the domicile. Until this decision was given, nobody in our province dreamed that that was the law. Therefore, I think we should make the law definite by providing that the service must be personal in the first instance, and then, if the man is evading service, giving the court power to order the service to be made in any way it sees fit.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that five days be substituted for ten.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think you are right. Five days is too short a time. I move that:

Section 10 of the said Act is hereby amended by striking out the word "or" and substituting the word "of" in the sixth line thereof, and in striking out the words "or at his or their domicile" in the ninth line thereof.

We had better pass this amendment as I have moved it, and then repeal the clause and re-enact it as amended.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. I move to omit the words: "and the court may, at any time thereafter, upon the application of either party, fix some convenient time and place for the trial of the petition." I move that these words be struck out of the thirteenth clause. How these words got into the Controverted Elections Act I do not know. They are not found in the English Act or in the Ontario Act, and the result is very mischievous, because the judges have held that they cannot fix an election trial until either party moves, and at this moment, when we will probably have a large number of election petitions for trial——

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That is all right. Nobody wants them to fix the time for trial.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is exactly what I think they should do. An election trial is a matter in the interests of the public. The party stepping forward as petitioner has virtually made himself a public prosecutor; and both in England and Ontario the judges fix the time for trial at their own convenience, having regard of course to that of the parties as well. After the last Ontario elections, the judges took the lists, and saw what time they had to spare, and what judges they had to undertake the trials, and they divided the work among them, fixing the days for trial, so that a judge started on an election petition circuit as he would on an ordinary circuit. In that way the work was got through as speedily as possible, instead of being delayed, as it sometimes has been, until the member whose election is petitioned against has sat in the House a couple of years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am opposed to making the judge a party, as it were, to the petition by enabling him to fix a date for the trial. I am opposed to his being allowed to intervene at almost every stage, and not giving the party interested the opportunity to decide how he shall carry on his own proceeding. I have not known, in my experience, of any difficulty arising in the way of delay in consequence of its being necessary that the petitioner should move to fix the time for trial. In my own province I know the trials have been disposed of very expeditiously, and it is not out of recollection that an election has taken place and the successful candidate unseated, and a new election been held between one session and another. Any difficulty that arises will certainly only be felt after a general election, when petitions are numerous, and it would not be well to alter the whole system by which the petitioner has to some extent the fixing of the time for trying his petition. The present crop of petitions is larger than has ever been known before, and the present

inconvenience is not likely soon to occur again. The law is sufficiently stringent in that regard, since it fixes the time within which the trial must take place, but to say that the judges shall decide of their own motion when the trials shall take place, would be placing the judiciary in a position it ought not to occupy with regard to the procedure on election petitions. It is true to some extent that the trial of an election petition is one in which the public is interested, but it is likewise true in many cases that the public interest is not the primary object which the petitioner has in view; and I think he should have the right to apply for a date when the petition shall be tried or whether it ought to be brought on or not.

Mr. McCARTHY. The amendment I make is by no means a novel one. It has been the law in England ever since they have had a Controverted Elections Act, and it has also been the law in Ontario. Under that law, ample notice is given the petitioner of the time fixed for the trial, and the Minister forgets that the petitioner really is a man who comes forward in the public interest with a *bonâ fide* intention that he will prosecute the petition, because provision is made that if he does not prosecute, another may apply and be substituted for him, so that the scope of the Act proposes that that should be done. It does appear to me that it will be impossible for the judges to try these petitions unless they can control the time when they shall be tried. All they do is to fix the day of trial and they do not do that until the case is at issue, and they fix it at a time when the parties have ample notice to be prepared for it. Then, if the petitioner does not want to go to trial, he can withdraw, giving, of course, the opportunity to some other person to take his place, but I am told by some of the judges who have spoken to me that it is most embarrassing to have some fifty petitions in the province, and only about six weeks after their circuit during which they have an opportunity to make an appointment for the trial of those petitions.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman knows that there are fictions of law which are not altogether based on the facts, and it is not literally a fact to say that election trials are public cases. If they were public cases, they would be dealt with at the suit of the Crown, but, though they may be technically public cases, they are brought at the suit of private parties, and the machinery of the law is open to the most diligent. It is, therefore, fair that the general principle should apply that the most diligent should have the advantage.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not desire to press this against the general view of the Committee, but I think my hon. friends are making a mistake in not permitting this to be done. In the Ontario election trials, the whole thing was done conveniently and the judges were able to get through with their work, commencing with the eastern and finishing with the western section.

On section 6,

Mr. DICKEY. I do not object to the clause itself, which I think is perfectly right, but it introduces an entirely new principle into the law. It throws the burden on the candidate petitioned against of proving a negative. He has to prove that no corrupt practices were committed during the election on his behalf. That is a very difficult task for any candidate. It seems to me that the proper way would be that, if the court or judge was of opinion from the evidence that such a state of matters existed in the constituency, this result might follow, but that the judge should not be required to report that the candidate has proved this negative. Let the judge form his opinion upon the evidence submitted, and do not leave a negative fact to be proved by the candidate after the case against him is closed.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Surely the least the candidate can do is to say on his oath that no corrupt practice has been committed by him personally.

Mr. DICKEY. Look at sub-section *d*.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is easy for the candidate under sub-section *d* to swear that, as far as he knows, there was no corrupt practice.

Mr. DICKEY. But the words are added "and his agents," which means every person in the county who has acted for the candidate.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It only applies to his knowledge. Now, the election would be void if these acts were committed by an agent, but this prevents the unseating of the candidate even if corrupt acts are committed by his agent, if he can clear himself. Sub-section *d* only requires the candidate to swear that he did not authorize corrupt acts or commit any himself.

Mr. CASEY. This does place, as my friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) says, the duty of proving a negative on the candidate. It assumes that, if corrupt practices have taken place on the part of the agents of the candidate, that should avoid the election unless the candidate proves his ignorance of those practices, his attempt to prevent them, or their triviality and limited extent. The candidate must prove those points before the assumption that he is responsible for the acts of his agents is got rid of. It is always difficult to prove a negative, and it would be difficult for the judge to report positively that it was proven that the candidate took all reasonable means to prevent the commission of corrupt practices, or that it was proved that the offences mentioned in said report were trivial. We leave it to the judge to say what sort of offences are trivial and unimportant. If it is contended that only slight breaches of the law, breaches committed with the knowledge of the candidate, should not void the election, then I think the nature and extent of the corruption, or the nature of the acts that would void the election, should be in some way specified in this Act. I think it is quite just that the candidate should not be held responsible for everything done by unauthorized parties professing to be friends of his; but I think the law should be so worded as to indicate what amount of corruption, what amount of bribery by unauthorized parties, even against the orders of the candidate, should void the election. It is quite possible that the candidate might make a great show of taking measures against the corrupt practices of his agents. We have known such things to be done before. We have known a candidate to take every means of avoiding responsibility, ignoring his committee and having no knowledge of what is going on, while at the same time an agent is sent in from elsewhere, and in the interest of that can-

didate, but wholly without his knowledge, has been guilty of considerable corruption, and corruption affecting the election. It seems to me that if this was so phrased as to provide that unless the judge reported that such amount of corruption had taken place even without the knowledge or consent of the candidate, and in opposition to his instructions, as appeared likely to have affected the result of the election, the election should not be voided. I do not think the words "trivial and unimportant" are a sufficient guide for the judge. It is not for the judge to say what is trivial or unimportant, it is for Parliament to say, and anything that affects the result of an election cannot be trivial or unimportant. This provision is so vague that the judge might easily err in making his report; whereas, if you are only asking the judge to decide whether it appeared likely from the cases of bribery that had been proven, that there had been bribery enough to affect the result of the election, in that case he might be called upon reasonably to come to a proper decision. Naturally, the petitioner could not be expected to prove as many acts of bribery as would have actually obtained the majority secured by the successful candidate, but if a considerable amount of bribery was proven, it would be natural for the judge to assume that the result might have been affected by cases which had not come to the knowledge of the petitioner and consequently had not been proven. We wish to obtain the opinion of the Minister of Justice also as to the effect of this clause upon election petitions now pending, as to whether this wording and the intention of this provision are to apply to the trial of cases which occurred during the last election. I think the intention of this provision is right and just, but it is open to great question whether this law should be applied to cases arising out of the late election, whether, in other words, it should be retrospective. The late election was conducted under the old law which provided that the act of an agent, no matter how trivial, if it were a corrupt act, was sufficient to unseat the successful candidate. The candidates and their agents, and all concerned, had full knowledge that such was the law and the elections were conducted with this full knowledge on their part, and with full notice to them to avoid all such acts as would, under the existing law, unseat the candidate. It is open to question whether this section relaxing the strictness of the law, should be made to apply to cases occurring under the old Act. I hardly think, for my own part, that it should, but I wish to get the opinion of the Minister of Justice on that point.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it is not unreasonable that the burden should be put upon the candidate of exonerating himself if the facts proven are such as, under the law as it stands, would forfeit his seat. As to the objection of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), that the words "trivial and unimportant" are vague, inasmuch as it is for the judge to decide whether the acts of corruption are trivial or not, I think we can leave that in no better hands, and it is probably safe to leave it there, inasmuch as we are just adopting the language, in that regard, of the Corrupt Practices Act of England, of 1883. I think it is better to adhere as closely as we can to the provisions of the statute under which a series of decisions have been made.

Mr. CASEY. Are those words the same?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, it is the same in the English Act. It is not an extensive change from the law of 1888. As regards the other point, whether this should be retrospective, I think it would be better and more dignified that we should add a clause to the Bill providing that this clause shall not affect pending petitions. There is a good deal to be said on the other side. It is not uncommon, when we relax penalties and penal provisions, to make them applicable to existing proceedings. But on the whole I think it would be better to allow the petitioners in pending cases to make what they can out of their petitions against us, and it would be a pity to deprive them of that right.

Mr. CHARLTON. I cannot agree with the opinion expressed by the Minister of Justice that the amendment to the law proposed by this Bill shall not apply to pending petitions that have not yet been tried. If the law required amending, if the law was in any respect unjust, if the law was in any respect unduly severe, if the provisions of the law in the interest of justice required to be changed, I would like to ask why this provision should not apply to suits that are yet to be tried, why the provisions of this law should be extended away on into the future, perhaps years from this time? If there is any need for the law at all, the need of that change is an instant need, it should apply to petitions now pending. It is admitting that there is no use for the law and no necessity for the law, practically admitting that we need not to make the law applicable to cases that are yet to be tried. I should say it would be an absurdity to place a law upon the Statute-book providing that it shall not go into operation until the necessities that called that law into existence, so far as they exist at present, have passed away. Most certainly the law should go into operation from the day that it passes, it should apply to cases that arise after the passage of the law, and after the law receives the Royal Assent.

Mr. SKINNER. I want to draw the attention of the Committee to section 8. When it was before the Committee previously, the Committee did not think that the party petitioned against should have to go to affirmative proof on sub-section *d* in order to get the benefit of it: but that he should get the benefit of the evidence as it stood. It seems to me that as sub-section *d* now stands, no part of the benefit of the sub-section would be had by the person petitioned against unless the conditions laid down in sub-section *d* are fulfilled, namely, proof that the election is free from any corrupt practice on the part of such candidate and of his agents. The word "agents" under the election law is a term of very general description, and persons are made agents by the law although the candidate had nothing to do with their appointment. Therefore, it is calling upon the candidate to produce a line of proof which it is almost impossible for him to bring forward. The Committee were of the opinion that the sitting member should have the benefit of the evidence as it stood at the time the judge made his report. I propose that sub-section *d* be altered, to the effect "that in all other respects the evidence did not show there had been any corrupt practice on the part of the candidate or his agents." If the judge reported that the evidence did not show corrupt practices on the part of the candidate or his

agents, the candidate should have the benefit of the provisions of this section; otherwise, at the election trial he would have to go through a process of proof with respect to all his agents, and establish that no corrupt practice had been carried out by any of them. It would be impossible to carry forward that proof with any reasonable success, owing to the uncertainty involved in the matter, and, therefore, to pass the section of the Act as it is would be practically nullifying the Act.

Mr. DICKEY. There can be no question with respect to sub-section *d* that the candidate must prove, in order to get the benefit of the section, that each and all of his agents had been innocent of corrupt practices during the election. This word "agent" is used also in the previous section, and as it is used twice it must necessarily receive the same meaning in each place, and therefore a candidate must prove that there has been no corruption anywhere in the county on the part of any person actually working for him. I admit that the candidate should be placed on oath to give evidence as to the absence of corruption; but it is unfair to make him prove the act of every agent throughout the county, of which, presumably, he knew nothing whatever, and especially when the effect of his failing to prove that, for he cannot prove it, would be that it would be thrown up to him throughout the constituency that he was not able to clear himself personally.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Strike out the words "any of his agents."

On section 6,

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to draw the attention of the Committee on this section to a matter which I think is very important. This absolves the candidate for the capital offence, as it may be called, of bribery. The amendment in the English law upon which this is founded, still leaves bribery, no matter how trivial the bribery may be, an offence for which the election ought to be avoided, and I would certainly protest against our law being altered in that regard. I think the experience of any person who has had anything to do with an election trial, is, that for every fifty cases of bribery you try to prove, and which I venture to say have been committed, you may establish only one, and that bribery is not committed unless the money has been furnished by the candidate, or by the candidate's friends. The individual elector does not put his hand in his own pocket and bribe. The result of experience in the Ontario election trials has been that perhaps you will spend five or six days endeavouring to prove a case of bribery, and although every person who hears the evidence will be morally satisfied that bribery has been committed, you cannot prove it. The witnesses say "no" or "they cannot remember," and all the rest of it, and perhaps, in the end, after a long trial, you will establish a case of bribery, and the judge has got to say: This is but one case of bribery of perhaps $5, and am I to set aside the election on account of that. We ought not to weaken the election law. We are always talking here about putting down corruption, and because it may be injurious to us personally, we ought not to weaken the law in that cardinal point. I think we will make a very great mistake indeed if we do. While for ordinary offences, undue influences, and treating, the judge may well say that the election ought not to be set aside, I venture to submit that we are making a mistake if we do not provide that the elections shall be set aside for even one case of bribery. I know that is the opinion of the hon. gentleman who formerly sat where my hon. friend who now leads the Opposition sits. If bribery is proved let the election be voided. The example is a good one at all events. What will be the result if we leave the law as it is? Well, men will say: We will bribe, and even if it is found out in one case, the judge will say it is a trivial matter and the election will not be set aside. Is not the experience of all of us that it is almost impossible to prove bribery? You have to take the evidence out of a hostile camp, and not only is the man desirous of sheltering himself personally from the disqualification which follows, but he is surrounded by his party friends, and the man who comes through the ordeal of cross-examination, battles with the counsel, and comes out triumphant, is a hero, whereas the unfortunate man who told the truth is looked upon as not quite fitted for the company in which he is.

Mr. LAURIER. That applies to all corrupt practices.

Mr. McCARTHY. No. Treating may be a trivial matter, and the judge can say if it is organized that it will void the election, but if it is merely a man treating another, which people often do at their own expense, it is left to the discretion of the judge whether he shall void the election or not. But, when money is paid, we know very well, whether we like to admit it or not, that it comes sooner or later out of our own pockets. It may not be paid at the time, but before the next election generally the call is made upon us, and it comes from the candidate or from those who put the candidate forward. I, therefore, would ask the Committee to pause before they pass the law in the wide sense in which it is now, and to omit from this the crime of bribery.

Mr. CHARLTON. What would you suggest?

Mr. McCARTHY. To meet the crime of bribery.

Mr. CHARLTON. The law now provides that the candidate shall free himself from all charges of corrupt practices. I cannot believe that my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is right, when he says that in all cases where bribery is resorted to the candidate is a party to it or ultimately becomes responsible for it. There are hundreds of cases where warm party friends, anxious to carry an election, will use means that the candidate will not approve of if he is appealed to, and which he never hears anything about. If you are going to adhere to the old rule that one single case of bribery will void the election, you are not making to any great extent the law less severe. I can cite the case of Dr. Platt, the former member for Prince Edward County, who was unseated on account of the payment of $1 by one of his agents, to a drunken loafer, whose importunities induced the man to give him $1 rather than be bothered with the man repeatedly coming to him. My experience leads me to believe that there are a great number of cases where party feeling runs high, and where improper influence being used, the candidate has no knowledge of. The candidate is not responsible for that, and he is powerless to prevent it. I cannot subscribe to the assertion made by the hon.

member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that in all cases the candidate will sanction it and will foot the bill before the next election. I think it would be more suitable if we adopted the provision of the Ontario law in this respect, which says that it should be shown that corrupt practices had prevailed to an extent to influence the result of the election. One solitary act will not, perhaps, influence the result of the election, but if it does then the candidate should be unseated. If one solitary act of bribery has occurred in a riding where there are hundreds of a majority, of course it does not affect the result of the election. I consider the Ontario law a fair and equitable law. It has worked well, and it has secured as great a degree of purity in the elections of that province as we can boast of in the elections for the Dominion. I cannot agree with my hon. friend the candidate in most cases has complicity in bribery, but on the contrary he is more frequently personally innocent. I think it would be an extreme hardship to assume that the candidate is responsible for the bribery, that he knows of it, and that he will be ultimately responsible by footing the bill.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree with my hon. friend in what he has said, and I would like to point out what happens in cases of bribery arising from betting. If a man has bet a considerable sum on an election, he is almost certain to use a portion of the money he has at stake in obtaining votes for the side for which he has bet. I have been told by betting men that they make it a practice to use half the amount of the bet in this way. I think a great deal of bribery of this kind goes on for which the candidate is not responsible, and it would be a shame if a successful candidate were to be unseated because one or two men had been guilty of bribery in working for their own interest. Of course if enough votes were influenced in that way to affect the result of the election, it should be voided; but if the judges report that they do not believe enough votes have been bought during the campaign to affect the result, I do not think the candidate should be unseated because there have been a few cases of bribery for which he is not responsible. That, I understand, is practically the meaning of the existing law in Ontario. It does not follow that nobody is ever unseated under that law, because the judges do frequently unseat successful candidates for the Legislative Assembly. But that clause prevents the unseating of candidates for things with which they have nothing to do.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not want to be misunderstood in saying that the candidate always pays the money. What I mean to say is, that either the candidate or those responsible for the election, the party pay the money, and not the individual man who states in the witness box that he paid $5 for a vote. The case to which the hon. member for North Norfolk has referred, that of the Prince Edward election, is certainly an unfortunate illustration for him. It is quite true that the case was decided on that one act of bribery. But on the first day of the trial a shocking state of things had been revealed; numbers of men had proven to have been bribed, and it was necessary to prove their connection with the candidate. But on the next day, as soon as one case was proved, the trial stopped, being decided on that; it was not necessary to go any further. That is the ordinary case. So many difficulties stand in the way, that you are, perhaps, able only to bring the briber home in one case. But so long as there is bribery, the public will perhaps think that we are taking a great deal more care of our seats than of the public interests, if we relax the provisions of the law against it.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has pointed out a case in which there was a great deal of bribery, but in which it was not all brought home to the candidate.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said that on the first day the facts of the bribery had been established, but that it remained to make the connection with the candidate. The first thing to do in an election trial is to establish the bribery; the next is to establish the agency. The bribery having been established in a series of cases, the connection was established in one case, and the other cases were not gone into.

Mr. CASEY. I propose that if we give the candidate the protection of not unseating him for an isolated case of bribery, we should go to the other extreme and provide that if it be proven that a sufficient number of voters have been bribed to affect the result, the election should be voided, no matter whether agency is proven or not. Although the candidate may have been perfectly innocent, yet if a sufficient number of votes have been obtained by bribery to affect the result, the election is not an expression of the will of the people of that constituency, and therefore it should be voided, though there may be no stain on the character of the candidate.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not agree with the hon. member for North Simcoe that this Bill in the slightest degree interferes with the election law. It will punish a man for bribery the same as before. The only object of this provision is to relieve persons who have conducted an election fairly and honestly and without bribery. As the law stands, the victim is not the man who is guilty of bribery, but the unfortunate candidate who may be innocent of bribery or any knowledge of bribery, and who yet may be unseated and saddled with an enormous bill of costs in consequence of that bribery. If the hon. member for North Simcoe had experience of that, as others in this House have had, he would realize that the victim is the successful candidate, although he may be a perfectly innocent man. We do not interfere with the law regarding bribery. I would make it much more stringent; and in my Bill I proposed to do so, and to make many things corrupt acts and punishable by fine and imprisonment, which are not now corrupt acts. There is no reason why a clause of this kind should not pass, even if it does not have the result that the Minister of Justice says it has. I do not know that I would be in favour of a provision requiring proof of a sufficient number of acts of bribery to affect the result. If a man had a majority of 500, a very large number of cases of bribery would have to be proven in order to affect the result of the election, although there may have been the grossest bribery and corruption practised. I think the clause goes as far as it should go, by leaving the matter in the discretion of the judges. I am perfectly willing to leave it there, as I have full confidence in our judges. The hon. member for North Simcoe speaks as if the candidates were the persons who commit acts of bribery and corruption.

That may be the hon. gentleman's experience, but it is not the experience of some. I have known leading men, active, vigorous canvassers, who never spent any but their own money in an election ; and it is the grossest hardship upon a candidate that although he may not have spent money, and may not have heard of any being spent until the fact is elicited by a sharp counsel like my hon. friend at an election trial, he is to be unseated and to lose $3,000 or $4,000 costs. And all because some man with whom he had practically no dealings whatever, and to whom he gave not a cent of money, did something he ought not to have done and violated the law. I have known it to happen more than once that because a zealous friend, zealous perhaps because he is a strong politician, or perhaps because, as the hon. member for West Elgin says, he has something at stake on the result of the election, has seen fit to risk something and has violated the law, the unfortunate candidate is made to suffer. We ought to have some consideration for the candidate as well as the people. We ought to see that they are not improperly and unjustly punished for something somebody else has done. It is a well-known principle of law that a man should not be punished for the act of somebody else ; but under this election law an innocent man may be unseated and saddled with a large bill of costs on account of the act of somebody else whom he did not authorize. It was for the purpose of getting over that difficulty and dealing out to members elected a measure of justice, that, at the beginning of the session, I submitted a Bill containing a clause having the same effect as this. I believe it is a measure of fair-play and justice which will commend itself to every right-thinking man. The hon. member for Simcoe, who objects to this clause and who has never had an election petition presented against him, has not had experience ; or has the hon. gentleman had experience ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not had personal experience, and am not like you in that respect.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). And on that account he opposes this section. I trust this clause will pass. I do not think that it will have any injurious effect in practice. On the contrary, I believe it will have good effect. If there is such a class of men in the community who spend money on the faith of getting it back from the candidate, they will not do so when they know that the candidate will not be unseated by anything they have done. I believe it will be in the interest, not only of purity of elections, but of a class of men, members of Parliament, who, in the past, have suffered by reason of the indiscreet acts committed by others.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would not trouble the Committee again were it not for the personal allusion the hon. gentleman has made. I do not think we can discuss a matter of this kind if we introduce personal allusions into it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I did not introduce any.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes ; the hon. gentleman made a pointed allusion to me.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I did not know you were protested.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was not protested, but have been engaged as counsel in election petitions, and have perhaps as large an experience as the hon. gentleman, though not his personal experience.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Is that personal ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I say I do not desire at all to introduce personal matters.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I would say that some of your friends have had a good deal more experience than I.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not speaking of my friends. The hon. gentleman has brought this upon himself. The records of the courts reek with his acts. I am sure it was not his friends, it was not any indiscreet man who had a bet on the hon. gentleman's election, and who took an interest in it, but the hon. ge' 'eman himself——

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No.

Mr. McCARTHY—who recorded in his own diary under his own hand——

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No.

Mr. McCARTHY—the items of the sums paid to churches as election expenses.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Certainly, were not these good payments to churches ?

Mr. McCARTHY. Very good, under the circumstances, and very evenly divided.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You surely do not complain of that ?

Mr. McCARTHY. What I propose, at all events, is to insert after the words "any offences" in the clause : "Where, after the passage of the Act, on the trial of an election petition respecting an election, the court decides that the candidate at such election was guilty, by his agents, of any offence other than bribery by the payment or the promise of payment of money"—leaving all the other election offences to be excused. That is section 15 we are dealing with.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it would be unwise, in dealing with a measure of this kind, to be governed by the feeling that public opinion may suppose that we are dealing too tenderly with an offence such as bribery. Even if such impression should prevail outside, the objection founded on it is altogether inapplicable. The effect of the clause is only to exonerate a candidate when two distinct circumstances appear. One is, that it has been proved to the satisfaction of the court which tries him, that he is perfectly innocent, that he is not only not connected with the particular offence which has been proved, but that he has not been connected with any other offence in the election. And the second element is that the offence which was committed by the other man, without the candidate's knowledge or consent, was unimportant. I am not afraid of public opinion when I exonerate a man who is innocent from the consequences of the offence of another man, and when I find that such offence was unimportant and committed without his knowledge. Under these circumstance, I think the clause should pass.

Mr. MULOCK. In section 15, second line, you use the word "court ;" and in the fifth line you use the words "court or judges." I suggest there should be uniformity.

Mr. McCARTHY. Better leave out the word "judges."

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. The clause reads as follows:—

Where, after the passing of this Act, upon the trial of an election petition respecting an election, the court decides that a man at such election was guilty by his agent or agents of any offence that would render his election void, and the court further finds no corrupt practice was committed at such election by the candidate personally, and the offences were committed contrary to the order and without the sanction or connivance of the said candidate, and that the said candidate took all reasonable means of preventing the commission of corrupt practices at such election.

Amendment agreed to

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. And the addition moved is as follows:—

That the offences mentioned were of a trivial and unimportant character.

Mr. CASEY. I would suggest the addition of the words "were not sufficient to have affected the result of the election."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The words here are stronger.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Sub-section *d* reads:

That in all other respects the election was free from any corrupt practice on the part of such candidate or his agents.

Mr. DICKEY. I move to strike out the words "or his agents."

Mr. McCARTHY. Will not that destroy the whole effect? The judge has to decide on the whole trial that the election is free from corrupt practices by the candidate or his agents. I think that should be left in.

Mr. CASEY. I must agree with my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and with what I conceive to be the intention of the Minister of Justice, not to protect a candidate unless he is ignorant of corrupt practices, even in trivial cases.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no practical difficulty about it. The judge can only decide upon the evidence.

Mr. MULOCK. The report as to the general existence of corrupt practices is involuntary on the part of the judge. It is very different if the judge has to report that not one agent of the candidate has committed any corrupt practice except of a trivial character. If a candidate is nominated at a public meeting, according to the present law every man who is there is the agent of the candidate for the purposes of this Act, and every one of the 500 or more people present could unseat the candidate, who would be obliged to satisfy the court that not one of these legal agents had committed any corrupt practice except of a trivial character.

Mr. McCARTHY. If there is no proof of a corrupt act, the judge certifies that there is none.

Mr. MULOCK. If the judge finds that there is no corrupt practice, he must find it on the evidence. Under this provision the court is called upon to find a negative, and it cannot do that without evidence.

Mr. McLEOD. Before this section applies at all, the court must find that the candidate, by himself or his agent, has committed bribery or some corrupt act. Then the judge has to find that in all other respects the election is free from any corrupt practice on the part of the candidate or his agents, and I do not see how he can do that without evidence.

Mr. CASEY. I think all the difficulty would be avoided by adding "as far as appears by the evidence submitted to the court."

Mr. DICKEY. I agree to adding "as far as disclosed by the evidence."

On section 7,

Mr. GERMAN. Before this clause is adopted I think it would be wise for the Minister of Justice to consider the question of costs in regard to election petitions generally. I think it would be wise if the same principle was adopted in the Controverted Elections Act of the Dominion that is adopted in the election law for the Province of Ontario, that is, limiting the costs to which an unsuccessful respondent or petitioner shall be mulcted, to a certain fixed sum. We all know that on certain occasions the costs which are involved in the trial of these petitions, are something enormous, particularly where neither party to the proceedings is quite able to pay the costs. Illustrious counsel from Toronto is employed—and I am not speaking from any desire to be personal—who are justly entitled to have very large fees, and besides that, enormous costs are incurred in getting witnesses, which in many cases are quite unnecessary. It may be said, of course, that the costs are subject to taxation; that is true, but we all know who have had any experience in regard to taxing bills of cost, that when they come before the taxing master, and a party to a suit shows that he has paid out money for witnesses, the taxes are generally allowed to go without any great strength of evidence. I submit to the Minister of Justice and to this Committee that before this matter is finally wound up, an amendment should be added limiting the amount of costs which shall be paid by the unsuccessful party in a controverted election case.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I quite agree with the observations of my hon. friend. I have had four petitions fyled against me, and I never was unseated but once, that was in 1874. I was not unseated at that time for subscribing to religious monuments in Penetanguishene or elsewhere; but I was unseated all the same. That election trial cost $3,500. These costs are a terror to any candidate against whom a petition is fyled. It is a lottery, but one thing is always certain, that is that whoever fails has to pay from $1,000 to $3,000. Now, that ought not to be. There are extortionate fees charged. You cannot get counsel from Toronto for less than two or three hundred dollars a day. If the sum is limited and fixed, such extortionate fees will not be charged by local counsel or by anybody else. At present the unfortunate candidate has got to pay it all. Therefore, I think, if it is possible for Parliament to fix the amount, we ought to do it, so that the unsuccessful petitioner or candidate should not be saddled with unreasonable costs.

Mr. MULOCK. I have drawn an amendment which I had intended to make at some stage in regard to the costs. I think there is a good deal to be said as to whether there should be any costs awarded at all in election trials.

Mr. McCARTHY. Don't let us have any election trials; that would be better still.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not speaking for myself. But I must say I sympathize with what has been the bitter experience of many men in public life, men of limited means, who have gone into public life in response to a demand on the part of people, and have been subjected to one or two election trials, and $5,000 or $10,000, the whole accumulations of a lifetime, are swept away. I sympathize with those people, and I think they should not be exposed to that loss. They are engaged in the public service, and they are the sole sufferers in the long run, and perhaps being ruined in public life, they become dependent on the Government of the day for some office. Perhaps they are induced from exigency to do what, in their earlier years, they would have shrunk from doing, and are ruined, perhaps, in mind, body and estate through a few election contests. The public are concerned in such matters, it is not a question of private right at all, it is a question of pnblic right, and I believe that unless the candidate is personally to blame, we might with perfect justice declare that in no case should the costs be payable except where the candidate himself had been personally guilty, and in that case I would not spare him. But in every other case I think he is entitled to a great deal of consideration; and if the House is not prepared to take the step of declaring that there shall be no costs recoverable at all, I think we might well limit the maximum amount recoverable. The fact that to-day costs are unlimited may be—I will not say it is, but may be—an inducement to some people to promote litigation. In many cases the petitions are not the result of known wrong, but they are fyled, perhaps, to serve some party purpose, not fyled by reason of the supposed existence of a wrong, but on speculation, and so on.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the greater evil is—and perhaps in that respect we do not sufficiently protect the sitting member—that men of straw are put forward as petitioners; that really is the greater evil, because each party takes his chances. If these election petitions are put in, they must be at the expense of somebody; and if the illustrious counsel from Toronto, to whom the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) has referred, are engaged, these will have to be paid by some person or another. A petition is fyled, that petition is successful, wrong has been done, and to that extent the public interest is subserved in the exposure of that wrong, and yet the petitioner has to be at the expense. Now, we might well consider how the respondent may be protected. I have known many instances of that kind, where the respondent finds that the party put forward is simply a man of straw and is not worth a cent, and that the deposit has been exhausted for witness and other purposes, and that there is no protection for him—I think that would be a matter that the Committee might well consider. But, on the other hand, limiting the costs will not reduce the counsel fees, it will not reduce the witness fees that will have to be paid by the successful party, but, after all, in the event of success, has done a public service.

Mr. MULOCK. I beg to move the following section as clause 6 of section 7:—

That no greater counsel fee or fees shall be taxed as between party and parties, in respect of or in connection with the trial, than $50, and when the trial shall continue beyond one day, a further sum not exceeding $40 for each additional day the trial shall continue, whether one or more counsel be engaged at the trial, except as to certain witness fees and other actual disbursements in regard to the evidence, taxable as in ordinary cases between party and parties, as may be allowed by the judgment or order of the court allowing or apportioning costs; no greater sum, including counsel fee, than $300 shall be taxed or taxable against either party as costs in the cause.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

After Recess.

THE RATHBUN COMPANY.

Bill (No. 171) respecting the Rathbun Company (Mr. Kirkpatrick) was considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 147) to amend the Controverted Elections Act.

(In the Committee.)

On section 8,

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if this new Act will have any bearing upon the position, that if proceedings were not taken within six months of the time of the protest, they fall to the ground?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It does not affect that.

Mr. MULOCK. I fully approve of the proposition involved in this clause, requiring two judges to preside at the trial; but I fail to see any necessity for there being two judges to hear the application for withdrawal. In the trial itself there is a severe contest, whilst the application for withdrawal is a minor matter altogether, and in most cases there is a consent so far as there can be any such under the Act. I would suggest that while there are two judges for the trial, a withdrawal can be before one judge.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is right in that. I notice this clause says: "And additional judges shall, if necessary, be placed on the rota accordingly." I have no doubt that is according to the English Act, but we have no rota here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We can strike out those words, and also provide that the withdrawal of an election petition may be before one judge.

Mr. MULOCK. That will be satisfactory.

On sub-section 2 of section 8,

Mr. CASEY. I would ask why it is that there is an appeal where the court is unanimous, and no appeal when the court is divided? One would expect that it should be the other way altogether.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When the court is divided there is no judgment to appeal from.

Mr. CASEY. That is the technical view of the matter, of course, that you cannot have an appeal where there is no judgment. But although there is no judgment, the same effect is reached; the member is confirmed in his seat, and the attempt to unseat him fails because the judges differ. On the other hand, if the judges agree to maintain the

member in his seat, there is an appeal, and further proceedings may be taken to show that he should not be retained in his seat. Although technically no appeal lies when the judges differ, I do not see why the Act should not provide for an appeal though no judgment is given; or else, on the other hand, make the judgment final when both judges agree, no matter which way they may decide. You ought either to make their judgment final in both cases, or else provide for an appeal when the court is divided as well as when it is unanimous. It is an anomaly that one member should be unseated by the unanimous decision of the judges, while another member is retained in his seat when the judges differ and no further proceedings are taken.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In such a case he gets the benefit of the doubt. The reason why there can be no appeal is not merely technical. The hon. gentleman will see that any further proceedings in the matter would not be in the nature of an appeal at all. The petitioner would be simply looking for two other judges who might agree, in order to have the case tried again. But surely when the member has been tried once, and the two judges are unable to agree that he forfeits his seat, it does not follow that there should be a second trial.

Mr. CASEY. Then why should there be a second trial when they agree?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is another matter. Personally, I am in favour of appeals as far as you can give them.

Mr. CASEY. Of course, the Minister can provide for what he likes in this Bill, and I think he should provide that where the judges differ there should be an opportunity for further proceedings; because the effect of the disagreement of the two judges is practically to give a final judgment, although as a matter of form no judgment is given. I think the Act should be made logical one way or the other.

Mr. McCARTHY. I happen this time to agree with the hon. member for West Elgin. If the two judges decide against a candidate, there is an appeal; but if the candidate has the good fortune to get the judges to differ, that decides the case finally. This is a logical absurdity which it seems to me should be removed. But the other question to which the Minister refers, I think, deserves our consideration. There is nothing that seems to melt the hearts of the members of this House so much as the fact that there are election petitions, and still more, that there are costs attending them. Of all the costs, those of the appeal to the Supreme Court are the greatest; and if two judges are to try instead of one, have we not sufficient confidence in our judiciary to make their decision final? Unless there is a concurrence of the two judges both in law and fact against the sitting member, he holds his seat. As ours is a federal system, we might perhaps provide that questions of law should be appealed to the Supreme Court.

Mr. CASEY. If an appeal is not allowed where the judges differ there should be an opportunity to institute new proceedings. The evidence already taken might be used again.

Mr. DAVIN. I should like to ask my hon. friend whether, in his experience, appeals have not generally been made by the candidate petitioned against?

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think appeals are as frequent one way as the other. Perhaps I may be allowed to move my amendment now, and we might discuss the question of appeal afterwards.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to let the clause stand in the meantime.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is another matter which seems to me of considerable consequence—that is, the mode of petitioning. At the present time we know that one-half of the seats in this House are attacked, and that in a great number of cases the petition did not originate in the constituency at all. The intention of the provision for a petition and the mode of trying controverted elections is to put an end to corrupt practices and to prevent gross abuses in elections. But it is possible to work the law as it now stands in such a way as to make it a greater evil than the mischief which it is intended to remedy. It is very clear to my mind that when parties living 200 or 300 miles away from a constituency come there two or three weeks after the election with a petition, and ask some elector to subscribe to it, assuring him that he need not make any deposit, but that it will be made for him, and asking him to charge all kinds of corrupt practices against the candidate who has received the majority of the votes, that is certainly a very serious abuse. I am inclined to think that the law as it stands provides the candidate with a remedy against that abuse; but it will, under any circumstances, entail upon him a certain amount of costs; and the proceedings against a man who has been returned as a representative of a constituency ought not to be vexatious proceedings. They ought to be undertaken only where a wrong has been done and an abuse is to be corrected. At present, petitions have in many cases been got up in the way I mention. It is a question whether the party petitioning ought not to appear before some judge on a motion asking for leave to petition, setting forth the facts upon which he relies, and which, if established, would justify the petition. I think such a proceeding would protect those who undertake to conduct an honest election against vexatious litigation, and it would at the same time put no barrier or impediment in the way of those who have been guilty of serious wrong, either by bribery or undue influence themselves or through their agents. In my opinion, if we were to make some provision requiring a party who has to be a petitioner to move before some judge for leave to petition, setting forth this fact, and have that right, as a matter of course, upon making out a *primâ facie* case, we would get rid of a very great deal of difficulty, the duties of the judges would be enormously diminished, and members who conduct elections honestly would be protected against vexatious proceedings.

Sub-section 2 allowed to stand.

Mr. McCARTHY. I move the following amendment:—

Section 23 of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted:—Any party may, at the trial or other proceeding, use in evidence any part of the examination of the opposite party; provided always that in such case the court may look at the whole examination, and if it finds that any other part is so connected with the part to be used that the last mentioned part ought not to be used without such other part, it may direct such other part to be put in evidence.

That is the law in Ontario in ordinary actions. It prevents the introduction of a mass of irrelevant evidence.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose now to bring up the question about the appeal, and I move the following amendment :—

Section 31 of the said "The Dominion Controverted Elections Act" is hereby amended by inserting after the word "district" in the 4th sub-section thereof, "and by consent of all parties, or without such consent for argument merely, or for the delivery of judgment to any place within the province," and before the words "as to him seems convenient."

Now, the 4th sub-section of section 31 provides that the judge of the trial may adjourn the same from time to time, and from any one place to another in the same electoral district, as to him seems convenient. I propose that by consent of the parties he may adjourn to anywhere else, or without their consent, he may adjourn anywhere else for argument or for delivery of judgment, so that the court will not be required to remain in the county, if the parties are willing to go to Toronto, for instance, to take, we will suppose, a witness who is not in attendance, or for any other purpose.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is reasonable that the court should be allowed to deliver judgment at other than the place in the riding; but I am not inclined to favour a consent to transfer the enquiry into questions of fact to a point remote from the place of trial. We know that it often occurs in the course of a trial that the parties will arrange, perhaps out of regard to the convenience of persons, to transfer the trial to a central place. In my opinion it is important that the trial of an election case should take place in the community, that the people should see for themselves what has taken place concerning this matter of public importance. I am satisfied that the spirit of the law which requires election trials to be had in the riding, was not only for the purpose of convenience and economy, but also that the election trials should be an object lesson to the electors. There is a great deal of good to be attained from the trial, with all its consequences, taking place in the community. For example, if a person has violated the law and it is necessary to punish him, the proper place in which to deliver that judgment is in the district in question, where he will be punished publicly in the presence of the whole community. I think that the transfer of that branch of the case outside of the riding would be a mistaken step.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is much force in what the hon. gentleman says, but sometimes expense is saved, that is the only thing.

Mr. MULOCK. The law part of it, perhaps.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what I mean. Sometimes the books of reference are not in the county, and it is difficult to argue the case satisfactorily, and therefore the argument is frequently without authority. But I think there is much force in what the hon. gentleman says, that the intention and spirit of the Act is that the whole matter should be conducted as an example and warning for the benefit of the public. I will not press the amendment against the sense of the Committee.

Mr. LAURIER. Even as respects the judgment, I am sorry my hon. friend does not insist upon the whole trial and judgment being rendered in the same place.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will now move the next amendment of which I have given notice :

Subject to the provisions of the next succeeding section, the trial of every election petition shall be commenced within six months from the time when the petition was presented, and shall be proceeded with from day to day until such trial is over, unless on application, supported by affidavit, it is shown the requirements of justice render it necessary that a postponement of the case should take place.

Then the next section will read :

In case the member elected is entitled to take his seat, the trial shall not been commenced during any session of Parliament; and in the computation of any time or delay allowed for any steps or proceedings in respect of such, or the commencement thereof as aforesaid, the time occupied by such session of Parliament shall not be included.

That is the law now, because if there are six months before you try a man, and Parliament sits, as this has, during five months, there is no time for trying him at all.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that an unmixed evil?

Mr. McCARTHY. I was going to ask whether members in the House against whom there are election petitions are competent to take part in this discussion?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask if those who are not petitioned against are competent to take part in this discussion, because I notice they are anxious to make the law more stringent than it is.

Mr. McCARTHY. The law at present is in a very unsatisfactory state. The law at first says the petition shall be tried within six months; it then says that during a session of Parliament, if it be necessary that a member should be present at the trial, the time of the session shall not be counted. Now, as a matter of fact, it is always necessary, but as the law does not say so, it is better to put it in black and white that the time of the session should not be counted. The result at present is that you have to make application for the trial, and the sitting member comes forward and says: I require to be present; and the judge has got to hear the point argued, and determine whether his presence is necessary, and if so, then the time does not count. If that does not take place, the time runs.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not see the necessity for the amendment. Any party to a petition can make an application to have the time enlarged.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; it has been decided otherwise in the Kingston case and two or three other cases. He cannot move on grounds unless he has asked for a trial and the respondent has said he wants to be present. The judge, therefore, postpones the trial on that account. I propose to say that during the session of Parliament the time shall not run. Then, no case will be tried, no application will be necessary, and the time will be counted out in the six months. No hon. member wants to be tried during a session of Parliament. The decision I have referred to was given by the Supreme Court in the Glengarry case.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman says that a judge will not consider an application for a petition unless there has been a motion for a trial.

Mr. McCARTHY. If you apply after six months for an extension of time the court would

want to know if within the six months the sitting member raised the point that his presence at the trial was necessary. The jurisdiction is gone otherwise. If the trial is not to take place during the session of Parliament the six months does not count.

Mr. MULOCK. You are asking for legislation on the ground of some decision.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will make it like the Mowat law, if that will suit you.

Mr. MULOCK. I will decide for myself. I would like to see the decision to the effect that the judge could not extend the time.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said he would not.

Mr. MULOCK. That decision I should like to see. I should like the amendment deferred until I see the authority.

Mr. McCARTHY. The law practically says that a man shall not be tried within six months. But the party is put to the expense of going through the ceremony of having a date fixed for the trial, of showing cause, and of coming forward and asking for postponement, because he has to attend to his parliamentary duties. That is a farce it is no use going through.

Mr. MULOCK. It is not much of a farce.

Mr. CASEY. The time of a session should not count.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The adoption of this amendment would make a man lie under petition for 12 months. You can move before the six months have expired to have the time extended. Otherwise, a man petitioned against in April would be liable to proceedings during the whole 12 months.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is in favour of members of Parliament that there should be no trial during the parliamentary session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is one view which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has not considered, I think ; but if he has, I should like to hear his views. The effect of the present law has been fully stated. The application to set down the case for trial must take place within six months, after which the petitioner is out of court. When it takes place within six months it is incumbent on the respondent to show that his presence at the trial is necessary, and he desires a postponement. The effect of the amendment will be to take away the right which is given under the present law of having the case promptly tried.

Mr. McCARTHY. Undoubtedly.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The amendment would compel the parties to wait until after the session of Parliament. It was, therefore, questionable whether we had not better leave the law as it is. If he is willing to take the trial, I do not see why he should not be allowed to do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. On theory that is sound. In practice, however, we find that no man wishes to do so, and no attempt is made. In all the petitions entered, not a single attempt had been made to fix a day for trial, not one in Ontario at least. I think it is looked upon practically in the profession as useless to attempt it, because the application would certainly meet with the opposition of the sitting member on the ground that he must attend to his parliamentary duties. I have no objection to leave the law as it is ; but all these applications add to the cost and trouble.

Mr. CHARLTON. In my opinion we had better leave the law as it is. If the date of trial falls during the session of Parliament, application can be made for an extension of time. The probability, however, is that no trial will fall during the session. Should it do so, the remedy can easily be applied. I agree with the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) that it would be absurd to make an arrangement by which the trial would be held over a member's head for a year by not counting in the time the session runs. I am convinced the law is better as it is now.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman thinks the amendment is absurd. I think his contention is still more absurd, because it is possible to keep a petition for a year over our heads by going through the process of obtaining an extension. I do not see any hardship to anybody in postponing the trial. I am sure no member of this House wants to subscribe to the proposition that he would like to see the law in such a shape that by keeping Parliament sitting for six or seven months he could prevent his petition coming to trial.

Mr. DICKEY. There is another view too, and that is, the petitioner in these matters has rights as well as the respondent. It may not be that the respondent can state under oath that his presence at the trial is absolutely necessary. So the petitioner makes his motion for his trial immediately, and it is not only for the sitting member to state that Parliament is sitting, but he must go further and swear that his presence is absolutely necessary at the trial. There may be many cases where he can go to a speedy trial.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. McCARTHY. I move that the following section be added as section 13 :—

If the appeal as provided by the said Act is made to the Supreme Court of Canada, the judge shall make the report and certificate required by sections 44 and 45 of the said Act, to the Supreme Court of Canada, and the same shall form part of the record in the said matter to be presented to the said court on said appeal.

Mr. LAURIER. That is to say, providing the two judges agree there shall be an appeal, but that if they do not agree there shall be no appeal.

Mr. McCARTHY. This is contemplating an appeal. In some instances that I know of when the judge has disqualified, the record does not come to the Supreme Court, because they only deal with the questions of law before them. What I propose is that in that case the report shall be made to the Supreme Court instead of to the Speaker of the House, and that the registrar of the Supreme Court shall finally report to the Speaker.

Mr. LAURIER. That is fair enough.

Mr. McCARTHY. Going back now to clause 6, I propose now to strike out an appeal on questions of fact, and leave an appeal simply on matters of law. I believe, as far as the province from which I come is concerned, that the public is perfectly satisfied with the decision of two judges on questions of facts. Gentlemen from the other provinces can say what they think of the matter.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is hardly in accordance with the law of the British realm that the subject should be denied the right of appeal. If we want an appeal I do not think my friend should step in to deny it.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no appeal in England, and there are British subjects there.

Mr. MULOCK. We know that the advantages of appeal on questions of fact are very limited, but still there is a kind of appeal in regard to facts, which should be continued. For example, we know that the appellate judges will not ordinarily review findings on questions of facts, but we understand their rule to be that they will draw inferences, and if the judges at the trial have drawn a wrong inference from the admitted facts, the judges of the Court of Appeal are free to draw the correct inference. I think that this should be left open to them still, and I do not think it is necessary to legislate to say that there shall be no appeal. I remember that the Supreme Court reversed the decision of the Court of Appeal in the South Ontario Dominion contested election case. In that case, whilst not overruling the judge below on the findings of fact, they drew different inferences, and, therefore, reversed the judgment of the Court of Appeal.

Mr. CASEY. I think my hon. friend forgets that now we have two judges instead of one, and the case in which different inferences were drawn by the Supreme Court from the court below was one in which only one judge presided. If we have two judges who must agree in order to unseat a man, we may trust that the inferences which they draw from the facts will be quite as correct as the inferences drawn by the Court of Appeal. I quite agree with what has been already said that permission to appeal at all can only lead to increased expense. I do not see any use in appealing questions of fact unless you re-examine witnesses in the presence of the court to which you appeal, because the judges who hear the facts are undoubtedly better qualified to find on the facts than any other court can be from a written copy of the evidence. I think, therefore, the best way out of the difficulty is to adopt the proposed amendment; for, under the clause as it stands, a man with two judges in his favour might be subjected to further proceedings, while a man with only one judge in his favour might be finally cleared. If you do not see fit to provide for an appeal in both cases, I think it is best to provide for no appeal in either case.

Mr. DAVIN. I am opposed to doing away with the appeal, partly on the ground stated in such sounding phrases by my hon. friend from North Norfolk. I yield to no one in my respect for the bench of Canada; all over the Dominion we have a bench of which we may well be proud; but I do not think our judges are exactly of the same build as the judges on the English bench, who are lawyers before everything else, generally speaking, being men who have devoted themselves entirely to law.

Mr. LAURIER. What of our judges?

Mr. DAVIN. Our judges are men who have devoted themselves partly to law and partly to politics, and who are sometimes politicians before they are lawyers. Although in any given case I believe that two of our judges would decide on fact and law according to their consciences, yet where there might be a close balance between the parties, and where a few decisions might determine whether the parties would or would not cross the House, the judges, being human, might be influenced by the atmosphere around them and the impending possibilities in politics. Therefore, from the peculiar nature of our political, social and legal life, an appeal in this country is of more importance than an appeal in England. I had in my earlier days an opportunity of knowing and studying the characters of the judges in England, and I know that a judge in England is as a rule law from head to toe—law, law, law.

Mr. MASSON. I agree with a great deal of what has been said as to the right of a person charged with any offence and incurring penalties, to have an appeal; but in case of a trial by two judges, I think that if the two judges agree that the charges are not made out, and that the sitting member has been duly elected, their decision should be final. If, on the other hand, they agree that he has been guilty of the charges made against him, and that he is improperly returned, I think it is only right that he should if he chooses seek a higher tribunal to rid himself of the odium which their judgment has cast upon him and the penalties and costs to which it has subjected him.

Mr. McLEOD. I think that in this case the right of appeal should be allowed. While I agree with the conclusions drawn by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I do not exactly agree with his reasons therefor. I believe our judges are good lawyers, and devoted to law; but from various causes I think there are stronger reasons for an appeal here than in England. I think at all events, as it is admitted that there should be an appeal in matters of law, that the appeal should cover the whole case. I have a great deal of faith in the right of a man to have his case tried by the highest court of the country, more especially should this be the case where the seat of a member of Parliament is attacked. Therefore, I think where the two judges agree there should be an appeal. It is different where the judges do not agree. In that case there is no decision whatever, and, of course, no judgment to appeal from.

Mr. LAURIER. It is universally conceded in all civilized countries that courts of appeal are an absolute necessity in the administration of justice. There is no country in the world where the judgment of the first instance is final in all cases. Is there any reason why in cases affecting the political and civil standing of a man, possibly even his rights as citizen of a country, the ordinary rule should be departed from? If you sue a man for $500 in any of the provinces of the Dominion, at all events in Quebec and I believe also in Ontario, he is judged in the first instance, then he has an appeal to the Court of Appeal of his own province, and then an appeal to the Supreme Court and in some instances to the Privy Council. In these election trials before two judges, if the case is open to doubt, there is no appeal, but if the case is so clear that they agree you have an appeal. There is no logic in that, no common sense either. At all events, it is not safe that rights so important as these should be determined finally on a hearing before two judges.

Mr. McCARTHY. Personally I have no very strong feeling one way or the other. Professionally I have a very strong feeling in favour of appeals. But all the same I am quite satisfied of this: Of the enormous cost of election trials, the greater portion arises in the printing of a tremendous book of argument for the Supreme Court. The only reason, in my judgment, why there should be an appeal on questions of law, is that ours is a federal system, and the judges of one province may determine the law differently from those of another, so that it is well the Supreme Court should settle the law for all the provinces. On questions of fact, however, the expense is tremendous, and nobody can complain that unless two judges concur in saying a member is guilty by himself or agents, he retains his seat, and it is only in that event he can have the right to appeal. Surely, that ought to be satisfactory enough. However, I bow to the general feeling expressed all round from the different provinces with regard to the right they think there should be for an appeal. I only draw attention to this fact that the first trial is expensive enough; but if there is to be an appeal, the cost to be saddled on the litigant will amount really to his ruin.

Mr. CASEY. It gives an enormous advantage to the man who has the longest purse or the strongest backing. I am with the hon. member in thinking there is no necessity for any appeal at all, but if there should be an appeal, I think the suggestion of the hon. member for North Grey comes in very well, that it should be only in the case where judgment goes against the member who may be looked upon in the same light as a convicted criminal because he is subjected to penalties on account of the judgment going against him. Any man who is convicted and whose rights are in danger through the judgment might have the right to appeal, if an appeal be at all granted. The law proposed by the Minister of Justice will give an appeal only where the judges are unanimous and refuse one where there is reason to doubt what the decision should be. That is wholly illogical. Every lawyer seems to see an insuperable difficulty in obtaining an appeal where no decision has been given. That arises from their purely technical way of looking at the matter. They look at it as lawyers and not as legislators. They do not realize, although there is no means of having such an appeal at present, it is within their power as legislators to provide machinery for an appeal; or if they do not choose to call it an appeal, for getting a decision from another court on the same set of facts. I do not see what difficulty there would be in providing that in every case where the judges disagree, if you are going to have an appeal at all, the evidence should be submitted to a higher court for decision, so that you would have an actual decision of some court on the point raised. It is very likely in most cases that the judges will disagree, and that therefore the object of obtaining a judicial decision upon the acts of the candidate is not attained, through no decision being had. The simplest way would have been to provide, in the first instance, that three judges should sit, and the decision of the majority prevail.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the subject is too important to be dealt with on such short notice. We had better take a little time to consider it. I therefore move that the Committee rise and report progress.

Mr. MULOCK. I intend moving an amendment that every petition be accompanied by an affidavit of *bonâ fides*.

Mr. CASEY. I propose to move an amendment in connection with clause 6. A great defect of the present law consists in the fact that the penalties provided for use of corrupt means are not enforced. Very few cases come to light except through the confession of the party himself who is protected by the certificate of the court; and even where other cases come to light, nobody proceeds against the offender. The party successful in the trial has nothing to complain of, and the defeated party is unwilling to prosecute the offender for fear of exciting animosity. It should be the duty of some officials appointed by the Government to prosecute the offender in every case. I, therefore, propose to move:

That the Governor in Council shall name or appoint an officer, whose duty it shall be to prosecute such parties as have been found guilty, during the trial of an election petition, of any corrupt practices, and who have not received a certificate from the court, for the enforcement of the penalties to which they have become liable under this Act.

Committee rose and reported progress.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. TISDALE. With the permission of the House I wish to make a personal explanation. I notice in the Ottawa *Free Press*, a newspaper published in this city, the following article in to-day's edition, headed "A Whitewashing Report." After reporting the proceedings of the Cochrane Committee, of which I am the chairman, that newspaper thus alludes to the meeting the Committee held in the evening with closed doors:

"A WHITEWASHING REPORT.

"In the evening the Committee met again, when Col. Tisdale, the chairman, presented a cut and dried draft report, completely exonerating Mr. Cochrane from all blame. It was evident that this report had been prepared by Mr. Osler, counsel for Mr. Cochrane, the language being almost identical with that used by Mr. Osler in his address. Even the William Johnson charge was reported disproved, although all the evidence on that charge has not been heard. This showed clearly that Col. Tisdale's draft report had been prepared before the Committee's decision re the Johnson charge had been reached. When the Colonel's attention was called to this he had the clause relating to the Johnson charge struck out. Messrs. Cameron, Mulock and German will not accept the Osler report, but will prepare a minority report, pointing out what charges have been proved."

Again in the same paper of to-day I find, in regard to another meeting, the following:—

"The Cochrane Committee met this afternoon to consider the report to be made to the House of Commons. It is admitted that the report submitted by Lieut.-Colonel Tisdale last night was prepared by Mr. Osler, counsel for Mr. Cochrane, and that it was prepared before yesterday's discussion. In other words, the lawyer employed by the accused member prepared the judgment of the court before the evidence was completed. And that report not only exonerates Mr. Cochrane, but declares that the committee which sold appointments on the Murray Canal, and which was duly recognized by Mr. Cochrane, did perfectly right in extorting campaign funds from applicants for offices. In other words Col. Tisdale and his Conservative colleagues justify and approve the sale of public offices for campaign funds. They defend crime on grounds of public policy. There is little doubt that the whitewashing report will be agreed to by Sir A. P. Caron and Messrs. Tisdale, Skinner and White, of Shelburne, while Messrs. Mulock, Cameron and German will sign a

report setting forth the facts as proved by sworn testimony."

Now, I wish to say in regard to the allegation made in these articles that Mr. Osler prepared that report, that it is an unmitigated falsehood, and further that I never had a single word in reference to the investigation or any matter connected with it, with Mr. Osler. In regard to the balance of the charges, of course, I cannot say anything as to what transpired in the Committee, but they must be untrue, because no member of that Committee, I am sure, would commit such a gross breach of privilege as to mention to anybody what had occurred with closed doors. I will say in conclusion that the time has come when I think something should be done with these papers to teach them that they cannot make such charges with impunity against members of this House.

SUPPLY--CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Public Buildings, Quebec..... $103,300

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he is in a position to give the House any assurance that the expenses connected with these post offices will not be so excessive as those connected with the erection of the Napanee post office, for instance. When the item was first brought down for the construction of that office, we had the most positive assurance from the Minister of Public Works that the cost of that building would only be $25,000, and it has cost $48,000. I would like to know if the experience we have had in the construction of the Napanee post office is going to be repeated in connection with the post offices at St. Henri, St. Hyacinthe and other places in Quebec, and whether the contracts have been let for the completion of these buildings or only for a portion of the work, and whether we shall have to vote other large sums for the inside fittings, the same as we have done in other cases. In my opinion the system should be abolished at once, and the entire contract should be let for a definite sum, and the Government should be called to complete the building for that sum and to take such precautionary steps as to secure that end, so that the estimate should in no case be exceeded.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not possible to make a hard and fast declaration that in no case will the original estimates be exceeded, and no practical man would make such a promise, because it is impossible to know at the beginning what changes may be found necessary. For instance, you may have certain information with reference to the class of building which is necessary, and you go upon that, but after a time it may transpire, when better information is given, that in some particulars it would be advantageous to make certain changes. I think no practical builder would say that in every case he will make no changes at all. There may be errors of calculation with reference to the foundation; it may be found when you come to make excavations to prepare the foundation, that the soil or rock may be different from what was expected, and in these cases it is not necessary to go by the distinct letter of the first plan, when that information was not obtainable. But I entirely agree with my hon. friend in stating that the original estimates should be made as carefully as possible, and when once they are made, no changes should be made, nor should the original plan be departed from, unless there are the best reasons to give to Parliament for so doing. I am sure nothing more could be stated by a practical builder, or by a Minister. Then with reference to the extreme cost of some of these buildings, I am sorry that such extreme cost was incurred. I think in some cases, that one especially, and some others could be mentioned, it is fair to suppose that for one reason or another the ultimate cost was far beyond what was anticipated at first, and far beyond what the necessities of the case would demand. However, I am not the Minister of Public Works. Our endeavour will be made in three directions: First, to accommodate the style and plan of the building to the population and resources and needs of the place in which it is built; second, to be careful as to the calculations for the original estimates and not to exceed those unless the very best of reasons occur as to why they should be exceeded; and third, to keep down the expenditure for incidentals and extras as far as is consistent with the proper supervision and completion of the work.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says he is not Minister of Public Works, and, if he will pardon me for saying so, it is just as well he is not. His notions of the duties of a Minister of Public Works appear to be so lax that I am afraid in the administration of that department he would not prove so great a success as he has in finance. The hon. gentleman made a speech in which he commenced by saying that is was impossible to force things, that a plan would not require to be changed. I can understand that in very heavy work which would involve hundreds and thousands of dollars which might be carried on at the bottom of a river there was sometimes occasion to make changes: but when you have to construct a building such as this Napanee post office, estimated at $25,000 at first, how can it be argued that the plans and specifications cannot be prepared so as to meet the estimate, how can it be at all difficult to keep within it. I can understand there may be a change made in detail. That is possible, but it is possible on very rare occasions. The hon. gentleman says that no change should take place except for the very best reasons. What are the very best reasons? If you admit that such changes can be made for the very best of reasons, you at once open the door to changes being made. I do not admit that such changes should be made. I admit that changes equal to 2 or 3 per cent. might not be objectionable, but it must be manifest to every hon. gentleman that when a contract is given for a lump sum, I do not care whether for a large or small sum, if afterwards the building doubles the amount set down at first, there must be laxity somewhere in practice. I will not charge bad faith; but simply from an engineering point of view, if the estimate is found to be so far wrong from the total amount at first intended to be expended, there must be some laxity in practice and it must be manifest to the Minister of Public Works that his engineers cannot be depended on. The Minister is not to draw up the plans and specifications, but he has to rely on his engineers; but if he finds the plans submitted to him do not agree with the estimates prepared by the engineers, and that double that

amount calculated by the engineers has to be expended on the work, he must be satisfied that the engineers are not competent, or must be something worse.

Public Buildings, N.W.T.....$102,310

Mr. CHARLTON. I move that the following words be added to the motion:—

That appropriations for the erection of post office buildings shall in future be made on an uniform rule having regard to postal revenues of the town or city in which such building is to be erected and when public convenience requires such building and when the importance of the town where it is proposed to erect such post office building warrants the expense.

Mr. BOWELL. There are many cases in which the postal revenue is not the most important one. It often occurs in erecting public buildings that the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments are more important than the Post Office Department. There are many places in which the post office receipts may be very small and in which the postmaster is paid by fees; but the revenue arising from the Customs and Inland Revenue may be of such importance as to necessitate increased accommodation, not only for the collectors of each department but for a number of clerks in addition. If the erection of public buildings is to be based exclusively on postal revenue, then such a system will necessitate probably the erection of two or three buildings, two at least, one for post office accommodation which would not require an expenditure of more than $5,000 or $6,000, for which a very respectable building might be erected if it were devoted exclusively to post office purposes. Then another building would be required for the other two departments, or accommodation would have to be rented. I scarcely think the hon. member for North Norfolk has given the subject that consideration which it deserves. If this system is to apply to all branches of the service in reference to building accommodation there might be some reason in it, and even then it does not follow that these should be the exclusive reasons for the erection of public buildings. They have to be erected in accordance with the places in which they are required, and have to be somewhat in accord with the character of the buildings in that particular locality. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the expenditure in many places has not been greater in the erection of these buildings than might perhaps be justifiable under all Governments.

Mr. LAURIER. Speak for yourself.

Mr. BOWELL. I have had sufficient experience in this House and as a public man to be able to speak respecting the Government of which the leader of the Opposition was a member with as good reasons and as much force as with respect to the Government with which I have been connected. I may say to the hon. gentleman that there have been some buildings constructed by the Government of which he was a member respecting which the greatest complaints as to their erection and what was termed the mean character of their appearance came from that side of the House. A member called the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that the public building which had been erected in his town—one of the most important in western Ontario—was of a character that ought never have been erected, and he hoped that no public building should be put up so cheaply and meanly as that. I am referring now to the hon. member for Brant. So that there is such a thing as going too far in one direction, as there is in going too far in another direction. The amendment is not only useless, but it would be inoperative; therefore I see no good reason for adopting it by the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I am disposed to agree with my hon. friend to a certain extent in some things which he has said: that Governments, even when they are Liberal Governments, may be liable to temptation. Of course, I cannot say so much as to Conservative Governments, but I go so far as to say that even Liberal Governments may be liable to temptation, and it is because men are fallible that we want as much as possible to preclude the causes of temptation. The hon. gentleman himself admits that in the past this class of expenditure has been liable to abuse, and so it has. The hon. gentleman has been forced to admit during the present session that some of these public buildings had been erected where really there was no cause whatever for the erection of such buildings; and where no cause could be found for the erection of them except simply that it was to favour some political follower of the Government. On the other hand, public buildings had been refused for places in which public buildings may have been necessary and were refused, because it so happened that the political complexion of the place was an objection. It is proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) that the erection of these buildings shall be henceforth, not left to the caprice of the Government or not left to the influence of the member, but shall be decided on an uniform standard, which shall be known and shall be established as the law of the land. I can conceive no other object but the collection of revenue which calls for this kind of building. I admit no other reason. There can be but one reason for the erection of a public building and that is the collection of revenue. It may be revenue from the post office, or from the Customs or from Inland Revenue, or all three combined; but at all events the only reason why such expenditure can be justified is the necessity of collecting public revenue in that locality. If that be the rule, and I think there can be no other just one, there must be a maximum and a minimum of revenue which can justify any locality being favoured by any such public buildings, and the revenue should reach a certain point before any locality should have a public building at all. If the hon. gentlemen were to admit that rule, if it were insisted on that no locality would be entitled to have any public building where the revenues of the Government would not be $10,000 or $20,000 or $40,000—I leave that to the judgment of hon. gentlemen opposite—if it were understood that no locality would be favoured with a building unless the revenue derived from all sources should reach a certain figure, then the Government would free themselves at once from many opportunities, and they would be no longer liable to such reproaches as they have been subjected to, and which they have to endure because they are well founded. We have passed appropriations to build certain post offices in certain localities where the building of these post offices could not be justified upon any reason whatever. What is the reason that the

Government has consented to give a post office building to certain places, which I will not name at this moment, but which I have in my mind and which they no doubt have in their mind? There is no reason but the importunity of their followers. Had it not been for that the expenditure would not have been placed upon the country. Therefore, the moment we have it well understood as the rule of the Government that no place is to have a public building unless they can show by figures they are entitled to it, it would be a law which would operate in the future to the advantage of all Governments, whichever they may be.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that any resolution upon the subject ought be a little more carefully considered than this one, because I think the hon. gentleman has probably drawn it hastily, and that he will see himself that it hardly fits the case. The Minister of Customs has given some of the reasons why it does not do so, but another reason that might be mentioned is the peculiar language of it in which it seeks to control future appropriations by this Parliament. It does not even propose to lay down a rule or affirm a principle, or even to say that a rule ought to be laid down, but it says that future appropriations of this Parliament should be guided by some rule. Parliament from time to time must be the absolute judge of the appropriations it shall make at each session, and in every case a resolution which seeks to control the future action of Parliament—and this does nothing else—I submit, is a resolution that would be practically inoperative and would not be a good form to adopt. I think it would be better that the subject should be further considered and the resolution not pressed at this stage.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose it is competent for this House to adopt rules which may be repealed by the House itself. Of course this motion, if adopted, would remain in force until some future Parliament rescinds it. As the Minister says, this amendment was perhaps hastily drawn, but it might be amended to cover the class of public buildings in which, as the Minister of Customs suggests, the combined revenue might be considered. The motion covers the case of post offices. Many post offices have been erected that are not designed for any other purpose but the use of the Post Office Department, and abuses have occurred in connection with the erection of public buildings for this purpose.

Mr. BOWELL. It is only in large cities.

Mr. CHARLTON. Post offices have been erected in small towns. I have in my mind a case where a post office has been erected in a town of only 800 inhabitants and where the revenue is only $600 or $700 a year. We have been considering appropriations for the erection of post offices in towns that are not entitled to these buildings.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope my hon. friend is not making a speech. My hon. friend knows as an old parliamentarian that the moving of the resolution precludes him from making a subsequent speech.

Mr. CHARLTON. Very well, Mr. Speaker, I trust I have conveyed my views to the House.

Mr. FLINT. I gather from the tone of the observations of the Minister of Justice that he is inclined to think the principle suggested by this resolution has sufficient merit in it, at any rate to warrant a little consideration, and I believe that the principle must, from the experience of hon. gentlemen opposite, demand from them serious consideration. Apart from the detriment to the public interest, which has been so ably demonstrated by the hon. leader of the Opposition, I think it will no doubt be admitted by our friends opposite that they themselves and the treasury have been to a large degree the victims of the unfortunate habit which the people of the country have got into in connection with appropriations for post offices and other public buildings. I think it is not necessary to enlarge upon the numerous political difficulties which this loose and hap-hazard manner of making apropriations has created hitherto. We know that in the cases named by the hon. leader of the Opposition, where appropriations could not be justified on their merits, they have been justified almost solely on the ground that other towns of no greater importance and with perhaps not as strong political claims, have received these public buildings; and an amount of jealousy and heart-burning and political immorality has been engendered on account of these political appropriations which has done a great deal of harm to the public service. I think the Government themselves would be relieved of a vast mass of importunity if they would adopt some definite system with reference to the erection of public buildings. I admit that my hon. friend's resolution does not perhaps cover all the details of this question. No doubt other public buildings than those in connection with the Post Office Department are to be considered in adopting any general rule, as many towns and cities require accommodation for other departments; yet there can be scarcely two opinions that public life would be more endurable, particularly to the Government, if a hard and fast rule were laid down, after due consideration, based upon some principle, on which appropriations for public buildings shall be made. Owing to the Government giving way to political exigencies or to the pressure of individuals, a great deal of injury and injustice is done. I have in my mind a case in which the friends of the Government pressed strongly upon them for a public building, and the Government acceded to their request, which I believe was put upon the ground that other places no more important had received public buildings. Land was purchased for it; yet subsequently, for reasons which I am not prepared to criticise just now, the Government did not construct the building, but delayed the work. In the meantime the political complexion of the constituency changed, and all further expenditure for that building was dropped, or postponed for a longer period. On the face of the record here was a community with claims for the erection of a public building; and the Government, whether properly or not, are charged with having acted on political grounds; and it forms a legitimate subject of attack on the Government and the purity of our institutions that it has not been proceeded with. I trust that the Government will take into consideration the reasonable proposition of the hon. member for North Norfolk between now and the next sitting of this Parliament, and see whether they cannot adopt some principle which shall be satisfactory to the country and have the effect of saving a large amount of money in the way of appropriations for public buildings, which are too often used by

people engaged in the elections as so much political gain. These buildings are often promised on the eve of elections, on the word of the candidate or without the word of the candidate; and a great deal of unpleasant feeling is aroused and severe observations are made upon the Government, perhaps undeserved, in consequence of their not fulfilling these promises. I believe that a large amount of political corruption would be avoided and a large amount of money would be saved to the public by the adoption of some such definite rule as my hon. friend proposes.

Amendment negatived on division.

Prince Albert Crown Lands and Timber Agent's Office..... $6,000

Mr. LAURIER. Is that for new offices?

Mr. FOSTER. For a registry office. The two are combined.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the Government's policy now with regard to the homestead provisions in the North-West? Do they retain the same regulations and rules as formerly with regard to odd sections in townships open to homesteaders and other sections open for sale, and what are the prices of public lands in different sections of the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Every even numbered section is a homestead section. The odd numbers are offered for sale unless reserved for railways, The prices for all Government land outside of the railway belt and inside of the railway belt, is $3 an acre.

Mr. CHARLTON. That applies to lands on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway and without reference to distance from the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Do the Government find that the price of $3 per acre is one likely to induce settlement? It is a higher price than the American Government ask, almost three times as high. It strikes me that the policy pursued by the Government with reference to our public lands in the North-West has been radically wrong from the outset. Their homestead policy is wrong. The prices for our public lands are too high. The policy of homesteading by alternate sections is not calculated to induce settlement to the extent it would if public lands were open to be homesteaded without reference to location. The policy pursued by the American Government in seeking for settlement under their homestead law, was to permit homestead settlers to homestead public lands wherever found, and by that means form continuous settlements.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is speaking twice. I am not going to raise objections, but draw his attention to the fact.

Mr. CHARLTON. Can you only speak once on concurrence?

Mr. FOSTER. He is not at liberty to make two speeches on the one item.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman asked a question which the Minister of the Interior answered, and, therefore, I do not intend to enforce the rule.

Mr. CHARLTON. This is another item, and not the item of post office buildings.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not rule that the hon. gentleman cannot speak on this item after having spoken on the item of post office buildings; but he asked the Minister of the Interior a question to which the hon. Minister replied. Strictly speaking, according to the rule, I presume my hon. friend would be precluded from speaking, but as he is dealing with a reply which the Minister of the Interior made to his question, I will not enforce the rule.

Mr. CHARLTON. I forgot that we are not in committee, but with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will make the few remarks I wish to make on this matter. It is a matter of a very great importance to the country. The settlement of the North-West has not been very rapid. That country has an enormous agricultural and mineral wealth. It is a country with a great future before it and in which we ought to have many more inhabitants than are there now. It will be a source of food supply for many millions of the human race, and our policy should be to secure its rapid settlement. I do not think it is a matter of such importance how much revenue the hon. gentleman derives from the sales of the lands as to get the lands settled and derive from Customs duties on the importations used by these settlers a larger revenue than would be from the sale of the lands. We have been for many years, and still are, a competitor of the United States in the obtaining of immigrants and placing them upon new lands. We are placed at a disadvantage in this competition by the fact that the United States public domain is nearer the market and more accessible than our own. The public lands in Dakota and Minnesota are more easily reached than those in Alberta and the Saskatchewan, or even Manitoba. This being the case, we ought at least to have made the inducements to settlers as great as those offered by the American Government. We ought to have made them greater inducements, but certainly as great. Contrast our homestead policy with theirs. The Americans offer their public lands for homestead settlement wherever they are: the homesteaders can go in and take a whole township and have a solid continuous homestead settlement without a single break in section, except one or two in a township reserved for school purposes. There is greater inducement under that system than under our checker-board system, where every alternate section is either reserved for sale or granted to a railway company. In this way we have suffered serious loss to the settlement of the country by not offering homestead settlers the inducements that our competitor and rival offers them. Then with regard to the price of public lands. In the United States the price within what is known as the railway belt, where the odd sections have been granted to railways, is $2.50 per acre, but outside of the railway belts it is $1.25 per acre. Now, while the American Government is selling to the settler who is not a homestead settler public lands at $1.25 per acre my hon. friend is selling the same kind of lands at $3 per acre. Well, the inducements are all on the side of the American Government. If a settler wishes to purchase, he can go to Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, Idaho, wherever he chooses, and obtain public lands at $1.25 per acre, but in our Canadian

North-West he will have to pay $3 per acre, and this difference in price itself would, in the majority of cases, determine the settler as to which country he will go to. I do not believe our policy is a judicious one. I have always held that we should in the first place restrict the sale of public lands to the wants of the actual settler. We ought to restrict the sale of land to the amount the settler will occupy, whatever that might be. In the next place we ought to offer that on as favourable terms as the United States offer. If we fail to do this we are carrying out a policy the results of which will not be as satisfactory as they would be if our terms were more liberal than those of the United States. In our North-West we have given away I do not know how many million of acres for railway purposes. My hon. friend promised to bring down a return of the amount, but he has not yet done so; but we have given a very large proportion of our public domain away. Now the balance of that land we want to have settled. We have a little fraction of it under cultivation this year and are going to have a score of millions of bushels of wheat to send to the markets of the world. If we had half a million or three-quarters of a million people there, if we had three or four times the area under cultivation that we now have, we would have, not twenty but eighty million bushels of wheat for export, which would make a vast difference to the country. My hon. friend should have adopted the most liberal land policy for the purpose of producing this result, instead of asking $3 per acre for land which the United States offer at $1.25 per acre. This policy by which the land is divided into a checker-board gives settlers the privilege to homestead alternate sections, while the United States give them the privilege to homestead public lands wherever it can be found. The difference in the policy of the two countries is telling against us as our census shows, and as every man whose eyes are opened to the conditions in the North-West and the progress of the country is perfectly aware of. I take the occasion to refer to this matter in the hope that the Minister of the Interior who is well acquainted with the North-West, its capabilities and resources of all kinds, both agricultural, mineral and timber, will see fit to inaugurate a more liberal policy and one better calculated to secure to that country what is its great want, settlers to bring the land under cultivation.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I presume the hon. gentleman's policy would be to throw the odd numbered sections open for homesteading, as well as the even numbered, because that is the policy of the United States. I do not think the tax-payers of the eastern part of Canada will agree to that policy. When the Canadian Pacific Railway was being built they were told that the odd numbered sections, or a certain portion of them, would be kept in order to pay for the construction of the road, and it is too late in the day to change that policy now, that would be breaking faith with the people of Canada. In regard to the price of land, it is my impression that we have been holding our land too low. I do not think we appreciate the value of our land. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken in regard to the price of land in the United States. But whether they have got any now or not, or whether they are selling any now or not, I think is a great question, because I think it has been pretty nearly all appropriated both for settlement and for sale, and they have to utilize the dryest portions of their territory because their good land is pretty well all gone. I was comparing the price of land all over the world and in British colonies, a few days ago, and I found that even at $3 per acre we are to-day selling our lands cheaper than any colony of Great Britain. My impression is that we have been making light of the value of our land. Our homestead laws are just as liberal as those of the United States, and even more so. Our present policy has been followed for years, the country has become acquainted with it, and it would be impossible to change it, if we would keep faith with the people.

Mr. LAURIER. Then we are to understand that the Government are satisfied with their policy, that, judging by the results of the census, they are determined to persevere in the policy of the last ten years. The hon. gentleman says that to change the policy now would be breaking faith with the tax-payers of Canada. The truth is that to adhere to his policy is breaking faith with the tax-payers. We have been induced to incur an enormous debt on behalf of the North-West, and the statement has been made again and again on the floor of this House that the sale of lands in the North-West Territories would pay for the increased debt.

Mr. FOSTER. So it will.

Mr. LAURIER. Present prospects are not in that direction. We have heard that statement before. We all remember that in 1884, and in 1881, Sir Charles Tupper made a declaration that by the year 1891, in which we are now, the sale of land alone would average $90,000,000. Where are we to-day in respect to that matter? And after such an experience the hon. gentleman still says that he is satisfied with his policy, and still thinks that the land will pay for the debt. I hope that his expectations will be realized, but if his prophecy is to prove true, it is not by following the mistaken policy that has produced such barren results. If that land is to pay for the enormous increase of our debt, we must reverse our policy. We were led to expect some years ago that by this time we would have a million inhabitants in those vast territories, but every promise held out to us in that direction has been proven false. To-day the only course for us to take is to retrace our steps and to adopt the policy suggested by my hon. friend. It must be obvious to every man that to continue to sell our land at $3 an acre, when immigrants in Europe can have just as good land at $1.25 on the other side of the line, is a policy which will continue to produce deplorable results.

Mr. TROW. The system adopted by the Government is evidently erroneous. In the United States the upset price of land is at $1.25 per acre; in the course of five years these lands are revalued and are then sold for 75 cents an acre, and in the course of five years more they are sold for 50 cents an acre, just the reverse of the policy of our Government. Our Government saw that the land increased in value on account of the settlement, and they consequently raised the price instead of reducing it. I think any government that wishes to settle that country should sell the land upon the most reasonable terms. We know that a new

settler is generally not able to pay much for his land. If they settle upon those lands and attain to eligible positions, they become consumers and add to the revenue of the country by paying taxes. I think if our lands were even given away to settlers it would conduce to the prosperity of this country. At present we have millions of acres in Manitoba and the North-West lying idle and useless, and I have always held that we should not merely encourage settlers to come in and buy those lands, but that it would be advantageous even to give them away for actual settlement.

Mr. DAVIN. It is difficult to understand the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite, and it is difficult to escape from the opinion that they are using words dubiously. What does the hon. gentleman mean by saying that settlers going in there pay $1 an acre for their land? We give the land free to a settler that goes in to the North-West; all it costs him is about $10 for 160 acres. The notion that you could settle up the North-West at $1 an acre, which was the notion of hon. gentlemen when they were in power, was proved to be perfectly absurd. How did that eventuate? It eventuated in hon. gentlemen, some of whom are sitting now on those benches, going up to the North-West and buying vast tracts of land at $1 an acre, which was the amount at which they were selling their land, withholding it from settlement in order to get a high price, and they have made large sums of money in consequence of the increase in value. I have frequently declared here and elsewhere that as to every step taken in the North-West by this Government, I do not say that every step was a wise step, but I say that if you go back to the Orders in Council, which you will find in the Eastern Block, passed while the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, you will see evidence of the most imbecile policy that any government could possibly adopt for settling the North-West. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) talked about settling the country by lowering the price of land. Why, Sir, anybody who talks about settling the country by lowering the price of land and points to the example of the United States, and says that has been the attraction which has brought people from Europe to the United States, shows the most gross ignorance of the history of the United States, of the history of its immigration policy, and also of our experience in the North-West. Settlers going in will not buy an acre of land as long as there are free homesteads. Remember that we are in a position that the United States are not. We have, and shall have, for a few years to come, millions of free homesteads to give to the immigrating world. Now, as long as you have free homesteads they will not buy. We have a number of men around Regina and Moose Jaw, men who came in and took up homesteads and pre-emptions, who bought cattle and have progressed, and after four or five years they have bought hay sections, and paid as much as $5 an acre for them, and they have made money. I could take you to a family—the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) knows the family; he has visited at their house and received their hospitality—the family of the Lamberts, who went there with $6 or $7 in their pockets and with the proceeds of the remnant of a farm that they had in the east. They came there, as they are proud to say themselves, with little money, and to-day they have a herd of blood and grade cattle of over three hundred, which the member for Wellington has inspected. To-day they own a large amount of property. I calculate they own land worth at least $30,000, if you place it at only $5 per acre. They have acquired that land partly by homesteading, the family keeping together, partly by buying up land; but they did not buy an acre until they had homesteaded and pre-empted and made money by buying and selling cattle and by making butter, and I consider they are worth some $40,000 at least. As to the practice of settling a country by lowering the price of land, the hon. member for North Norfolk cannot point out a single instance, or, if he can, it will be a single instance in the whole history of the United States, of settlers coming into the States, and when they came in buying land, when, by going a mile or two miles distant, they could settle on free land.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How does the land get a value if none of it is settled?

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman sometimes ask conundrums. He now asks, how does the land get a value if none of it is settled? The value of a thing is what it will bring, and although that is a very old saw in political economy, I will venture to say, and I have paid some attention to political economy, that a thing may have a real value, as we use the word value, before you have placed any price on it at all. Will the hon. gentleman deny that the 160 acres that are given to the incoming settler for nothing has a value beyond what he gives for it, the $10 entry fee? The hon. gentleman knows that it has. And yet sometimes in our history there would have been difficulty in selling it for $1 an acre. Why? Because there were no buyers. To my hon. friend I may say that in political economy, as in higher matters—

> "A little learning is a dangerous thing,
> Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring."

When gentlemen study political economy as children bathe who go down to the stream and dip their ankles in the water, I sometimes feel it would almost be as well if they had not studied political economy at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did you go in further?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, a little further; I went knee deep. The way to settle up a country is to do what my hon. friend who has just spoken said he would do, and which the Government is actually doing—giving incoming settlers free lands on as easy conditions as possible. That is the way to settle up a country, and the North-West is settling up, as the evidence of the census shows. It has not settled up as quickly as some of us anticipated, but it is settling up; and one of the reasons why it has not settled up as rapidly as many of us anticipated is well known. It is this, because the emigrating world can form a habit, as an individual can form a habit, and for years and years the habit of the emigrating world in Europe has been to go to the United States. As Mr. Bright once said in a magnificent passage, at a time when I had the privilege of listening to him: "When the Irish or the Scotch peasant looks for home and food and blessings, his eye follows the setting sun, his heart expands beyond the broad Atlantic, and in spirit he grasps hands with the children of the West." He meant by the West the United States. I quote that, and I am glad it appears to please some hon.

gentlemen opposite. It is a dangerous thing for a person such as I am to quote from the speech of a man like Mr. Bright, because Sterne tells us that a dwarf who brings a measuring line along with him is a dwarf in more ways than one. The reason I quote that is this: What does that statement prove but that a few years ago, when I was accustomed to hear Mr. Bright in the British Parliament, the habit of mind of the emigrating world was to go to the United States? It is only a short time ago, only since Lord Dufferin came here, and his services as an advertising agent for Canada have hardly been appreciated, that the people of England have realized what Canada is, or know anything about it. Canada was only beginning to be known; but Canada is known to-day, and the services of the much-maligned High Commissioner have done a great deal to make Canada well known. Whatever credit belongs to the High Commissioner for those services is reflected on the Government which he represents. Only for the high respect, great regard and admiration I have for the leader of the Opposition I would not refer to the twaddle that fell from his lips as to what the North-West has cost this country, and how you are to be recouped. I ventured the other night, when an hon. member from one of the constituencies of the lower province was speaking, to interject a remark that he should point out what the present harvest in Manitoba and the North-West means to the whole of Canada. The hon. gentleman who is sitting there (Mr. Paterson), who is an energetic merchant and manufacturer, will benefit by that splendid harvest in the North-West. That harvest of more than 20,000,000 of bushels for export—what will it bring to this country? At the very least $15,000,000. That amount, if the hon. gentleman will make the calculation even on the extravagant, absurd and outrageous basis of the hon. member for South Oxford, would more than pay the compound interest that the North-West has cost you. The hon. gentleman for Brant (Mr. Paterson) once delivered a speech in this House, which I read and I think listened to, in which he spoke very strongly in favour of a certain policy. My hon. friend is a shrewd man, an able man, and not only a great man in parliamentary life, but one of our ornaments in the business world, and he knows as well as I know that he and his brother merchants and manufacturers will reap the benefit of that great harvest, and they are indeed reaping the benefit already. The merchants and manufacturers in Toronto told me two or three years ago when I was there——

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No one denies that.

Mr. DAVIN. Then, what is the meaning of the leader of the Opposition asking where are we to get back what we have spent in the North-West? If the policy hon. gentlemen opposite would fain apply to Canada and the North-West should obtain——

Mr. SPEAKER. Allow me to interject a word here. At the outset of the discussion I rather thought the hon. member for North Norfolk was transgressing the bounds somewhat in opening up this whole question, but I was under the impression, on looking at the vote, that as it provided for officers for Crown lands and timber agencies, he might refer to the question of the price of land in the North-West. I am, however, quite sure the hon. gentleman will agree with me that it will be most inconvenient to open up a discussion of this kind on an item like this.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You should not forget, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman addressing the House has been knee-deep, and special privileges should be allowed him.

Mr. DAVIN. I would not disagree with you, Mr. Speaker, for the world. I am glad my speech and your remarks have given an opportunity for a brilliant display of wit on the part of my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson). But, Mr. Speaker, as a member from the North-West, when a man holding the distinguished position of the leader of the Opposition asks a question so vital to Canada, I surely must reply. When he asks how this country is to be recouped for the outlay in the North-West, am I not bound, Sir, in the interest of Canada, in the interest of the Empire, and in the interest of the hon. gentleman himself—because, although he knows a good deal, he does not know everything—am I not bound, Sir, even so humble a person as myself, to instruct him on this?

Mr. LAURIER. I am open to conviction.

Mr. DAVIN. I was about to point a moral and adorn a tale when you interrupted me, Mr. Speaker, but some other time I will make use of the illustration that occurred to me and which was at once forcible and, I think, conclusive.

Mr. DALY. Do I understand that you rule, Mr. Speaker, that there shall be no further discussion on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. I can hardly deter my hon. friend from going on in the same line that the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) did: but I am quite sure that the House will agree with me that unless my friend is very desirous to address the House, it would be better not to adopt a very inconvenient practice.

Mr. DALY. I am very desirous, Mr. Speaker, of correcting some of the statements made by the hon. gentleman, and I think my position as a member from the North-West entitles me, with your permission, to say a few words. I would not have taken up the time of the House, were it not for the statement of the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that the land policy of the United States was more liberal than that of the Canadian Government. We have had this matter under discussion to my knowledge for five years, and I have heard the hon. gentleman make these statements over and over again. I have contradicted him, and the hon. members from the North-West have contradicted him, but it seems like throwing water on a duck's back, and the hon. gentleman recurs to these statements every session. As to comparing the land laws of the United States to the land laws of Canada, it seems ridiculous after the enlightenment the hon. gentleman has received at my hands, and at the hands of other hon. gentlemen, that he should insist on making these misstatements. Let us take the Dominion Lands Act. A man comes to Manitoba, he takes up a quarter section for which he wishes to get a homestead entry, he goes to the land office, pays $10 entry fee and gets his land. He is required to put in six months in each year, and at the end of that time he sends notice to the nearest land agent saying that he desires to get his homestead patent, and an inspector is sent to his

very door, so that the man is not put to the inconvenience of going to the Dominion lands office at all. On the evidence of the settler and of two corroborating witnesses the inspector makes his report and he receives his patent. On the other hand the laws of the United States are that a man must reside five years on his land. After the expiration of that five years the inspector is not sent to his door, but he has got to give notice in a newspaper for five previous weeks, then go to the nearest land office and hire and pay an attorney to get his patent. In view of these facts I ask hon. gentlemen whether or not the land laws of Canada are more liberal than the land laws of the United States? I have made these statements time and again on the floor of this House, and I cannot understand the reason which induced the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to make these representations unless he is interested in some lands in Dakota or in the western states, which he desires to sell, and uses his position as a member of Parliament to hold out that there are better land laws in Dakota than in our Canadian North-West. If land is cheaper in Dakota, why is it there is such an exodus from Dakota to Manitoba? We have had a thousand souls from Dakota into the North-West this year, and more are coming every month. That does not look as if the land laws in the States were more liberal than ours. The hon. gentleman has taken exception to the fact that the value of lands, as stated by the Minister of the Interior, at $3 per acre, is too much. Now, Sir, I will quote from the report issued by the Department of Agriculture of the Local Government of Manitoba on 1st July, 1891, and I will show the value of lands as given in this report as follows:—

	1890.	1891.
Average cash price of improved land	$9.43	$10.85
Average cash price of unimproved land	$5.43	$ 6.96
Percentage of land occupied	57·2	62·7
Percentage of land fit for cultivation	71·4	74·8
Number of farmers in the province	13,877	18,937
Average acreage put under crop by each	73·0	78·5

These figures will illustrate to hon. gentlemen opposite, or to any person who desires information on this question, that the Province of Manitoba is increasing in wealth year after year. It is true that our population has not increased as we desired it should, but I believe when the full census returns are brought down to this House, they will show that the material resources of the North-West have increased in a greater ratio that in any state in the Union. They will show, I believe, that the value of farm lands, cattle, horses, farm buildings, farm implements, and everything that goes to make farmers wealthy, have increased in a greater ratio than they have in any state in the Union. I say, Sir, that the census returns will show a material progress that will astonish even hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who are desirous of seeing that country opened up and developed. Even if we have not increased in population at the rate we desired, it is already shown that we have increased by 148 per cent. since 1881. That is a greater increase than Dakota has made during the last five years according to the state census. The hon. gentleman desires us to believe that the land policy of this Government is not as liberal as the policy of the Government of which he was a supporter some years ago. I will read to the House the following Order in Council passed on the 26th September, 1874, in reference to lands, showing the policy of the Mackenzie Government at that time:—

"Copy of a report of a Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council on the 26th December, 1874.

"On a memorandum, dated 24th December, 1874, from the Honourable the Minister of the Interior, stating that in view of the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway line westerly from the present limits of the Province of Ontario, he submits that in all probability during the coming season there will be a disposition manifested on the part of the settlers going into the Province of Manitoba to squat upon lands along the route, thus possibly embarrassing the Government in carrying out the provisions of the Railway Act of last session, and under these circumstances he recommends that he be authorized to give public notice to the effect that all land within twenty miles on each side of the line surveyed, and upon which the telegraph is now under construction, are for the present withdrawn from sale or settlement under the Dominion Lands Act, and that no rights of entry upon the said lands by parties who may have settled thereon after the issue of this notice, will be recognized by the Government until further notice. The lands so withdrawn to include also a district twenty miles to the westward of Fort Pelly. The Committee advise that the requisite authority be granted.

I will now ask hon. gentlemen whether they will say that the policy adopted by the Liberal Government was a liberal one or not, when this Order in Council says that as they expect squatters to settle on the lands of Manitoba they will withdraw all the lands within 20 miles of the line of railway. Although their policy was in force for three long years, yet in 1877 on the representation made by the representatives of the country at that time, and by the press of Manitoba, we find that an Order in Council was passed in 1877 which contained the following:—

"He therefore recommends that the lands in Manitoba withdrawn as above, be thrown open for actual settlement, but not for homestead or pre-emption entry, or for entry by military bounty or police warrants, or for ordinary sale. No person to be allowed to acquire more than one-half section, or 320 acres, and such land to be paid for by the occupant at whatever rate and upon such terms as may be fixed therefor by the Government, when the remainder of the lands in the province of this class are disposed of.

"He further recommends that persons desiring to acquire such lands shall, previously to settlement thereon, be required to be entered therefor at the nearest Dominion Lands Office, and in order to prove their good faith, the applicants shall be obliged in each case to make a payment in advance at the time of entry of one dollar per acre in cash on account of the purchase, and further be required to settle in and commence to cultivate the land within one year from the date of entry, or in default thereof the payments so made to be forfeited."

After reading that Order in Council and the Order in Council of 1874, I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether the policy of the present Government is not more liberal than the policy of the Government of Mr. Mackenzie. Now, Sir, in reference to this land question, we have offered another privilege to settlers in this Dominion which has never been enjoyed in the United States—that is, the right of pre-empting 160 acres. Before the Act of two sessions ago, any man was entitled to pre-empt 160 acres contiguous to the 160 acres of his homestead at $2.50 an acre on very easy terms of payment. Such a right never existed on the other side of the line; settlers there were entitled only to the bare 160 acres of their homestead. Any person desiring to give a fair and unprejudiced opinion on the land laws of Canada as com-

pared with those of the United States must admit that our laws are better in every respect and better administered, and give a greater facility to settlers than do the land laws of the United States.

Mr. FLINT. I would like to make an observation which though, perhaps, not strictly in order, will be very brief. I think the hon. gentleman who has spoken on the other side ought to admit that——

Mr. FOSTER. Would you allow a suggestion? We have had an equally full discussion of this subject on both sides, and we should now come to the point.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I am to blame for permitting this discussion at all from the beginning, and that is the reason why I have not interfered with it before. The hon. gentleman will understand that on the resolution agreeing to the vote for Dominion Lands, this question will be in order. Of course, if the hon. gentleman insists, he may go on.

Mr. FLINT. I do not wish to go on after your ruling.

Material for repairs, &c., in connection with the ventilation of public buildings at Ottawa..... $4,000

Mr. CHARLTON. The ventilation of these buildings has been defective ever since they were constructed, and I have called the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this matter every year. Fortunately, this summer, we have not suffered so much, as we have been able to get free air into the building, but during the winter the ventilation is wretched. We continue to bring the air in through the subterranean ducts that run from the brow of the hill, and there seems to be some objection that cannot be overcome against introducing pure air. By running a tower up in the court we could bring in the pure air from heaven, but instead of that we draw it through a sewer, and it comes to us tainted by its passage through fungi and damp and mold. This system ought to be changed. We are squandering enough money in other ways to afford an expenditure of a few thousand dollars for the protection of the health of members who come here from year to year. The building at present is unhealthy, and every session we lose some of our number on that account. I hope the Minister of Public Works will attend to this matter, and see that this chamber and the other rooms connected therewith are properly ventilated.

Mr. McMILLAN. I was led to believe two years ago that there was a plan in the Public Works Department by which this building was to be extended. What was the cause of that plan being set aside? A petition was sent to the Department of Public Works and a promise made that it would receive attention, but so far nothing has been done. Have the Government any other scheme for improving the ventilation than the one of extending the building, for which a plan was prepared?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know of any other scheme. I know that one would have cost a good deal of money, but I do not know whether the reasons for not carrying it out were money considerations.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Is there any plan by which this chamber could be better ventilated than it is? The system is so bad and the draft so continuous, that it is impossible for people to remain here and enjoy health as they would in a well ventilated house. The registers are immediately behind our chairs, and the cold coming in from the corridors creates a draft that is felt almost every day. Surely if the matter were submitted to engineers, they would devise some scheme. There is not a building in Ottawa which has cost $5,000, in which there is not far better ventilation than in this building, which has cost $1,000,000.

Harbours and Rivers generally..... $6,000

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Under this heading I want to get a little information in reference to an item in the Auditor General's Report under Harbours and Rivers, on page 42—C in regard to the salary drawn by A. P. Kilganan, that appears to be extraordinary. He received payment for 395 days in one year, at $3 a day. When I went to school there were only 365 days in a year.

Mr. FOSTER. That is changed since, we are progressing.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It will be necessary for the Finance Minister to say when the change took place, and if it took place specially for this man's advantage. Now, he received "sustenance"—I suppose that means food—not for 395 days, but for 417 days, so that he must have been a hungry person when he started to work. In addition to that he received $328.24 for what is termed "travel and outlay." Now, I can understand what "travel" means, but I do not know what "outlay" means.

Mr. FOSTER. You did not go to school long enough.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It appears not, and I am going to call you in to give me assistance, as you have had a special training for this purpose; and as you are going to put yourself up for tutor I hope you will do your work well.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will send me over that paper I will get him the explanations, but the question is clearly out of order, because it refers to an appropriation made a year and a-half ago, whilst this is for works to be gone into during this next year.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I understood I was in order in putting this.

Mr. FOSTER. It may take some time to get the explanation. It is a difficult question, but as soon as it can be solved——

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am afraid my tutor does not know any more than his pupil. Are you not going to venture any explanation about the 395 days?

Mr. FOSTER. Not to-night.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Nothing about the "sustenance?"

Mr. FOSTER. Not a word.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No explanation of what "outlay" means?

Mr. FOSTER. I will refer you to the dictionary.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No explanation as to hotel bill in addition to sustenance? That appears to be a very strange account, and the

Finance Minister should be in a position to explain it, more particularly when he ventured so good humoredly to answer.

Mr. FOSTER. I said I would get the answer if you would send over the questions.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). You will get the questions to-morrow, probably, in the *Hansard*, if you will be kind enough to read them over, and give the answer in a day or two.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes: it will be more pleasant to ke them out of the *Hansard*.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 14th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GUYSBOROUGH FISHERY OVERSEER.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. FRASER) asked, What salary was paid Thomas McKeen, of Melrose, in the County of Guysboro', fishery overseer, between the 1st of June, 1889, and the 1st day of September, A.D. 1891? Has any further sum or sums of money been paid the said McKeen besides his salary? If so, for what reason, and what are the items of any further sum other than salary paid him?

Mr. TUPPER. The amount paid Thomas Mc Keen, of Melrose, County of Guysborough, N.S., for salary as fishery warden between 1st June, 1889, and 1st September, 1891, was $67.50. A further sum of $167 was paid Warden McKeen for expenses incurred in defending himself against a charge for criminal assault while discharging his duties, the items of which are as follows:—Paid J. H. Sinclair, barrister, for defending at investigation, $13; witnesses at investigation, $7.20; witnesses for attending at Supreme Court, $51.80; Daniel Macdonald, Q.C., counsel fee, $20; C. F. McIsaac, for going to Guysborough from Antigonish and defending at trial, $75; total, $167.

SMITH & RIPLEY AND THE HON. J. A. CHAPLEAU.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. FORBES) asked, Has the Government, or any member thereof, had their attention called to the following statements published over the signature of Wm. McDougall:—

"1st. Shortly after the accession of Sir John Macdonald in 1878 the Government determined to abandon the construction of the Georgian Bay Branch of the Pacific Railway.

"2nd. It was then under contract in which Messrs. Smith & Ripley, of New York, well-known railway contractors, had acquired a controlling interest.

"3rd. Mr. Chapleau had been retained by these contractors to advise them in acquiring this controlling interest.

"4th. In consequence of his ignorance or neglect the assignments of the interests they bargained and paid for were so informal and imperfect that a majority of the judges of the Supreme Court, on appeal from the judgment of the Exchequer Court in their favour for $171,000, held that Messrs. Smith & Ripley had acquired no legal interest in the contract, but a majority of the judges expressed the opinion that as these gentlemen had acted in good faith and had expended a large sum in the building, that the contract had been legally assigned to them and the Government ought to and no doubt would overcome the defect and deal justly with them.

"5th. Mr. Chapleau neither appeared nor advised in any of the proceedings in the courts from 1879 to 1884, when the case was finally disposed of on a petition to the Governor in Council prepared and presented by me.

"6th. On the day information reached me that the Council had decided to offer them $83,000 in full of their claim, Mr. Smith informed me that the Chapleaus had demanded ten per cent. of the amount.

"7th. Whether Hon. J. A. Chapleau actually received that sum or any part of it, I cannot affirm, as I did not see the money paid to him; but I know that he was exceedingly attentive to Messrs. Smith & Ripley on and during the day on which they drew the money from the bank.

"8th. Mr. Smith and his partner gave as reason for offering me $2,000 for my professional services, extending over a period of upwards of four years, that they had been compelled to pay large sums to people who had done nothing but use influence with the Government.

"9th. I believe Mr. Chapleau received a large part of that solatium.

"I leave the records of the Exchequer Court, the reports of the Supreme Court, and the testimony of my professional brethren who were of counsel with me, to vindicate my reputation as a lawyer in that difficult case. It would have been simple and easy if Mr. Chapleau had given proper notice to his clients, when they paid him $1,500, as he says, for securing to them a controlling interest in the contract.

"I am, &c., &c.,

(Sgd,) "WM. McDOUGALL."

And does the Government purpose taking any steps in the matter? If so, whether an investigation will be immediately directed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman in whose name this question stands (Mr. Forbes) had been in this House, I would have called attention to the gross abuse of which he has been guilty in taking advantage of a question to make it the vehicle of attack and to bring up an old and exploded charge. This was made about six years ago. It referred to a private and professional matter, and referred to professional transactions which immediately afterwards were clearly and specifically denied on the part of both the parties who were referred to as being aggrieved. Since then, the charge has not been revived, and it is now made, as I understand, in no sense by the authority of the person whose name is used.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would ask leave of the House to supplement the answer of the hon. gentleman, and I am sure I will be allowed to do so as a matter of privilege. Although this charge was specifically denied at the time and was repeatedly denied afterwards, in spite of that, I have been often very wantonly assailed both in the press and on the hustings on account of this unfortunate publication which originated only in regard to a matter of personal and professional spite between Mr. McDougall and myself. But as an hon. member of this House has, from what motive I do not know, thought fit to revive this long dead issue, I think it my duty to bury for all time that half pulverized skeleton which was disinterred as a fine morsel to scandal eaters. I believe that I cannot do that better than by reading to the House a letter which I received last evening on this subject:

"SOMERSET STREET, 13th September, 1891.

"MY DEAR MR. CHAPLEAU,—I am sure you will believe me when I tell you that I have neither prompted nor assented to the re-publication of extracts from a letter

written by me some seven or eight years ago, in *re* the affairs of Messrs. Smith & Ripley.

"I am unable to discover the pertinence of that old controversy in the discussions of Parliament at the present day. My accusation at most was that of professional neglect. That charge was afterwards denied by my clients, as well as the alleged demand of 10 per cent. I may remind you that my letter was not altogether unprovoked, though after the positive denial of Smith & Ripley, which, if I am not mistaken, they verified by affidavit, I never ventured to repeat the accusation against you.

"I may be permitted, as an old parliamentarian, to say the attempt to invoke the interference of the Government in a newspaper squabble between two lawyers about the proper conduct of the case many years ago is unprecedented and not to be countenanced.

"I remain, my dear sir,
"Very faithfully yours,
"WILLIAM McDOUGALL."

I may add that I have here the two affidavits mentioned in this letter, but I think it is not necessary to submit them to the House.

FISHERY OFFICER FITZGERALD.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BARRON) asked, Is Mr. G. W. Fitzgerald a fishery officer under the Government of Canada? Are his duties confined to the County of Peterborough? If not, what are his limits? How many persons were prosecuted and fined by him, or through him, in 1890? What are the names of such parties, and what is the total amount of fines collected?

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. G. W. Fitzgerald is a fishery officer under the Government of Canada. His duties are confined to the inland waters of the County of Peterborough. Ten persons were prosecuted and fined by or through Mr. Fitzgerald in 1890. The names of these parties are as follows, with place of offence:—Stone Lake—John Mills, Edwin McElvina, Joseph Yelland, J. Bennett, G. Bennett, Thomas Hull, Davin Drain, John Drain; at Katchabogamog—J. J. Bennet, J. E. Bennet. The total amount of fines collected was $29.

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES AND THEIR SALARIES.

Mr. LÉPINE asked, 1. Whether, in accordance with the promise recently made to this House, the Government have taken steps to appoint a successor to the late Sir A. A. Dorion, as Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench for the Province of Quebec? If so, has the position been offered and declined, and if declined, for what reason? When will the appointment be made, and what salary is to be attached to the position for the future? 2. Have the Government been informed of the serious and incurable illness of the Hon. Mr. Justice Church, and of the prolonged illness of Hon. Mr. Justice Tessier, both of them Puisné Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench? Have the said judges tendered their resignations, or is it the intention of the Government soon to call upon them to resign, and to appoint their successors before the next ensuing term of the Court of Queen's Bench fixed for the 15th September instant? 3. Is it the intention of the Government to submit to Parliament during this session a special measure to provide for an increase in the salary of judges, or for a different system of pension for judges retiring or discharged on reaching a certain age or a certain period of service? 4. Whether the Government have, since their recent statements in this House in relation to provincial legislation at Quebec authorizing the appointment of two additional judges with civil and criminal jurisdiction in the Court of Queen's Bench, notified the Government of that province of the expediency of issuing forthwith the proclamation giving effect to the said legislation, and of their desire to appoint such two judges in conformity therewith? If not, is it the intention of the Government, at an early date, to call the attention of the Government of that province to the necessity of appointing the said two judges, and completing the organization of the Court of Queen's Bench?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Steps have been taken to appoint a successor to the late Chief Justice Dorion of the Court of Queen's Bench for the Province of Quebec. The position has not been declined. The appointment, I think I may say, has been made. The salary to be attached to the position is that provided by statute. The Government has been informed of the serious illness—I cannot say at present incurable—of the Hon. Mr. Justice Church. They have likewise been informed of the prolonged illness of Mr. Justice Tessier, both Puisné Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench. Mr. Justice Church has not sent in his resignation. Mr. Justice Tessier has resigned. I cannot say that we will call upon Mr. Justice Church to resign, for such is not my duty, or that of the Government. A successor to Mr. Justice Tessier will be appointed before the opening of the term. It is not the intention of the Government to submit to Parliament during this session a measure providing for the increase in the salary of judges, or for a different system of pension for judges retiring or discharged on reaching a certain age or a certain period of service. The Government, since their recent statement in this House in relation to provincial legislation in Quebec as to the appointment of two additional judges with civil and criminal jurisdiction, has not notified the Government of the province of the expediency of issuing a proclamation giving effect to that legislation, or of any desire on their part to appoint two judges. It is not the intention of the Government to call the attention of the Government of the Province of Quebec to the necessity of appointing two judges and thus completing the organization of the Court of Queen's Bench, because that does not seem to fall within the duties of the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman is not in a position to say now who is to be appointed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to tell him later.

MICHAEL COSTELLO, MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. McMULLEN) asked, Is Michael Costello night watchman in the Customhouse, Montreal? If so, what is his salary? Who appointed him, and when was he appointed? Are the Government aware that the said Michael Costello, who is a brother-in-law of M. P. Ryan, the present collector of Customs at Montreal, is the contractor for draining St. Antoine Ward, Montreal?

Mr. BOWELL. Michael Costello is night watchman in the Customs examining warehouse at the

port of Montreal. He is paid $2 per day—or rather per night. He has not been appointed permanently, but has been employed since 1st March, 1885. The Government has no knowledge of Mr. Costello's relationship with Mr. Ryan, nor of the contract for draining St. Antoine Ward, Montreal; and I may add that even if he has such contract, there is nothing in the law to prevent him taking such contract, and draining the whole city of Montreal if he likes.

WALTER HOGG.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether there is a person named Walter Hogg employed on the Intercolonial Railway, and if so, in what capacity is he so employed, and what is his salary? Does he employ, with himself, one or more of his sons, and if so, what are their duties?

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed that Walter Hogg is not employed on the Intercolonial Railway, nor are any of his sons so employed.

MR. JULES HELBRONNER, MONTREAL.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BRODEUR) asked, 1. How much money have the Government paid to Mr. Jules Helbronner, of Montreal, since 1884, and for what was such money paid? 2. Was the said Mr. Helbronner sent to the Paris Exposition, at the expense of the Government, and in what capacity?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Helbronner was appointed one of the members of the Royal Labour Commission, and the sum of money paid to him has been reported in the Auditor General's Accounts. Mr. Helbronner was not sent to the Paris Exposition by the Government, if the hon. gentleman means the Special Exposition of Social Economy. By request he was sent as the general delegate of the Council of Trade and Labour. He was given by me a letter to our agent in Paris, and during the time he stayed there he took part in the Congress of the Exposition of Social Economy. Mr. Helbronner prepared a very extensive report which was afterwards printed by the Government as one of the appendices to the Royal Labour Commission.

POSTMASTER OF STE. ANGÈLE.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BRODEUR) asked, Whether the Government have dismissed M. B. Loiselle, postmaster of Ste. Angèle, in the County of Rouville? Were complaints made against him, and who is the person who made such complaints? Why was he dismissed as postmaster?

Mr. HAGGART. The dismissal of Mr. B. Loiselle from the postmastership of Ste. Angèle de Monnoir has been decided upon by the Government. Complaints were made that a registered letter addressed to Mr. A. Guillet, and repeatedly applied for by the addressee, was improperly detained in the Ste. Angèle de Monnoir post office for three days, and the post mark altered to conceal the time date of receipt. The principal complainant was Mr. A. Guillet. These complaints were found on enquiry to be well founded, and the facts have been considered sufficient to justify the postmaster's removal from office.

SALE OF ORDNANCE LAND ON RIDEAU CANAL.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, Has the Government sold ordnance land on the Rideau Canal, near the Ottawa exhibition grounds? Was the land sold at public auction? If not, how was it sold? To whom was said land sold, and in whose name was the patent issued? What was the extent of the land sold and its dimensions? What was the price paid? When was the Order in Council passed confirming the sale?

Mr. DEWDNEY. 1. Yes. 2. No. 3. It was sold under sub-section 3 of section 5, chapter 55, which provided that the Crown may, by private contract, sell lands occupied and improved with the assent of the Crown, to the person in possession, without resorting to public auction. It was so sold to Mr. Thos. F. Wallace, who, in addition to being the occupant, held an assignment of a perpetual lease from the Crown to Lewis Williams dated 1830, at 2½ cents per acre. This perpetual lease had been assigned to Mr. T. F. Wallace by Mr. H. H. Williams, son and heir of said Lewis Williams. The sale was made in accordance with the terms of an Order in Council authorizing the same. The land was sold to Thos. F. Wallace, and the patent issued to him. 5. $\frac{67}{100}$ of an acre. 6. The price paid was $75, being $25 in excess of the valuation placed upon it. 7. 30th August, 1890, but the application to purchase is dated 20th July, 1889, and Mr. Wallace asked to purchase upon the same terms and conditions that had been granted to the other purchasers of similar lands. The said Order in Council reads as follows:—

"On a memorandum dated 18th February, 1890, from the Minister of the Interior stating that on 12th December, 1889, he has submitted to the Privy Council an application by Mr. F. Wallace to purchase a strip of ordnance land in the township of Nepean, as to the sale of which the Department of Railways and Canals had reported that that department had no objection, but the matter was referred back to the Minister with direction that this application should stand over until the question of title in the case of the Sparks estate against the Crown now pending in the courts is determined.

"The Minister represents that it was subsequently ascertained that the land applied for does not now and never did form part of the Sparks estate and is not in any way affected by the suit on that matter, and, further, that it has been under lease from the Crown to, and fenced in and cultivated by, Mr. H. H. Williams, the person from whom Mr. Wallace purchased the land in rear, for upwards of 42 years, It will thus be seen that it is and has been for some time in the actual possession of Mr. Wallace with consent of the Crown,

"The Minister recommends, with the concurrence of the Minister of Justice, that the piece of land shown red upon the annexed plan, being a portion of lot K, concession T, township of Nepean, containing an area of 67-100 of an acre, be sold to Mr. Thomas F. Wallace for the sum of $75 cash."

STONY ISLAND BREAKWATER, N. S.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. FLINT) asked, What amount was voted for breakwater at Stony Island, Shelburne County, N.S.? Who is the present contractor? What is the contract price? Will the work be completed this session? Are works now being pushed to completion, or are the same suspended? If suspended, for what reason?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. 1. Fiscal year 1890-91, $3,800. Fiscal year 1891-92, revote $2,600, new vote $1,300—$3,900. The total amount voted is, therefore, $5,100. 2. John Nicholson. 3. $4,650.

4. The time for the completion of work, according to the contract, is 20th October, 1891. 5 and 6. The work was suspended to 1st September, owing to lack of timber, but will be resumed before the end of the month and pushed to completion.

ORDNANCE LANDS IN MONTREAL.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. McMULLEN) asked, Was there a lease of any of the ordnance lands in the City of Montreal, or in the vicinity thereof, granted to any person within the last three years? If so, to whom, and how much? Was there an application made by any person for a lease of any of the said lands and the application refused? If so, by whom, and why declined? Was there any effort made to purchase under such a lease by virtue of the law regulating the sale of ordnance lands? If so, by whom?

Mr. DEWDNEY. 1. No lease for ordnance lands in Montreal or vicinity has been issued during the last three years. 2. No lease has been applied for or refused during the same period. 3. No effort made to purchase.

FISHERY WARDENS—P. E. I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Have all the fishery wardens in Prince Edward Island been appointed guardians? If not, what are the names of those who have not been appointed, and for what reason? What are the names of those appointed in their stead?

Mr. TUPPER. All the late fishery wardens in Prince Edward Island have not been appointed guardians. The following are the names of those not appointed:—Queen's County—Michael Ready, Lionel Garnum, George Stevenson, James Power, Jonathan Delaney, Finlay Mackenzie, William Whitehead, Thomas Murphy, James P. Trainor, Geo. F. Beers, Dominique Buotte, Joseph Murphy, Charles C. McDonald. Prince County—John Rix, John A. Ramsay, John B. Stewart. King's County—Daniel Riley, Peter Duffey, James Mitchell, John O'Brien. The reason for the non-appointment of the above is that I am not aware that their services are required. The names of late wardens and others who have been engaged as temporary special guardians are as follows:—King's County—James Cuddie, James H. Dingwell, Ronald McDonald, Allan McDonald, Malcolm Matheson, Henry Morrow, Henry K. Griffin. Queen's County—Peter Bradley, Newton McKenzie, Neil Currie, Alexander C. Shaw, James Howatt, Francis Stanley. Prince County—John McNally, Calvin Howatt, J. E. B. Holland, E. L. Brien, John A. Sharpe, V. S. Gillis, Alexander McDonald, Laurence Doyle, Peter Aylward, James M. Nelligan, John Chiasson (Chapel), Peter Reid, James Ramsey, J. A. Macdonald, Stanley Compton, Hubert Mills.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to have the attention of the Minister of Finance for the moment. I should like to ask him if he proposes to bring down Supplementary Estimates; if so, when?

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to bring Supplementary Estimates, and will try to bring them down to-morrow afternoon.

NORTH SHORE RAILWAY.

Mr. BOWELL moved third reading of Bill (No. 170) respecting the North Shore section of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. LAURIER. I desire to offer the hon. gentleman an amendment with respect to this Bill, the effect of which will be to bind the company to perform their work within a certain period. The Bill now reads as follows:—

"On the execution by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government of Canada of a deed of agreement in such form as is determined by the Governor in Council, effectively binding the company to commence forthwith and to complete within such time as is prescribed in such deed the execution of the works and improvements."

There is nothing here to bind the Government to any limited time, or any limit as to time when the contract is to be entered into or the work performed. It seems to me that this is altogether too vague. I propose that the time to enter the agreement shall be fixed at within two months from the prorogation of the session, and that the time to complete the works shall be twelve months after the contract has been signed. This seems to be reasonable delay. If it is not reasonable, I shall have no objection to the time being extended if it is thought advisable to do so; but the Government, I hope, will agree to the necessity of having some limit of time fixed within which the work must be performed. I, therefore, move:

That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, and that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend the same by adding after the word "agreement" in the second line of the first section, the following words:—"within two months after the prorogation of the present session," and by striking out the following words in the fifth line of the section:—"such time as is prescribed in such deed" and substituting the following:—"twelve months after the completion of such deed."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I submit to the hon. gentleman that it would not be wise to insert so rigid a provision as this just now. A good deal of allowance must be made, as I claimed when the resolutions were under discussion, for lack of detail in the scheme, and this was essential from the fact that we had made no agreement upon the subject. I am sure that Parliament would prefer that the Government should come down with a scheme and submit it here before entering into agreements in all cases, but that course has sometimes to be departed from. In adopting this course we are always placed at a disadvantage by asking to have details inserted which require to be very carefully considered before we undertake to be bound by them in the form of a statutory obligation. The Bill as passed so far says that the completion shall be at a time to be fixed in the agreement. That requires some little negotiation. As regards the time of the commencement of the work, I think that the time should be as stated in the resolution, two months after the session, provided the contract is immediately made, as I presume it will be, but if not, it ought to be, at any rate, within two months after the execution of the agreement or as soon as we settle upon terms with the company, so as to ensure setting about this work immediately. Considering

that it involves so large a sum of money, and that considerable time is required for the preparation of materials, and so on, I think the limitation of a year is too short. Communications have been entered into with the company in that regard, and the company require a much longer time. I am not prepared to say that we would be disposed to concede what they do require as regards limitation of time, but I think we would be very much hampered by having the time limited in the statute thus requiring, if we do not come to an agreement, that we should come to Parliament for an amendment of the statute next year. In the meantime we shall find ourselves unable to execute an agreement with the company. This requires an expenditure of from $600,000 to $750,000, which is a very considerable sum to be raised, and not only is that the case, but part of the work is in the nature of iron and steel bridges which may not be capable of being constructed within a single year. The utmost time that we would be disposed to concede would be three years and with a stipulation that one-third of the value should be placed on the line every year. I hope the hon. gentleman will realize that it is perhaps unwise in the interest of the work that we should bind ourselves in the form of a statute on this subject, and I think it would not be unreasonable to expect that he would accept our assurance that we intend that the work shall be commenced immediately on the execution of the agreement, and pushed forward as rapidly as we can get it pushed forward; but, at any rate, with the undertaking that each year a proportionate amount shall be expended.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not at all convinced by the argument of the hon. gentleman, and I rather leave it altogether to his own diligence and to the diligence of the Government, whether we shall be bound by such a long term as three years.

Amendment negatived on division.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Geological Survey.....$60,000

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to ask whether the Geological Survey Report for this year is yet out?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The last report is just about out of the printers' hands. I have received an advance copy, and I think the others will be ready for distribution almost immediately. I think the plans are not quite completed yet.

Mr. CHARLTON. Where was this report published?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It has been in the hands of the Montreal *Gazette* Company for some time.

Removal of the residue of the Lake of Two Mountains Indians from Oka to Township of Gibson (revote).....$4,865 83

Mr. LAURIER. I was not in the House when this item was before the Committee, and I would like to know whether any information was given as to the number of Indian families yet to be removed from Oka to Gibson?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think there are about 150 Indians still at Oka.

Mr. LAURIER. Willing to be removed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; they are not. We thought at one time that we had an arrangement with them by which we could induce them to remove; but some influences, of which I have no knowledge, were brought to bear to induce them to change their minds, and at present we have no intimation of the willingness of the Indians to remove, except that one or two, whose friends are at Gibson, occasionally make up their minds to go. Since this matter was before the Committee of Supply, I have seen some newspaper remarks which assumed me to have stated that this matter had been tested by a case in the courts, and that the Indians had obtained a verdict. The fact was exactly the opposite. I said that I was under the impression that a case had been heard in the courts, and that the Seminary had obtained a verdict. Since that time I have found that there has been no case, but that the highest legal authorities we have been able to consult have expressed the opinion that the land belongs to the Seminary. That was what was on my mind, and what I intended to state. I was also reported to have said that the sum we had on hand for the removal of these Indians was about $300,000, whereas the amount is what is stated in the Estimates. The Seminary has offered to pay the cost of removing the Indians and the cost of the improvements on the different Indian locations. Consequently the cost to the Government will not be very great when the Indians make up their minds to move.

Mr. LAURIER. I speak under correction, but I was under the impression that a case was pending in court to test the rights between the Seminary and the Indians. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could inform me as to that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; that matter has never been in the courts.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would it not be well to have a judicial decision on that question?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I would not like myself to express an opinion with regard to that, although I should like very much to see the matter settled. I think the Indians who remain at Oka are really at a disadvantage, for they must feel that they are not at home there, whereas, at Gibson, I believe they would prosper very much better than at Oka.

Mr. CHARLTON. What proportion of the tribe are at Gibson now?

Mr. DEWDNEY. About two-thirds.

Mr. CASEY. It seems to me that the Government, acting as the guardian of the Indians, should have obtained a judicial decision as to their rights in this matter before they attempted to remove them from their homes. The law may have been exactly as the Minister has been advised by those whom he consulted; but it certainly would have been less open to objection if a judicial and final decision had been secured before the Government undertook the expense and responsibility of inducing these Indians to leave the place where they have been so long settled. The land might belong to the Seminary subject to certain conditions, or it might belong absolutely to the Seminary; but there is no use of expecting to settle a matter of this

kind by an *ex parte* opinion given by legal authorities, unless the case has been thoroughly tested in the courts.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think the opinion of the Government of Mr. Mackenzie was that the Seminary had the right to the property. I think it was through the instrumentality of Mr. Mackenzie that the Ontario Government provided the township in Algoma to which the Indians were removed, and I am quite sure that he would not have taken any action in that regard unless he was satisfied that the Indians would be better provided for there than at Oka.

Mr. SCRIVER. My impression is that a suit was instituted on behalf of the Indians at one time, but that it was dismissed on some technicality, and the question as to the right of the Indians to the property has never been actually tested before the courts, though I believe the hon. Minister is right in stating that opinions were obtained by a preceding Administration to the effect that the rights of the Seminary in the property were good. However, I rose for the purpose of asking the opinion of the hon. Minister as to the present condition of the Indians at Gibson—whether they have prospered there, or are in such circumstances as to warrant the belief that the removal of those remaining at Oka to that township would be in the interest of the Indians?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This year I have received no direct report from the chief at Gibson, but last year I received a report from him stating that his Indians were progressing and doing very well, and he has written one or more letters to his friends at Oka, advising them strongly to remove to Gibson.

To provide for survey of Indian Reserves $1,639 02

Mr. CASEY. What Indian reserves is it intended to survey at present? I remember presenting a year or two ago a petition from some Indians on the reserve adjoining my county asking for a sub-division survey. Is this merely intended to survey the boundaries of reserves or sub-divisions?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The boundaries of reserves, some of which are indistinct and have given rise to several disputes. I gave the explanation when the item was up before.

Mr. CASEY. Is it the hon. gentleman's intention to do anything with regard to the sub-division of the reserves among the Indians, as there are constant complaints among the Indians of encroachments?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We are very anxious to do that, and I am giving my attention to it. We have not done much sub-dividing in the older provinces, but in the North-West Territories I was induced to do it on account of difficulties that arose with regard to bounties.

To aid agricultural societies of Indians to enable them to give prizes:
Oneida Agricultural Society..... $60
Muncey Agricultural Society..... 90

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the policy of the department in reference to aiding Indian agricultural societies? These seem to be exceptional cases. No doubt it would not be wise to bring all the societies within the limits; but are there some special reasons in the case of these two? They have very successful exhibitions in the reserves in my riding, and I do not think they get any grant. Has there been any application for one, or does the hon. gentleman deem it advisable to initiate this system?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We think it is a good policy to encourage agriculture among the Indians, who have no funds of their own, by giving a small amount to be competed for in prizes. The Indians the hon. gentleman refers to in his riding are very wealthy, compared with these. They have made application to receive some assistance, not with regard to agricultural prizes, but with regard to the amount to be given to an agricultural society for fencing and other purposes. These two amounts were in last year for the first time, and a strong request was made to repeat them this year, and the Indians have very little funds.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not catch the full import of the statement of the hon. gentleman, but I believe, from what I could gather, this is the introduction of a new principle into the policy of his department, and, I venture to say, a rather vicious principle. The hon. gentleman is now introducing a system of giving aid to certain agricultural societies on behalf of the Indians. He will have to make that aid general. Is he prepared for the full result of the policy carried out to its logical consequence? Or are there special reasons for these two votes which do not apply to other Indians throughout the Dominion? When you get in the thin edge of the wedge the result will be that in a few years all the Indians will require the same aid. If you grant these amounts on special grounds, it would be well for the House to understand what the grounds are. If this is to be a principle generally applied it means the expenditure of a great many thousand dollars during the year.

Mr. DEDWNEY. Are there any agricultural societies in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not speaking of Prince Edward Island; and I suppose I have the privilege of speaking for the rest of the Dominion, although there are no Indian agricultural societies in my province.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I merely asked because I thought there were no agricultural societies in Prince Edward Island, as there are none in some of the other provinces. The Indians mentioned in this vote are very enterprising, hard-working men, and have no funds of their own. Last year was the first year this was voted, and it has been asked for again this year; but it is not to be continuous, and this is to be the last year application will be made. For myself, I think that, wherever the Indians will take an interest in agriculture, a small amount should be granted them for prizes, as it would have a good effect. I should like to see a much larger sum given to all agricultural societies.

Mr. LAURIER. There may be no agricultural societies among the Indians of Prince Edward Island or of Quebec, but it is very true that after this vote agricultural societies may spring up on every reserve. If agricultural societies are formed which are only the result of this vote, they may be of very questionable utility. There ought to be some principle on which these grants are made, some rule of efficiency, but the hon. gentleman will admit that if on the fact alone of an agricultura

society being established it is to be entitled to a grant, he is introducing an unwise policy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask whether those two agricultural societies, the Oneida and the Muncey, towards which we have just passed votes, are the only two societies to which we grant aid?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are the only two in the eastern provinces. We do give some to the agricultural societies for Indian exhibits in the North-West.

Mr. CASEY. I did not understand that. In my county there is a very excellent society at——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member cannot enter into that again. That has been passed, and I must enforce the rule of the House.

Sioux Indians, North-West Territories. $5,669

Mr. CHARLTON. How many Sioux Indians have we in the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. About 3,000 Sioux and Assiniboines. Some of them are treaty Indians. The great majority of the Sioux are Minnesota Sioux who came over many years ago, and some came in with Sitting Bull, but they are gradually going back to the States.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are the American Sioux getting assistance the same as our own Indians?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No, they are receiving a very slight assistance, but the Sioux Indians are doing very well for themselves, they are almost self-supporting. They only receive between $2,000 and $3,000, and $1,300 of that goes to a school.

Schools, British Columbia..... $43,730

Mr. CHARLTON. Is this for Indian schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Have we in British Columbia the system of paying missionaries as we discovered we had in New Brunswick?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the New England Society give any aid to Indians in British Columbia now?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Running expenses of Steam Launch.... $2,860

Mr. CHARLTON. Where is this steam launch used?

Mr. DEWDNEY. On the north-west coast from 100 miles south of the mouth of the Skeena northward to the upper end of our territory.

Mr. CHARLTON. How often does she make trips?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Whenever the agent thinks it is necessary to visit the reserves.

North-West Mounted Police..... $701,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the character of the arms with which the Mounted Police are now equipped? Have the Government taken any measures to prevent arms of precision, Winchesters and so on, getting into the hands of Indians in the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have a memorandum on that subject, but I cannot put my hand on it. I know there are a large number of Winchesters and some Enfields. We are taking every precaution we can to prevent the rifles getting into the hands of the Indians. We found lately that a trader was doing business south of the Blood Reserve on the other side of the line and was selling not only arms, but I think also whiskey. Within the last ten days we have communicated with the American Government, and I have no doubt they will stop this as they have stopped similar cases before. We also prohibit the sale of arms without the permission of the Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. TROW. The Indians on the reserves do not want any arms, because they are agriculturists.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are getting rid of them very rapidly, but we considered it would be out of the question to disarm them.

Mr. CHARLTON. With the permission of the House——

Mr. FOSTER. Spoke.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order, and I would suggest that, if any members would put their questions before the Minister answers, it would be more convenient.

Mr. CHARLTON. I simply wished to refer to the very great importance of doing what the Government are doing, to prevent the Indians getting these improved arms. The United States Government found the Indians armed with improved breech-loading rifles, and it cost millions of money and many lives to put them down. We want to be alert in this matter, as I trust and believe the Government are.

North-West Mounted Police—Clothing, $59,000

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman doubtless remembers that when we had this item in committee, he promised to bring down the names of successful tenderers for clothing.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Not only for clothing, but I was asked for the names of all the contractors for supplies to the Mounted Police: and I have them here. My information does not give the prices. It is a very long list, there are about a hundred contractors for clothing, for provisions, beef and forage. I will lay the list on the Table. The contracts were all given in the usual way to the lowest tenderer.

North-West Mounted Police—Repairs, renewals, replacement of horses, arms and ammunition..... $50,000

Mr. CHARLTON. Where arms are replaced, are the Government substituting Winchesters for the old Enfields?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. To what extent and how rapidly is that substitution going on?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have a memorandum stating the police are armed with the Winchester repeating carbine and the Enfield revolver. One hundred and twenty rounds of carbine and about 60 rounds of revolver ammunition are issued annually to each member of the force for private practice. When the rifles are worn out they get the renewal parts from the States, They are now nearly all armed with Winchester rifles.

North-West Mounted Police—Books, stationery and printed forms..... $4,000

Mr. CHARLTON. Does the Government furnish books and papers for the reading rooms of the North-West Mounted Police stations?

Mr. FOSTER. These are Mining Commissioners' Reports.

North-West Mounted Police—Contingencies..... $8,000

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman promised to give us some information as to the expenditure for telegrams in connection with the North-West Mounted Police. He will remember that the objection was made in committee that the expenditure was very large, and we desired to know how that expenditure came to be so large.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The total of the amounts shown in the Auditor General's Report, 1889-90, page C—224, is $3,360.61. The correct amount, as per departmental books and vouchers, is $3,520.62. The difference appears to represent charges for postage which, in the classification in the Audit Office, have been included as telegrams. The distribution of the $3,520.62 is as follows:—

Department, Ottawa	$ 449 17
Regina	1,652 61
Battleford	39 73
Prince Albert	113 75
Saskatchewan	88 43
Lethbridge	146 41
Macleod	411 13
Calgary	251 39
Medicine Hat	50 93
Maple Creek	152 35
Wood Mountain	90 61
Portage la Prairie	7 20
Government Telegraph Service	66 91
	$ 3,520 62

The charge of $1,652.61 for Regina includes telegrams sent from the numerous outposts east of that place and in Southern Manitoba. Regina being the headquarters accounts for the large item for telegrams at that point. The item of $113.75 for Prince Albert includes several telegrams respecting the destitute condition of certain half-breeds in the Prince Albert and Batoche districts during the winter of 1889-90, and the relief extended to them. Many of these telegrams were properly chargeable to relief to destitute half-breeds. The items of $146.41, Lethbridge; $411.13, Macleod; $152.35, Maple Creek; $90.61, Wood Mountain, contain large sums for telegrams reporting the movements of smugglers, suspected horse thieves, &c., also telegrams in connection with extradition cases. Every effort is made to keep down the telegraph charges of the Mounted Police, but it is impossible to lay down definite instructions, and reliance has to be placed on the judgment of the members of the force as to the necessity of using the wires. It must also be remembered that many of the police outposts are not connected with the regular postal routes, and the telegraph line is the only source by which information can be rapidly communicated. The telegraph account in connection with Customs and Interior business in Southern Manitoba is all charged to the police account.

Canada Gazette..... $6,000

Mr. CHARLTON. How large is the circulation of the *Canada Gazette*? To what extent is it circulated free, and about how many persons subscribe for it?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I could not give that information unless I obtained it from the department. The old circulation has increased, I suppose. Last year for the first time I had a surplus from the Official *Gazette*.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then the hon. Minister is not able to give any information about it whatever?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No. I can have the list this evening. There are no great changes.

Miscellaneous Printing..... $22,000

Mr. CHARLTON. Of what does this printing consist?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It consists of all reports sent to Council, the printing of papers, and miscellaneous printing for the departments, with the exception of reports. It is an item in which the only change is the amount asked.

Mr. LAURIER. Economy and retrenchment.

Customs, Prince Edward Island..... $19,885

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to ask the Minister of Customs if he has had time to give consideration to some remarks made from this side of the House respecting the collection of revenues at Charlottetown, and the salaries of the officers? I think the hon. gentleman was kind enough to intimate that this matter would receive consideration at his hands.

Mr. BOWELL. My promise was that the question of the salary of the chief clerk should receive the consideration of the department. The general question to which the hon. gentleman refers has received my attention and consideration a great many times. I do not see my way, as I indicated in my former remarks, to increase the expenditure which would be incurred by adopting the system suggested by the hon. gentleman, or having statutory increases for all officers of Customs. Since that discussion, I have looked at the list of officers at Charlottetown and compared it with the lists at the cities to which he referred, and I do not find that discrepancy he indicates, except in regard to the higher classes, the chief clerk and surveyor. But as regards the landing waiters and tide waiters, they are about on a par with officers of like character in St. John, Halifax and Montreal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then with respect to the higher officers, their cases are under consideration?

Mr. BOWELL. They are. The question as to the chief clerk, to whose case special attention was called, should be considered.

Travelling Inspectors..... $18,000

Mr. CHARLTON. How many inspectors are there in the service of the Government?

Mr. BOWELL. I answered that question before. One for Nova Scotia, one for New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, one for Quebec and part of Ontario, one for the upper section of Ontario including Manitoulin Island, one for Winnipeg and as far east as Port Arthur and west to British Columbia, and one in British Columbia. As British Columbia has not many ports I gave the power and authority of the inspector to the collector at New Westminster. These are the regular inspectors.

There is also the financial inspector, Mr. McMichael, in Toronto. When any difficulty arises in connection with the books and collections we send him to all parts of the Dominion in order to settle the matter. He also performs all the duties formerly discharged by Mr. Wolfe, and no new appointment was made in that officer's place.

Board of Customs $17,550

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the nature of the duties of the chairman of the board, and what is the total amount of his salary?

Mr. BOWELL. $4,000. He presides at all meetings of the board in addition to performing his other duties in connection with questions affecting the tariff and the interpretation of the tariff. This sum has been paid ever since the board was established.

Mr. CHARLTON. And Mr. Johnston is still acting?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Administration of Chinese Immigration Act $2,000

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the Customs Department had any representation made to it by the United States respecting the smuggling of Chinese from Canada into the United States in the guise of women?

Mr. BOWELL. No; no information of that character. We have had information, however, as I explained when the item was before the Committee, from the United States about smuggling or the passage from our country into theirs of Chinese. Moreover, the United States Government have made representations to the Imperial Government, who have transmitted the despatches to this country, asking that we co-operate with them in preventing the Chinese leaving this country and going to the United States. The House will easily understand what answer they received to a communication of that kind. When once a Chinaman is here and has paid his $50 he has a right to go and come as he pleases.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is no friction or bad feeling between the two Governments?

Mr. BOWELL. Not at all.

Mr. LAURIER. I think I have seen it in the public press, that by a judicial decision recently rendered, either by the Supreme Court of the United States or the Supreme Court of California, I do not know which, applying a local law to the State of California which provides that all Chinese coming into the United States in violation of the laws of the United States are to be shipped back: it was supposed they were to be sent back to China, but I understand that the court decided in this case that they should be sent back to the country whence they came, which is British Columbia. I have seen the statement somewhere that such a decision has been rendered not later than three weeks ago.

Mr. BOWELL. I have not seen that. The former decision was quite the other way.

Indians, New Brunswick $6,200

Mr. DEWDNEY. In connection with this item I would like to make a statement in reference to an accusation that was made by the hon. member for Guysborough when we were in committee on the supplies for New Brunswick Indians. I am sorry the gentleman is not now in his place, but he made an accusation against one of our Indian agents, and I think it is only right that I should take the first opportunity I have of showing that he was misinformed with regard to the accusation he made, and to clear the character of the agent, who I believe is an honourable man. The member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) stated that a yoke of oxen had been sold to the department by a man named Donald Chisholm for $70 or $73, and that Donald Chisholm had only received $60. I told the hon. gentleman then, that this was a very strong accusation to make unless he had good proof of it, and that if he would send me the proof he had, I would make enquiries, because if the agent was found guilty of that he would receive his instant dismissal. The member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) sent me the following day the information which induced him to make the statement which he did, and from it I can find no fault with the hon. member for making the accusation, but if he had come to my office with the accusation, he would have found this agent to have been most grossly maligned, and he would have had no occasion to leave him for a week or two under the ban of being a thief. The following is a copy of the memorandum which the hon. gentleman forwarded to me, and on which he based his accusation:—

"This is to certify that I sold a pair of oxen to W. C. Chisholm, Indian agent, in summer 1888 for sixty dollars ($60) and I see he has charged the Government $70 or $73 for them.

"DONALD CHISHOLM,
"Afton, Antigonish.

"AFTON, 17th July, 1891."

The following day I went to the department to make enquiries into the matter, and I find from the voucher, a copy of which I hold in my hand, that a voucher had been made out to Donald Chisholm for $70 for a pair of oxen and $1.50 for an ox chain, making $71.50; that the cheque had been made out in Donald Chisholm's name, forwarded to him, and that he endorsed it and certified to having received the money. On the day following I received a letter from the agent to this effect:

"HEATHERTON, ANTIGONISH CO., N.S., Sept., 1891.

"Hon. E. DEWDNEY,

"Supt. Gen. of Indian Affairs, Ottawa, Ont.

"SIR,—My attention has been called to a remark made by D. C. Fraser, M. P. for Guysborough, in the House of Commons, as reported in *Hansard*, 31st August, page 4730, in which he said:

"Among those supplies was one yoke of oxen charged at $73 and one yoke at $70. On making enquiries I find that the oxen did not cost that much. I have a certificate signed Donald Chisholm, who sold the oxen, stating that he sold a yoke of oxen to Indian agent W. C. Chisholm for $60, and that he found that the agent had charged $70 or $73.

"I beg to inform the Department that Chisholm received the whole sum of $70 for the oxen at that time. That there is not an atom of proof in anything said to the contrary, that Chisholm says he signed the certificate under a misapprehension, that upon my asking him to give me a declaration to the contrary he did so in the presence of Allan J. Cameron. I enclose a declaration signed by Chisholm. Hoping this will satisfactorily clear up this affair,

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"W. C. CHISHOLM.
"*Indian Agent, District No. 9.*"

The declaration of Donald Chisholm is as follows:—

"I, Donald Chisholm, of Afton, in the County of Antigonish, hereby declare that I received seventy dollars for a pair of oxen bought from me in the fall of 1887, for the Indian, viz., Charles Pullet, by William C. Chisholm, Indian agent, and I also declare that any statement made to the contrary is false.

"DONALD CHISHOLM.

"HEATHERTON, 30th July, 1891.

"I hereby certify that in my presence Donald Chisholm, of Afton, acknowledged the above statement to be correct and the said signature to be in his handwriting.

"A. J. CAMERON.

"HEATHERTON, 30th July, 1891."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is that the same man who gave the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) the statement?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, the same man.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not rise to impugn in any way the accuracy of the statement which the Minister has just read to the House, further than to say that the memorandum he read is in no sense, legal or otherwise, a statutory declaration. It does not profess to be such, and the hon. gentleman of course must not represent it to the House as such. The statement, as it appears from the remarks of the Minister, was made by this same Donald Chisholm in the first instance to the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who, as the Minister of Interior justly remarks, was fully justified in making the remarks he did in the House. This man Chisholm now makes a simple statement contradicting the first one he made, but it is not in any sense a statutory declaration and neither the House nor the country will receive it as such. Another man states it was made in his presence, but it is not a statutory declaration and is not subject to the penalties which may be attached to such.

Mr. TUPPER. The first statement was not a statutory declaration either.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Neither is, and therefore so far as the member for Guysborough is concerned, he was perfectly justified in making the statement to the House. What I rise for is to repudiate the implied reflection which the Minister cast upon the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) in bringing this matter before the House. He intimates that the proper way was for the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) to run around to his office and get the information privately. I wish to take issue distinctly on that point. If the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), or any other member of this House, has information of such a character as that placed in his hands by the seller of the article, saying that he had sold the article for such a sum, and that a less sum was credited in the public accounts, it is the duty of the member to make that statement in his place in the House. Reckless statements will be discountenanced at all times by the House, and no hon. gentleman who values his reputation will make them; but when he has a statement to make affecting the character of a public officer and respecting the proper conduct of public affairs, his duty is to make it from his place in the House. I do not think the Minister's contention was correct, that instead of the hon. member making his statement in the House he should have gone to his department. Members of Parliament cannot be expected to run around to the public departments trying to find out whether each one of the statements they receive from all parts of the country is correct or not. The matter must be laid before the House, and the House is the proper place in which to make such statements. The statement made, and the refutation such as this, will now go before those who are, or ought to be acquainted with the facts, and they can judge whether the statement was correct or not. As the matter now stands the House has two statements made by the same man and contradicting each other, and we have nothing further.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The course which the hon. gentleman suggests would be a very proper one if there were no interests to be considered except those of the public, the member who is possessed of the information and the department. But this matter relates to a gentleman who has another interest, namely, his private character. He is a public officer, and as such is, of course, open to censure and enquiry, but he is not subject among honourable men to be robbed of his character by an unjust accusation. Now, I do not want to say one word reflecting upon the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), in his absence; far from it. I merely suggest this as a general principle, that, where a charge is made, without knowledge by the member of the credibility of the person making the charge, perhaps it would be well for him to send it across the House to the proper Minister before reading it to the House, in order that enquiry may be made. I do not know the person who gave this certificate in answer to the charge, but it seems to me that the certificate is a complete refutation of the dishonest accusation which he made, and which misled the hon. member for Guysborough. I know Mr. Chisholm, the agent, and I know that he is one of the most respectable men in the county, a man against whom no such charge would be made by anyone who knows him either in that county or in the adjoining county of Guysborough. He is a respectable merchant, a councillor of the County of Antigonish, and a man whose reputation is above reproach. I know that if the hon. member for Guysborough knew the man, he would have allowed an opportunity for the answer to be made before giving the charge publicity.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to add a word in entire approval and support of the position taken by the hon. Minister of Justice in reference to this matter. I think that a great responsibility rests upon members of Parliament in bringing injurious accusations in this House against people throughout the country. Only a short time ago a most respectable and highly esteemed man in my own constituency was attacked by an hon. member in this House, in exactly the same way, and the injurious statements that he made were circulated through the press. This gentleman and his family were, for a very considerable time, caused the greatest possible mental distress by these utterly unfounded statements. If a charge is placed in the hands of an hon. member of so serious a character as to render it necessary for him to bring it to the attention of this House, it would be a very simple thing for him to make some enquiry in reference to the matter from the department. I think we all, as members of this House, ought carefully to consider this matter, and make up our minds that no charge shall be laid against any man upon our responsibility as members, with-

out first making enquiry as to the *bonâ fides* of the person who places the charge in our hands.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a matter of some importance, and I believe, and I think the House will agree with me, that in all such matters the public interest is best served by members of this House discharging their public duties on the floor of this House. For my part, if such a matter were placed in my hands, I would be opposed to going around to a Minister's department to have, I will not say a Star Chamber enquiry, but a private enquiry into the accusation. This system of making charges may be liable to abuse; in all such cases abuses are liable to take place; but I contend that less abuse will take place if these duties are discharged openly in this House than would be the case if the course suggested were followed. Occasionally some injustice may be done to certain men; but there is certainly something extraordinary in a person making an accusation against an officer of the Government, and afterwards repudiating it. At all events, the character of the officer has not suffered, as the party who made the accusation, I believe, now retracts it, and there is more likelihood of justice being done to all parties concerned by having the matter ventilated on the floor of Parliament. If the other course suggested had been taken by the hon. member for Guysborough, what would have happened? If he had gone to the Minister's department, perhaps the vindication of the character of the officer would not have been as speedy and full as it has been. Under all circumstances, it seems to me that the best course to be followed is to have any charges made against an officer of the Government ventilated on the floor of the House, with full publicity.

New Brunswick Indians—Medical attendance..... $1,195

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think this is the item that includes certain payments made to some Roman Catholic missionaries in the Province of New Brunswick, and charged as such in the public accounts. A good deal of attention has been attracted to this matter, and I should like to know what the intention of the Government is in regard to it, because we cannot allow salaries to be paid to the clergymen of any church under conditions such as those under which these payments are said to be made. This money is intended for the material well-being of these Indians, and it may be expended in a careful and judicious manner; but it appears to establish the principle of voting money for the religious instruction of the Indians. I am not going into the question whether such religious instruction should be given by the state or not. All I say is, that this is not the present policy of the Government, and it must not be applied in one case and in no other. The Minister must see that this money is used as far as may be for the purpose for which it is intended, and not in the exceptional manner in which it is now distributed.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was in hopes that we should have something suggested by the Minister in regard to this matter. It is a matter that will attract a good deal of attention in the country. As my hon. friend from Muskoka says, the principle of making payments from the public funds to denominational teachers of the Indians is one that will not be accepted by the country. It is as well to have this matter settled now. The amount is not large; but, in my opinion, it is better for the Government to drop this entirely, and to leave to the different denominations the religious instruction of the Indians.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think I explained, when this matter was before the Committee, that these reverend fathers had been continued year after year ever since Confederation; in fact they were in the service of the Imperial Government before Confederation. This money is for the distribution of medicines among the Indians, and for work which, if we change our policy, will have to be done by agents. In New Brunswick we have only two agents at present. The matter having now been brought to the attention of the Government, however, I propose to consider it during the recess, and see whether any change can be made; but nothing can be done until we enquire into the general working of Indian affairs in New Brunswick.

Management of four Well-boring Machines, North-West Territories.... $3,000

Mr. CHARLTON. When in Dakota some months ago, I heard a good deal of talk about artesian wells, which are being carried on to some extent there and have proved quite successful. Do the Government intend trying the system in the North-West?

Mr. DAVIN. In accordance with your decision, Mr. Speaker, that the members should speak before the Minister replies, I would state to the hon. gentleman that these four boring machines, I am sorry to say, are not artesian machines. We have no artesian wells in the North-West, but the Minister is making an experiment at Deloraine. There cannot be the least doubt, judging by what has been done in Dakota, that if the Government would sink artesian wells in the North-West, in those places where it is difficult to get water—not because there is no water, but because the means of the farmers will not allow them to dig deep enough—parts of the Territories which are richer than I can describe, but in which there is no irrigation at present, would become very attractive to settlers. As it has been declared on very high authority that this Government is the real Government of the North-West, that it administers the land, it is the duty of this, and not of the Local Assembly, to deal with the problem. I was on a visit to Dakota two years ago, and I saw what I thought was a lake in that prairie country, but I was told it was not a lake at all, but the flow from the artesian well. The well runs the whole year, the pipe rises above ground, and overflows into an immense tank, the overflow from which finds its way down to the valley and forms itself into a lake, at once useful and picturesque. If we had artesian wells at points where four sections touch, we would have water, at a cost probably of $1,000, within the reach of sixteen settlers, and if you divide that amount by sixteen you will see what a paltry lien it would be on each farm.

Mr. CHARLTON. Could you have an artesian well for that amount?

Mr. DAVIN. No matter what it would cost. Suppose it cost $2,000 or $3,000, that would still leave but a small lien on each farm, when divided by sixteen, especially when you set against it the distance the farmers often have now to go in search of water, ten miles and twenty miles. I have

urged on the Minister and the Government to deal with this question and not shift the responsibility to the Local Government. A large portion of country near Moose Jaw and south of Wascana and other parts of the North-West, where you have the best land in the world, but where water has to be brought a great distance, if artesian wells were dug, would become most attractive and profitable to the incoming settlers for agricultural purposes, and not be wholly devoted to grazing.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I appreciate the importance of the question, and we are now endeavouring to see whether we have an artesian basin in our country or not. We have, with the aid of moneys invested by the municipality of Deloraine and by the Local Government of Manitoba, succeeded in boring over 1,800 feet deep, and have not yet succeeded in obtaining water. We expect to do so, however, and parties in Dakota are as much interested in the well as we are. Some of the experts from Dakota have been examining the well, and are very anxious with regard to the result, as the well will serve the country between our boundary and Devil's Lake, where the present artesian well has been so successful. With reference to the scheme proposed by the hon. member for West Assiniboia, I do not think we can attempt to sink wells at the intersections of four sections, because we would have to bore to a great depth, and $1,000 would be altogether insufficient. The machines referred to in the Estimates are well-boring machines, which are not expected to go further than a few hundred feet, and are for the purpose of giving information to the farmers how far they will have to go for water. They will then know whether it is within their means to sink the wells themselves. They have been a very great success as far as they have gone, and have been very much appreciated by the farmers, who give what assistance they can in the shape of horse power towards sinking these wells. The subject of artesian wells is a very large question, and some people are under the impression that irrigation can be carried on to some extent by means of artesian wells. I think that is a fallacy, and, as I know by experience and by enquiries, there is very little irrigation to be obtained from artesian wells. The largest artesian wells on the continent of America is in Southern California, and the water obtained from that is only sufficient to irrigate one square mile of territory, so I think this system cannot be used very much for irrigating purposes, though it may be useful in a country like ours if the water can be carried long distances for the use of farmers, then the system would be of great benefit. However, it is very uncertain yet, and I doubt if it is so difficult as has been represented to obtain water in the North-West. I know that south of Regina, which was reported to be so very dry, they have sunk wells lately where it was stated it was useless to do any boring. They obtained the services of some knowing Hungarian and followed his advice, and I believe they have some running wells now. With the aid of these borers, I believe we shall be able to do a great deal of good in this dry part of the country, and that we shall be able to find water in the upper stratum, in the gravel, at reasonable depths, but I believe that below the clay it would be necessary to go down 1,800 to 2,000 feet.

Mr. TROW. I think this is commendable where the Government have large tracts of territory, but I do not think it is desirable to spend money in this way at every cross road. Surely, if it is true as has been stated that the grain will this year reach the price of a dollar a bushel, the capitalists who own so much land in the North-West should undertake to make the improvements, or a few of the farmers combined could do it without the Government carrying water to every man's mill in the North-West. We have been exceedingly liberal to the North-West all along, and I think it is time to put on the brakes.

Rent of Court Room..... $500

Mr. CHARLTON. Where is the court room?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is in a building erected by the North-West Land Company in Regina.

Contingencies (to be approved by Minister of the Interior)..... $3,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What does that mean, "to be approved by Minister of the Interior"?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think this item will appear here for the last time, because, after the next meeting of the Assembly, they will have it in their own hands.

Schools, North-West Territories..... $100,000

Mr. CHARLTON. Is this for Indian schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; for public schools.

To meet expenditure in connection with the Canada Temperance Act.. $2,500

Mr. CHARLTON. What expenses are we incurring now in connection with the Canada Temperance Act?

Mr. FOSTER. This is to meet what may be required to be expended. For instance, if any county petitions to have the Act put in force, or to have the Act repealed, the expenses of the voting will be taken out of this.

Mr. CASEY. I think this Government has tried to throw too much expense and too much responsibility on the Local Governments in connection with this Act. This is a Dominion Act and should be enforced by Dominion officers. It concerns the Department of Excise in the first place, and the Government ultimately, to see that this Act is enforced. I do not say that the law is always practicable. There are districts in which the public sentiment is strongly in favour of prohibition; it may be so, but in a mixed community it is very difficult to enforce it. It has not been the policy of this Government to attempt to enforce this Act, and I can hardly characterize their course as otherwise than cowardly. They are apparently afraid to incur the hostility of those who deal in liquor by taking means to enforce the Act. They prefer to allow the officials of the Local Government to make the attempt at enforcement, and to leave the cost of carrying it out upon the Local Government, which is always blamed in case of a failure to enforce the Act. I do not think it has been sufficiently made plain how far this Government is forgetting or intentionally neglecting its duty in this matter. I should think I might appeal to the Minister of Finance, as one

who is well known for his interest in temperance matters, to see that a change is made in this direction. If we allow counties to take a vote and put in force a Dominion Act, undoubtedly the responsibility for enforcing that Act rests with the Government here, and it is the duty of Ministers to take the responsibility for such enforcement. I have known a good deal of ill-feeling to exist in my own county where the Scott Act was for a time in force, and although the Local Government officials did their best, they failed to enforce the Act. They simply succeeded in collecting a considerable amount of revenue in the way of fines, and it came to be practically a question of fining the tavern-keepers so many times in a year, and thereby collecting a reasonable revenue, and the Local Government was blamed by the prohibitionists of that county and of all counties, for not enforcing the Act better. Now that the Government are taking a vote in connection with this Act, I think it behooves the Minister to explain what steps he intends to take for its enforcement, where it is supposed to be in force, and the extent of the responsibility of this Government in connection with the matter. I would like to hear what he has to say on that point before the item is concurred in. I have no doubt that under the circumstances, considering that this is a question of temperance work, he will not allow this challenge to pass without reply; if he does, he confesses that he does not intend to do anything, that he does not acknowledge the responsibility of this Government in the matter, and does not wish to incur the ill-feeling of another class of the community by enforcing the Act. I think he might explain the intentions of the Government in respect to enforcing the Scott Act; if not, he will confess by his silence that they do not intend to try to enforce it at all, that they intend to continue the course they have pursued hitherto, of leaving the matter in the hands of those who have not machinery sufficient to enforce it, and to blame them for the failure of the Act itself.

Mr. FOSTER. Carried.

Mr. CASEY. Confessed.

To compensate members of the North-West Mounted Police for injuries received in the discharge of duty.. $2,000

Mr. CHARLTON. Is this supposed to cover all possible contingencies under this head?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is supposed to meet all contingencies.

To provide for the payment of Mr. Fabre's salary and contingencies of his office..... $3,500

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would not feel warranted in asking the Minister to give the House information that might have been given at a previous stage, simply because I was absent, but I have looked through the *Hansard* diligently under the date when this item passed through Committee, and apparently it was passed without discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. I gave explanation at the time.

Commercial Agencies..... ..... $5,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have not been able to find it yet, but no doubt the subject is of sufficient importance that the Minister perhaps will not object to say a few words again in explanation. I remember a few years ago when this item was put in- I think it was $10,000—I viewed it very favourably; I thought it was a step in the right direction, I thought it was well to locate agents in countries where we might expect to do a foreign trade and that benefit would result from it; but I am not aware that we have had any explanations in any year as to any effective work that has been done in this direction. If I remember rightly a portion of the vote, at any rate, was supplied to sending Mr. Jones to the Argentine Republic. It seemed to me that was scarcely the object for which it was voted. It is well known in the House that the Canadian exporter and manufacturer visiting a foreign country is under a good deal of disadvantage. The British manufacturer has, of course, the British Minister in the country to whom he can apply for assistance, if he requires it; and the United States manufacturer, of course, has the United States Minister to whom he can apply, while the Canadian manufacturer or exporter, in visiting one of these countries to push his sales, finds himself without any assistance. Of course he may apply to the British Minister, and no doubt would receive a very courteous reception from the British Minister, and it would probably be conveyed to him that the interest of the British manufacturer and the interests of the Canadian manufacturer were separate and distinct in these matters, and that he was charged particularly with advancing the interests of the manufacturers in England, or in Scotland, or in Ireland, and that it was not his particular duty to give assistance to the Canadian manufacturer or exporter. I had thought, when this item was first placed in the Estimates, that it was with a view to feeling our way as to whether a resident agent in some country in which we might hope to develop a good trade, might be found of sufficient advantage to warrant its introduction and the extension of the principle. So far I see there is just the same amount asked from year to year, and as I said before, I am not aware that any explanation has been given to the House as to how this money has been expended. I would like the Minister to say whether we have really had a commercial agent at all, one that might fairly come under the designation for which this vote is asked? Have we had any agent of the Canadian Government residing in any foreign country to attend to the commercial interest of Canada? That, I think, was the object of this vote. Sending an agent to Jamaica, or to the Argentine Republic, or somewhere else, does not seem to me to have come within the idea that was entertained when this vote was asked from Parliament. I would like to ask, further, whether the full amount of $10,000 has been expended each year, how it has been expended, to whom it has been paid, and whether it is intended to try the experiment of having a resident agent, a commercial agent who shall look after the commercial interests of Canada, in some countries?

Mr. FOSTER. On September 7th, as will be seen by referring to *Hansard*, a discussion took place on this item, although it was brief. I think last year there was a little longer discussion upon it, and I explained a little more in detail what we proposed to do with the vote, which was form-

erly $10,000, but is now $5,000, and which, as he says, was used but only in part, to defray the expenses of Mr. Jones' trip to South America. Since then I do not think much has been expended out of that vote. The last fiscal year of which we have a record nothing was spent out of that vote; in the fiscal year just passed, of which we have not a record yet, the expenses which were incurred in my mission to the West Indies was charged to that vote, and as long as we have such a vote we may use it for purposes of a like kind.

Mr. CASEY. Did the hon. gentleman say that the expenses of the Jamaica Exhibition were paid out of it?

Mr. FOSTER. If at any time during the course of the year it is thought expedient to send any commercial mission to any country—and such things do occur, and they are liable to occur at any time—it is quite well to have a sum voted out of which an expenditure for such purpose can be had. But my main object in continuing the vote since I have been Minister of Finance, was in the direction that my hon. friend hinted at, namely, commencing with a few countries, to establish a kind of commercial agency, not on a large scale at all, but to make the beginning of a kind of stationary agent, who could report the state of the markets, the requirements of the markets, the prices of goods and the like of that, and these reports being sent to the department could be published for the benefit of the commercial public. During my trip to the West Indies I had personal conversations with gentlemen in several of the Islands to that end, and I intend this year to bring before Council a plan, not at all ambitious or large, for the establishment of commercial agents in several of the more important points of the West Indies, and in other points in countries, especially those with which we might be able to establish trade. Of course the small sum at my disposal would not allow me to go very far in this direction, but I should like to make a trial of it and find out how it worked; and if we obtain valuable reports, and I have received a very excellent one of its kind from Trinidad, such as will help the commercial community, we could have them printed in bulletin form and distributed to the commercial community, to the boards of trade and other bodies, so that the merchants would get hold of them and the information might be acted upon and found very valuable.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In connection with this subject of the necessity of the Government obtaining accurate information from foreign ports with respect to matters affecting Canadian exporters, I should like to recall the attention of the hon. gentleman to an important conversation which took place in the House about two weeks ago respecting our right to have our products admitted free into Havana. The Minister of Finance, a short time after that conversation took place, said he was in a position to communicate to the House the information that our products would be admitted free into Havana up to next January, January 1st, I think, on equal terms with those of United States. That statement was received by both sides of the House with very great pleasure, and it was received with still greater pleasure by those exporters in the Maritime Provinces who for a year or two past have engaged very largely in exporting the products of the Maritime Provinces to that port. To-day I received from one of those gentlemen a Havana prices current issued by M. Gondalez & Co., dated Havana, September 5, which has created some little consternation among the exporters of the Maritime Provinces. In that circular, referring to the item of potatoes, it is stated: "Potatoes from the United States, free; from other countries 1·050 per kilogramme." I think it right to bring this matter to the attention of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. What date?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Fifth of September—nine days old. Some of the steamers are in the act of leaving, or are getting ready to leave for Havana, and it is highly important that shippers should be informed at the earliest possible date what the real facts are. I am also aware from information conveyed to me that New York shippers are under the impression that, in the Havana market, United States produce will have an advantage over Canadian produce in that respect, and they are also declaring in circulars and otherwise that they will have control of that trade this year, which of course will be detrimental to the interests of our merchants. I hope, therefore, if any step is still required to be taken by the hon. Minister to settle the matter absolutely, he will take such step at an early date, and will take this House into his confidence, and let us know how we stand. I hope he will be able to repeat his assurance that our produce will be received in Havana at exactly the same terms as that of the United States.

Mr. CASEY. I have had several cases in my own county bearing on this subject. I have received a letter from a gentleman who wishes to export beans to Cuba, the markets of the United States being closed against him by the duty of 40 cents per bushel which is now imposed. He informs me that he has been in communication with a party in New York, who reported there was a good market for beans in Cuba, and that if he could get them entered on the same terms as beans from the United States a large trade could be opened up, which would afford a market for farmers in Western Ontario where beans are very largely grown. In the western portion of Elgin, and in Essex and Kent, they are one of the leading crops. That gentleman asked me to find out what the Government knew about the matter, and whether our produce would be admitted into that Island on the same terms as produce from the United States. I understand the ministerial explanation to be that, under the most-favoured-nation clause of the British treaty with Spain, we had the right to enter our goods under that treaty as the most favoured nation. I understood the Minister of Finance at the time to say that treaty ran on to June—perhaps it was a mistake for January. Has the hon. gentleman any further information to communicate to the House?

Mr. FOSTER. The information I conveyed to the House some three weeks ago, in answer to a question put to me by the hon. member for King's, N. S., was substantially as stated by the hon. member for Elgin, which was to the effect that my information from the British Government was that, until 1st July, 1892, or the last of June, on account of the convention existing between that country and Spain, our goods, because we were included as a colony in that convention, would be received in Cuba and Porto Rico on the most-

favoured-nation terms. I have had no information to the contrary. I can quite understand how this idea to which the hon. member referred arose. I know that about that time the same statements were being made, not only in the public press, but in private letters, that after 1st September there would be a difference in the duties on United States products and the products of all other countries. It may be simply the survival of that idea, which may very easily obtain among people not acquainted with the terms of the convention and whose attention had not been called to it. I have no reason to give any other information to the House, but having had my attention called to the subject, I will make special enquiries regarding it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Finance spoke about obtaining commercial reports from Trinidad, and having them circulated among the merchants of the country. I would suggest that if we were to obtain from the English Foreign Office copies of the consular reports from all those countries with which it was thought possible that Canada could establish trade, and have them circulated as our blue-books are circulated, we would be conferring an immense advantage. If these were sent to the manufacturers and merchants of the country they would prove of very great service. There are no reports I know of which are so complete as those from the British consular agents. They are published by the Consular Department of the Foreign Office and distributed as are other public documents. If the Government were to distribute three copies to each member they would be widely circulated, and not only convey accurate and full information with respect to trade and the character of trade with Trinidad, but with every other country in the world, if we chose to obtain complete sets of the reports. I received them for some years when connected with the press, and they were worth to me all other documents of every other kind put together. I am sure very great advantage would accrue to our manufacturers and merchants if these reports were circulated as are the official documents of the House. We have grown into a sufficiently important Dominion to take interest in foreign trade, and these reports published by the Consular Department of the Foreign Office will be found invaluable to our mercantile and manufacturing classes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I was pleased to hear from the Minister of Finance that he intends to take the step he indicated. That would be good, but I think the point he ought to bear in mind when he is making these arrangements with these agents is to have it understood that anyone interested in that will be at liberty to call upon them, and that, as part of their duty, they shall give them all information and every facility, in addition to the statistics.

Mr. FOSTER. That will be done.

Mr. CASEY. Might I ask the permission of the House to make a suggestion?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must remember that we are not in Committee of Supply.

Mr. CASEY. I merely ask the permission of the House to make a short statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rules must be maintained. I cannot allow the rules to be violated.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. CASEY. I am asking the permission of the House and no person objects.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, the courtesy of allowing members to speak twice has been extended to several members of the House on this very subject.

Mr. SPEAKER. It has been accorded to the Minister of Finance because questions have been asked him by different members, and I suggested some little time ago that whatever hon. members had to say in regard to each of these items had better be said before the Minister was required to answer. I can hardly prevent the Minister from answering questions which have been asked by hon. gentlemen.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; chair.

Mr. MULOCK. I am quite in order, because I have not spoken before on this question. I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that inasmuch as not only the Minister of Finance but other members have been allowed to speak twice, it is not equal rights all around to interfere with my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey).

Mr. CASEY. Speaking to the question of order I was merely asking permission of the House to ask a practical question concerning the interests of my county in this matter. The importance of obtaining some authoritative information about the difficulty in Cuba is such as to justify people in wishing to obtain it, before they ship their goods to Cuba. If we do not obtain these privileges, the market for beans is closed entirely against us, and this is a very important matter to my constituents.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a question which must be settled, and it all comes down to the point as to whether the reciprocity between the United States and Spain is in force, or not in force. I was surprised the other day when I heard the statement of the hon. gentleman, because my impression was that the treaty between Spain and the United States is in force.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly on the 1st September.

Mr. LAURIER. Then we are not any longer in the same position in which we were. We have still the most-favoured-nation clause in our favour, but at the same time the treaty between Spain and the United States is in force. The reciprocity clauses of that treaty are not now in operation, and, therefore, the class of articles which are now admitted from Canada under the most-favoured-nation clause, pay duty, while the same class of goods from the United States pay no duty, because the reciprocity clauses in their favour would apply. If the treaty is in force we are at this moment in the same position in which we will be after the 1st July, 1892; but if the treaty is not in force, and perhaps it is not, because if I remember aright the correspondence between the two Governments, it was stipulated that the provisions in the treaties between Spain and other nations had to be provided for, Therefore it may be that the treaty is not in force, but if it is in force the American shippers have an advantage which we have not.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a preliminary arrangement up to the 1st July.

Mr. CHARLTON. The question is whether or not the most-favoured-nation clause affects the reciprocity treaty between Spain and the United States.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope my hon. friends are not going into a general discussion on the question of the reciprocity treaty.

Mr. CHARLTON. I merely want to know from the Minister of Finance if he asserts that under the most-favoured-nation clause of the treaty between Great Britain and Spain, Canada and Great Britain will have the same right, with regard to the markets of the Spanish West India Islands, that the United States has under a special treaty. Are we admitted to the same privileges of reciprocity, and do we grant them the same privileges that the United States grant? If not, it is useless to tell us that under the most-favoured-nation clause we are enjoying the same privileges that the American shippers do, and it is not fair to the shippers of beans, to whom my hon. friend refers, to convey the impression that under the most-favoured-nation clause they stand on the same footing as the people of the United States. This is a matter of money, and let it be well understood. We should not convey a false impresion to the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was officially stated we had the privilege.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you allow me to state that I will bring down and lay on the Table the correspondence with reference to the Havana and Cuba duties. I may read this statement from the last Halifax paper:

"Messrs. Pickford & Black received a cablegram last night announcing that the cargo of potatoes sent from Halifax on the steamer *Beta* had been entered free of duty at Havana."

Mr. CHARLTON. At what time was the entry made?

Mr. FOSTER. About the 10th or 11th of September.

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

After Recess.

Homestead Inspectors' Salaries..... $8,400

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior a case of hardship, as I regard it, to a settler in the North-West. A Mr. Thomas Campbell removed from the County of Huron in the spring of 1890 and went to the North-West and homesteaded, in the office of Brandon, the north-east quarter section 12, township 6, range 19, near where his brothers were already settled. He and his son went upon the section and made some improvements, and while so engaged he received a notification from the agent at Brandon stating that a mistake had been made in giving him that quarter section, as it had been promised in sale to a Mr. Hislop in 1887, and that Mr. Hislop had made one payment upon it, and advising Mr. Campbell not to go on with further improvements until he again heard from him. Mr. Campbell thereupon gave up work, after working for a week on the land. Ten or twelve days afterwards a letter came from the agent stating that he had referred the matter to the commissioner at Winnipeg, the result of which was that Mr. Campbell's right to the homestead had to be cancelled, owing to the promise made to Mr. Hislop in 1887. Mr. Campbell feels it a hardship that after taking up this land as a *bonâ fide* settler, and making improvements upon it, he was compelled to leave it because of a promise that had been made to a man three years previous, although only one payment had been made and none in the previous two years, and no interest had been paid. Mr. Campbell had taken steps to build a house, although he had not proceeded very far when he was obliged to leave the quarter section, and he squatted on school lands near by. He states that there is no other available quarter section in that locality, and he is unwilling to leave his brothers and go farther west. He was asked by the agent at Brandon to send in a statement of the amount of labour he had expended. He sent in a statement, asking $40 for the improvements he had made, claiming that he had ploughed ten acres. It appears the inspector was sent out for the purpose of ascertaining how much improvements were made, and he reported that Campbell was only entitled to $10 for his improvements. After I came here, I saw the Deputy Minister, Mr. Burgess, who is always willing to give every information he possibly can. I got him to write to the inspector to visit again Mr. Campbell's improvements, and have the ground measured, and he did so. He reported that only five acres were ploughed, that ploughing there only cost $2 an acre, and that he was willing to recommend that $10 be paid to Mr. Campbell. But Mr. Campbell claims rightly that he is entitled to more than $10 on account of the mistake for which he was in no way responsible. He lost time from the 10th of July, when he got the first notice that there was a mistake, to the 21st of July when he was told his homestead would have to be cancelled. Having gone there early in the spring, expecting to be able to bring his family shortly after, he found himself unable to do so on account of this mistake; his whole summer's work was thereby lost because he had done all his work on this claim, he has no home now, for his family are still living in my riding, and he is away out there in an unsettled frame of mind. Being a fiery tempered man, he says he is going to leave the country, he says he is going to Dakota, but, of course, allowance must be made for what a man will say when angry at unjust treatment, and I do not believe he will leave the country. All I ask of the Minister is that he will examine into this case thoroughly and indemnify Mr. Campbell for all the trouble and expense and damage he has been caused. He claims about $40 for his improvements and the time lost. It took him and his son a whole week to get to that place and come away again after receiving notice that there was a mistake. His hardships were increased by the fact that he and his son were a whole night and part of the day out in the drenching rain without any protection, having no place to go to. If the hon. Minister will take into consideration all the circumstances, he will see that Mr. Campbell's case ought to be liberally dealt with. I leave the matter in his hands, hoping he will do what one man should do to another under these circumstances. I speak for Mr. Campbell, not for any personal interest I have in the matter or any political bias whatever, because he is a strong Conservative, has always supported the Conservative party in Ontario, and no doubt will do so out where he is.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think I recollect the circumstances of the case referred to. There was a great deal of correspondence regarding it. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say whether he had made any improvements on that quarter section or not.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Campbell says that Mr. Hislop took a considerable quantity of the timber off, but he made no improvements.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman must understand that we have to be guided by the reports of our agents, unless we have some very special information. I will give this case special attention and make further enquiry, and if I find Mr. Campbell is entitled to a larger amount than offered him, I shall see that justice is done him. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Campbell is a good Conservative and has always worked for the Conservative party. I do not know anything about that, but my impression is that Mr. Hislop is on the other side of politics.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I believe so.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am sure there has been a great deal of correspondence from people in the neighbourhood, who generally take sides in a matter of this kind, and we came to the conclusion that Mr. Hislop was entitled to the quarter section. At the same time Mr. Campbell has something in his favour when, by inadvertence, the entry was given him; and, under the circumstances, he deserves some consideration.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I also understand that ploughing is worth more than $2 an acre.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Breaking was worth from $3 to $4.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It was breaking up; the first ploughing was in July.

To meet expenses for cattle quarantines and possible expenses for cattle diseases and sheep scab $15,000

Mr. O'BRIEN. I wish to take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Government to a matter which is closely connected with this vote. In a recent publication, the *Farmer's Advocate*, a very respectable and influential paper, published at the beginning of this month, I find an extract quoted from an American paper. The article in which it appears is one written just before the Government announced their intention not to permit the admission of American cattle for slaughter at the proposed establishment at Three Rivers. That, of course, is done away with, but this article, in order to point out the dangers likely to arise, quotes an article from an American newspaper, as follows:—

"BURLINGTON, IOWA.—The mysterious hoof and mouth disease so prevalent among cattle in north-western Iowa is in full force in Des Moines County, nearly 200 cases having been reported. The disease is found in all parts of the country, and is quite prevalent over in adjacent counties. The dairies around Middletown, Danville, Augusta and other places have been attacked, and the healthful supply of milk is greatly diminished. The state veterinarian has been notified of the situation, and has signified his intention of investigating the trouble. There is a great deal of uneasiness regarding the use of infected milk."

Then it quotes a number of extracts from American authorities on pleuro-pneumonia, pointing out the great danger which may arise, not from actual contact, but from the germs being carried in various ways. One illustration given is that of a herd of cattle which had been to a show at Detroit and was returning, but were placed on a switch side by side with a car-load of cattle that were affected with pleuro-pneumonia. The result was that the whole herd had to be destroyed. They were on adjacent sidings. I see also by this paper that an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia has occurred in England, and the herd of Sir Wilfred Lawson has been destroyed. Taking these facts together, it is likely that greater uneasiness will be caused in England as to the danger of pleuro-pneumonia, and I ask the Government whether it is wise for them to allow, under any circumstances, the passage of possibly infected cattle through our country to markets in the eastern states. Mr. Gibson, of Delaware, a very well informed man, writes, advocating a period of quarantine on cattle coming into this country under any circumstances. Of course, the adoption of such a plan would effectually stop the transit in bond through Canada from Detroit or anywhere on that frontier to the eastern states. It seems to me, if the dangers of infection are as great as they are said to be by those American authorities, it would be advisable to prevent the transit of American cattle through our country. Of course, as long as there was no increase of disease in the United States, it might not be worth taking these representations into account, but, as we have the evidence of this fresh outbreak, and we know that all these cattle have their market in Chicago, and that, if the outbreak is in Iowa and in Illinois, their cattle have to find their market in Chicago, they may possibly bring the infection into Canada, and the result of one case of that pleuro-pneumonia in Canada would at once be sufficient to stop our trade in live cattle with the mother country. The danger is so great, the risk is so enormous, the consequence is so serious, that I think the Government should carefully enquire into this matter and ascertain whether their present restrictions are sufficient to protect us from the danger which threaten us. I have no doubt that reasonable restrictions are demanded and have been taken with regard to the transportation of these cattle, but from the evidence which is laid before us, as to the ease and rapidity with which this infection may be carried through the germs which may be floating in the air, and may find resting places from which they may be conveyed to cattle in various ways, the danger certainly seems to be exceedingly great. I see it is stated here that the droppings of cattle, the manure which may be shovelled out of the cars, may be a source of danger. That, of course, cannot be prevented. Something of that kind must take place to a greater or less extent in the transport of cattle, and if by that means infection can oe communicated, it is certainly another serious source of danger. I have nothing further to say except to call the attention of the Government to the fact that this sudden outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in the States of Iowa and Illinois should put us on our guard in respect to the transport of cattle coming from that infected country, while the additional fact of a fresh outbreak in England will make the farmers there much more anxious than they have been hitherto to avoid any possible danger. But, of course, all that brings us to the very serious consideration that the slightest out-

break from this source will at once put an end to what is now our most valuable and profitable trade.

Mr. HAGGART. I will draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the remarks of the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). It is a very serious question to consider whether we should put a stop to the transport of cattle in bond through this country from the United States. They pass through on regulations and conditions which are approved by the Imperial Government, and every means possible will be taken for the prevention of the spread of any disease. As I understand the subject, it was stated the other evening that pleuro-pneumonia is only communicated by contact with diseased animals. I think every precaution is taken in their transport through the country. However, I will draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the statement of the hon. gentleman, and if he will give me the pamphlet I will hand it to the Minister.

Mr. MULOCK. The other evening, when the subject of quarantine was under discussion, the Postmaster General then announced it as the opinion of the veterinary department that pleuro-pneumonia was only communicable by contact. The authorities quoted by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) this evening would indicate that that theory was not correct. Should these authorities be correct, I trust there will be better safeguards adopted at quarantine. The Postmaster General should remember that it was announced the other evening in the House that animals coming in by different vessels were housed only 20 feet apart from each other, so that a diseased herd might be within 20 feet of a sound herd. If cars passing each other can communicate the disease, surely there is danger of its being communicated when animals are standing by each other for 90 days only 20 feet distant from each other, even if there may be some frame shed or structure separating them. That, I understand, is the condition of affairs at quarantine where there appears to be no valid reason for the continuance of such a state of affairs. There is no limit to the quantity of land at the disposal of the department; there is land enough in Canada surely for quarantine buildings at a safe distance from each other so as to avoid any possible risk being incurred. The member for Muskoka raises a most important question, and inasmuch as the Postmaster General intends to communicate with the Minister of Agriculture upon the subject, I would venture to suggest that he should also see what precautions are taken by the Railway Department to see that the cars in which cattle from the states are shipped are thoroughly disinfected before Canadian cattle are shipped in those same cars.

Mr. BOWELL. The railway authorities, not the Railway Department.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Customs says the railway authorities have to look to that. Now, whilst it is their duty to carry out the regulations, it would be the duty of the Government to prescribe proper regulations.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not the duty of the Government to attend to any matters affecting either quarantine or Customs. The regulations are very strict and very severe, and it is the duty of the Customs Department, not of the Railway Department, to see that they are carried out to their fullest possible extent, with the aid of the Department of Agriculture. I can assure the hon. gentleman that nothing has been left undone in matters affecting either quarantine or the enforcement of these regulations. I did not understand the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) to quote any authorities or any instance to show that anything else than contact would communicate the disease from one herd of cattle to others. It is true he quoted some authorities who had given the opinion that it was communicated by the droppings; but it is quite easy to understand that the germ of the disease might be communicated from a carload of cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia standing alongside of another, because the wind would carry the breath from the cattle of one car to those of another, and by that means the disease might be communicated.

Mr. MULOCK. That is not what we were told the other night.

Mr. BOWELL. That is what the member for Muskoka told us to-night, and that is the reason for a stricter adherence to the rules which at present are in force. I can only add to what the Postmaster General has already said, that the Minister of Agriculture is always on the lookout, together with his officials, in order to prevent the possibility of the contagion spreading in this country, and I am quite satisfied that if the disease is spreading in the United States to the extent indicated by the hon. member for Muskoka, the most rigid steps will be taken, even to the point, if necessary, of preventing the transportation of cattle through Canada from the United States, in order to preserve our Canadian cattle from the disease.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Toronto Harbour Works..... $75,000

Mr. MULOCK. Before this item is adopted I desire to call the attention of the Minister in charge to the fact that a leading paper in Toronto, the *Mail*, recently published an article referring to the work in question, making some very grave charges against the department in connection with that contract. I had expected before now there would have been some communication and announcement in regard to it. The papers were ordered to be produced before the Public Accounts Committee some time ago. I have not yet learned of their having been produced, and before this item is passed there are some points on which I should like to trouble the Minister who has the matter in charge. First, I should like to enquire why this contract was let to Murray & Cleveland, and why the tender of Macdonald & Aylmer, which I understand was much lower, $40,000, was passed over.

Mr. FOSTER. As the hon. gentleman says, or implies in what he has stated, this work was advertised for public tender on 15th April, 1889. In reply, tenders were received up to and including 3rd May following. There were twelve tenderers, the first being Murray & Cleveland, of St. Catharines; the second being Macdonald & J. A. Aylmer, of

Toronto. Calculating the estimated quantities by the schedules of prices given in each tender, the tenders turned out, not as the hon. gentleman intimates, but quite the reverse, the tender of Murray & Cleveland being $192,810, while that of Macdonald & Aylmer was $193,125. All the other tenders were higher, grading up as high as $315,912. So tenders were called for by advertisement, twelve were received, the lowest tender was accepted and the contract was given to the lowest tender.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman has a statement of the calculations worked out?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Will it be put on the Table?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I am told the specifications for the work called for two dredges being regularly employed on it, of the joint capacity of 1,500 cubic yards per day, with a penalty of $50 a day for failure of performance on the part of either of them.

Mr. FOSTER. I am informed that it is a fact that under the specifications two dredges were called for, and in fact two dredges have been at work, and have worked always except when disabled, either by breaking down or some accident of that kind, or prevented from working by bad weather.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the hon. gentleman's contention is that that condition of the contract has been substantially fulfilled. Is that what he desires the Committee to understand?

Mr. COATSWORTH. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that in the newspaper article to which he referred, one of the charges was that too much dredging was done.

Mr. MULOCK. When I have finished putting my questions, the hon. gentleman can put any questions he likes.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I was not putting any question.

Mr. MULOCK. The quantity of work is not complained of. The complaint is that it was not prosecuted with proper dispatch.

Mr. FOSTER. The two dredges furnished by Murray & Cleveland have performed the work very well, with the exception of the times when one or the other was disabled, which will happen, I suppose, under the best of circumstances. The two dredges did all that was necessary, and did it satisfactorily, and the periods during which one or other of the dredges has been incapacitated from work have not been long periods. It is to be remembered also that the dredging that is to be done during this time, until the crib-work it built, is simply for keeping open the channel for navigation, and I believe that has been fairly satisfactorily done.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the Minister gives us to understand that the dredging has been proceeded with as rapidly as the contract requires?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Therefore, there has been no default in this part of the work, and the other question which I intended to ask, whether there had been any fine imposed which the contract provides for, I need not ask in view of that reply. Then I would desire to know whether the engineer in charge of the works has made any complaints to the Public Works Department that the contractors have not been living up to the specifications or any of them?

Mr. FOSTER. The engineer in charge has made no complaints so far as the engineer here can remember at the present time.

Mr. MULOCK. I would call the attention of the Minister to the statement which I have to the effect that the contract requires the work to be built within thirty months, and that the contract provides that time is to be the essence of it. Has the contract been proceeded with as rapidly as this condition of the contract requires?

Mr. FOSTER. No: the time of the contract will not be complied with. The engineer informs me that there were certain good reasons for this.

Mr. MULOCK. Do you mean the engineer on the ground?

Mr. FOSTER. No: the engineer from the department who is here at the present time. He says that in the first place this contract was let in the wrong season of the year so to speak, that is it fell in the fall of the year, when there is great difficulty and delay in getting the material. The works being very important, the time given for the completion of these works was considered too short and the change made involves much more work.

Mr. MULOCK. Has there been an extension of time given?

Mr. FOSTER. I find that the time for the completion of the work was stated to be the 21st June, 1891. Of course, that time has not yet expired and no application for an extension of time has yet been made to the department. It is also to be remembered that the work was to be enlarged, and that also will be a reason why probably an extension of time will be required. In fact I may say that the engineer informs me that the work will probably not be completed until the end of 1892, or the beginning of 1893.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the hon. gentleman say what amount of money has now been expended on the contract, and what will be the amount of the original contract and the additions thereto?

Mr. FOSTER. I answered my hon. friend that the amount of the original contract was $192,000, and the addition caused an extra expenditure of $30,000, making $222,000 in round numbers. Up to the 11th September, 1891, $109,000 had been expended, leaving $113,800 to be still expended. This, however, cannot be taken as representing the actual value of the work done. The work is for the purpose of creating a permanent channel at the eastern entrance and for navigation purposes. While the work is under construction, and until it is completed, a certain quantity of dredging has to be done each year to obtain a free passage for vessels. The necessity of this dredging was urged upon the department by the City of Toronto in the interest of the harbour and of general navigation.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say what work is mentioned in the additional contract?

Mr. FOSTER. It is on account of the change made upon the express report of Mr. Page in the.

absence of Mr. Perley, and upon his recommendations, that the crib-work was first to be laid upon the natural bed of the lake and between the crib-work with a channel of twelve feet; but after his investigation and on his recommendation that was increased to sixteen feet, and the extra crib-work and dredging was to be laid sixteen feet below water, instead of twelve feet, and the channel between the two lines of crib-work deepened to sixteen feet, the extra work as estimated on the schedule prices for the first contract amounted to $30,000.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. gentleman lay that contract or a copy of it upon the Table?

Mr. FOSTER. The contract for the additional work was simply an Order in Council which authorized the change to be made on the schedule prices as in the first contract. I will lay the Order in Council on the Table.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that the contract requires the crib-work of the piers to be filled with stone ballast, and I would enquire whether there has been any change in that from the terms of the contract?

Mr. FOSTER. No change.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I would like to enquire whether there has been any departure by the contractors from that term of the contract? Have they put in the cribs any other material than "hard approved stone," such as is mentioned in the contract?

Mr. COATSWORTH. I do not think the hon. gentleman stated the terms of the contract right. The terms of the contract, as I understand from the report of the engineer, read:

"It is charged that the cribs have been put down in such a way as to create as much remunerative dredging as possible to the contractors, and that the engineer and superintendent have failed to prevent them from partially filling the cribs with sand dredged from the channel instead of stone, and that they receive the price of stone for it. I would here state for your information that 30 feet main cribs contain when full, 1,500 cubic yards of stone. My instructions from your department are to permit of 180 cubic yards of sand being placed in each crib and to allow the contractors for this amount at the rate for stone-filling per cubic yard, but no sand is ever placed in any crib until there is a sufficient quantity of stone first anchoring it. I would here remark that it is really a temporary allowance to the contractors, as the cribs are not water-tight, and the effect of the waves soon necessitates the replacing of the sand by stone at the contractors' own expense. In practice and effect stone is ultimately used, and the sand in the meantime is beneficially employed in rendering stability to the work."

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister whether permission has been given to substitute the filling for the cribs with other than the material specified in the contract?

Mr. FOSTER. No departure has taken place with reference to that from the original terms of the contract. The sand that is allowed to be put in is not put in for the purpose of filling the cribs. It is put in, I understand, at the bottom, to prevent the silting or washing out and tipping over of the cribs. Perhaps I had better read what the engineer says in regard to that:

"The contractors have been allowed to put some sand in the cribs in order that this sand may fill the space between the natural bottom of the seat dredged out and the ballast flooring. They are not paid the price of ballast for it, but are paid only 12 cents per cubic yard, as per schedule of their contract. Experience has shown that unless this precaution be taken, a scouring would inevitably occur, and the cribs be tilted over."

Mr. MULOCK. Does the contract require piles to be driven along the face of the piers? My instructions are that it does require them to be driven in at intervals of 10 feet and elsewhere where they are required by the engineer. Has the engineer required piles to be driven at other intervals than 10 feet? If so, have they been so driven, and have they been driven at all events at distances not greater than 10 feet?

Mr. FOSTER. The prices paid are schedule prices. It was optional, of course, whether the department should demand that piles should be driven or that the sheathing and protection should be done in another form. If the piles are not driven they are not paid for, and the engineer informs me that the work is better done in the manner in which they have done it than if piles had been driven.

Mr. MULOCK. I am told that the salaries and expenses of the Government officials employed, chiefly at the other works at the eastern gap, for the protection of the south-eastern coast of the island, including an engineer, an assistant engineer, a superintendent, and an inspector or foreman, for the year ending 30th June, 1889, amounted to $9,763, while for the labour on the work $8,648 was paid. I can hardly expect the hon. gentleman to say now whether or not this statement is correct, as it would require a little examination of accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. I may give my hon. friend some explanation. Mr. Temple, Mr. Swait and Mr. Evans, with the foreman, are supposed to oversee and supervise the operations of a staff of 19 men, including engineer and watchman. These gentlemen are in charge of two kinds of work. They are in charge not only of Murray & Cleveland's work, but also of the works done by days' labour for the protection of the island, which, as my hon. friend knows, is a different work. These works are done with great care, and it is said they are a credit to the staff. So that you are not to regard these men as supervisors to Murray & Cleveland's contract only, as they have to look after both. As to their dividing up among themselves, according to the statement, $6,000 or $7,000 per annum for doing it, Mr. Temple gets a salary of $170 a month, which I do not judge to be an extraordinary salary for an engineer of his standing; Mr. Swait is superintendent of the protecting works on the island, and receives $5 a day, which I do not think is excessive: Mr. Evans, assistant engineer, gets $100 a month and 75 cents allowance while on the works on the island, and not otherwise; and Mr. Hurdon receives $3 a day and 75 cents allowance when on the island. These are the constant staff, and these are the salaries paid.

Mr. MULOCK. Do these salaries continue all the year round?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; all the year round, because these men are at work all the year round.

Mr. MULOCK. In winter as well as in summer?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; there is office work as well as outside work.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the Minister say how many cubic yards of dredging is estimated for in connection with Murray & Cleveland's contract?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows the situation of these works and the peculiar difficulty which is to be met with in connection with them, that is, the constant drifting in of the sand. Every storm which comes from a certain quarter drives in the sand, and that has to be dredged out again So that it is almost impossible to make anything like an accurate estimate of the number of cubic yards of dredging that will have to be done before the contract is ended. But a rough estimate is given at about 600,000 cubic yards. My hon. friend will see how difficult it is to estimate the dredging under these circumstances.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the hon. Minister say how many yards have been dredged up to the date of the last report?

Mr. FOSTER. About 300,000 cubic yards up to the 1st of August last.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the hon. gentleman state where the dredgings are taken to?

Mr. FOSTER. About a mile outside in the lake.

Mr. MULOCK. To the east or to the south?

Mr. FOSTER. South-west.

Mr. MULOCK. Has there been any change in the price for dredging since the contract was let?

Mr. FOSTER. The same price continues.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the system of measuring the dredging?

Mr. FOSTER. The dredged material is put into scows, and the capacity of these scows is measured and known, and the aggregate quantity is made out from the number of scow loads.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that the specifications call for a depth in the eastern channel of fifteen feet. If this is correct, how often since the contract has the channel been dredged out, and what is the depth now?

Mr. FOSTER. The original specifications call for a depth of twelve feet. After the change was made the depth became sixteen feet. Of course, as I explained before, it is continually drifting in, and they keep a temporary channel in the meantime, the depth of which is somewhere about twelve feet.

Mr. MULOCK. And all the dredgings have taken place in the channel?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; with the single exception, of course, of the seats for the cribs?

Mr. MULOCK. Are the contractors allowed to place any of the dredging in the cribs.

Mr. FOSTER. Sand is allowed to be put into the bottom of the crib.

Mr. MULOCK. Are the contractors allowed the same price for the sand dredged out of the channel and dumped into the cribs as if they had to carry it out to the lake?

Mr. FOSTER. Twelve cents a yard.

Mr. MULOCK. As much for the sand they dump into the cribs as if they hauled it out a mile or so in the dredge?

Mr. FOSTER. The same price for the amount they put in the cribs.

Mr. COATSWORTH. They have to shovel it out of the scows into the cribs, whereas in the lake they just open the bottom of the scow and dump it in, so that it is more expensive to put it into the crib.

Mr. DENISON. I was surprised to see in the *Mail* of the 22nd of August an article headed: "Bungle and Boodle; the slime of the serpent is over them all; another Public Works scandal," and so on. The whole tenor of the article is to besmirch the reputations of the engineer and the assistant engineer, and knowing what a respectable paper the *Mail* is, I am surprised at their taking the course they have. I feel satisfied, however, they must have been imposed upon by some person who came to them with a story about the great frauds perpetrated, so that they naturally sent a reporter to examine into it, the reporter went to work with the idea of writing the matter up, and the result is the elaborate article I have now before me. If there is anything wrong in the manner in which that work has been done, if Messrs. Cleveland & Murray have been conducting the work improperly, it is quite right for the paper to call for an investigation, and it is quite right that the time of this House should be taken up in looking into it; but, on the other hand, we should be careful how we throw abroad charges of this nature, by which the reputations of honest, upright and competent engineers may be affected and sacrificed. Now, all the charges are boiled down to about sixteen, which are at the end of the article, and I shall take up only some of the main ones. The others consisting of numbers one, two, six, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, are arguments rather than charges, and I think require very little to be said about them. Charge number three reads as follows:—

"That the engineer in charge of the works has proved himself incompetent for his duties, and as a result work has been done in the most expensive manner and often twice over. That he devotes but little time to the works in progress."

As I wrote to the Minister of Public Works recommending Mr. Temple, I am to a certain extent responsible for his being there, and I think it is only right that I should lay his side of the question before the House. When this charge appeared I wrote asking him what explanation he had to give, and in reply I received this letter, a portion of which I would like to read:

"TORONTO, 29th August, 1891.

"I am in receipt of your letter of 28 inst. Since sending you the report on the charges that appeared in the *Mail* against the harbour works, I wrote the Hon. Frank Smith, going probably more fully into the matter."

Then he goes on to state his services. He says:

"My experience extends over twenty years, in the course of which I have been during nine years assistant engineer of the North Shore Railway; and subsequently division engineer of the Newfoundland Government railway and the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, as well as assistant engineer on the Ontario division of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and am a member of the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers, besides holding a diploma as a land surveyor for the Province of Quebec."

I may state in addition that Mr. Temple is a man from fifty to fifty-five years of age and in no respect an incompetent man. With regard to Mr. Kelly Evans, I might say that he is a son of one of our most respected citizens and a graduate of the Royal Military College, and, as hon. gentlemen know, no graduate of that college could fairly be

called an incompetent man, only those competent being allowed to pass, the incompetent ones being rejected and never allowed to graduate. In charges four and five the *Mail* says:

"Than the eastern channel, which was to be fifteen feet deep, has been dredged three times, and now contains little more than eight feet of water.

"That the cribs that had been put down have been done in such a way as to put as much remunerative dredging as possible in the hands of the contractors and that the work has been ill done after all."

As to that I have a letter from Mr. Temple in which he says:

"My instructions from the commencement of the work were to keep a channel open for navigation. Since that time there has been an uninterrupted passage through the eastern gap. It has of course been necessary to do some dredging there occasionally after a heavy blow from the eastward, as the sand drifts in more or less, and I consider that such dredging will still have to be done from time to time in the future, as in the past, until the eastern pier or crib-work is completed. I do not permit the contractors to do more dredging than is absolutely necessary for navigation purposes."

Then there is charge seven:

"That the stone placed in recent years on the breakwater slope has cost $8.50 and $10 per cubic yard, when at the outside it should not have cost more than $3, and thus, entirely in consequence of the incompetence of the engineering and superintending staff, a loss of many thousands has occurred."

I must remind the House that there are two distinct works. There is the work outside at the entrance to the harbour, and the work which has recently been started. The work outside of the harbour is intended to protect the shores of the island, and that was commenced some years ago and is superintended by Mr. Swait. The other part of the work, the eastern entrance, is looked after by Mr. Evans, Mr. Temple overseeing the whole.

Mr. CHARLTON. What business has Mr. Swait?

Mr. DENISON. He has to look after the crib-work?

Mr. CHARLTON. What is his trade?

Mr. DENISON. I cannot tell you. As to that charge, I would like to read from a letter of Mr. Temple, of the 27th August, in which he says:

"Regarding the officials employed, I can only say that each has his work mapped out for him to do, and the services of each are utilized to the fullest degree. They state that the stone for the protection of the breakwater costs from $8 to $10 per cubic yard and that stone has only been dumped here and there. During the progress of these works 8,834 cubic yards of large stone have been carefully and systematically placed on lake side of the breakwater, and upwards of 6,000 cubic yards of small stone recovered from the lake on the bay side of the works, making a total length of 5,350 lineal feet on the lake side and 4,500 on the bay side fully protected, at a cost of $53,391.10, including expenses of supervision, or $3.50 per cubic yard, instead of $8 and $10, as stated in the *Mail*. Regarding the charge that sand is used to fill the crib instead of stone: My instruction from the department is to permit of 180 cubic yards of sand in each crib, but no sand is ever placed in any crib until there is a sufficient quantity of stone first anchoring it, and in accordance with my instructions I am to allow the contractors for this amount of sand at the rate of stone-filling per cubic yard. I would here remark that it is really only a temporary allowance, as the cribs are not water-tight, and the effect of the waves soon necessitates the replacing of the sand by stone at the contractors' expense. Should subsequently any sand wash out of the cribs and the stone settle down, I compel him to fill it up with stone at his own expense."

I have already given his answer to charge No. 8. I would like to explain to the House how that is done, and I cannot do so better than by reading this cutting.

Mr. MULOCK. If I understood the engineer's statement correctly, it is that the sand is allowed in the first place to be put on the cribs to a certain extent, and then the stone is put on the top.

Mr. DENISON. No; the stone is put in first, in order to anchor it.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, if the sand filters into the channel, who pays the expense of moving it again?

Mr. DENISON. This is fully explained here, and I think this is the shortest way to get at it:

"The cribs are built in 100 feet lengths of sound square timber, thoroughly bolted together and properly tied with solid cross-pieces. Seventeen inches above the bottom of the crib, resting on cross timbers, are floors of round spruce timber, upon which the stone rests. On being sunk the cribs are filled with stone flush with the top. Upon this crib, already filled with stone, the sand is dumped, the object of putting it there being that the waves may wash it down to fill up the vacant space of 17 inches below the flooring, and also to fill the interstices of the stone, making a solid mass. If this vacant space below the flooring was not filled the action of the waves would soon undermine the foundation of the cribs. Thus, instead of this being an attempt to swindle the public, as the *Mail* alleges, the sand is really necessary to make a permanent job. If any large quantity of sand were put into the cribs, as the *Mail* says, any one can see that the waves would soon wash it out, and the stones settling down, the contractors would have to fill up the cribs again flush with the top, so that they cannot get paid for sand more than fills the interstices of the stone."

I think that explains the matter quite satisfactorily. I have also had handed to me a letter from Messrs. Murray & Cleveland, which I will read:

"ST. CATHARINES, ONT., 28th August, 1891.

"DEAR SIR,—You have probably observed an article which appeared in the *Mail* newspaper of the 22nd inst., in reference to the Toronto harbour docks.

"The article referred to is such an infamous slander, so far as it refers to our contract with the Government, that I have thought you might wish to be informed of the facts, or some of them, when the estimates for the works are under discussion in the House.

"On the date of the article referred to there were eighteen (18) cribs in place, filled with stone, and the work done in the most thoroughly efficient manner. (The *Mail* stated there were only six (6) cribs in place). At present there are twenty-one cribs in place—twelve in the line of the breakwater and (9) nine on the line at the entrance pier. The water is kept at the full depth in the ship channel, which is authorized by the department, viz.: nine (9) feet on the line of the entrance pier the water is fifteen (15) feet in depth from deep water in Toronto Bay to the south-east end of the entrance pier, and when the entrance pier will have been extended to the outer bar there will be a navigable channel into Toronto harbour of not less than fifteen feet in depth.

"On the date of the article referred to there were 18 cribs in position on the bar, and there were 15 cribs built complete at the slip west of the northern elevator, 33 cribs in all.

"As to the delay in the progress of the work: Bosh! Since the plans for the cribs were placed in our hands, no power on earth could have done more than has been done. In executing the dredging for the crib seats to a depth of 18 feet below the surface of the water we are subjected to serious delay in consequence of the continued shifting sand, which shifts with every change of wind, and when a crib seat is dredged to the proper depth, very often before the crib can be placed the seat has become too deep or too shallow, and consequently has to be re-dredged.

"The weather and continually shifting sand is the whole cause of delay in proceeding with the work; but for those unforeseen difficulties we could easily finish the whole work this season. But the weather, heavy winds and shifting sand are beyond our control, and consequently we can only foresee as fast as the weather will permit us. In conclusion, I wish to say the works have been carried on in the most thorough and efficient manner by ourselves and the engineer in charge. You can state in the House, and I wish you to so state, that there is not a better piece

of work of its class in the Dominion, neither is there a piece of work of equal magnitude and subjected to such difficulties of construction which has cost the Dominion Government so small a sum of money.

"The shore line protection works referred to in the *Mail* is under the control of E. B. Temple. We have nothing whatever to do with them, but I do know that they have been conducted efficiently and honestly.

"I would be obliged by you giving this matter your careful attention when the Toronto Harbour estimates are about to be passed. I have given you facts upon which you can rely most implicitly.

"Yours truly,
"T. MURRAY."

The *Mail* of 28th August, 1891, in a leading editorial, says :

"That the Toronto members have never done a hand's turn towards the proper carrying out of the contract.

And again :

"It is almost incredible that our Toronto members have been totally unaware of what was going on, the nefarious nature of which were pretty plainly set down in the public reports."

I suppose this refers to the public press, but I confess to have seen nothing that I can call to mind reflecting upon the conduct of the work in Toronto harbour. I may say that I have never received any letter, anonymous or otherwise, calling my attention to any frauds or anything irregular in the conduct of that work, and if there had been any irregularities I think the chances are that I should have received a letter, but neither I or any of my colleagues, so far as I understand, have received any communication of such a nature as I have mentioned. Nor do I consider that it is the duty of a member of Parliament to oversee these works. It surely has not come to this that a member of Parliament has got to sit upon the docks and see that the men in charge do their duty properly. It seems to me surprising that a respectable paper like the *Mail* should publish such an article as that and put forward such a doctrine. It may be that it is the duty of a member of Parliament to enquire into frauds that are perpetrated upon the public, and if there has been any wrong in this matter I certainly wish that it should be investigated. But in this instance I think the *Mail* has been imposed upon ; and so far as I can see, without any justification whatever, its proprietors have listened to some story from individuals who have gone to work and vilified the reputation of two competent and honest engineers in a way that they certainly ought to be ashamed of. I may say in conclusion that the City of Toronto cannot suffer by any laches or any wrong-doing that may have taken place in connection with the harbour. If anything of that kind has been perpetrated, the Government will have to bear the responsibility. When the people of Toronto paid $100,000 to the Government it was on the understanding that the works should be kept in repair for all time by the Dominion Government, and, therefore, so far as that sum is concerned, the interest of the City of Toronto is safe in the hands of Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to make a change in the wording, so as to add the words "and western," after the word "eastern."

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Denison) seems to take satisfaction out of the situation, because he says that the City of Toronto cannot suffer ; no matter what laches may occur the city is all right, because the Government has got to stand between the city and harbour. That may be very satisfactory for the City of Toronto, but I think the people of Canada are interested in their being no laches at all, if possible. I am not at present able to say whether there has been any laches or not ; I have no information on the subject except the article that appears in the public press. I have no doubt that the matter will be thoroughly investigated, and I shall be extremely surprised if an enterprising journal such as the *Mail* is entirely mistaken in its alleged facts.

Mr. DENISON. I am afraid they have been taken in this time.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sure it will be satisfactory for the country if it is found for once that the Department of Public Works has done good service for the country. There is one thing in which the City of Toronto is interested, and I am afraid my hon. friends who represent that city have been on this occasion somewhat regardless of their duties. We have it on the statement of the Minister that the work is about a year behind.

Mr. COATSWORTH. No, not at all : the Minister said it would be finished this fall.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman will have his opportunity of defending the maladministration of the department. The City of Toronto is interested in the speedy completion of that work, because the eastern gap is most necessary in order to facilitate navigation. The hon. gentlemen who represent the city will at least admit that it is their duty to see that proper despatch is used in the work.

Mr. DENISON. The time has not expired yet.

Mr. MULOCK. We are told to-night the time expires on the 31st of December.

Mr. COATSWORTH. 1892.

Mr. MULOCK. 1891. However, the Minister of Finance stated that the contractors would not be up to time, that the contract was entered into in May, 1889, and was to be completed in 30 months. The Minister of Finance said that tenders were advertised for in the spring ; they came in in the month of May, if I remember rightly, and that from the time the contract was entered into the work had to be built within 30 months.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Will the hon. gentleman say what difference it makes to the City of Toronto, as long as the channel is kept open for navigation all the time ?

Mr. MULOCK. Then, if the work is not required, why are they engaged in doing it ?

Mr. COATSWORTH. To make the channel a permanent one, and when the work is finished it will not be necessary to dredge it.

Mr. MULOCK. I believe the original depth of 12 feet, the engineer to-night informs the House, is not sufficient. The hon. gentleman will have quite enough jobs to defend if he is in this House very long, without having to defend one that is perpetrated upon the City of Toronto, if one has been perpetrated.

Mr. COATSWORTH. You have not shown any yet.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know whether there is one or not.

Mr. COATSWORTH. You have insinuated it.

Mr. MULOCK. I am willing to allow myself to be a good deal swayed by an editorial article appearing in a responsible journal like the Toronto *Mail*. I consider that the article is sufficient to

demand enquiry on the floor of this House from the representatives of the people; it is our duty to make enquiry when we see such charges made in a responsible journal, and if there is no foundation for them we shall all rejoice in it; if there is foundation for them, then we must see who is to blame. At all events, if the work is not yet completed it is our duty, whilst there is yet time, to see that if any wrong has been done there should be a cessation of the wrong-doing. That is the line I am taking now, and it is the only line one could take. I say that if we get warning that some public work is not being done as it ought to be done, it is the duty of the people's representatives to take advantage of the warning, and it is in that spirit that I bring the matter before the House. If a channel dredged to the depth of 12 feet is quite sufficient for the purpose of navigation, then why has it been deemed necessary to have it extended to 16 feet?

Mr. COATSWORTH. To take in larger vessels.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, at what stage is it going to be to the interest of the city to let larger vessels in? The contract says that the dredging shall be extended to sixteen feet within a limited period. Now, I presume the sooner the channel is able to receive vessels that will draw sixteen feet of water the sooner we shall have vessels drawing sixteen feet of water coming in to Toronto. We are not going to build vessels and have them wait outside the harbor. When the harbour is able to receive vessels of that draught we shall have vessels of that draught put on the lake, but the deepening of navigation must precede deepening of the draught of the vessels. If, therefore, vessels drawing 16 feet are to the advantage of the carrying trade of Canada, the sooner we make our harbours and navigation capable of admitting vessels of that draught the better for the whole country and for Toronto, too. It is to our interest that the depth should not only be twelve feet, but should be made, at the earliest possible moment, sixteen feet, according to the contract.

Mr. COATSWORTH. It ought to be known to the hon. gentleman, as it is to all of us, that the western channel is quite capable of receiving the deepest draught vessels that enter our harbour. It ought to be known to hon. gentlemen, also, that the eastern channel has been practically of no use to Toronto at any time; at all events, before the Government took hold of the work there never had been a proper channel at the eastern end. Many years ago, within my recollection, there was a sand-bar, and horses and waggons drove where the channel is at the present time. Only within recent years the lake has cut a channel through, and even after that had taken place there was not sufficient depth to allow vessels to pass. Only since the Government has taken hold of the harbour works have vessels been able to pass through the gap, except for some very short periods. I do not think the hon. gentleman intended any reflection on the members for Toronto, and even if the remarks of the hon. gentleman might be taken as implying such, they had no foundation, because we have a better channel than ever before, and any delay, as the Minister has explained, has not been caused by finishing the work under contract, but has been on account of the extra work that apparently became necessary while the work was in course of construction. So, I feel satisfied that the Government are carrying out their part satisfactorily, and I think at the same time it is not wrong that their attention should have been called to the fact that perhaps there has been a little more delay than was necessary, according to the opinion of the newspapers, or some of them, which may not, however, know much about the question. The very fact of these circumstances being called to the attention of the Government will no doubt make the officers doubly vigilant to have the work prosecuted with the greatest possible despatch.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman contends that as Toronto has a western harbour, there is practically no need of an eastern harbour.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Not at all.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the excuse he offers.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Not at all. The hon. gentleman left the impression that we had no entrance into Toronto for deep draught vessels.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose they know Toronto.

Mr. COATSWORTH. The hon. gentleman apparently does not know it.

Mr. MULOCK. We all know there is a western harbour. The fact that we are engaged in making an eastern harbour shows that the accommodation is not sufficient and that other works are necessary. The fact that we have a western harbour and require an eastern harbour is evidence that the former is not sufficient to met the requirements of the city.

Mr. COATSWORTH. It is not a western harbour, but a western entrance to the harbour.

Mr. MULOCK. A western entrance to the harbour. If the western entrance is sufficient, why are we engaged in constructing an eastern entrance? It is simply because an eastern entrance is required. To use the western entrance, a vessel leaving Toronto and going east is compelled to add several miles to her course.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Ten miles, I think.

Mr. MULOCK. Therefore, the sooner we get an eastern channel suitable for all purposes of navigation the better, for ten miles will be saved by shipping going east. I am glad the member for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) has wakened up to the necessity of giving his attention to the matter.

Mr. ALLISON. Is the western entrance sufficient to admit the largest vessels on Lake Ontario?

Mr. COATSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. The largest vessels running from Kingston?

Mr. COATSWORTH. Yes. There are two objects to be attained by an eastern entrance. One is to save to vessels going east a distance of ten miles.

Mr. MULOCK. And it will save an equal distance to vessels coming from the east?

Mr. COATSWORTH. Yes. And it will also be very useful for the purpose of cleaning out the bay.

For three lines of steamers between St. John, and Halifax and the West Indies and South America..... $103,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not my intention to discuss the question of policy on this appropria-

tion. That was done at an earlier period of the session, and it was done very fully and exhaustively by the late senior member for Halifax, at the time the appropriation was proposed. At that time the view of the Minister of Finance prevailed, and he obtained from Parliament an appropriation of $60,000, granted tentatively, for the purpose of securing, if possible, four services, which were to be provided, sailing between New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and the West India Islands, and certain ports in South America. The hon. gentleman at that time advertised for tenders to secure steamers to be placed on these different routes. Three services were tendered for, and for one no tenders were furnished. The hon. gentleman in inserting the advertisement in the newspapers did not seem to possess very much information on the subject, as for the class of steamers that would be required, the speed they ought to attain, and the amount of freight that should be secured between the ports of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick on the other side, and the West India ports and certain ports in South America on the other. The hon. gentleman asked that the steamers should each have a registered capacity of 1,000 tons, and be capable of carrying at least 30 first-class passengers, and of proceeding on their voyage at a speed of 12 knots an hour. The tenders which the hon. gentleman received, and which have been laid on the Table, show that the steamers available were of a smaller class than those for which he asked, and that they were not capable of sailing with the speed which the hon. gentleman thought was necessary for steamers on these routes. The nearest approach, both in regard to expedition and in regard to capacity for which the hon. gentleman asked, were the steamers offered by Mr. Furness. The propositions of the hon. gentleman were not altogether acceded to; counter propositions were made, and a very considerable amount of time was wasted, and the opportunity was lost. Tho hon. gentleman did not answer at once the enquiries of Mr. Furness or his agent. He did not consider immediately the propositions which Mr. Furness made to him, and he subsequently accepted steamers of an inferior character, of certainly no greater speed, and of very much less capacity than those that were offered by Mr. Furness. I think, Sir, that it is impossible to read that correspondence without seeing that there are indications in it of a disposition on the part of the hon. gentleman to get rid of the offer that Mr. Furness made.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that again, please?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say that the correspondence indicates, in my opinion, a disposition on the part of the hon. gentleman to get rid of the offer made by Mr. Furness, and to deal with other parties from whom, perhaps, we might suppose he could obtain better terms or more suitable vessels than those that Mr. Furness offered. So far as it is now possible to ascertain, these tenders came, at all events in one case, from a party who possessed no ships and had none of the necessary appliances at the time the tender was made, but he proposed to enter into a contract with the hon. gentleman, and even to go to New York, or elsewhere, and to see whether vessels could be obtained which the hon. gentleman would be ready to accept. The correspondence also says——

Mr. FOSTER. May I interrupt my hon. friend a moment. He has made a rather grave assertion, and I would like him to prove it. I wish to call his mind to that matter before he leaves it. He has stated that, in his opinion, the correspondence indicates on my part a desire to get rid of Mr. Furness' offer. He should not leave the matter there. He should show in what respects that is shown.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It will be open to the hon. gentleman to show that my conclusions or inferences from that correspondence are not well founded.

Mr. FOSTER. You have not made any conclusions. You have only made an assertion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows this: He carried on this correspondence with a Mr. Schofield, who showed as much anxiety to oblige the hon. gentleman as to serve Messrs. Furness & Co. The hon. gentleman asks me for evidence for the statement which I just made. Well, Sir, the evidence, in my opinion, is found in the correspondence which the hon. gentleman has brought down. The hon. gentleman was asked to telegraph or to inform Mr. Furness or his agent at a particular time as to whether his proposition would be accepted or not. He tells the hon. gentleman the character of the vessels he is ready to put on the service; and that vessels of the capacity and speed for which he has asked are not to be found but have to be specially built for that purpose. If the hon. Minister is disposed to accept the offer, he asks the Minister to inform him by telegraph at once, because it was necessary that an order should be given for the construction of that particular class of vessels. The hon. gentleman allowed days to elapse before that communication was answered, and it was perfectly clear from the communication itself that if that answer was not promptly given that Mr. Furness was to be counted out of the race of competitors. The answer was not given, and Mr. Furness accordingly withdrew. The reason which the hon. gentleman gave for delay was that his colleagues were away, that they were not here to discharge their duties, and that it was not possible to communicate with them before he would answer Mr. Furness. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman, while he seemed extremely anxious to consult with his colleagues as to whether he would accept Mr. Furness' offer or not, did not exhibit the same amount of dependence on his colleagues at a later period when he was dealing with Mr. Baird. He certainly took more upon himself in many other parts of the history of this transaction, as he certainly took more upon himself when he ventured to alter the terms of the contract or to disregard them, and disregard them, not in the public interest, but in the interest of the other contracting party. A Mr. Wood offered to enter into the contract for vessels of 700 tons burden, capable of carrying 30 first class passengers, of making a speed of 12 knots an hour and of complying with the hon. gentleman's requirements, except with regard to the capacity of the ship. He asked whether the hon. gentleman would call for fresh tenders or not, and, if I remember rightly, Mr. Wood's proposition was that he was ready to perform the particular service he referred to for $20,000 year. The hon. gentleman made a contract with Pickford & Black and one of the

vessels that this firm put upon the route was the *Alpha*, which was a vessel of 677 tons capacity.

Mr. FOSTER. What route?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the route between Halifax and the West India Islands.

Mr. FOSTER. But there are a great many West India Islands.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman knows what the terms of the contract provides for, and it is not necessary that I should undertake to repeat the particular points in the West Indies at which these vessels call.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Wood's, and Messrs. Pickford & Black's vessels, or offers, were for entirely different routes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman say that Mr. Wood was not ready to engage in the same route that Mr. Black engaged in? Does he say it was a tender for a route for which tenders were not called?

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me I will tell him this: Mr. Wood's offer was for the West India service to Demerara, which is a certain route. He offered 700-ton vessels. My hon. friend commences to contrast my taking from Pickford & Black that 700-ton vessel——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; 677 tons.

Mr. FOSTER. That was for a different route entirely—from Halifax to Jamaica.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was not, Sir, a matter of the slightest consequence, and any hon. gentleman who will take the trouble of reading the correspondence will see that it is not. What the hon. gentleman asked for was ships of a certain capacity, and the vessels which Mr. Wood offered for one of the routes were larger and of greater speed than the vessels which the hon. gentleman accepted; and the hon. gentleman rejected Mr. Wood's offer. For the "B" route the hon. gentleman accepted the service of the *Alpha* by Pickford & Black, a vessel of 514 tons registered capacity; and the two ships, the *Alpha* and the *Beta* were employed by the hon. gentleman, and the terms of the contract were $35,000 a year. Now, the correspondence shows that the hon. gentleman asked these parties from what time they were to count their contract as beginning, and in the case of one vessel they stated the 15th November and in the case of the other the 25th of December. This is their own statement. That left the hon. gentleman $25,000 for the other two services. For the one service "D", with Buenos Ayres, no tender was received, but for the other service, between certain ports in the West Indies and the City of St. John, the hon. gentleman accepted subsequently an offer from Mr. Van Wart. Mr. Van Wart seemed to be the agent and spokesman of a gentleman who had a seat in this House, and I do not find among the papers which the hon. gentleman has brought down any charter or copy of a charter of incorporation of this company under the Joint Stock Companies Act. There is no disclosure in any of the papers whether in this company, which had no existence at the time these negotiations began, which did not exist for some time afterwards, which had no legal existence at the time the contract began to run, there was $5 of stock owned by anybody other than the hon. gentleman who sat in this House, and who was a member at the time this understanding was had and this contract was informally entered into. Now, Sir, I am not going to discuss the question whether this contract was one which ought to have been confirmed by Parliament or not. I wish to bring to the attention of the House that it appropriated $60,000 for four services, that the hon. gentleman used the whole $60,000 for three services, that this appropriation for four services was for twelve months for each service, that the hon. gentleman exhausted the whole $60,000 on three services for a period much short of twelve months, and that he did what in my opinion he had no right to do, what he had no authority to do without coming here and asking for the authority and confirmation of Parliament. In the case of the offer made by Mr. Furness, we find that Mr. Furness offered two boats, the *Rollo* and the *Orlando*, the one having a registered tonnage of 1,100 tons, capable of carrying 50 first-class passengers, and having a speed of 10 knots an hour; that he offered to build two new vessels with a registered capacity of 1,100 tons each, capable of carrying 2,000 tons of freight each, and with a speed of 12 knots an hour; that he was ready to construct these vessels and put them on the route at the end of twelve months; that these ships, which could be put on at once, he says are registered as A1 at Lloyds; that they are vessels of the first-class; that they had the capacity which the hon. gentleman said ships should have that are to be put upon these routes, and that they complied with the conditions of his advertisement in everything except speed. Now, the tenders which the hon. gentleman received show the class of vessels that were available, and they showed that, except in the case of Mr. Furness' offer, there were none available of the capacity which he required, and as to the speed there were none available at all approaching what was required. The hon. gentleman accepted an offer of Mr. Van Wart and Mr. Baird. He accepted an offer on behalf of a company which had no legal existence, which had no existence in fact, which was not yet incorporated, and which, so far as this House knows, was not a company that was responsible, that could give the necessary assurance to the Government or Parliament that it was capable of performing the services which it had agreed to perform or to fulfil the obligation which it had undertaken. Now, Sir, as soon as Mr. Baird and Mr. Van Wart entered into a contract with the hon. gentleman for the purpose of performing the services between St. John and the West Indies they undertook to purchase a boat for the purpose of carrying out the contract, and we find that the boat they offered—the first vessel put on the route, the *Portia*, was a vessel of 732 tons, very much smaller than the hon. gentleman had asked for, and of very much less speed than was required, and the hon. gentleman accepted the service of that ship as a complete fulfilment of the conditions of the contract. Subsequently another vessel, the *Loanda*, of larger capacity, having nearly 900 tons burden, went on the service; and the contract into which the hon. gentleman entered on behalf of this country was a contract for $4,100 a trip. It was upon the fulfilment of the contract on the part of Mr. Baird and Mr. Van Wart that this sum was to be paid. The hon. gentleman had no more right to pay another dollar be-

yond that sum than I have. He had no more right to put his hand into the public treasury and take a dollar in addition to that $4,100 than any other member of this House. The hon. gentleman, as a member of the Administration, is a public trustee. He has devolving upon him certain public duties and he is supposed to perform those duties under the law. He is not above the law; he is not beyond control of the law. He is pledged to discharge those duties properly. The whole protection that may be given him for anything he may do depends upon his compliance with the legal requirements of the case; and the legal requirements of the case were that these vessels should have a certain capacity, which neither of these vessels had; that they should have a certain speed, which neither of them possesses; and that a certain sum, $4,100 a trip, should be paid, which was not the sum the hon. gentleman paid. The hon. gentleman, after several of those trips were made, paid, not $4,100 a trip, but 50 per cent. in addition. He paid $6,150 a trip. By what authority did he do that? By what authority did he take, in the case of this vessel, the *Loanda*, for the four trips she made, $2,050 per trip from the public treasury, or $8,200 in all, and make that $8,200 the property of Mr. Baird or Mr. Van Wart, or any of the parties they may have associated with them? The hon. gentleman has dealt with the public treasury as though it were his own private patrimony. It may be that Mr. Van Wart or that Mr. Baird was his friend, and that might entitle them to some consideration at his hands in his private capacity, but it did not entitle them to receive from the public treasury, without the authority of Parliament, a larger sum than the hon. gentleman had contracted to pay them. I say he had no right whatever to take such a sum from the public treasury. Is that the way in which the Government usually deal with those with whom they enter into contracts? Why, if you take the other confracts relating to the various branches of the public service into which the Government entered, what security will Parliament have if such a policy were adopted, that, long before the year has expired, the public treasury will not be denuded of the money the public have paid into it? The public treasury is under the hon. gentleman's control, but the hon. gentleman is under the control of the law. He is not above the law, yet he has undertaken to deal with these moneys as if he could add an unlimited amount to the amount promised to be paid to George Baird and to Mr. Van Wart. If the hon. gentleman can pay $2,050 a trip beyond the contract price, he can pay $4,100 a trip beyond what the contract warranted, he can pay twice $4,100 a trip, and there would be no limitation of his power. But that is not the position the Minister of Finance occupies. He is bound by the law. He entered into a contract; he ought to have taken security for the fulfilment of that contract. Does any man in this House suppose that if Mr. Furness had stood in the place of Mr. Van Wart or Mr. Baird he would have been allowed to have taken large sums of public money out of the public treasury, through the hon. gentleman's authority, beyond what the contract warranted? Why, if Mr. Baird could not make money out of it, if it was not a profitable undertaking on his part, that might have been a reason why the hon. gentleman should have relieved him of his contract. He had taken no security, and he might have said: I am ready to permit you to cancel your contract, and I will advertise again. But the hon. gentleman did not do that. He came to the House and said: Baird had made a bad bargain; he had lost money by the transaction. But that was not our business. That was not the business of the hon. gentleman. His business was to protect the public treasury, not to protect the interest of Mr. Baird. Mr. Baird was endowed by Providence with a certain amount of capacity, which, I suppose, enables him to protect his own interests; and the hon. gentleman was not acting on behalf of Mr. Baird but on behalf of the public; and in taking from the public treasury for each trip of that vessel $2,050 more than the contract warranted he did what he had no right to do. When the hon. gentleman terminated this contract he made a gratuity of $8,200 to Mr. Baird for four trips of this vessel, which was a very slow craft, a craft of less capacity than the hon. gentleman required when there was question of contracting with another party. Then this vessel, which was bought by Mr. Baird, becomes the property of Pickford & Black, and the hon. gentleman puts his hand into the public treasury again and he draws $15,000 from it, and hands it over, so it is said, as it was said in the other case, to the party with whom he has a contract, for services that were performed before there was any contract at all, if they were performed at all. What evidence has this House before it of the services that were rendered to the country for the $15,000, which Messrs. Pickford & Black received? Does the hon. gentleman pretend that Pickford & Black said they had a contract with him? That contract, in the case of one vessel, began on the 15th of November; in the case of the other vessel it began on the 25th of December. For every trip these vessels made after the 15th of November and the 25th of December, respectively, the hon. gentleman had paid Pickford & Black every dollar to which they were entitled. But when the hon. gentleman transfers the other service to them, the service from St. John to the West Indies, he agreed to pay Pickford & Black $60,000, and he paid them $15,000 for services that were never performed—services that were not performed under any contract or agreement. If Pickford & Black had vessels sailing to the West Indies before the 15th of November and the 25th of December they sailed them upon their own personal responsibility and risk, for their own purposes. They were not moved to take any action in that matter by anything the hon. gentleman was authorized to do or by anything which he did. The hon. gentleman did this: he took $15,000 out of the public treasury without warrant of law, without the authority of Parliament, and he gave that money to Pickford & Black for services they did not perform on behalf of the public, or under any contract or agreement made with them by the Finance Minister as Minister of the Crown. The hon. gentleman made a contract, paid over the money after he had terminated the contract with Mr. Baird, and for what did he pay the money? Has he ever come down to Parliament and showed in what way the public had incurred any obligation or that any contract or agreement had been entered into with Pickford & Black which entitled them to receive this $15,000? Why, for aught we know that money may have been given to charitable purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. By whom?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) I do not know by whom.

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you not say it?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) The hon. gentleman had no business whatever to put his hand into the public treasury. The hon. gentleman should have come to this House and asked this House to excuse or condone what he had done. He ought to trace that money and to show where it went and for what purpose it was given. The hon. gentleman may pretend, if he likes, that there was service performed, but I tell him that, in the papers he brought down, there was a written statement by Pickford & Black that they had sent their vessels to sea, that they wanted this contract in regard to one vessel to date from the 15th November, and in regard to the other from the 25th December, and yet the hon. gentleman pretended to pay for services performed prior to these dates, when there was no subsisting obligation between him as representing the Crown and as trustee for the Crown, on the one side, and Messrs. Pickford & Black on the other.

Mr. FOSTER. For the sake of clearness, will the hon. gentleman say whether he means that I paid the money or pretended to pay it?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman asks me to make a statement. That is exactly what the House asks the hon. gentleman to say. I say that the hon. gentleman took $15,000 out of the public treasury without any warrant of law, without any proper contract with these persons, without any legal or moral obligation upon him as representing the public to pay one cent, and it may be that he paid that amount into the hands of Pickford & Black, and next day it may have gone into an election fund. We do not know. He sees what has been done a hundred times, and he knows that he should have conducted that business in a way that would not have been open to suspicion.

Mr. FOSTER. No one but a man like you would have any suspicion about it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman may be as unparliamentary as he likes or as insulting as he likes, but I am simply pointing out to the House and to the country how the hon. gentleman has discharged the trust reposed in him, and I say again that, for all we know, Messrs. Pickford & Black may not have kept the money paid over to them, but may have put it into an election fund.

Mr. FOSTER. You have no evidence of that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That was said in the Pacaud case.

Mr. FOSTER. You were an apologist in that case and defended Pacaud.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was not. I objected to the tribunal, and defended him only as I would defend any man who ought to be tried by the courts instead of by a mob. I am in favour of a legal and honest administration of affairs of this country, and I say that there is not a legal administration of the affairs of this country when money is paid in this way.

Mr. FOSTER. You do not say there is not an honest administration of affairs this time—you did last time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say that, when you put your hands into the pockets of the public to pay people who have no claim, morally or legally, it is not an honest transaction. There is no room for two opinions in a matter of that sort, and I am simply calling the hon. gentleman's attention to it and giving him an opportunity of explaining before this Committee how it was that he disregarded the law in these two cases, paying $2,050 in the one case more than the contract called for and $15,000 in the other case, when there was no contract at all. I think it is high time that, in the administration of the affairs of this country, we should have some regard to the use we make of the public money. I hold that the hon. gentleman, as Finance Minister of this country, has no more right to deal with the public moneys as he thinks proper, unless he chooses to act always as the law requires, than a clerk in my service has to deal with my own money in such a manner. A clerk in a bank might deal generously with the money belonging to the stockholders in that bank, but we know how he would be dealt with, and it is of the first consequence to the management of the affairs of this country that the representatives of the people in this House and the Ministers of the Crown should deal as carefully, as strictly within the limits of the law and within the directions of Parliament with the public moneys as any clerk or trustee would deal with the moneys placed under his control. I say that the hon. gentleman, in paying in one case $8,200 contrary to the terms of the contract and $15,000 in the other case without any contract, disregarded these principles. The hon. gentleman may have an explanation to give, but that explanation has not yet been given, and, so far as the facts appear upon their face, there was no warrant whatever for the payment of either of these sums of money. I think it is high time that a little more care should be exercised by Parliament in regard to its control and supervision over the expenditure of the public moneys of this country, that a more strict surveillance ought to be exercised by this House as the special representative of the people in this matter, and that steps should be taken to see whether these parties are entitled to retain any portion of the funds which the hon. gentleman has paid to them without warrant of law, and contrary to the terms of the contracts into which he had entered.

Mr. FOSTER. I must, in the first place, very good naturedly condole with my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) on the good opinion the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Mills) has in regard to his ability in dealing with questions before this House. Not more than two or three weeks ago, the hon. gentleman from Queen's, after having had all the papers before him, after having digested those papers, after having given notice of what he proposed to do, after having armed himself at all points in regard to what he proposed to do, brought this self-same matter before the House just as ably, just as eloquently, just as concisely and just as conclusively as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has done to-night; but the hon. member (Mr. Mills) had so poor an opinion of the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies), had so poor an opinion of his capability to deal with the task, or felt so much disappointed that the task which was essayed and carried out by his colleague met with so poor a reception from this House, that he must needs mount his little steed and put his little lance in rest and tilt

against this imaginary grievance. I suppose therefore that, though I replied fully to my hon. friend from Queen's, we must review the whole case to enlighten the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. In the first place, I congratulate him on the fine spirit he has evinced and also upon the backwater he has taken. He spoke in this House some two weeks ago; he made insinuations and assertions then which he has kept clear off to-night. If he had made the statements to-night that he made the other night, I would have asked that his words be taken down, and if there were any constitutional way by which he could be made to take them back or prove them he would have been given the privilege. The hon. gentleman has three courses open to him as a gentleman, as a man, as a member of this House and a co-member with myself. The first course is to consider my explanations satisfactory and say no more about them. The other course is to make his charges in this House, if in his heart he believes that which he insinuates, and have them tried before the proper tribunal in this House; and if he will make that charge he shall have his tribunal, he shall have all proper facilities for making his proof. The other course open to him is this: If he is man enough not to shelter himself behind his privilege as a member of this House, and say here what he does not care to say outside, let him say these same things outside, let him put them in a letter over his own signature in any paper in this country, and although my hon. friend has a knowledge of theoretical law which enables him to give lectures at so much each in the City of Toronto, I will speedily give him a taste of practical law. Now, Sir, this is no laughing matter. A public man has a reputation as such, and no other member in this House has a right by insinuation, or by underhanded methods, to try to take that reputation from him. It is all that a public man has with which to stand before the country. The animus, the spirit and the tendency of the hon. gentleman's remarks, both before and at this time, seen and known by every man in this House who has listened to them, have been designed to stab my reputation as an honest man in dealing with the public moneys and the public contracts of this country. Everybody knows that. Is it fair that he should do it? And then shield himself behind his privileges as a member of Parliament——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I asked the hon. gentleman to say what——

Mr. FOSTER. Speaking in cold blood—and there is no unprejudiced man who will take up his remarks and read them, who will not say that the hon. gentleman from Bothwell suspects and states his suspicions just as strongly as it was possible for him to state them in this House, that I dealt dishonestly with the public moneys. I will leave that to any unprejudiced jury, and they will come to no other conclusion. Do we need to go back to a former debate? Not at all. We have here to-night heard this christian gentleman in five different cases, thrusting out the sharp lance of his insinuations and his suspicions upon a negative which he calls upon me to prove. Sir, a man's reputation is worth this much to him, that before a gentleman like my hon. friend opposite attempts to take it away he ought to have some positive ground to stand upon, and should not merely make assertions and call upon me to disprove them. Is that fair and honest treatment of one man by another? My hon. friend has learned discretion since the other night—at least, he has not gone so far as he did. Any hon. gentleman who will read over the remarks which are written against him in *Hansard* will see that he went still further then than he did to-night—that is a former debate, and I am not going to allude to it just now. But I will take up the remarks that he made, and I will deal with them just as plainly and simply as I did before. The first is that I did not immediately answer Mr. Furness. I gave the House my explanation, the House received that explanation, and the House, I believe, were fairly well satisfied with the explanation. Must I give it again? It seems so. The whole matter has to be threshed out twice because my hon. friend does not confide in the ability of the hon. gentleman beside him to do the matter justice; he must needs come to the rescue. The reason that Mr. Furness did not get his answer sooner was the reason I gave before to this House. The tenders came in on the 31st of August, as every one knows a time when the Cabinet is dispersed. Mr. Furness received his answer in a speedy time thereafter, just as soon as Council could be brought together, as Council alone could give me authority, for I could not act by my own authority. And although he studiously concealed the fact—he knew the fact all the same—that as I did not act on my own authority in the case of Mr. Furness, so I did not act on my own authority in any other case in this matter from the beginning to end. He knew this; but he did not state it to the House, and he did not wish to state it to this House. That, Sir, is the simple reason why Mr. Furness did not get his answer sooner than he did get it, and the delay was not an unreasonable delay, and no reasonable man will say it was. Now, Sir, for the first time, the fine christian and manly sentiment of my hon. friend discovers in the correspondence that the Minister of Finance desired to get rid of Mr. Furness' propositions in order that he might make an offer to some one else. I asked him to prove it from the correspondence, but he did not give a tittle of proof for it. Does my hon. friend assert that I had a desire to get rid of Mr. Furness' tender? Will he state it? If he asserts it, or states it, he says a thing which is as false as anything a man can possibly utter, as far from the truth as one pole is from the other. I am speaking strongly, I admit, but it makes a man speak strongly when, as I stated before the House, and as every one of my colleagues know, it was my earnest desire to get the tender of Mr. Furness accepted, and I gave the reason why. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), with that weak disdain which sits so naturally upon his countenance, laughs and sneers when I say that. He does not believe it either; the two hon. gentlemen do not believe it. That was the truth. I speak strongly, because I feel it is an outrage that an hon. gentleman should, without a tittle of evidence, declare that I was anxious to get rid of a tender which I was earnestly desirous to make good for the term of years agreed upon; and, until he shows by irrefragable evidence that there was this desire on my part, my assertion of it, I think, must stand, and I think it will stand in this House. Now, Sir, when I pointed him to the truth, and by

venturing to interrupt him, asked him to prove that assertion just then and there before the assertion got cold, what proof did he have? None in the world; but he shuffled off to Mr. Schofield, who, he said, was the agent of Mr. Furness, and declared that there was something in Mr. Schofield's communication with me which showed that he was acting in accordance with my desire, and helped it along, to get rid of Mr. Furness. Mr. Schofield is to-day, was then, and has been for years, the trusted agent of Mr. Furness and his company, and it is very odd that the hon. gentleman should, in the same breath, say two things so inconsistent as to declare, without a tittle of evidence, in the first place, that I wished to get rid of Mr. Furness' offer, and, in the second place, that the trusted agent of Mr. Furness was an accomplice of mine in that design. Now, that is his proof, and he has given none other before this House, nor is there any other which he can bring before this House, or to the forum of his own conscience, if he has any. I stated that the vessels, according to Mr. Schofield, could not be found; they had to be built, and he introduced that as a proof that Schofield was acting in complicity with me. When he read that statement of Schofield's he read what Mr. Furness had stated, that these vessels could not be found ready-made; they had to be built for the service, and until they could be built as he intended to build them he would have to get temporary vessels. Mr. Schofield conveyed that information to me, and that is the evidence that he was in complicity with me. The second point on which this veiled—no; not veiled, but open—insinuation was brought out by my hon. friend was this: that I did not show the same respect for my colleagues—and I want my hon. friend's attention, if he pleases—in this case; that I showed great respect for my colleagues in the matter of the Furness tender, but not equal respect for my colleagues in the matter of the later tenders. I state again, for fear it may not penetrate the heart and mind of the hon. gentleman, that I acted with the consent of my colleagues, and only after consulting my colleagues, in the second case exactly the same as I did in the first case. The only difference between the two cases was this: My colleagues were here and with me when the second came up; my colleagues were dispersed and I had to wait their return when the first came up. Will he prove that I did it off my own bat, so to speak? Has he a tittle of evidence to show that what was done with respect to Mr. Van Wart's offer was not done on consultation with Council and on an Order in Council? Will he show it? He cannot show it. The papers show the very opposite. What, then, becomes of his assertion? Just what became of his other assertions. They are mere assertions and have no foundation. Then the hon. gentleman went on to say—and he got very much mixed in regard to the different routes—that I must be found guilty of wrong because I did not take Mr. Wood's tender. That was for a small vessel, 700 tons, and it was for "C" service, and that only. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that, when we divided these routes out into three distinct services and came to the full consideration of the question, we determined we would take vessels of 700 tons for "A" and "B" services, but we would require 1,000-ton vessels for "C" service. Mr. Wood never offered for "A" and "B" service at all. The hon. gentleman went on to prove me guilty of inconsistency by stating that after refusing Mr. Wood's tender I immediately took Pickford & Black's offer and put on 700-ton steamers. They are, however, put on a different route from the service tendered by Mr. Wood, and in regard to which we have been talking the whole evening.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). All the hon. gentleman's tenders called for 1,000-ton ships. That is no explanation. You cannot mislead in that way.

Mr. FOSTFR. I cannot mislead; I do not intend to mislead. That is not my trade; the hon. gentleman knows much more about that than I do. Let him go back to *Hansard* of last year. Let him show a little diligence in hunting up records as well as in throwing out suggestions. Let him go back to that year's *Hansard*, and he will see the matter was thoroughly explained, that although we called by advertisement for tenders for 1,000-ton vessels, we yet stated that the tenderers could send in tenders for smaller vessels. The reason was given—the advertisement bore it on its face. The reason was given to this House, and it was one of expense. The idea was that, although we would like to obtain 1,000-ton vessels for all the routes, yet we might not be prepared to go to a large expense which this would entail: and when the tenders came in we decided—not I, the Government decided, Council decided, the decision came to the House, and the House had the decision before it and confirmed it—that vessels on "A" and "B" routes should be 700 tons, but that we should adhere to 1,000-ton vessels for "C" route.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) Why did you not do it?

Mr. FOSTER. Wait. I am not through with the hon. gentleman yet. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to say that Mr. Van Wart was an agent of a member of Parliament When he stated that he stated what he cannot prove, what he has not attempted to prove, what there is not a scintilla of proof of.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh, yes; there is.

Mr. FOSTER. Why, then, did not the hon. gentleman give it? We have been parts of two days on this subject, and the hon. gentleman has not given the proof, nor could he give it. Mr. Van Wart put in a tender for a company that was to be formed. The hon. gentleman is not satisfied because I do not state something that is not the fact; I cannot favour him in that regard. I only state exactly what is the case. Does the hon. gentleman deny that that was the form of the offer? I have not his ear. Does he deny that Mr. Van Wart's offer was not in these terms?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I deny this, that the hon. gentleman can make a contract with any party in behalf of a company that has not an existence—a legal contract.

Mr. FOSTER. You are a bad witness. If the hon. gentleman was before a court and was asked this question, and answered it as he has, the judge would send him to "quod" for paltry equivocation. He answered it disingenuously by asking another question, or rather by making an assertion quite away from it. The statement I make is this, that Mr. Van Wart does not appear in these papers as an agent of a member of Parliament. He puts in his offer as agent and representative of a company not formed—I am not going to

be disingenuous about it—and the Order in Council which the hon. gentleman had before him, which he has before him now if he has the papers, expressly states that the offer of Mr. Van Wart is exactly in that line, and the second Order in Council, which accepts it, explicitly states that the offer is accepted for a company to be formed, not then formed. And that company was formed. Will the House please notice another form of statement by my hon. friend? He laid me open to suspicion; he would try to lead the House to the conclusion that there never was a steamship company of that name and kind chartered. He says it does not appear in the papers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Neither does it.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman state that the company was not duly chartered? Will he state that they did not duly get their papers; that in February, 1890, they did not become a duly chartered company? He will not do so. But he says, you have not proved they were so. The presumptive evidence is in these papers, a statement embodied in the Order in Council that they did become duly chartered as a company under the general Act, and as a consequence we were empowered to enter into a contract with them. What is the use of the hon. gentleman quibbling; why not come out honestly and admit it? He could easily have looked up the records before he threw out the suggestion to the House that probably there was no such company. I say there was a company formed on 3rd February, 1890; that presumptive evidence is given in the assertion of the Order in Council in the report over my own hand. The hon. gentleman could in two minutes have convinced himself of the truth of my statement. He did not do it; he preferred to come here and make an assertion that was without foundation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When was the contract made?

Mr. FOSTER. In March of the same year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was it paid for from that date?

Mr. FOSTER. From the date the vessels began running; the outward trip beginning on January 8th and ending February some time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then an amount was paid before the company was formed?

Mr. FOSTER. Not a cent was paid until one month after the company was formed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me make it plain. The first vessel went on the route, starting from St. John on 8th January. The company was formed on 3rd February, 1890. The contract was made on 5th March, 1890. The first payment was made a month or more after that time. These are the items of the information as stated in the resolution of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). Why, my hon. friend from Bothwell, the gentleman from Bothwell, has no excuse at all. His hon. friend who sits alongside of him went to the trouble of drawing up a whole history of that case, and after it was corrected in one or two unimportant particulars by myself it went on the records of the House, and all that my diligent and careful friend had to do was simply to turn to that page of the Votes and Proceedings and he would have found all this there. He did not do that. Now, Sir, he says that I was guilty, because I used the appropriation for three services, which was called for under the advertisement for four services. My hon. friend knows, the House knows, I do not attempt to conceal it, that when these advertisements were put in they were put in for four services—not, as I stated to the House, with any idea that we would gain a Brazilian service, but that we might be able to get a tender as to what it would cost. As I stated here, we did not expect to get for the $60,000 anything more than the West Indian services and one of them going to a South American port in British Guiana. That was all stated to the House, and the $60,000 was given with that idea, because it was voted and came into effect on the 1st July, 1889, and was available for this service thereafter. It was the only law that was to guide me or guide the Government in the whole matter. By the enactment in the Estimates and by the Supply Bill that $60,000 was put in the hands of the Government for the purpose of carrying on services to the West Indies. That was the law, and that was all the law in the matter. The law did not state that it was to be three services, it did not state that it was to be over any particular routes, it did not state that it was to be paid at so much a trip. The law which my hon. friend has talked so much about was simply the appropriation and the Supply Bill, where the Parliament of Canada gave into the hands of the Government $60,000 to be spent in that fiscal year for steam services to the West Indies. That is the law, and that is the only law upon it, and still my hon. friend travelled backwards and forwards in his vain attempt to make it appear that I had violated a law. I say that that was the only law, that there was no violation of that law, and that he has not proven it, and that he cannot point it out. He says that after we had taken the Van Wart contract—not I, but the Government—that I took two vessels of a less tonnage than a thousand tons. That was all pointed out in a former debate. Is my hon. friend willing to declare now that he has read all these papers and correspondence? Has he really read these papers through from beginning to end? He is silent: I suppose that his silence gives his assent. He has read them, and if he has read them he read the Order in Council expressly stating that for the first year it was contemplated that the service should be a temporary service, and that vessels less than 1,000 tons could be used. It is expressly so stated, and my hon. friend, if he has read the papers, knows that it is so stated, and that by the authority of Council. It was explained to the House, when the House was on these Estimates last year, that it was by the authority of Council that it was decided that during the first part of that service we must necessarily have a service of an inferior kind. So, a 732-ton vessel and a 970-ton vessel were respectively and successively taken during the first year. Neither of them came up to the requirements, but both of them—not in my opinion, but in the opinion of Council acting on my advice and research, such as it was—the best that were available during that first year. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman goes on to state that I was to pay that company $4,100 per trip, and that if I followed the law I could not pay them more than $4,100. Will my hon. friend point out to me a law upon the Statute-book of this country

which says that I was to pay only $4,100 per trip to that company. He cannot do it. The only law upon the case is that $60,000 were put in the hands of the Government for the West India service, during that year. Who gave the authority for paying $4,100 per trip. It was the Government of the country acting on my advice, in virtue of the vote of $60,000 for this service having been granted; and the very same Government which gave the authority for $4,100 a trip could have made it $5,000 if the tender had been such, or could have made it $6,000 per trip if the tender had been such, and broken no law. My hon. friend knows it right well, and the attempt to prove that the law is broken is a futile attempt. Why was more than $4,100 given? I explained that fully to Parliament and I took the responsibility of it; the Government took the responsibility of it, and the operation was not carried through even on my own single responsibility. I stated to the House, and my hon. friend knows it, that before I went down to St. John and made these arrangements I consulted my colleagues and had their authority to make the best arrangement I could to that extent; in order to do what? Not, as the hon. gentleman insinuated, to put money into the hands of my friends, but to keep the service from stopping in the middle of the season, until the Council should meet, and could be able to take some definite steps for the permanent continuance of the service. I gave my reason to the House that I would take that responsibility, and do it under the authority that we had, rather than to let the service slip by and go to pieces for four, or five, or six months, or until the current would have been turned aside, and the prospects for the successful building of the trade would have been very materially altered. The hon. gentleman says that I dealt with this as though it were my own property. I did not. When I am dealing with my own property I deal with it without anybody's advice, or without anybody's authority, but in this case there was not a dollar paid out except upon consultation with, and on the express authority of Order in Council with my colleagues of the Government, myself forming one of that Government. To state that I dealt with this as though it were my own private property is a statement which is not true. I come to mention one other point now, and that is this: It is an insinuation implied in the statement, or in the question of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that if Mr. Furness had been Van Wart and Baird, would he have been relieved of this amount? What did my hon. friend mean by that? It could only have meant one thing, namely, that I did this for the sake of personal friendship, or from a worse motive, and that I did for two friends what I would not have done in the case of Mr. Furness or any other contractor. My hon. friend has no proof of that. He has my statement to the contrary, made somewhat warmly, maybe, but made honestly, that there is not a word of truth in that assertion. He has my statement as to why that further payment was made. It was made for the reasons which I gave to the House before, and which I give to the House to-night; and the very same treatment would have been given to Mr. Furness or any other contractor under like circumstances. Then he insinuated, and very plainly, that this money might have been paid over or might not have been paid over. To-night he rather modifies that, by admitting that the money may have been paid over to Pickford & Black, but suggests that it may have gone into an election fund directly thereafter. Well, Sir, my hon. friend by the exercise of a very little diligence might have made himself perfectly aware whether this money was paid over or not. I hold in my hand every cheque of every payment made for every service performed in this whole West India business, with the receipts and the vouchers; and if my hon. friend will do me the kindness of examining them, if he has any doubt in his mind, he will find whether or not every cent of this money was really paid into the hands of the persons carrying on this West India service. That disposes of the question whether or not this money was paid over by me to them or not. If the hon. gentleman wants to know whether there was any corrupt bargain betweem them and me, or whether the Government profited by a single dollar, he can find that out by the way open to him in this House, of having these persons summoned before the proper tribunal and putting his questions to them before their faces. But I simply state to-night, although such an insinuation is not worthy of a statement, that it cannot be shown by the gentleman from Bothwell or by any other gentleman that a single cent of the money went into my pocket or into the pockets of the Government in any way. It cannot be shown; and if my hon. friend cannot show it, I invite him to cease throwing out the insinuation that such might be the case. I may surely demand that much of fair treatment, even from the gentleman from Bothwell. There is but one other point. He says that Pickford & Black informed me when they wanted the contract service to begin. He has, I suppose, read the letter of the 15th January, 1890. If not, I will read it:

"DEAR SIRS,—We are now preparing contract for 'A' and 'B' services, and I will be obliged if you will kindly let me know what trips have been made by the *Alpha* and *Beta* since you received notice of the acceptance of the 'A' and 'B' services respectively."

Their answer is given, as he stated, that one began in November and the other in December, and the contracts were made in answer to that, to date from those special dates. Then, he says that I held no warrant of law, but, contrary to the law, took $15,000 of the people's money and handed it over to Pickford & Black, and it might have gone into election funds. I did pay $15,000 to Pickford & Black; I so stated in this House; and I gave the reasons why only two weeks ago. Shall I give the reasons again? This West India service had been talked of for a long while. The money had been voted in March or April of that year, and the vote came into force on the first day of July, 1889. Nearly a year before that Pickford & Black had put on steamers to the West Indies—to Jamaica and Cuba—and fully a year before that, namely, on the 15th of September and on the 4th November, 1888, they had been given by the Postmaster General authority to carry the mails. They were to be paid for carrying the mails after it had been decided to whom the contracts were to be given for the West India service which we were then talking about. These mails were delivered over to them in September and November, 1888, and they were carried by them from that time on. Although the money was voted by this House in March or April, delays occurred in asking for

tenders and in getting in the tenders, so that what should have been a service started on the 1st of July, owing to these difficulties, did not start until late in the autumn; and Pickford & Black, who had been running on these two routes for several months before the 1st of July, for which they made no claim—and they gave their manifest of every voyage in and out according to our requirements—put in their claim from the first that the Government ought to consider their contract as running from the 1st of July instead of from the fall of the year. They were not paid at first, and I wished to see how the service would go on and what our probable expenses would be, and I would make no arrangement with them until I found that the vote would be sufficient for all the services. Then I felt authorized to take their claim to Council, and the Government felt authorized to deal with it without coming to Parliament. It was within the $60,000 vote. The same power that could decide that the contract should begin on the 1st of November could say that it should begin on the 1st of July, and the Government considered it just that they should be paid from the 1st of July, and they were paid.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says a claim was made. There is nothing of that in the correspondence brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. That is nothing. Does the hon. gentleman doubt my word? It would be like him to do it. The claim was made; but it was not entertained, and no payment was made until I found whether I would have money enough or not in that vote of $60,000 to meet their claim and carry on the services. Otherwise, I would have waited until Parliament met to ask from it that portion of money covered by their claim. The Government, taking the circumstances into account, came to the conclusion that the payment should be made, and ordered it to be made. And that was done without any ulterior motive of profit of any kind, without any thought of its being part of a bargain for taking over the contract, but was done on account of what we thought was the justice of the claim, and for no other reason. The hon. gentleman cannot prove that there was any other reason. That ends my defence of this matter. The gentleman from Bothwell in this whole matter has not treated me in the manner of an honest and independent member of this House, having a full knowledge of his responsibilities and our relative positions, and anxious for our reputations and characters as public men, or as I would have dealt with him under similar circumstances.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The House has had the advantage of having the facts relating to these contracts stated to it some time ago, and they have been before it for some weeks. My hon. friend from Bothwell did not seek to introduce any new statements of facts before the House. Acting properly within his constitutional right, he discussed the facts and submitted to the House certain conclusions of constitutional law which he drew from those facts, and the Minister of Finance was excessively restive during the discussion both the other night and to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly, I was.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes; he was restive, because the conclusions my hon. friend drew from the facts cannot be refuted, and have not been attempted to be refuted. The Minister of Finance confined himself entirely to dealing with what he said were certain suspicions which the hon. member for Bothwell cast on him, and which were justified by the facts and the conclusions. The charges submitted to the House were that the hon. gentleman, according to the papers, appears not to have acted in perfect good faith in the first instance with the Furness Company, and afterwards, when he came to deal with the company with which he did enter into a contract, he paid them 50 per cent. more than the contract price, without any justification for so doing. These were the charges made. The hon. gentleman had no right generously to use the public money as he would his own, but, being a trustee of the people's money, and having contracted with his friends for a certain service at a certain sum, he had no right to put his hand into the public treasury and pay twice the amount; and having done so, he was guilty, in a political sense, of having acted improperly. My hon. friend from Bothwell did not charge anything more than that, and that charge he has proved. In fact the Minister of Finance did not attempt to defend himself, but was very restive, and spoke of my sneering and laughing. I took no part in the debate going on and certainly had no intention of sneering or laughing at the hon. gentleman, and was not listening to the hon. gentleman at the moment he called attention to it. But I listened to my hon. friend's speech, and having studied the papers, I have come to the conclusion that he was well within his constitutional right in calling attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman, in the first instance, did not deal fairly with the tenderers, and afterwards dealt most unfairly, so far as the public interests are concerned, with the favourite to whom he gave the tender. It is unnecessary to go over the facts again, but let us look at the two or three points to which the hon. gentleman calls attention. On the one hand it was evident that the Finance Minister did not give that attention to the Furness Company he should have given, that if he had shown one half the zeal in attending to the demands made by Furness & Co. as he showed in attending to those made by Messrs. Van Wart & Baird, Messrs. Furness & Co. would have entered into a contract. The papers show that Messrs. Furness & Co., the owners of a large steamship line, a firm able to carry out any contract they entered into, said, when tendering for this new contract, that they required an answer on or before a certain day, because certain steamers necessary for the service and which they had in view were obtainable before that date but not afterwards. The hon. Minister knew by the letters he had from Mr. Schofield, the agent of Messrs. Furness, that if he wanted that firm to take the contract at all he had to give an answer by the 5th of September. But he withheld his answer for reasons he has explained to the House, and which the House can judge as to whether they were satisfactory or not, until the 20th of September, when the steamers which Messrs. Furness & Co. had in view could not be obtained, and they declined to enter into the contract. My hon. friend, in taking up the facts as they have been admittedly proved in the House, was perfectly in his right in charging that the Minister of Finance had not in his dealings with Messrs. Furness & Co. shown that diligence and prudence which the House had a right to expect

from him. The hon. gentleman had charge of the whole service; all he had to do was to offer them the contract, as theirs was the lowest tender.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not the lowest tender.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was the lowest tender before the hon. gentleman, for he took the responsibility of rejecting the other.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He took the responsibility of rejecting Mr. Wood's tenders. He did not hesitate about that, but wrote to Mr. Wood at once that the tonnage offered was not what the requirements of the service demanded. The charge before the House and the country is this, that having in his possession a tender from a responsible English ship-owner, accompanied by a limit of time, the 5th of September, after which it could not be effectively carried out, the hon. gentleman deferred answering until the 20th of September, when he knew that his acceptance would be too late. What more? When he gave the contract for the "A" and "B" service to Messrs. Pickford & Black, what did he do? In his advertisement calling for tenders he requires vessels of 1,000 tons, the same for the "A" and "B" service as for the "C" service to Demerara. But he allowed Pickford & Black to put on that service the *Beta*, 677 tons, and the *Alpha*, 514 tons, raised subsequently to 750 tons by another deck being put on, or the original tonnage was nearly one-half short of that called for. The hon. gentleman knows that the vessel he accepted for the "A" tender to Jamaica, the *Alpha* is a steamer twenty-eight years old. It is stated publicly in the Halifax press, and I have also the information in letters from Halifax gentlemen, that Messrs. Pickford & Black made a profit of over 60 per cent. on the money invested in that service, that they bought up all the other shareholders in that company and cleared 60 per cent. And we have what? A steamer twenty-eight years old to compete with the New York liners, running from New York to the West Indies! Do hon. gentlemen expect, under conditions and circumstances of that kind, that we can have a successful competing line? The Minister of Finance knows the thing is an absurdity. Yet, we are paying to-day as a subsidy to that old tub $15,000 a year. With regard to the *Beta*, we are paying $20,000 a year, and what is she doing for the service from Halifax to Cuba? Why, I have in my desk letters from large fish merchants in Halifax telling me that they can ship their fish to New York, and do ship their fish to New York by the best steamers running from Halifax to New York and thence to Jamaica at 10 cents a drum less than the freight which the steamers subsidized by us charge from Halifax to Jamaica. My hon. friend from Bothwell charges the Finance Minister with having, in the first place, entered illegally into a contract with Messrs. Baird and Van Wart. The hon. gentleman entered into a contract with a company which did not exist. Let me ask him under what contract did the steamer run and earn her money in the month of January, when she ran between St. John and Demerara? She was put upon the service by Mr. Van Wart, acting for himself and friends, Who were the friends? They were George F. Baird, then member of Parliament, who signs himself a managing director. And I say that the hon. gentleman knew that the contract he then entered into, if contract it can be called, was carried out by that vessel running in the month of January before the company was ever formed. In the month of February she started on a second voyage before the company was formed.

Mr. FOSTER. No; you are wrong.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) She completed her first voyage in January, before the letters patent were issued.

Mr. FOSTER. You are wrong. She left on the 8th January and could not get back until the 3rd February.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What company was in existence on the 8th or the 28th of Januuary? No company was in existence. The hon. gentleman at that time therefore entered into a contract with certain gentlemen, one of whom was a member of this House, and part of the work was performed before, though I am aware that the payment was not made until after the company had been formed, so that Mr. Baird might escape the penalties which the law imposes on those who violate the independence of Parliament. The hon. gentleman says that, when the contract was entered into, there was a provision made for a temporary service. It is true that he allowed a vessel which was very much below the requirements he called for to run in that service—a vessel slower in speed and smaller in size, and not equal to the requirements he told the world were essential for that service, and he allowed that to go on for six months, and then Mr. Baird was to build and put on the line the new vessels. But did he do it? Did the hon. gentleman ask him to do it? Was he ever asked to fulfil one term of his contract? When the month of July came, and Mr. Baird found he had not got the bonanza he expected, what did he do? He had solemnly signed a contract to run these boats for $4,100 a round trip, just a shade below what Furness offered to put the boats on for, and, when he told the hon. gentleman he was losing money, the hon. gentleman, without a vote of Parliament, without any legal authority, in defiance of the express terms of the contract, gave him 50 per cent. more than the contract called for, and not only said I will give you $6,150 per trip for the future, but I will apply that to every trip the *Loanda* has made in the past, and although your contract binds the company to perform that service for $4,100, I, as Minister of Finance, will give you $6,150. What is the hon. gentleman's defence? It is this: I induced my colleagues to ratify what I did—thus sheltering himself behind a report to Council. The hon. gentleman is himself primarily responsible for this. He entered late into a contract with his friend Baird, by which he, under the name of the West India Steamship Company, agreed to perform this service for $4,100 a trip. They performed that service, and then the hon. gentleman gives his friend Baird $6,150, not only for future trips but for the past. That is the charge my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) brings before the House. I ask the House if that has been answered. In addition to all that, in addition to paying $6,150, which neither the law nor the contract justified him in paying, I ask him now under what contract he paid that money? There is no contract produced. There is no contract with the signature of the Queen to that effect.

That money was paid without law, and against the signed and sealed contract, and that contract is there to this day, showing that the hon. gentleman violated the contract and paid 50 per cent. more than the contract called for or the law justified. He says that, in consideration of paying $15,000 to Pickford & Black, the mails were to be carried by those boats; and he made a statement to-day, as I understand, which he did not make when this matter was previously before the House, that a claim had been made by Pickford & Black for payment for this service between July and November. That statement is contradicted by the papers the hon. gentleman brings down, because there are papers brought down which he has under his hand now, showing that before the money was paid to them the hon. gentleman's department asked them from what time they claimed the subsidy should be paid to them, and they replied that it should be paid to them, as they thought, from November or December, not because they had entered into the contract then, but because one of the members for Halifax, Mr. Kenny, had told them their contract had been accepted. There was never any complaint made by any member of this House that they should not be paid from those dates. If they were informed by the member for Halifax that they were to be paid from November or from December we made no complaint in regard to it; but we did complain that, after their request had been granted and they had been paid from the very dates they had fixed, nine months afterwards they came to the hon. gentleman and asked to be paid for six months previous to those dates. There is no evidence that they carried the mails, and the hon. gentleman will not venture to state that they were under contract, or that they carried the mails, or that they were doing anything at that time for the Government or the people of Canada. There were dozens of vessels traversing the ocean during that time. Why did not the hon. gentleman give them a subsidy? Why should Messrs. Pickford & Black receive $15,000 for running their boats to the West Indies? I know gentlemen who own steamships which were running to the West Indies during that time. Why were these men paid this amount? Where is the law and where is the contract to justify this payment? I challenge the hon. gentleman to produce the law or the contract to justify this payment. He paid the amount in defiance of the contract, which says the payment shall only begin in November or December; and, as to the equities of the case, I want the House to understand that the payment began, not from the dates fixed by Parliament, but from the dates fixed by the parties themselves. It is, therefore, evident that the $15,000 was nothing but a present to the company. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) says: You paid the money, but I have no guarantee that it was not paid back to an election fund. I would like to hear the hon. gentleman say that it was not paid back to an election fund. We are not going to divest ourselves altogether of common sense in dealing with this matter, and if the hon. gentleman pays 50 per cent. to his friends more than the contract calls for, and pays a large additional sum to another friend more than his contract calls for, I say it opens the door to corruption, and it calls for the censure of Parliament if Parliament is to exercise the right of censure at all. The hon. gentleman's conduct is not only not above suspicion, but it is indefensible, and it has not been defended by the hon. gentleman. The other day the policy of granting the money was not attacked. We were then not attacking the policy, but the execution of the policy. The hon. gentleman says better boats are put on. The hon. gentleman attempted to tell us that he has got better boats on now. Well, Sir, I hope after two years he has got better boats on, but he has not got new boats, as the contract called for. He has got the *Taymouth Castle*, built in 1877, although the contract called for new boats. He has got the *Tay* boat—I have not seen her, but I am prepared to take the hon. gentleman's statements concerning her. But I point out to the House the fact that the old tug *Loanda*, which the West India Steamship Line, or George F. Baird, put on and run for months and months, was a disgraceful old tub, so disgraceful that the passengers shouted in dismay at the accommodations which were offered them, and which they said made the boat the laughing-stock of the West Indies and the Maritime Provinces. Sir, the hon. gentleman stated that the trade between the West Indies and the Maritime Provinces had been increasing very largely. The hon. gentleman read certain manifests, the values of certain cargoes which were carried from Halifax to those ports in the West Indies. But he stopped short at a certain date; he did not pursue the argument as far as he should have done, and in that way he misled the House. Why did not the hon. gentleman read the return cargoes, if there were any? Because they would have been a laughing stock in the House. The hon. gentleman knows that, as a matter of fact, and it is a matter of record, we cannot shut our eyes to it, that our trade with the West Indies has been decreasing to an enormous extent, our trade with the West Indies has decreased one million dollars during the past ten years. And the hon. gentleman talks about the value of cargoes increasing during some of those trips. He knows, and every man from the Maritime Provinces knows, that if the steamers carry a little more than at first they are carrying it because they have taken it away from the sailing vessels that for many years have carried on that trade. There has been no new trade to any extent introduced, and the evidence of it was shown by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), who gave the figures when he made his speech in this House when this subject was last before us. I will not take up the time of the House any longer on this point. I say that my hon. friend who has made these charges to-night was well within his rights in making them, and in making them he has not overstepped the proper and legitimate bounds which are accorded and allowed to members of Parliament in this House in the discharge of their functions in criticising public expenditure.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Before I shall be able to agree in the concluding observations which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has just made, it will be necessary that we should arrive at some agreement as to what the charges were, and what the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has proved; because the member for Queen's, during the last hour, has been stating things which he said the member for Bothwell had charged and had proved,

but which the member for Bothwell never mentioned, and which only the fertile imagination of the member for Queen's has conceived. Now, there has been a good deal said with regard to this West India service, and the hon. gentlemen assume that the circumstances surrounding it are of a suspicious character. I fully concur in that view, when we find two hon. gentlemen opposite bringing that subject to the notice of the House in debate on four several occasions, and on those four occasions beating over the whole ground one after another, making statements as they advanced from one stage to another, increasing in vehemence, increasing in violence, and increasing in inaccuracy. I have no hesitation in saying that the manner, at least, in which the charges have been brought forward, warrants suspicions of the gravest nature as to the ingeniousness of those hon. gentlemen bringing the charges. Now, let me examine the charges preferred by the hon. member for Bothwell, and the revised version of them given by the hon. member for Queen's; let us see if these charges, the true charges, according to his statement, have in the least degree been substantiated. One of these charges was that the Minister of Finance was ashamed to show to this House the manifest of the cargoes of these vessels, or put it in evidence, because it would make the Government and Parliament a laughing-stock throughout the country, to see how insignificant the trade was. The hon. gentleman said that, in relation to a document which has been on the desk of every member of the House for weeks, and which the hon. gentleman himself was conning, before he moved his resolution two or three weeks ago, for hours at a time, in face of every member of this House. That is the statement which the hon. gentleman makes, and in relation to which he declares that the conduct of the Government is disingenuous, and he expects us to believe that these charges are sustained against the evidence of our eyesight as to this manifest having been on the desk of every member of the House. Now, another statement, or rather insinuation—because nineteen-twentieths of what has been said on this subject has been, not accusation, but mere insinuation—another insinuation which the hon. gentleman has thrown out was that $15,000 had been paid as a present by the Finance Minister. The hon. member was more careful and more fair than his predecessor in debate, because he said the Minister of Finance paid it to Pickford & Black, which the member for Bothwell would not even admit. But he said: "Will he tell me that it did not go back to the election fund?" Now, I will give my answer to that question, it did not go back to the election fund, not a single dollar of it; and when he proves that that $15,000 was paid for political services, past or future, or that it was paid in view of any subscription to the election fund whatever, or that it was ever paid out for election purposes, or contributed to an election fund, having my assertion to the contrary, he will drive me from public life. Sir, that payment was made to Pickford & Black in the autumn of 1890, and at a time when there was no circumstance in this country to indicate that a dissolution would take place, or that any election would come on. If it were desirable that we should take $15,000 from the public treasury and contribute it to somebody who would give it back to us in an election fund, I do not know that Messrs. Pickford & Black would have been chosen for the purpose, even if we could have been base enough to have chosen anybody for that purpose. I have known Mr. Pickford for some years; I know nothing of what his views may have been in the last election, because I was only in Halifax for a night or two—but Mr. Pickford, all the time I have known him, has been a stout and stalwart Reformer; his partner, Mr. Black, has been a moderate Conservative. Those boats are the property of a joint stock company, and this money neither of these gentlemen would venture to control for their own purposes. But I repeat, in order that there may be no mistake about it, and that the hon. gentleman may have his answer, that not a dollar of that money was paid in any form whatever to an election fund. Now, I intended, when I rose to make a few observations on this subject, to separate in my remarks the observations of the member for Queen's from those of the member for Bothwell, but that will detain the House too long, and I will treat the two sets of observations together. Under what circumstances was that money paid to Pickford & Black? I will tell the hon. gentlemen the circumstances. Requests were made to the Government away away back in 1887 and in 1886, to have these services to the West Indies subsidized, the "A" and "B" services particularly. They had been for years under subsidy from the Imperial Government, and these steamers, or one of them, I believe, had been performing that very service, the *Alpha*, which is now running for this Government, receiving a subsidy of £16,000 a year from the British Government for a long series of years. It was only in consequence of the solicitation of certain persons interested in small sailing vessels in Halifax that the Imperial Government decided that it was an unwise policy for that Government to spend its money in subsidizing steam vessels between Nova Scotia and the West Indies, and the subsidy was discontinued by the Imperial Government. But when it was discontinued, application was at once made here to keep up that service, and no one who asked to have it kept up expected it would be kept up otherwise than by those steamers that had been carrying on the service under the subsidy from the Imperial Government. In 1886 and 1887, and in 1888, the application to the House that a subsidy should be given was unavailing, but in 1888 it was announced in Parliament that a subsidy would be given, and a vote taken at the following session. Remember the contract was not entered into until 1890—the vote was not passed in 1888, but the announcement was made by the the Minister of Finance in that session that while the estimates for that year would not contain a vote for that service, the Government were pledged to the policy of bringing down a subsidy in 1889. In the summer of 1888 Pickford & Black put on the same steamers that had been on those routes and commenced to serve the Government and the country with a view of subsequently securing that subsidy. When they put on those boats they applied for the privilege of carrying the mails, and they applied for a money subsidy. We told them we had not a vote of Parliament and could not give a money subsidy until we obtained a parliamentary vote. They asked permission to carry the mails under contract with the post office. I went myself and asked the Postmaster General to give the carriage of the mails

to that line of steamers, that we were not able to give a subsidy, that they would carry them without a subsidy in expectation of a subsidy to come, and that in the meantime it would be fair to give them the carriage of the mails. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), in stating how fully these charges against the Minister of Finance had been proved, declared to this House that these vessels did not carry a mail.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I spoke from the papers.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know what the hon. gentleman quoted from, those were his words.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am glad I am quoting the hon. gentleman correctly, for he says "hear, hear"—that they did not carry a mail. On my own application the Postmaster General gave authority for these boats to carry the mails in the summer of 1888; and in view of the hon. gentleman's statement, which he now reiterates, that they did not carry a mail, let me read a telegram from the postmaster at Halifax. It is as follows:—

"First mail by *Alpha* to West Indies, despatched 15th September, 1888; and by *Beta* 4th November, 1888."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not under that contract.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That will not save the hon. gentleman, and he may regret in a moment that he jumped so soon, because he may want to jump in another direction before I am through with that point. These two vessels, then, according to the charge which has been so distinctly proved, and with raps on two desks on that side of the House, did not carry a mail; but I know they did, and the postmaster at Halifax gives the date in autumn 1888 when they did begin to carry the mails under that contract with the Postmaster General. "Not under that contract," the hon. gentleman says. So much the worse for him, because that shows there was another contract under which both morally and legally we were bound to pay the firm; yet hon. gentlemen opposite try to fasten the charge on the Minister of Finance of paying $15,000 improperly under this contract of 1890. Matters went on in this way. Every trip each vessel carried the mails under promise of the Government that they would pay them, although not under contract at a stated sum, because that had to be ascertained when we took tenders, and ascertained what the service was worth and what Parliament would vote for it. Then we come to 1889, and in that session a subsidy was given to that very route. The next step in the transaction is that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) charged that these were unfit vessels, very improper vessels, very unsuitable vessels. I may tell the Committee that not only were they the vessels to which the Imperial Government had been paying for years a much higher subsidy, proportionately, but that they were on that very route when Parliament voted that sum for them, and Parliament voted it knowing the boats were on the route, and that they were those boats that were doing the service, and without any thought of any other boats being employed for the purpose.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman said I had charged that no mail was carried between July and November. I made the charge; does he deny it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is what the hon. gentleman denies, that any mail was carried in 1888 when the boats were first put on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) For the period between July and November when you paid them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Minister of Finance declared the boats were put on in 1888, and that although there was no subsidy for them, they were given the carriage of the mails with the understanding that a subsidy would be granted. I presume it was referring to that statement, because it was referring to no other, that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) said they did not carry a mail.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That, I repeat. I do not, however, want to be misunderstood. Tenders were called for in July; the contract was not entered into until December. When asked what time the contract was dated from, they asked to have it dated from November or December, and subsequently the Government paid $15,000 to the vessels for running between July and those dates in 1889, and I asserted they did not carry a mail between those dates. The hon. gentleman says that a year before they carried the mails.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in every point he has made. These vessels carried the mails in September and November, 1888. In the next place, the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in quoting from the papers, when he said they asked to be paid from some date in November, 1889. I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). If the hon. gentleman will look at the papers he will see I am right.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Now, what is the next step is the transaction? The boats were on in July, 1889. The vote of money was at the disposal of the Government by Parliament on 1st July, 1889. In September and November of the previous year they had been carrying the mails. They had not only been carrying the mails, but they had been doing the full commercial service for which the subsidy was subsequently voted by Parliament. We ought in all fairness, if the money had been available to us, to have paid from the time they put those boats on the service. They were just as much entitled to it then as they are entitled to it now. There was no subsidy available for the period between September, 1888, and July, 1889, but from July, 1889, the subsidy was at our disposal, and, under these circumstances, the boats having been put on under the pledge of the Government that the subsidy would be given to the route, the boats having been on at the time Parliament voted money to the route, and from the 1st July the money was at our disposal. The firm had been doing the work, they had been more than doing the work, because for a year previously they had been carrying our mails, and what the Minister of Finance did was to pay them from the 1st July, the period when the money was voted by Parliament, and to pay them just the money that was voted by Parliament and no more, and for doing just the service that Parliament declared that money should be expended for. Now, then, the hon. member for

Queen's (Mr. Davies) states that there is a letter here which indicates that they never expected to be paid for these back services. His recollection of it is that Pickford & Black stated they wanted to be paid from November. Now that is not the correspondence. The correspondence does not ask them when they wanted to be paid from. There could be no doubt about that, because let me tell the hon. gentleman that Messrs. Pickford & Black gave the Government no peace, for a week even, of the period between the time when the money was voted by Parliament, their boats being on the route, to pay them from the time that the boats began to run. Everybody connected with the Government knew perfectly well they were going to claim that from the time the money was voted, and everybody expected, in addition to that, we might have to pay the carriage of the mails for the previous year. Under these circumstances there was not the slightest necessity for anybody to approach Pickford & Black and ask them when they expected to be paid from, and nobody ever did so, although the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) thinks they did, and that, therefore, the charges can be sustained. This is what Mr, Courtney wrote :

"We are now preparing the contract for 'A' and 'B' services, and I shall be obliged if you will kindly let me know what trips have been made by the *Alpha* and *Beta* since you received notice of the acceptance of the 'B' and 'A' services respectively."

The reading of that does not seem to take by surprise in the least degree the gentlemen opposite, who represented it to the House as a request to be informed from what date they expected to be paid. Then, Sir, this is the answer they wrote, referring of course to that letter :

"On the 16th November, Hon. Mr. Foster wrote us advising that our tender for 'B' service had been accepted, and on the 10th December we heard through Mr. Kenny that the Government had accepted our offer for 'A' service.

"We supposed the contracts for these services will date from and with the November voyage of the *Alpha*, which was begun 15th November; and for the *Beta* with the voyage on which she started from here to Cuba, 25th December.

"We shall be glad to receive the contracts at your convenience."

They could not do otherwise than date the contract from those dates, because these were the dates at which the tender was accepted, and under that contract nothing extra has been paid, but only the service rendered by the *Alpha* from 15th November, and by the *Beta* from 25th December. But under the other contract, and for the services which were rendered while that money was at our disposal, and under the promise of the Government it would be given to them if no lower tender came in, and for the carriage of the mails for nearly two years before, the Minister of Finance simply paid the money that Parliament voted should be paid and not a dollar more.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman understands the case, and when he presents it to the House for the fifth time I hope he will present it with a little more knowledge of the subject.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We would like to see that contract.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman I dare say would deny that he ever saw it, if he did see it. I have not touched the gravest matter connected with these charges. The real charge is one that everybody in this House must lament to see connected with a transaction of this kind. What is this transaction, as it appears to hon. gentlemen opposite? It would seem to be a transaction in respect to which the Government has paid more than the contract called for, has paid for services performed before the contract was signed, and under these circumstances, instead of fair criticism and interrogation, what was the accusation made? Three or four times to-night and three or four times another night, the insinuation was made that the Minister of Finance had taken this money himself from the treasury, and that perhaps he paid it to Pickford & Black and perhaps he did not, and when the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was asked fairly by the Minister of Finance : Do you say that I did not pay it over? The House was told, it was for the Minister to prove that he did.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the hon. gentleman's wretched position at the present moment when he cries "hear, hear." Now, Sir, we must always anticipate, and anybody with the feeling of a man in him would anticipate from gentlemen opposed to him in policy, active and fair criticism when any transaction with regard to the public money appears to them to be unwarranted ; but, public life is sinking to a lamentable depth if the men who are charged with a public trust, every time find criticism accompanied by insult and dishonest accusation. Let us reflect on this point first, and I make it with the utmost confidence and am able to prove every word that I utter, namely, that in this transaction, from beginning to end, the Minister of Finance did not put his hand to one motion in regard to it, in relation to which he had not the sanction of the Government after full consultation with his colleagues, and after a report, and after an Order in Council. It was not a question of shielding himself by a report to Council at all. The service was an experiment which we had pledged ourselves to the country to endeavour to carry out even at large cost. It was a very considerable undertaking for this country, and one of great importance as regards the trade of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, but it was an experiment previously untried. It was in relation to new routes which we had never subsidized before, it was in opposition to some gentlemen of the Lower Provinces who were concerned in rival lines of business, and at every step in that transaction, the Minister of Finance had the full, and cordial, and unanimous approval of his colleagues in what he did. Therefore, this matter should have been treated as one in which the policy of the Government should have been assailed, in which they should be attacked as strongly as hon. gentlemen opposite could attack them if they thought necessary to do so ; but in respect to which it was unfair, I would almost say dishonourable, to single out the Minister of Finance and to say that for personal or political purposes he had carried on this transaction himself. But when the Committee remembers the charges to which I have just referred, and to which, when I recapitulated them, the hon. member for Bothwell said "hear, hear," namely, the charge that the Minister of Finance may have paid

this money out after taking it with his own hands from the public treasury, and he may not- stating that that was not an honest transaction, and using these words to-night, that the Minister of Finance had paid or pretended to pay this $15,000 to Messrs. Pickford & Black after taking it out of the treasury himself—let me ask the House what its opinion will be of the fairness or political or other honesty of the man who made these statements when he knew that the Minister of Finance never took the money from the public treasury at all, that he could not take it from the treasury at all, that under an Order in Council that money was voted to Messrs. Pickford & Black, that it did not lie in the power of the whole Cabinet to take that money out of the treasury and pay it to Messrs. Pickford & Black, that it could only be paid on the cheque of the Auditor General, to the order of Messrs. Pickford & Black themselves and on their vouchers ; and when the hon. gentleman said that it was for the Minister of Finance to prove what he had done with the money after he took it out of the treasury, he knew that the Minister of Finance never took it out of the treasury, but that it was paid to Messrs. Pickford & Black. We feel, with regard to every step of this transaction, that we have been justified in all that we have done. We have been justified, as the correspondence proved on another occasion, in sanctioning the lessening of the rigid terms of the contract in order to secure this service, because it is very valuable to Canada, knowing that we should have had no service at all if the rigid terms of the contract had been adhered to. Having done that, we expect criticism and court criticism, but we do expect fair treatment in debate and otherwise, and not accusations against the Minister in charge of the matter, of dishonesty, or of putting his hands in the treasury, or of being suspected of having appropriated the public moneys to his own use.

Mr. FLINT. If any defence could have been made of the transaction which is the subject of discussion this evening, I would have expected that defence could have been made and would have been made by the hon. Minister of Justice ; and with regard to some of his observations there is no attempt on this side of the House to dispute them, because they lie entirely without the range of the criticism made by the hon. gentleman who brought this matter to the attention of the Committee. I would like to know where, either in the previous discussion or in the papers which have been laid before the House, there has been any allusion whatever to the contract with Messrs. Pickford & Black for carrying the mails or for any other service performed by them for the Dominion Government previous to the written contract which has been referred to in these papers.

Mr. TUPPER. You will see it at page 4673 of *Hansard*.

Mr. FLINT. The papers reveal nothing in regard to this implied contract besides a general observation made in a letter from Messrs. Pickford & Black when they first made this claim for extra payment. The extra payment of $15,000 is not claimed by Messrs. Pickford & Black as a sum due to them in consequence of any previous contract or understanding with the Government ; but whatever defence the Government may have for the payment of that $15,000 by allusion to a contract which is not before the House, and which is not alluded to in any of the papers brought down, we are not in a position either to dispute or deny anything with reference to a contract the existence of which I learn for the first time this evening. If there was any sum due to Messrs. Pickford & Black from September, 1888, for carrying the mails up to the time of their entering into this contract for the "A" and "B" service, then why was not Parliament asked to vote an appropriation for the purpose? But Parliament was never asked to vote one cent to carry out what we are now told was a *bonâ fide* contract with this firm. On what ground could the Government ask other persons to tender for a service, when at the same time they had a secret understanding, of which Parliament and the public knew nothing, with this firm for carrying the mails, and performing substantially the same service in connection therewith that they entered into in this contract to perform? While I am prepared to admit that there is no proof before the House of the suspicions that would naturally be engendered in the minds of a critical opposition looking into this case, yet the whole transaction, ably defended as it has been by the hon. Minister of Justice and by the eloquent Minister of Finance, certainly presents features of a suspicious character to critics on their guard in reference to the matter. What do we find ? We find in the first place an appropriation made by the Parliament for carrying on a certain service. We find that the whole transaction was of a most unbusiness-like character. A very short space of time was allowed for the presentation of tenders, and tenders were invited on terms that gave an enormous latitude to the Government and enabled them to select certain favourites if they thought fit to do so ; and we find that after long delay and a vast amount of correspondence between the Government and the tenderers, contracts were entered into, but it appears that they were only entered into by the Government for the purpose of being ignored or being administered to favour such parties as the Government saw fit to favour; and it does appear to me that the substantial features of these contracts should not have been entered into. And when gentlemen of the Opposition, looking over these papers, find that the contracts have been ignored from the first, that solemn agreements as to certain payments are, upon the representations of the parties, doubled ; when we find that the payments to these parties were not increased for future services or in order that the service might be sustained or improved as intimated by the Minister of Finance, but for services which had been performed, the Opposition would be derelict in their duty if they did not call attention to these matters. We find that Messrs. Van Wart & Baird did not provide the style of boats required by the contract, and then we find that they stated to the Government that they were losing money, and were unable to carry out their contracts. The Government would have done its duty had it taken the contract off their hands ; but instead of that we find the Minister of Finance dealing with these parties who were his political friends, paying them extravagant amounts for past services, and allowing them to throw up the contract when it suited themselves and not the Government. We find, furthermore, ground for reasonable suspicion of improper conduct on the part of the Government in the fact that other contractors, after lengthy correspondence,

agreed to undertake a certain service beginning at a certain time, and subsequently claimed that they had been unfortunate and had lost money, and we find the Minister of Finance paying them $15,000 for services performed previous to the time fixed by the contract for their work to begin. The Minister of Finance explains this payment on the ground that they had been doing the service, which they had contracted to do beginning at a certain date, previous to that date. We answer you had no right to deal thus with public money. The Minister of Finance pleads the existence of a contract, of which Parliament never before had notice, for which, if it had been brought to the attention of Parliament, Parliament would willingly have voted the proper sum of money, for the Dominion does not desire that any parties should carry out public services without being adequately remunerated. Yet we find, without a word being mentioned respecting it in this House, that Messrs. Pickford & Black claim to have carried the mails for the space of a year without any other arrangement for compensation than some vague utterance of the Minister that at some future time they would be compensated. When we find that 50 per cent. more was paid than need have been paid under the agreement to gentlemen who are political friends of the Minister of Finance, and strong supporters of the Government, and when we find that $15,000 were paid without any warrant, either of contract or law, upon the mere generous whim of the Government, we have a right to charge that the Government have dealt improperly with the public money and have laid themselves open to censure. The Minister of Finance defends himself upon the ground that, in the first place, he is backed up in all these proceedings by his colleagues, and in the second place, that the House condoned his action by its vote, and that, therefore, the matter has passed out of the domain of criticism. But I believe this discussion cannot fail to be productive of good in contributing to check this hap-hazard way of dealing with public funds by which the Minister of Finance has signalized himself. If the Government enter into contracts for public services, let them hold the contractors to the terms of agreement throughout the whole public service. We find that the Government have for years persistently ignored the terms of Government contracts. We find that there is scarcely a public estimate for public works which has not been grossly and extravagantly exceeded, and every session the Opposition are compelled to ask the Government to explain these amounts paid in excess of contracts. There ought to be a fair understanding between the Government and contractors that the terms of a contract shall not be exceeded, and certainly the transactions which have been discussed in this connection are the most indefensible that have ever come before the House. I am not prepared to say that there is proof in these papers of any improper use having been made of the money, but the money has gone into the hands of favourites ; and although in the face of the strong representation on the part of the Ministers of Finance and Justice, I presume we are bound to assume that these payments did not go beyond the parties who are presumed to have received them, at the same time when moneys have been paid in violation and in excess of a contract, without any good reason, we have a right to suspect that they have been put to some improper use, and we would be wanting in our duty if we did not endeavour to have the transaction thoroughly sifted and discussed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to make a few observations in reply to what has been said concerning myself by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance seems to think that his conduct is not amenable to criticism, that legitimate criticisms of what we may regard as improper or unwarranted payments are not to be made unless some member will assume the responsibility of making a personal charge against the Minister who is accused of the irregularity and illegal conduct. As I understand the rule of Parliament it is this, that if an hon. gentleman has in his possession evidence of misconduct, it is open to him to make a charge against a member or a Minister of the Crown. But the matter under discussion is not a case of that sort. All we say here is that the hon. gentleman entered into a contract, that the negotiations which led up to that contract showed that some parties, at all events, were, in the estimation of hon. gentlemen on this side, unduly favoured. The Minister says they were not. That is a fair subject for discussion and a fair subject for criticism upon the papers that have been laid before the House. Then the hon. gentleman entered into a contract. He admits himself that the company with whom that contract was legally made in the end was a company that had no existence when these negotiations began, that the steamers undertook trips from St. John to certain stations in the West Indies, with the understanding that certain sums should be paid before the company to whom that money was paid and with whom the contract was to be made had any existence in fact or in law. That is a position which unquestionably is untenable. The hon. Minister could not know who would be the members of that company. He could not tell whether the company would ever come into existence or not, and there is no rule of law better settled by formal decision than this, that no party can make a bargain or contract that will bind a corporation or company that had no existence when the bargain was made. I am not going to discuss that point further. The hon. gentleman contracted to pay a certain sum of money, he paid 50 per cent. more than that, and he says, I had the sanction of my colleagues, and that is my defence. It is very bad for the colleagues. It does not improve the hon. gentleman's position at all, but it makes the position of his colleagues so much the worse. Then the hon. gentleman says: You do not know all the facts. There was a correspondence in regard to the $15,000 between myself and the firm of Pickford & Black, which shows that they asked for this payment before the time when the contract was made. Where is the correspondence ? The hon. gentleman is an old parliamentarian and he knows that he cannot properly refer to documents which are not before the House.

Mr. TUPPER. He did not refer to them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He referred to a claim which he said had been made by Messrs. Pickford & Black. Was it a verbal claim ? Was it a claim of which there is no official record, or minute, or note, which the hon. gentleman could bring before Parliament? He was asked to bring before Parliament all the papers relating to this matter. He

said that these, which he has brought down, were all the papers. It is true that there are certain papers disclosed which are not amongst these, but there is nothing at all in reference to any correspondence making a claim for services before the 15th November and the 25th December. The Minister of Justice came to the rescue of the hon. gentleman and said: There are some facts which you do not take into consideration, some facts which are not disclosed in these papers; we had a contract with Pickford & Black for carrying the mails from September, 1888. If the hon. gentleman had a contract at that time, why is it not laid before Parliament? Has the hon. gentleman paid out money on a contract without the sanction of Parliament? If he will examine the Auditor General's Report or the Public Accounts, he will find that the Post Office Department is not charged with any portion of the subsidy under this contract. If Pickford & Black had a claim under that contract, they have it yet. No portion of this money was voted for this purpose. It was intended and claimed for another purpose altogether which was said to begin in July, 1889. We put some steamers on the route between this country and the West India Islands. We began in July, though the contract did not call for the steamers being put on until November; and we want you to pay us for that. They had no postal contract, no such contract is disclosed, no such claim is made, and I venture to say that no such thing appears in the Public Accounts. The Minister of Finance says: I give my word that such a negotiation has taken place. Does the hon. gentleman ask any member of this House to take his word if the papers have not been brought down and laid on the Table? That is not the way in which private business is conducted or the way in which public business should be conducted. The Minister of Finance told us the other evening that the trade from St. John to the West India Islands was a growing trade, and he quoted some figures. I had in my possession then a certain paper, which I have not now. The hon. gentleman quoted figures to show that the trade between St. John and the West Indies was growing, so long as the figures showed an increase in the amount of trade, but he stopped before the end. The last returns show a diminishing trade instead of an increasing trade. Why did not the hon. gentleman give the House all the facts, in ordinary fairness?

Mr. FOSTER. The returns which I brought down to the House and read were prepared by the officers of my department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman stopped short of the last return, and the last statement he read was a return of $24,000 for the last outgoing trip. The last trip, however, was less than $9,000, but the hon. gentleman did not give that or the one before. The Minister of Justice tells us that we were bound to pay Pickford & Black for this service, that this was an obligation which Parliament could not escape. If that be so, why did the Minister of Finance ask for tenders at all? If there was a contract with Pickford & Black in existence, there was no freedom to enter into a contract with any other party. That is the position taken by the Minister of Justice, but that was not the position taken when the hon. gentleman asked Parliament first for this appropriation. He did not say it was to pay an old score, to pay an amount of indebtedness which had been entered into without the sanction of Parliament. It was stated that this money was to meet the future, and was not being voted for the past. If the money is intended for any other purpose, then it was misapplied, but I am sure that the hon. gentleman will find that the returns will show that the money was not voted for the Post Office Department, and that the Minister of Justice was mistaken in saying it was. The Minister of Justice says I was violent and unfair to the Minister of Finance. He forgets a debate in which the Finance Minister brought charges of boodling against a Government which has not been in existence for many years, charging boodling against a former member of Parliament who has not been here for several years, and when I referred to this transaction, I pointed out that a very serious inference might be drawn from the conduct of the hon. gentleman. Now, I press this upon the attention of this Committee, that there was a payment of $6,150 instead of $4,100; that there was a payment of $15,000 without authority or warrant of law; and if you want to have an improper or corrupt transaction, that is the way to begin it. I do not say this was so, but I said this was dishonest, and I say so still, because if you pay money to men which they are not entitled to, if you put your hand into the treasury and pay it out to men who have not earned it, it is a dishonest and an improper payment. So I characterized it, and so I believe it to be; and there is nothing said by either the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Justice which takes away that moral feature from the transaction. The hon. gentleman says that I have no right to indulge in a criticism of that sort. Sir, if he takes money out of the public treasury and pays it over to a party who has not earned it, if he contracts with a man for a certain sum and pays him 50 per cent more than he has agreed to pay him, I say that the burden of proof of showing that that money was, upon moral gronds, a proper payment, rests upon him from beginning to end. It does not rest upon anybody else, it does not rest upon me, or any one on this side of the House; it is not for us to show that the contract said four and that you said six; the burden is upon you to show that it was a proper transaction. Then with regard to the other transaction, the Minister of Justice has drawn a herring across the track, but he has not made the position any better before this Committee or before the country. $15,000 were paid to Pickford & Black which they had not earned, ostensibly under a service which did not exist at the time as a public service. Pickford & Black did precisely what anybody else would have done, what scores of others for aught I know have done—sent ships on to the service with a view of promoting their own interests, from the maritime ports of the Dominion to the West India Islands. In August the Government had entered into an engagement with them, not because there was any anticipation of payment from the public; if there were, then the Government would not have been free to contract with anybody else, and the demand for tenders on the part of the Minister of Finance would have been a delusion, it would have been a dishonest and misleading transaction to have asked for tenders when he was already tied hand and

foot, bound under obligations to somebody else. Let me suppose for one moment that this contract of December and November had been made with somebody else than Pickford & Black. Could Pickford & Black have come forward and made a claim for services between July and November? Would the Government have listened to this claim? Would they have paid over $15,000 for those services under those circumstances? Why they would have said there was no claim existing, they would have said: You undertook to send steamers to the West Indies upon your own responsibility, for the promotion of your own interests, for making gain for yourselves. You did not consult us, we incurred no obligation. We were inviting the public at large, inviting others as well as you to enter into this contract, and it was because we did so that we were free to contract with any person else, and we too are free to contract with you, and we are bound to pay you the amount agreed upon for the time for which this contract was entered into. But, Sir, it is not for any such services as these that $15,000 was paid; it is for a service that was performed months before, not, as the Minister of Justice says, for services performed before the first of July, 1889, for mail service. Nothing of the sort. No such claim is made. It was for the service rendered between July and November, a service for which they put these boats on as a private speculation, for the promotion of their own interest. It was undertaken for a service with which the public had no more connection than it has with the service between Timbuctoo and Soudan, and there was no greater obligation to pay one than to pay the other. It is impossible for the Minister to say that he had any warrant to pay the $15,000; it is impossible for him to say that he was under any obligation to pay one dollar of that money. The Minister of Justice stood up here to-night and denied that one dollar of that $15,000 went to an election fund. I ask him: How does he know? When he says he does not know, I am ready to accept his statement; I do not doubt that; but when he tells me that no portion of that money went for political purposes, then I have a right to ask him the question: How does he know? What statement has Pickford & Black made to him that satisfies him that not a dollar of that money was paid for election purposes? I say that it is the natural outcome of a system, and the whole proceedings and disclosures of this session of Parliament show that it is so, and it is because it is so, that I have invited the attention of the House to this particular contract. I say if you pay a contractor a large sum of money for which they have neither a moral nor a legal claim, you are putting these men under obligation to you, and it is natural that they should deal generously with those who have dealt so liberally with them. And so you take the first step in that moral deterioration that ends in the corruption of the public service. I say that is the natural outcome. I do not care to consider whether one dollar of this money was so applied or not. That is not the question, the question is: Did the Minister of Finance pay this money out by legal authority and for a service that warranted the payment? I say he has not shown that to the House, he has not satisfied a single member, either on that side or this, that such is the case, and he will have to make a very different statement from that which he has made this evening before he will convince any one capable of exercising his rational faculties, that Pickford & Black had any claim whatever upon the public treasury, moral or legal, for the $15,000 which they received.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have only one observation to make with respect to the controversy which exists between this side of the House and the Government, as to the payment of the increased amount to Baird & Co. The Minister of Justice, for reasons of his own, did not see fit to defend that; but the hon. gentleman did rise in his place and attempt to lead this House—and I submit to himself whether he acted ingenuously or not—to believe that there was a valid consideration for the payment of that $15,000, and that that consideration consisted in the carriage of certain mails by Pickford & Black.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. And for the performance of the service for which the subsidy was voted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has not read his brief up very well, if he had he would have seen that he was altogether wrong.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was not wrong.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He cannot deny the record that stands before him. I will hazard the assertion that if Pickford & Black carried any mails for Her Majesty in the year 1888, they were paid every dollar that it was worth.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not a cent. The member for Bothwell has just told you they were not paid a cent.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I said nothing was paid out of this $15,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I declare that no part of the money has been charged against the Post Office Department, and therefore was not paid out of this money. But the hon. gentleman will agree with me that his defence has been peculiarly unfortunate, because he cannot establish the assertion in this House that Pickford & Black carried the mails for the Post Office in 1888 and got no pay for it. We will not, however, depend on memories. We will go to the records. I will take the hon. gentleman to the Minute of Council passed by himself; I will take the hon. gentleman to the application of Pickford & Black for the payment of $15,000. That Minute was before the hon. gentleman when he made his statement. Does the application bear out his statement? Is there a claim direct or indirect from Pickford & Black for $15,000 because they had carried Her Majesty's mails?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not say there was.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Their application is here and reads:

"In November, 1889, we completed arrangements with the Government to perform two of the services asked for, viz., Canada to Cuba, and Canada to Jamaica, by which we were to receive a subsidy.

"Whilst operating these lines previous to November, 1889, we did so at loss to ourselves. The routes were very expensive ones and no return cargoes could be got."

Therefore it was not because they had carried the mails, but because they were carrying out a private service of their own that they lost money.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They were very wise in their generation. That was the claim they put forward. We paid it. Then they had a claim behind. We paid this in lieu of everything.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will take the hon. gentleman a step forward and show him he is still more in fault. When he accepted the application based on the letter reciting the fact, the Minute of Council was passed because Pickford & Black performed those services at a loss. That is the reason the hon. gentleman put in the Minute of Council, and not that they had carried mails or anything of that kind. I venture to say to the hon. gentleman that if on examining the accounts of the Post Office he finds they did carry mails in previous years, he will find they were paid for every mail bag they carried. Whether they were or were not, it will be difficult to make me believe that if Pickford & Black had a claim on which they could base an application for money they would not have put it in their letter written on 23rd September, and it would not have been placed in the Minute of Council authorizing the payment.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 15th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE MEMBER FOR EAST NORTHUMBERLAND.

Mr. SKINNER presented second report of the Select Committee appointed to enquire further into certain charges preferred against the member for the East Riding of the County of Northumberland.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that resolutions reported from Committee of Supply (14th instant) be concurred in.

Resolutions concurred in.

LAND SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed resolutions (page 3308) respecting the granting of the subsidies of land therein mentioned to railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also thereinafter mentioned.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know on what grounds this is proposed, where these lands are to be granted, and also full particulars about the whole line that is proposed to be constructed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In presenting these resolutions to the House it will be necessary, as the hon. gentleman suggests, to give a slight historical review of the Manitoba and South-Western Railway. I have placed on the Table of the House a map which, if the hon. gentleman will place it before him, will serve as a guide to the remarks I am about to make. I will also hand to him the Order in Council, which will enable him to follow me. I will place on the Table of the House a map which the hon. gentleman asked for, showing the land grants already made to railways; also a statement showing the amount of lands granted to different railway companies that are now in operation, as well as the grants to companies for which we are liable. The Order in Council to which I refer is dated 2nd February, 1891. It will be seen that by Order in Council of 30th April, 1884, a tract of land was set apart within which the company should be permitted to acquire by purchase at $1 per acre the odd-numbered sections at the disposal of the Government, the tract being described as follows:—Bounded on the south by the international boundary, on the east by the road allowance between ranges numbers twelve and thirteen, on the north by the northern limit of the south halves of Townships numbered four of the Dominion Lands system of survey, and on the west by the range of hills known as the Grand Coteau, or Dirt Hills. That by Order in Council of the 4th October, 1884, the odd-numbered sections within this tract were made applicable, subject to the approval of Parliament, as a free grant in aid of the construction of the railway, but on payment of the cost of the survey at the rate of 10 cents per acre, to the extent of 6,400 acres per mile of the company's line for the whole distance from Winnipeg to the neighbourhood of Whitewater Lake. This grant was confirmed by the Act 48-49 Victoria, chapter 60, which authorized a subsidy of 6,400 acres per mile from Winnipeg to near Whitewater Lake, about 150 miles, or about 960,000 acres. Previous to this, however, the company had already constructed 52 miles south-westerly from Winnipeg, and by the Order in Council of the 6th April, 1885, the Order of the 4th of October, 1884, before mentioned, was amended by apportioning the 972,800 acres therein provided for equally over the line beyond the end of the 52 miles constructed, for which purpose the line was divided into three sections, as follows:—*(a)* From the southern end of the 52 miles already constructed to Manitou, 30 miles, as section 1; *(b)* From Manitou to Whitewater Lake, about 80 miles, as section 2; *(c)* From a point in township 8, range 4, to township 8, range 9, about 20 miles, as section 3. Manitou, I may state, is the junction of the Manitoba South-Western and the Canadian Pacific South-Western. Upon the report of the Chief Engineer of Government Railways that section 2, 80 miles in length, and section 3, 20 miles in length, were properly completed, the land grant appertaining thereto, 748,384 acres, was authorized to be conveyed to the company by Order in Council of the 5th of April, 1886. In presenting this order to the Government I reported that no work has ever been done on section 1, as described in the Order in Council of the 6th of April, 1885, that is to say, the 30 miles necessary to connect

the terminal point of the 52 miles south-westerly from Winnipeg to Manitou; but in lieu of this the southern branch of the line, that is to say section 2, was extended to Deloraine, near Whitewater Lake, about 20 miles, and the northern branch was extended westward to Glenborough, about 60 miles, and the company asked that these extensions be subsidized in lieu of the 30 miles north of Manitou, for which they claim there was no immediate need. This was allowed, and on the 15th November, 1886, a land grant for these extensions, on the report of the Chief Engineer of Railways that the work was completed, was granted, representing 384,000 acres. This land was authorized by the Government to be conveyed to the company on 19th March, 1887 The total area, therefore, which has been authorized to be conveyed to the company by the Order in Council of the 5th April, 1886, and the 19th March, 1887, is 1,132,384 acres, that is to say, for 27 miles in excess of the distance for which the Act 48-49 Vic., chap. 60, provided a land subsidy, involving a land grant of 172,384 acres. I went to Council and reported that the company have, however, actually built and have had in operation for some years some 212 miles, including the 52 miles south-west from Winnipeg known and hereinbefore referred to as section 1, and this length of road, at the usual rate of 6,400 acres per mile, would entitle them to a total grant of 1,356,800 acres, being 224,416 acres more than has so far been provided for by His Excellency in Council, and 396,800 acres more than authorized by the Act 48-49 Vic., chap. 60. It will thus be seen that this is the condition of the mileage: There were 150 miles authorized by statute, and 177 miles authorized by Orders in Council. They had built, however, 212 miles, which left a balance of 27 and 35 miles; 27 miles was not authorized by statute but were built, and 35 miles were built but not covered by Orders in Council or by statute, which constitute the 62 miles in the first resolution I present to the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister of the Interior promised the House a statement showing the total amount of lands granted to railways in the North-West.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The statement is on the Table. It amounts to 22,716,000 acres, excluding the grant of 18,000,000 acres to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The entire total is 42,132,000 acres, representing every railway which up to this time has had a land grant from the Government.

Mr. CHARLTON. I must say, Mr. Chairman, that we have progressed very rapidly in this matter, and I imagine that it is time to go a little more slowly for the future. I see by the map on the Table that the North-West is pretty well checkered with the land grants, and although these railways may be necessary, yet there are many of these branch lines that would be built as fast as the wants of the country require by a powerful corporation such as the Canadian Pacific Railway is. This company has been endowed by the Government with immense bonuses in money and land, and probably no railway corporation in the world has a stronger position financially than the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Central Pacific commenced business with a capital of $12,800 in 1862, and the last statement of that company's assets that I saw, show that they amounted to $280,000,000 above its liabilities. The Canadian Pacific Railway certainly is in an infinitely better position than the Central Pacific was at the same age. A company such as the Canadian Pacific Railway, with its enormous resources and energy of management, with an energy of management which is certainly without a parallel, a company of that kind is able to build all the branch lines it may require, and I believe it will do it as fast as that country requires development. I think the Government ought to cry a halt in this matter of giving such an enormous grant of land to railways. There are cases no doubt where it is necessary to make grants in order to secure the construction of railways, but there is always the danger of speculators getting the influence of persons who have influence with the Government to secure large grants that are entirely unnecessary. My hon. friend who is administering one of the most important departments of this Government, if he looks over the history of railway land grants in the United States, will be convinced that the system of granting lands to railways is liable to very great abuse, and was very greatly abused in that country, and is liable to be abused here. As the administrator of that department I hope he will move cautiously in this matter. Those of us who are interested in the North-West and wish to see it developed, want to see the settlers procure their lands at a reasonable price in that country, and to see the settlement of the North-West progress much more rapidly than it has in the past. The locking up of vast areas of land in the hands of railway corporations who will sell them at the highest price to the settlers is certainly not the way to secure settlement. We have railways enough in that country now. We have land made accessible to railways to a sufficient extent now to accommodate ten times the population we have in the North-West, and we may very reasonably and properly go a little slower in this matter and preserve that great heritage of the people, the public domain of the North-West, a little more carefully?

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say whether this Manitoba North-Western Colonization Railway is operated under its own charter, by its own officers, or has it any working arrangement with any other company?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I understand it has been operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway for some years.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the hon. gentleman say what are the terms between the Canadian Pacific Railway and this railway? Is it leased in perpetuity to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not quite sure, but I fancy it is a ninety-nine years lease.

Mr. MULOCK. That is about the same. It is only an independent railway on paper. Practically it is the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know what its stock is. I fancy it is an independent company.

Mr. MULOCK. It must be a separate corporation, or the grant would not be made in this way. You are treating it in law as a separate corporation; but if the hon. Minister is right it is really the Canadian Pacific Railway under another name. I suppose that this second paragraph is to the same effect, and that the whole line is under the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, I believe so—the Manitoba South-Western and the Souris Branch. But they are distinct companies.

Mr. WATSON. Was it not claimed, in the case between the Northern Pacific and the Canadian Pacific in reference to the crossing of this South-Western Colonization Railway, that it was part and parcel of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that on that ground they had a right to prevent any crossing?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I presume so.

Mr. WATSON. Then there is no doubt that it is a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. DALY. The South-Western Colonization Railway Company has its own charter. It was chartered prior to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and it has its separate land grant; but it has been leased and is operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose the only asset it has is its charter?

Mr. DALY. No; it has the land grant.

Mr. MULOCK. But the land grant goes to build the road. I suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway Company pays nothing for the line. I suppose there was no money put into it.

Mr. DALY. Oh, yes.

Mr. MULOCK. There may have been promoters, but I do not think there was any money. I observe that part of this resolution speaks of a grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for a road already constructed. On what principle do you grant aid to a railway which is already constructed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Orders in Council are generally worded in this way: About so many miles. It is seldom that they are more exact.

Mr. MULOCK. But I am speaking now about a grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of so much a mile for a railway already constructed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is part of the general arrangement for granting the land subsidy to the Manitoba and South-Western Railway. There were three or four more negotiations with reference to the building of that railway. The first land grant was given for a railway from Winnipeg straight to Whitewater Lake, including this 52 miles, and this is only to carry out the arrangement made with the Manitoba South-Western Company when it took over the railway from the company which I think originally built that portion.

Mr. DALY. The railway as projected originally was to run to Manitou, and then across the country; and when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company took hold of it, they diverted the line, and continued it to Glenborough or Whitewater Lake, and it was on account of the diversion of the line that this question arose with reference to the land grant.

Mr. MULOCK. We have at present, then, an arrangement made between the two companies. But how can such an arrangement bind this Government to give this land grant? This is the first time this matter has come before Parliament.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No, no.

Mr. MULOCK. I am speaking of this additional grant. Parliament was never called on before to vote it, and I want to know how it is that we are making a land grant for the construction of a railway which is already constructed, and, I suppose, in operation?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We are closing up the whole matter, and it is found that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are entitled to a land grant covering 212 miles.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say on what ground they are entitled to this additional grant? This resolution implies that the only obligation to make land grants heretofore has been to secure the construction of 150 miles. How comes it now that we are called upon to give an additional grant for 52 miles of railway which is already constructed? Is there any statutory obligation binding us, or what is the foundation of this resolution?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a statutory obligation in reference to the 150 miles, and there are Orders in Council in reference to 177 miles; and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in submitting the matter to the Government, state that they have completed the 212 miles, as a result of a distinct understanding and arrangement with the Government that they should receive the usual land subsidy therefor, that is, 6,400 acres per mile for the 212 miles.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is that understanding in writing?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is an Order in Council covering the whole of it.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman assigns now as a reason for our granting this 6,400 acres a mile for this additional mileage, that there is an understanding between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government that this shall be granted. Will he give the exact nature of that understanding—when it began, what it culminated in, and what form it took?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman will find it in the copy of the Order in Council which I handed to the hon. member for North Norfolk.

Mr. MULOCK. This is a very lengthy document, and it is impossible to read it through in time to discuss this resolution. I did not know but the Minister would be able to give the information on the points I am mentioning. If not, I think the resolution should stand over to give us time to read these documents. At present all we have before the Committee is this statement, that there is a road actually constructed and actually in operation. We are told that we are now to grant 6,400 acres a mile in aid of the construction of a road which is already built, and the Minister says the reason he asks for this aid is that there is an understanding on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway that we should make this grant. Well, I have a great respect for the Canadian Pacific Railway and its understanding, but I have more respect for the property of the country, and I want more reasons than mere understanding on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway before I shall be prepared to assent to a grant of the public domain to a completed road.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is completed. Since 1884 52 miles have been completed of the first section.

The others have been completed from year to year, and the whole now is completed.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is now asking the House for the first time to make a grant of land to a railway which is built. Generally these grants are made to bring about the construction of a road and for no other purpose, but in this case the Minister says the road is constructed but we must all the same make this grant.

Mr. DEWDNEY. But this road was gone on with and completed on the distinct understanding that it was to have a land grant.

Mr. MULOCK. Give us the details of the understanding?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I did, as near as I could, when I read this description contained in an Order in Council. I have not all the Orders in Council, but can get them.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the whole history of the transaction should be laid upon the Table before the House can move. At present the hon. Minister has given the best reasons why we should not make a grant, namely, that it is not required to secure the construction of the railway.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Surely the hon. gentleman would not ask a company to build a road and promise them 6,400 acres a mile, and then refuse to carry out his promise.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to see what the pledge is. Promises that are made must be carried out, but it is only reasonable we should know the circumstances before we pronounce on this proposition. Supposing, without any understanding binding on the Crown, after a road is completed the company came down and asked to be presented with a grant of land per mile, would Parliament listen to the application? The only grant to which Parliament can assent is that which has been legally and constitutionally made. I do not desire Parliament to break faith with the road, but wish to see to what extent our faith is pledged.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that an Order in Council was passed in consequence of any action taken by Parliament, or was it merely the spontaneous action of the Governor in Council? And if so, what authority had they to make the Order in Council authorizing them to grant any railway company a part of our public lands?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is the way it is always done.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Without the authority of Parliament?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Of course it depends on Parliament to carry out the Order in Council or not, but the Order in Council is passed granting a subsidy in land or money, and then the Bill is brought to Parliament.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman must be labouring under a misapprehension. It is true that the Crown may, by Order in Council, promise to grant lands to a railway company; but if the Crown makes such a pledge, it ought to inform Parliament at the very first opportunity, so as to give Parliament an opportunity of pronouncing upon it. But if Parliament declares that any railway company which will undertake the construction of a road over any unoccupied territory shall be, between any points the Government may choose to designate, entitled to a certain sum of money or grant of land, that will be the authority of Parliament for the Government to act. But I do not understand that there is any such Act. The hon. gentleman has not referred to any such Act, but simply to an Order in Council promising to grant to a railway company a large portion of the public domain if the company will undertake to construct a railway. That Order in Council should have been communicated to Parliament, and has no force or utility until Parliament sanctions it. The Government surely will not undertake to grant away hundreds of thousands of acres of the public domain without any authority whatever. The Crown is a trustee of the public lands.

Mr. DEWDNEY. With reference to this Manitoba and South-Western Railway, there have been several communications in regard to not building certain portions when it was found circumstances made it more in the interest of the country a change should be made, and certain portions should not be built and others built in their place. This led to a complication difficult to understand, but everything is perfectly clear; the Government agreed to give to the Manitoba and South-Western the usual grant and are bound to carry out their obligation.

Mr. LAURIER. When was the Order in Council passed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The last one closing up the whole matter was passed 4th February, 1891. Orders in Council were passed at different times from the 30th July, 1884, and these brought about the construction of the road as laid down in this Order in Council passed 4th February, 1891. There were five, six or seven different Orders in Council passed.

Mr. LAURIER. Were they brought to Parliament from year to year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I fancy they must have been, because there have been subsidy Bills granting portions to the road at different times.

Mr. CHARLTON. This grant of land was made at a time when additional postal subsidies were granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that time was coincident with the date of the dissolution of the last Parliament. This method of arranging all these important matters by Orders in Council, of changing the grants and conditions, varying lines, &c., is an irregular and improper way of doing business. The Government control the majority of the House, and as a rule, any action they may choose to take in a matter of this kind will be sanctioned by this House, but the Government at least ought to comply with the conditions of responsible government by consulting the House in a matter of this kind. We have had, it certainly appears, a very loose method of doing business with regard to making land grants in the North-West. We have given away an enormous quantity of land, 48,000,000 acres in round numbers, and these grants have been made apart from that to the Canadian Pacific Railway and without its being necessary to make them. The Manitoba and South-Western road is an important feeder of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is

a line which it was in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway to build, and which that company would have built under any circumstances. The Canadian Pacific Railway is a powerful corporation, its stock will probably go to a hundred within a short time, and this stock will have to be watered fifty to seventy-five per cent. to keep it down to the figure of one hundred within the next forty years. There is not a corporation on the continent which has the resources of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is not a pauper company, it does not need to come to the Government to beg for aid in building the branches necessary to develop the country and furnish business to the road, and this business of passing Orders in Council just on the eve of an election, and shortly before the time an appeal was made to the electors of the country by the magnates of that road in favour of the Government, looks very suspicious indeed. It is time that the policy of the Government with regard to the land grants in the North-West should be carefully considered, and that the Government, before committing itself to any scheme whatever, before pledging the grant of one acre of land, should, as a preliminary, consult this House and receive its sanction. We may be bound here, and probably we are, and if so we must carry out the obligation.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Every Order in Council is made subject to the approval of Parliament.

Mr. CHARLTON. These Orders in Council have been made and the companies have gone on to construct the road, relying upon the Orders in Council being carried out, and the faith of the Government is in a sense pledged, though it is true that Parliament may reverse that action. I urge that the preliminary steps should have the sanction of Parliament before any operations are undertaken with the consent of the Government.

Mr. DALY. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to object to the giving of land grants to railways?

Mr. CHARLTON. I have asserted that a powerful corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is able to build the lines which are tributary to it. It is not necessary now for that company to come here and ask for contributions, as they had to do when they were building the main line. We have built their main line, and we give them the opportunity to build the branches. It is not necessary for us to give away our lands in the North-West in order to have this done. We should consult the interests of the people more than the interests of the railway corporation. While I am not opposed to making land grants in aid of railway construction, I am opposed to these wasteful and indiscriminate land grants, which I say are not necessary.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister has placed on the Table a copy of the Order in Council of the 4th February, 1891, and he said that the statements contained in that Order in Council were such as to warrant this motion being made, and that this document set forth the reason why Parliament was now asked to make this grant.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It referred to an Order in Council which brought about this one.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, but let us look at this document. After setting forth certain Orders in Council and certain legislation which has taken place, it is stated on the second page, in the second paragraph that, as to 27 miles of this road —part of the road, I presume, in respect of which a land grant is now asked—those 27 miles are in excess of the distance for which the land subsidy has been pledged. The Minister will understand that this paragraph puts him out of court as to the 27 miles, when he asks whether we will keep faith or not. You must point to some Act of Parliament or some formal obligation binding the Crown before you can talk about not keeping faith. As to 27 miles out of the 62 miles, therefore, the document which the hon. gentleman has placed on the Table states that there is no grant and no pledge on the part of the Crown, the Government, or the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. It states specifically that there are for the 27 miles, "172,384 acres already approved by Your Excellency, but not yet confirmed by Parliament."

Mr. MULOCK. The Order in Council states:

"The Minister further states that the company have, however, actually built and have had in operation for some years 212 miles, including the 52 miles south-west of Winnipeg known and hereinbefore referred to as section 1, and this length of road, at the usual rate of 6,400 acres per mile, would entitle them to a total grant of 1,356,800 acres, being 224,416 acres more than has so far been provided for by Your Excellency in Council, and 396,800 acres more than authorized by the Act."

Mr. HAGGART. Read the next section.

Mr. MULOCK. The next section says:

"The company submit that they have constructed the whole length of their railway now in operation as the result of a distinct understanding and arrangement with the Government that they would receive the usual land subsidy therefor."

There is no such thing as a "usual land subsidy," unless you can point to a pledge given by Parliament to that effect.—

"They are now fairly justified in asking the approval of Your Excellency of the subsidy of 224,416 acres appertaining to the twenty-seven miles hereinbefore mentioned, and that Your Excellency should submit to Parliament at its next session a measure confirming the grant of that area and the additional area of 172,374 acres already approved by Your Excellency but not yet confirmed by Parliament."

I would like to know whether we are simply called upon to endorse something which has been done by the Governor in Council, or whether we are doing something which has been already sanctioned by legislation. We have it stated on the face of this document that there is no legislation covering the whole of the requirements, and the Minister of the Interior evidently felt that there was no legislative sanction or authority for what he is asking, because he goes on to state—and this is the flimsy way in which the rights of the Crown are to be dealt with:

"The Minister further states that the records of the Department of the Interior leave no doubt whatever that the company's statement that both branches of the railway were constructed on the understanding that the usual subsidy of 6,400 acres of land per mile would be provided for the whole length of the road, is well founded."

There was some understanding in regard to this matter. Where is it in the records of the department? This road has been in operation for some years, and there must have been some understanding. Where are the records on which this understanding is based? Are the rights of the Crown to

depend on the understandings which are contained in the archives of the department? Where are these archives? Had they the sanction of Parliament, or of the Government, or of the Governor in Council? The Order in Council goes on:

"Apart from this, however, and in view particularly of the incalculable benefit which Southern Manitoba has derived from the construction of the two branches of this railway, putting in direct communication with the world one of the richest agricultural regions of the North-West, he, the Minister, is of opinion that the company's claim is a reasonable one."

It is not based upon the contract. The Minister does not pretend that there is a contract entitling them to this land. I would be the last man to sanction in any way the violation of a contract or of any obligation of a legal character, but the Minister himself, in addressing Council, did not base his recommendation on a contract, but on what he calls reasonableness. He goes on, in his Order in Council, to say:

"And he recommends that, subject to the approval of Parliament, the difference between the area already authorized by Your Excellency to be conveyed to them, namely, 1,132,384 acres, and the total area of the 1,356,800 acres, represented by a grant at the rate of 640 acres per mile for a distance of 212 miles, that is to say, 224,416 acres, be granted to the company, subject to the following conditions."

On the face of this document the Minister himself declares that there is no statutory grant for over 200,000 acres of land which he is now asking us to grant to this railway, and he cannot point to any, and we are now asked to grant 6,400 acres per mile for a portion of this road which has been in construction for years. Unless the Minister can furnish better explanation than this, Parliament should not listen for a moment to the proposition. Before further observations, I think the Minister should produce all these documents on which he drew the conclusion that this request was reasonable, that there was such an understanding. Parliament is entitled to see his Order in Council, and see what these requests were on which the Minister based this report of his. I again come back to the question that I put in the beginning—would the Minister please produce the documents on which this understanding is based which he alleges to exist?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will bring everything down before the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me this is a very peculiar proposition, and it is a very strange suggestion on the part of the Minister of the Interior, that this Committee should adopt this resolution without first seeing all the information that has been asked for by the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock). This is the first time in my political experience, that a proposition of this kind has been brought before this House, a resolution to grant a subsidy to a road that is actually constructed and in running operation. So far as the Canadian Pacific Railway is concerned I am sure we, as Canadians, all feel proud of the marvellous progress that road has made. We are glad to know it has done as well as it has; we rejoice to know that its financial standing and progress are so good as they are; at the same time we are here to legislate as between the interest of the people of this country and of that corporation, and while wishing it all success as a great national transcontinental highway, and while we rejoice to see it in the position it is, at the same time the people of this country have a very direct and deep interest in the North-West. It was stated to this House when the inception of this scheme for the final construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was presented to the House, and afterwards when we were asked to grant a $30,000,000 loan in order to enable the company to complete the road in advance of the time that had been agreed upon,—we were told then that by this year, the year 1891, we should have not less than from fifty million dollars to seventy million dollars out of lands in the North-West from the results of sales towards recouping this country for the construction of that line. Now, in place of having that, we have not one single farthing; in place of that we have enormous sums of money sunk there in many ways for which the people of this country have not received one dollar. I notice that whenever the question is brought before this House with regard to the development of any section of the North-West, the North-West members join unanimously in declaring that it is highly desirable that the lands of that section of country should be granted to any railway company, it does not matter whether it is a wild-cat scheme or any other kind of a scheme, so long as the lands are given away for the purpose of building any road in the North-West. They are willing and anxious that all such propositions should be carried through, and anxious that this House should give its assent at once. Why? Because the lands in the North-West belong to this Dominion, and are held and should be held, to recoup this Dominion for the enormous amount of money that has been spent in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and anything that will secure the giving away of this land in the North-West meets the views of hon. gentlemen opposite from Manitoba, and they are willing that the House should consent to grant that land at once. I have no desire to advocate that we should refuse to encourage, in a proper and careful way, the development of the North-West; I am quite willing to do so. At the same time I contend that this South-Western and Manitoba line is running through a section of country that could as well afford to grant aid towards the construction of that road from a provincial standpoint, as the municipalities throughout the Province of Ontario or any other province, that have granted aid towards railway construction. The North-West has municipal organizations, and they should be asked to grant their money towards building the road, if they want to do so, the same as the municipalities in the Province of Ontario that are labouring under burdens of debt, and paying from year to year very large sums towards the liquidation of the debts contracted for the construction of their roads. What right have the Government to ask the poor farmers of Ontario to consent that the money that it was promised should be recouped to them for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and should come into the coffers of this Dominion, should be spent in the construction and developments of roads in the North-West without those farmers receiving a single dollar in return? That is a fact, and hon. gentlemen opposite know it. Now, while I am quite willing to deal fairly and justly with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, or any other company, I contend that we should give no special concession to any company, and this is undoubtedly a special concession so far as the 6,400 acres per mile are concerned. When the Minister says that he made an

Order in Council, it is rather remarkable that the date of that Order in Council was on the 4th of February, and the date of the general election was on the 5th of March; that is to say, thirty days afterwards. I wonder if that Order in Council has had anything to do with a remarkable manifesto that was issued by the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway in favour of hon. gentlemen opposite. It may have had something to do with it: we do not know. But I say that the hon. gentlemen opposite, when Parliament met, should have laid the whole facts of that question before the House, with all the information in their possession. They have not done that. They bring it out at the tail end of a long session, when this House is wearied out with the amount of scandals that have been unearthed, with all the abominations that have been discovered among the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Opposition have brought to light this session, scandals and iniquities that should bring the blush of shame to every honest Canadian; and I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite that we have not yet reached the end of the abominations; we are only at the beginning of them, as they will find out before this session is closed.

An hon. MEMBER. Trot them out.

Mr. McMULLEN. Now, I say that before this item is passed the Minister of the Interior should lay before the House the information that has been asked for by the hon. member for York. We are asked from time to time to pass items with the solemn pledge of hon. gentlemen opposite that the information asked for will be brought down and laid on the Table of the House. That is legislating in advance of information. I contend that Parliament is not here merely to register the will of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have certain rights and certain privileges, and we have a right to expect that our privileges shall be respected, and that information we are justly entitled to shall be laid before the Committee, before we are asked to go on in this way. Let the hon. gentleman reserve the item, and bring down the information; then we shall be legislating with our eyes open and not with our eyes shut.

Mr. DALY. It seems to me the hon. gentleman is making a great deal of fuss about nothing. I think the explanation contained in the memorandum of Council which has been read by the member for North York, is sufficient, and if he was willing to accept that explanation, there would be no need of discussion. Now, this resolution refers to the Manitoba and South-Western Colonization Railway Company. In the memorandum for Council reference is made to the statute of 48 and 49 Victoria, chapter 60, an Act to authorize the granting of certain subsidies in land for the construction of railways therein mentioned. Section 2 of the Act provides as follows:—

"The Governor in Council may grant to the Manitoba and South-Western Colonization Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding 6,400 acres for each mile of the company's railway, from its commencement at Winnipeg to its terminus at Whitewater Lake, about 150 miles."

It is in the recollection of hon. gentlemen from Manitoba that about the time of the passing of this Act, in 1885, there was a great deal of agitation in Manitoba, where the people were asking that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should extend its south-western branch. The Canadian Pacific Railway, in obedience to the demands of the public, went on and extended that branch, and as a matter of fact, they went on building to such an extent, that they got beyond the Order in Council that gave them their land grant. That is how the whole difficulty has arisen. It was not discovered until they had completed their whole line, and then they ascertained that they had not received the land grant to which they were entitled. It is plainly laid down by the Act of 1875, that the company were entitled to a land grant of 150 miles, and they built 212 miles, and the Government were pledged to give them the land grant for this additional mileage.

Mr. CHARLTON. Why?

Mr. DALY. By virtue of having agreed to give the company 6,400 acres per mile for the first 150 miles. They went on and constructed 62 miles additional on the clear understanding that they were to get the same subsidy. They would not have undertaken the building otherwise.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the understanding?

Mr. DALY. By the Act I have quoted, the company were given 6,400 acres per mile for 150 miles. They built 62 miles beyond that point on the clear and distinct understanding, if the hon. gentleman opposite will believe me, that they were to obtain the same land grant for the additional mileage. They got beyond the Order in Council, as they built faster than they supposed, and they thought the Order in Council gave them the land grant for the length of railway they built. They discovered the mistake. This Order in Council is as follows:—

"The company submit that they have constructed the whole length of their railway now in operation as the result of a distinct understanding and arrangement with the Government that they would receive the usual land subsidy therefor, that they are fairly justified in asking the approval of Your Excellency to the subsidy of 224,416 acres appertaining to the twenty-seven miles hereinbefore mentioned, and that Your Excellency should submit to Parliament at its next session a measure confirming the grant of that area and the additional area of 172,384 acres already approved by Your Excellency but not yet confirmed by Parliament.

"The Minister further states that the records of the Department of the Interior leave no doubt whatever that the company's statement that both branches of the railway were constructed on the understanding that the usual subsidy of 6,400 acres of land per mile would be provided for the whole length of the road, is well founded. Apart from this, however, and in view particularly of the incalculable benefit which Southern Manitoba has derived from the construction of the two branches of this railway putting in direct communication with the markets of the world one of the richest agricultural regions of the North-West, he, the Minister, is of opinion that the company's claim is a reasonable one, and he recommends that, subject to the approval of Parliament, the difference between the area already authorized by Your Excellency to be conveyed to them, namely, 1,132,384 acres, and the total area of 1,356,800 acres, represented by a grant at the rate of 6,400 acres per mile for a distance of 212 miles, that is to say 224,416 acres, be granted to the company subject to the following conditions."

The whole gist of the matter is contained in the last paragraph I have read: "The Minister is of the opinion that the company's claim is a reasonable one." Will hon. gentlemen opposite say that claim is not a reasonable one when by the Act of 1885 they were granted 6,400 acres per mile for 150 miles, and they proceeded and built 62 miles additional, for which a land grant at the same rate is now asked?

Mr. MULOCK. Then where is the limit?

Mr. DALY. The company reached the limit because there is no more of that line to be constructed.

Mr. MULOCK. They might build another 100 miles.

Mr. DALY. Looking at the question from a reasonable standpoint, hon. members cannot but conclude that if the company built 62 miles additional, they were entitled to the same land grant per mile as to the original 150 miles. The whole matter under discussion is one that we cannot expect to be fairly considered by hon. gentlemen opposite, because it appears to me that no matter what proposition is brought forward referring to Manitoba and the North-West, hon. gentlemen opposite take exception to everything the Government propose to do on behalf of the people of that country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I cannot congratulate the hon. gentleman on the speech he has delivered,—

Mr. DALY. I do not expect it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—nor on the petulant remarks with which he closed his observations. I do not think the Opposition are open to the charge he has made, nor are they going to remain silent under it. The Opposition have never in any case —I challenge the hon. gentleman to prove his assertion—offered improper or unreasonable opposition to any proposition made by the Government or by any hon. member, having for its object the proper promotion and development of the North-West. But I will take the hon. gentleman's own argument. What is the argument he has addressed to the House? That by the Act 48 and 49 Victoria, chapter 60, the land grant of 6,400 acres per mile is given for this road for an extension of 150 miles. That was given in addition to the Order in Council by which the company got a similar number of acres per mile for 23 miles beyond that. The hon. gentleman says that because the company have built a longer line of road, it necessarily follows that they must get a correspondingly increased land subsidy. I do not see the force of that logic. The Order in Council which the Minister submitted to the House, and on which he asked the House to assent to his proposition states that it was passed because the Minister found in the records of his department certain statements which left no doubt whatever that the company's statement was true, that both branches of the railway have been constructed and that the usual subsidy of 6,400 per mile should be granted. What has been asked by the Opposition? The Minister says: I came to this conclusion from certain documents in my department; that Council approved of my conclusion, and I asked the House to assent to it. The hon. gentleman says he will bring down the documents on which he arrived at that conclusion before the third reading of the Bill. Why should we not have now the documents which led the Minister to come to this conclusion and which led Council to approve of it? Why should they be withheld from us? Have we no right to see whether the conclusion was a sound one or not? Suppose his understanding is wrong, and that he made no legitimate deduction from the papers he referred to. What then? Is the House to be treated as a spoiled child? Such an idea is ridiculous. The hon. gentleman is asking this House for an area of land equal to a principality, and when we ask for the papers on which they decided to make this grant, the Minister says he is willing to bring them down after the Bill has passed to its third reading. Did the hon. gentleman intend that as an insult to the Opposition or the House? If not, it must have been done from the hon. gentleman's ignorance. He knows that when a Bill has passed its second reading and its principle assented to, it will be eventually carried. We want the reasons now. Why did not the hon. gentleman submit the papers when he asked the House to assent to the resolutions, in the first instance? Instead of doing so, the hon. gentleman turns round and says that the papers on which he acted and on which the recommendation was made are in the archives of his office; and, on the Opposition asking them to be produced, he replies he will not produce them until the third reading. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) says the hon. members of the Opposition are unreasonable in their demands. The hon. gentleman knows that what we ask is perfectly reasonable. As the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has stated, if it appears, when the documents come down, that the hon. gentleman has drawn a fair deduction, and that there was a clear and distinct understanding binding the country, legally and morally, to this land grant, there will be no difficulty in the House passing the Bill.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will get them for the second reading.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why should we not get them now, and why should not members of the House be treated as intelligent people representing the interests of their constituents, and acting as trustees of their constituents for the public domain in the North-West? We hear hon. gentlemen opposite in their calmer moments declaring that we have granted enough Dominion lands in the North-West, and that we must not go further. This great corporation, which has its grip on the throat of the country now and which can, beyond question, do what it likes has been granted enough. I think, whether this proposition to grant them a little more may be defensible or may be indefensible, and the hon. Minister says he has papers in his office to show that it is perfectly defensible, should be postponed until the papers are produced. If when they come down the facts are as stated, well and good; if not the proposition will have some opposition. Hon. gentlemen opposite must see that the Opposition are not factious, are not unreasonable, and that our demand is a fair and reasonable one.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I offered to bring down the information before the third reading of the Bill. If it is required sooner I will bring it down before the second reading. When I do bring it down, hon. gentlemen opposite will be no wiser than they are to-day, because everything is contained in the last Order in Council, and the only further information they will have will be the Order in Council itself.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says in this paper which he has placed upon the Table of the House, that the records of the department leave no doubt whatever that there was an understanding between the Government and the company that these lands should be received. Very well; that is the fact that we desire to have before us. We want to know how far the Government

have pledged themselves, and if the Government have improperly pledged themselves then the Government is liable to the censure of this House. The hon. gentleman says that he will bring down these papers at the second reading. Well, Sir, I know that for many years past the House of Commons of Canada has been treated as a very subordinate body. The power that is supposed to be exercised by the House as the representative body of the country has been exercised in fact by the Government. We had an all-powerful Prime Minister in whom hon. gentlemen opposite had the most implicit confidence, and they gave their judgment a holiday and they gave their power to that hon. gentleman as their leader. This House is not to-day in exactly the same position that it was last year or the year before. There has been to some extent an emancipation of hon. gentlemen opposite, and they stand now in that respect upon a footing of equality with hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. They are free to exercise their own judgment, and we ask them to exercise that judgment. We do not ask them that they should treat the Government which they follow unfairly, but we ask them that they should not abdicate their functions and pass over the authority which they were sent here to exercise, to hon. gentlemen who sit upon the Treasury benches. If they persist in abdicating their functions as popular representatives and to trust to the Ministers to think for them, and to decide for them what course should be pursued in the public interest, then the production of these papers at the second reading of these resolutions may be adequate. It is not so regarded in the United Kingdom, and it ought not to be so regarded here. The authority is with the House and not with the Ministers. They are a committee of this House trusted with the duty of conducting the public affairs of the country when the House is not in session, but we at all events are not disposed, while the House is in session, to abandon our functions and to permit the Government to act in our behalf.

Mr. DALY. In answer to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) in reference to my statement that the Opposition were unreasonable, the hon. gentleman will recollect that we are only dealing with the resolution now, that a Bill will be brought down to the House founded on the resolutions, and it is on the second reading of the Bill that my hon. friend says he will furnish the information. We will have every opportunity then of discussing the question. I do not see that it will interfere with the opportunity the hon. gentleman will have to discuss the matter by allowing these resolutions to be adopted now, and continuing the discussion on the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like my hon. friend to say what is the object of this Committee, what is the object of these resolutions, if it is not to put the House in possession of all the information necessary to come to a determination on the matter, and yet the hon. gentleman is not willing at this stage of the proceedings to give all the information which the House needs in order to come to a conclusion. The hon. gentleman must see himself how unjust he is when he says that the Opposition are always against Manitoba. As my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has just stated, we do not pronounce for or against these resolutions at the present time. The only thing we ask is that all the information which is necessary to come to an honest conclusion on the subject shall be placed on the Table of the House. What is the objection to that. The objection taken by the Government to-day is utterly untenable. It has been the policy in the past to subsidize by way of land grants railways in the North-West and Manitoba. Whether this policy has been carried too far or not is not the question at this moment. It has been the principle of this Parliament never to give any such grants except in the way of helping the construction of railways, and here we are asked, not to help the construction of a railway, but to help a railway which has already been built. The position is a unique one in the history of this country. It is stated that the Government is pledged to grant this subsidy, and that is exactly what we want to see. Is the Government pledged or not pledged; is the honour and credit of the country pledged to give that subsidy? If it is, well and good, the honour and credit of the country must be maintained; but if it is, let us have all the information necessary upon the matter. On the 7th of February last the Government were informed that:

"The Minister further states that the records of the Department of the Interior leave no doubt whatever that the company's statement, that both branches of the railway were constructed on the understanding that the usual subsidy of 6,400 acres of land per mile would be provided for the whole length of the road, is well founded."

It may be well founded or not, but before this Parliament is asked to vote a single acre of land, Parliament must be satisfied that the contention here set down, which would satisfy the Minister of Railways, ought also to satisfy Parliament. It is contrary to all principles of constitutional and responsible government to ask this Parliament to vote a single acre of land or a single cent of money until Parliament is satisfied by the evidence which the hon. gentleman says he has in his possession. If he has it in his possession, what is the objection that it should be brought down when he now asks Parliament to give the land, and not at some future stage? This is the time to bring down the evidence and the information which would satisfy Parliament on this matter, and it would be tantamount to abolishing our rules of procedure to allow these resolutions to pass until we have the information which the hon. gentleman has, and which he withholds. If there is any reason why the information should be withheld we want to know it, but if there is no reason, then the Committee should either rise until it has the evidence before it, or if the Committee is not to rise now, that we should have the evidence at this present moment and not later.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are other reasons, it appears to me, why the Committee should act with great caution in granting three-quarters of a million acres of land within Manitoba to these railways, which are virtually the Canadian Pacific Railway in both cases. I dare say the House will remember that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were treated with extreme indulgence in the matter of this grant in the first instance. When this grant was first made, it was made on condition of $1 an acre being paid to the Government. This was taken away, and it was made a free gift to the company, in common, I believe, with one or two other railways at the same time.

At that time, it will be in the recollection of the House, that I protested, and so did other gentlemen on this side of the House, against the placing of these lands in southern Manitoba in the hands of a company, without putting on such restrictions as would ensure them being sold at reasonable rates to the settler. It is within my personal knowledge, and it is within the personal knowledge of many members of this House, that owing to the neglect of that precaution these lands have been deliberately locked up by the Canadian Pacific Railway. These lands have been put at prohibitory rates, the settlement of Manitoba has been retarded to a very great extent, and tens of thousands of persons who would have been in southern Manitoba to-day have been practically expelled from that country or prevented from settling there by reason of the refusal of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to sell these lands at reasonable rates. Now, Sir, we are asked to give altogether some seven or eight hundred thousand acres to this company without any restrictions, without any provision being made to prevent a recurrence of that evil to which attention has been called so often; and we are asked to do that by virtue of an Order in Council passed on the 7th of February, 1891. Sir, it looks to me very much as if that was a part of the bribe by which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were induced to come to the assistance of these hon. gentlemen. We have seen in our postal subsidies a proof of part of their bribe; we have seen in the provisions made for the City of Quebec large sums of money granted virtually for their benefit; and now we are asked to give three-quarters of a million acres more. Sir, if there ever was a transaction in reference to which it was the duty of this House to insist on the fullest information being given, a transaction which bears suspicion on its face, it is this identical resolution now before us.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Some time ago, when a question similar to this was before the House, I asked the Minister of the Interior if he could give us an idea of the quantity of land granted to railways in Manitoba and the North-West Territories.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have it here.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is very desirable that, before granting away this land, we should carefully consider the matter, because it undoubtedly retards settlement. Some years ago some constituents of mine travelled through Manitoba in search of land, intending to settle there, and they found that much of the land was locked up, and, owing to the high prices asked for it, it was impossible for them to obtain satisfactory locations. Good settlers they were, having a considerable amount of capital, but they got tired of the search and went and settled in Dakota. They did not do so willingly, but simply because they could not get land in Manitoba. Now, it becomes the duty of this House to consider very carefully before making any further grants of land to railway companies. I understand that the United States will not grant any further land to corporations of any kind, but reserve it for settlers. I do not know but what it would be well to introduce such a policy into Canada, where this system of granting land to corporations has retarded the settlement of the country. I think we should scrutinize very closely any measure which proposes to lock up any more land in favour of any company, however great or deserving that company may be. All the land we have should be for the settler, and the settler alone.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see that the statute 48 and 49 Victoria, chapter 6, section 2, authorizes this land grant in the following terms:—

"The Governor in Council may grant to the Manitoba and South-Western Colonization Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding 6,400 acres for each mile of the company's railway, from its commencement at Winnipeg to its terminus at Whitewater Lake, about 150 miles."

This, Sir, would seem to be all the statutory authority which the Government possesses in the premises. In the return laid on the Table of the House of grants to various railway companies, the first entry relates to the railway under discussion, the Manitoba and South-Western Colonization Railway. The Orders in Council are dated 30th April, 1884, 4th October, 1884, and 15th November, 1886, and authorize in accordance with the above provision, grants for 150 miles. The return gives the miles subsidized at 150, the miles built at 212, and the rate of the grant per mile 6,400 acres. Now, Sir, it seems, from the remarks in connection with this return, that the charter has expired. The land grant to which the company is stated to be entitled was 1,356,800 acres, at the rate of 6,400 acres per mile. Of this, 1,132,384 acres have been conveyed to the company by Orders in Council, leaving a balance due of 224,416 acres. Now, under the authority of the Act the company are entitled to 960,000 acres, covering the 150 miles, but the Government have already granted them by Order in Council 172,384 acres more than they are entitled to, and are now asking us to authorize them to grant 224,416 acres more. There is no question that this is a matter requiring investigation by the House; and if Parliament does not demand that this authority on which this is asked be laid before it at this stage, before we proceed any further with the measure, but permits the Government to go on in the manner in which it has been doing, it will be abdicating its proper functions as the custodian of the public interests.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will pass these resolutions, because it seems to me that no good whatever can come from the contention which they are making here to-day. The hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Bothwell have both very properly described the inquisitorial character of this House. It is no doubt a very proper thing that this House should enquire into every demand made upon it by the Government on the part of a railway or any other corporation. But the hon. gentlemen knew very well, for their experience will bear out what I am saying, that whatever correspondence may be in the Department of the Interior cannot give them any information that they are not in possession of already. My hon. friend raises his eyebrows in incredulity; but what sort of correspondence would be there? The railway company would naturally point out that it had built a certain number of miles more than it was subsidized for; and instead of being condemned for that it ought to be rewarded. If the Government had come to this House for a subsidy for the length of railway thus built the subsidy would undoubtedly have been given.

Mr. LAURIER. Why was it not asked?

Mr. DAVIN. I suppose it was not; but suppose the railway company says: We have built these miles of railway in continuation of a scheme sanctioned by Parliament, and our moral claim to the same subsidy is undoubted. That is the sort of correspondence, I apprehend, that will be found underlying the sentence put by the Minister into the Order in Council, that the correspondence leaves no doubt whatever that the claim of the railway company is a reasonable one. This is no recondite matter, in which it would be difficult to divine what sort of demand the railway company would make. As business men they would naturally say that they had carried out a scheme sanctioned by Parliament, and in doing so had actually been carrying out the will of Parliament; after all, my hon. friends are fighting on a mere technicality. My hon. friend from Bothwell shakes his head; but in this case, at any rate, if I may borrow a joke of O'Connell's, there is nothing in it. In this case there is no real point in the objection, because we have already given a subsidy to this railway. They extended the line, and they asked us for a subsidy of land for each mile of the extension, for which they had not been given a subsidy. Is there anything unreasonable in their asking the Government to do this?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend says it is unreasonable. I do not think it is. He cannot point to a case of a railway which, in carrying out its original project, exceeded the number of miles originally subsidized, and in which Parliament was not ready to say: You have carried out the scheme we originally sanctioned, and of course we shall give you the same help for the extension which we gave you for the other part of the line. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) points out very properly that we shall have abundant opportunity to discuss this on the second reading, but I do not at all complain of the general proposition laid down by the hon. gentleman, namely, that in this Committee the fullest information should be given. I say, however, that it is morally certain that we have the fullest information already, and that the length and breadth, the height and depth of the claim of the railway for this subsidy can be no other than that they have done certain work in completion of the scheme sanctioned by Parliament, and that, therefore, they have a moral claim to this grant. This claim no doubt was represented to the Minister, he looked into it, and said what any rational man would say, looking at the claim, it seems to be a reasonable one, and on his representation the Order in Council was passed. That Order is before us, and what other information could hon. gentlemen have? Do they suppose there is some interesting correspondence of a curious and recondite character, such as cannot easily be imagined behind this. I will venture to say, although I have not seen the correspondence, that it is of a commonplace business character, pointing out that the work was done, and that there is a moral claim which any hon. gentleman looking at the matter merely on its merits would sanction.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken borrowed a joke of O'Connell's, and said, in reference to our contention, there is nothing in it. I could answer his argument by borrowing not a joke, but a very serious phrase, of a gentleman whose memory is dear to hon. gentlemen opposite, "there ain't nothing to it." I am shocked and horrified when I hear gentlemen who pretend to be Conservatives, who ought to be the guardians of the rules of the House, who ought to be the guardians of those rules which have come to us from the mother land and which should be the bulwark of the Government, saying that these rules ought to be maintained, but maintained only in theory and not in practice. They say we ought to be satisfied on this occasion without the correspondence, because there is nothing in the correspondence. That is the very reason, Sir, we want to see it. I agree with the hon. gentleman that there is nothing probably in this correspondence to justify the vote.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not say that.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps you did not, but you said it was of a very commonplace character.

Mr. DAVIN. It must be, as it is of a business character.

Mr. LAURIER. Simply that the work had been done. Very likely it is of the character described by the hon. gentleman, but that does not warrant this vote. Upon what ground can this vote be justified? Only on the ground that the honour of the country has been pledged to it. It has never been the policy of the country to subsidize railways that were built, but to subsidize them before they were built, so as to achieve their completion. Here, however, we are asked to help a railway which requires no help, and we are asked to do this on the ground that it has a moral claim on the country. That policy is a vicious one. It is not to be pretended, under any considerations, that a subsidy must be granted this company which has built this railway, unless you can show that they had the pledge and promise of the Government. If there was such a promise it must be carried out. But what evidence have we of it? The Minister, in introducing the resolution, said we had to do this because the honour and the credit of the country were pledge to it. Very well; if there has been such a pledge given, let us have it and see what it amounts to. But is the hon. member for Assiniboia prepared to say that on the mere *ipse dixit* of a Minister, without any chance being given to Parliament to canvass the conclusions arrived at by the Minister, Parliament is to be bound. There is but one safe rule to follow, and that is, that the same information which the Minister possesses and which guided him in coming to the conclusion he did ought to be laid on the Table. We have the same right as he. Our right is to pass judgment upon him, and unless we are given the information on which he based his decision a wise constitutional rule is violated.

Mr. WATSON. We ought to have some information from the Minister concerning the understanding which existed between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government, and in virtue of which this Order in Council was passed. I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. member for Selkirk justify every act of the Government, when he knows that a large portion of his county has suffered for years on account of some understanding between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government—an understanding which was a mystery to most of us. Is that section of the country to be held as a preserve for the Canadian Pacific

Railway, at the expense of the settlers, in which to build railways whenever they see fit? I am credibly informed that in 1888 or in 1889 the Northern Pacific Railway, which had secured an entrance into Manitoba, offered to build 300 miles in south-western Manitoba and in southern Assiniboia on condition the Government would give them the ordinary land grant of 6,400 acres per mile. The Government, however, said that by Order in Council they had extended the time to the Canadian Pacific Railway for beginning to build a line into that country, which line the Canadian Pacific Railway only attempted to build this year, and thus excused themselves from accepting the terms of the Northern Pacific. I am informed that the Northern Pacific offered, as a guarantee that they would construct the line inside of three years, to deposit with the Government $200,000, provided the Government would grant land to the extent of 6,400 acres per mile. The Government, however, would not listen to the proposal. They claimed that under an Order in Council the same arrangement existed then as exists now. It is greatly to be deplored that such an understanding should exist between a large corporation and the Government and that it should not have been known to this House. I would ask if there is any understanding between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, in virtue of which Government candidates are able, during election times, to secure special trains to carry electors to the polls or for their own use. I do not know whether the candidates pay for them, but I presume they do not. If this is done by reason of some special understanding, we ought to have some information concerning it laid before this House. We ought to know what the understanding is now and what it has been in the past. The Minister said that the Canadian Pacific Railway saw fit at times to make changes and build roads here and there. Is this House prepared to grant 6,400 acres a mile to the Canadian Pacific Railway for any piece of road they may see fit to build in order to aid and feed their own line. I say that Parliament ought to sanction that before it is done, and we ought to know what the understanding is. We were told by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) that the Canadian Pacific Railway constructed 62 miles of road before they understood that they were entitled to a land grant for such construction. They constructed 212 miles before they knew that they were entitled to a land grant for 62 miles which they constructed. There must have been some understanding with the Government or they would not have constructed one mile over the 150 miles. In 1881 there was a railway company which proposed to build a road in Southern Manitoba, and the Government took such a part in fighting that road that Sir Charles Tupper went to Manitoba and opposed it, on the ground that it was an American corporation, and that it was not proper that this Government should allow a railway to run within 15 miles of the boundary to the south. On account of some understanding, I suppose, between the Government and the company—and I, as a Manitoban, desire to know what that understanding is—we are now asked to vote these land grants to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for roads which have already been built under some understanding which has not been explained to the House; and I hope we may have these explanations and may know what the understanding has been in the past between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government.

Mr. DALY. If the hon. gentleman will read the clause of the Act quoted by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) he will find that it was provided that 6,400 acres per mile should be given to this road for 150 miles. The company built 62 miles extra, and there can be no doubt that they would not have built the additional miles if they had not expected that they would receive the same amount per mile as they had for the other portion of the road. The hon. gentleman knows that there has not been a railway built in the North-West, except the beautiful Northern Pacific Railway, without receiving a subsidy of 6,400 acres per mile. This company constructed that 62 miles under the understanding and belief that the Order in Council had been passed giving them the usual land grant, and it was not until after the work had been done that they found no Orders in Council had been passed. All that is asked is that what the Government committed itself to should be carried out. It is clearly understood that the Manitoba and South-Western Railway has built 150 miles of railway with the usual subsidy of 6,400 acres a mile, and is it not reasonable that they should have a subsidy for the extra 62 miles?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is part of the February contract.

Mr. DALY. I do not doubt that, but I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the policy which his Government adopted between 1874 and 1878. I have here a speech delivered by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on the 28th March, 1878, in which he said:

"He held that the only policy to open up and develop these large tracts of country was a liberal railway policy; and that, while it was proper to exercise due caution, it would not be good policy to postpone the building of lines for the sake of saving a few hundred acres to the mile. They could not induce capitalists to embark in a speculation of that kind unless they offered liberal terms."

I think that position was a reasonable one, and that is the position which is taken by the Government to-day, and these men have gone on under the expectation that they would receive this grant.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman has referred to a speech made by me in 1878, in which I avowed myself in favour of a liberal policy of granting aid to railways, with the exercise of due caution. That is what we are asking now. We have not avowed that we are opposed entirely to the granting of land subsidies in the North-West, but we say that these grants have been recklessly made. If a railway company can build a line without Government aid, it is not necessary for the Government to step in and give the company a subvention for the purpose of building a branch line. In 1878 the North-West was without a mile of railway, it was entirely undeveloped, but since that time the Government, by land grants and by giving a bonus of $60,000,000, has built a railway across the continent, and the contrast between the condition of that country now and its condition in 1878 is very marked. Now there are three times as many railways constructed in that country as are required by the inhabitants. Instead of confining ourselves to building railways there, as the population develops and in acccordance with the actual wants of the settlers, we have run lines through the various parts of the North-West, and have created

scattered settlements from Winnipeg to Calgary with great stretches of uninhabited land between them. No one can doubt that 200 miles of railway would have given sufficient accommodation for all those settlers, but instead of exercising due caution we have been making those grants lavishly and extravagantly. I do not wish to see the North-West handed over to speculators and charter-brokers, and that is what we are criticizing. Here we find that the Government has subsidized a line 150 miles in length with 6,400 acres to the mile, and the company goes on and builds 212 miles of road, and my hon. friend tells us that, because the company has exceeded the 150 miles and has built 212 miles, it is right to subsidize the company for the extra 62 miles. If the hon. gentleman should give a contract to build a house, would he consider that he should pay for building two houses, if the contractor saw fit to go on with the work to that extent? The Government is bound to fulfil the contract with the company, nothing more and nothing less, and unless we have some reasons given to us for binding the Government we ought not to make this additional grant. I believe the company built that additional piece of road without expecting any grant; I believe they extended the road because they required it, because it was a good country, and it was in the interests of the company to build it. But whether or not, if the faith of the Government was pledged, and it was necessary on the eve of the last general election, just when the manifesto of the president of a great corporation was issued to the people, let us know it. If I stood in the position of the Minister of the Interior I should want to let the House know it; I should not want to be under the imputation that there was anything of this kind. I would move at once that the Committee rise and report progress, and I would lay these reasons before the House before I asked the House to consider these resolutions. There is just one other point that my hon. friend took notice of, in criticizing the speech of the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly). He did not inform us whether there were actually extra trains run in the North-West by the Canadian Pacific Railway for the benefit of the Conservative candidates.

Mr. DALY. I had nothing whatever to do with any train. I do not suppose that the Canadian Pacific Railway would run any railway train during the election day, or at any other time, for which they were not paid. I had nothing whatever to do with the arrangements made for hiring those trains on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Whatever service the railway rendered to me I paid them for it out of my own pocket, and I have got a receipt for it. They do not do anything for nothing. Now, I will give some more of the hon. gentleman's speech which he made in 1878, which shows that he is quite inconsistent with the position he takes now:

"It was useless to think of opening up and settling this country without furnishing it with railway facilities. Now, it has been said that the American railways were subsidized to a greater extent than necessary; perhaps that had in some instances been the case. Reference has been made to the Illinois Central Railway. At the time that road was projected nearly the whole interior portion of the State was a wilderness; farmers living 50 miles from Chicago were in the habit of teaming wheat to the market often, when the roads were bad, at a cost one-half the value of the wheat. The country had a few struggling settlements in the interior, but there was no extent of population. The country would never have been opened and settled as it has been but for the construction of a system of railways of which the Central was the chief."

Now, Sir, that is entirely inconsistent with the position the hon. gentleman takes now, and the position that is taken in this House by the hon. member for Bothwell, for they both contended that the Canadian Pacific Railway was built too fast. This line that we have under discussion was built at the direct instance of the people of Manitoba. They were crying out for railway facilities in a section of the country where the farmers had to draw their wheat 60 miles to Brandon, on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, just the same as the hon. gentleman said the farmers had to do on the Illinois Central. It was a direct outcome of the agitation on the part of the people of Manitoba that the Canadian Pacific Railway built this extra 62 miles. It seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite get more unreasonable as they discuss this question. After the explanations that have been given by the Minister, and after reading that Order in Council, after all the information that is in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite, it seems to me that the Committee can arrive at no other conclusion than that the Canadian Pacific Railway is just as much entitled to the subsidy for this 62 miles as they were for the subsidy, by the Act of 1878, for the 152 miles.

Mr. WATSON. After the statement of the hon. gentleman that the Canadian Pacific Railway did not run trains for nothing, I am still more anxious to get information as to this understanding between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am of the same opinion as the hon. gentleman. I am satisfied that the men who were in charge of trains on election day did not pay for them out of their own pockets. No one supposes they would do it; therefore, we certainly ought to have the understanding that exists between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway. If the company are to be paid for their services by legislation in this House we want to know it. Now, the hon. gentleman had to have a fling at the Northern Pacific. The Northern Pacific Railway Company have built some 225 miles of railway in the Province of Manitoba that is in operation to-day, and to the great advantage of the people of Manitoba, and this Government has not contributed one dollar to that company for the construction of that road. This Government apparently have only one company in that country which they will consent to assist. But the people of that province felt it was necessary to have competition with that one company, towards which this Government stands in the relation of a parent, and they found it necessary to give a cash bonus to the Northern Pacific in order to build a competing line with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to complete a railroad through that portion of country which was promised railway communication by the Canadian Pacific Railway four years before, and for which a reserve was set apart; but on account of some understanding between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, that reserve was held for the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Northern Pacific built a portion of their road for a cash subsidy of $1,500 a mile, and another portion for $1,750 per mile, which was a subsidy less than that granted to any other road by any province in the Dominion of Canada. It paid the Northern Pacific to build that road in competition

with the Canadian Pacific Railway for a small bonus, whereas the Canadian Pacific Railway are getting 6,400 acres per mile. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman will not get up in this House and state that the Provincial Government paid too large a subsidy for the construction of the Northern Pacific, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will state that he can buy in Southern Manitoba any land better than the land of that subsidy for less than $5 an acre; in other words, they are getting $32,000 of a bonus per mile for building a road through a tract of country in which the Northern Pacific built a road for a bonus of $1,500. Now, I say that we should not assist the Canadian Pacific Railway in getting control of that whole country through which they are building lines of roads. I do not think it is the business of this House to retain a monopoly in that North-West country. We know that the Canadian Pacific Railway is carrying wheat much more to the advantage of the settlers of the Western States than to the people of Manitoba. We know they are carrying wheat and flour from Minneapolis for 8 and 9 cents a bushel less than they are carrying it from Winnipeg over a line of railway built by the people of Canada. I say we ought to consider the interests of the North-West, and the interests of the North-West are not considered when you give assistance towards the construction of a railway to one corporation alone, when, if the information is correct which I have given here to-day. The Northern Pacific actually offered to put up a large deposit that they would construct 300 miles of road south-west of Brandon to the Souris coal-fields inside of two years. I say, in view of this fact, that the Government have not been doing their duty towards that North-West country. I am surprised to hear the member for Selkirk attempt to justify the Government in aiding the Canadian Pacific Railway to construct this road. I am satisfied, and I believe the hon. member for Selkirk is satisfied, that the settlers in the south-west portion of his constituency went into that country in 1880 and 1881 under the promise of a railway, and cultivated large tracts of lands, and they have not got a railway to-day. I am satisfied he would admit, if he honestly expressed his opinions in this House, that a line of railway would have been built in that country years ago if the Government had given the same assistance to outside corporations that it has given to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am surprised that he does not make that statement in this House ; but, apparently, he does not want to say anything against the Canadian Pacific Railway. I know that this road assisted him ; probably they were paid for it. I do not know anything about that, but I do not believe the Canadian Pacific Railway would do work for nothing, and I believe they were paid for it, or will be paid for it. I do not really believe that the hon. gentleman paid all the expenses of railway train services in Selkirk. I am pretty well satisfied that my opponent in Marquette did not pay for the railway service when the Canadian Pacific Railway brought in about 250 outside voters. We have learned during this session that funds are provided by different means for different purposes. We should have the information asked and the agreement arrived at between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway placed before the House, before we are asked to pass this Bill. The House should be placed in possession of the fullest information. We had already a road running through the section of the country from Barnsley to Manitou, partly constructed by the friends of the Northern Pacific road. Why this portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been built in the same district, when other sections of country are without railway facilities, I am at a loss to understand.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The road to which you refer is not to be built. The company gave up that piece of road, and we allowed the piece to be built from Clearwater Lake to Deloraine. It was on account of giving up that portion of the road the company were allowed to build the two extensions.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) admits that the charter for this road in question expired some years ago. Those Acts were revived by Order in Council. I am speaking now particularly of the extension of the south-west branch. A charter was granted by this Parliament in 1883, I think. The company had three years within which to construct the road through south-western Manitoba. At the end of three years they asked for a renewal, and the time was extended to three years, notwithstanding our protest and our demand that the Government should call upon the company to put up security for the construction of the road. The company come this year for powers to build the very portion of road for the construction of which they obtained a charter from this Parliament in 1883. Now we are asked to confirm these Orders in Council giving land grants to that road, although their charter practically lapsed five years ago.

Mr. TROW. Presuming the Minister of the Interior holds documents in his possession from the department which, as he alleges, would be sufficient to satisfy the minds of the Opposition, if they were brought down, I cannot understand why he should hesitate to do so and prolong this discussion.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In order to save time.

Mr. TROW. No more time would be occupied. I am still more surprised that a business company, managed by practical men like the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, should construct upwards of 60 miles of road without having a proper and satisfactory agreement with the Government prior to its construction. We should be guarded in this respect. We have given away in the North-West and Manitoba already 100 per cent. more land than we have improved in the whole Province of Ontario, nearly 50,000,000 acres ; and great caution should be exercised by the Government in disposing of our territory. We want all our waste lands that are fit for successful settlement, that they may be settled and improved by honest settlers. If there is a tacit agreement between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that they should receive 6,400 acres per mile for the construction of that road, certainly we have no objection to that bargain and agreement being carried out in its integrity. I know the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have done much towards the development of that country and its successful settlement. The company advertise very freely in the old country, and probably they are the best immigration agents we possess. In the United States the railway companies have done more than the Government in developing that country, and

filling it with successful settlers. I hope the Minister will see the propriety of not continuing this discussion longer, but of allowing the matter to remain in abeyance, until he produces these documents, which he admits he has in his possession, to satisfy members of the Opposition. They are not going to oppose a grant if it is a legitimate and proper one; but they wish to be satisfied that the whole matter has been done in a proper and legal manner.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot object to the remarks which have fallen from the lips of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow). When I came down to the House with this proposition I thought the last Order in Council, which really embodies the whole of the negotiations that took place, would be sufficient to satisfy hon. members. It gives the dates of the Orders in Council, which cover every mile of road shown on the plan which I have laid on the Table of the House, with the exception of 27 miles, which it was found, after the work had been completed, the Order in Council had not given sufficient mileage to the company. That is the only portion of the road for which Orders in Council had not been obtained. The member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) evidently had not read the Order in Council. A special Order in Council was passed giving authority to make the two extensions, which cover the mileage of everything except the 150 miles of the original Order in Council. I have here the Order in Council of 5th April, 1886, and that of 15th November of the same year, which was the original one for 150 miles. I do not, therefore, understand what else hon. gentlemen opposite want. Those are the Orders in Council, based on the applications of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company when the different charges were made in respect to the construction and direction of the road. The matter, it appears to me, is perfectly simple. If any other information besides these Orders in Council is required, I shall be pleased to bring it down; but it appears to me that everything is contained in those two Orders in Council. They refer to the two alterations made in the construction of the road, the extension from Manitou to Barnsley and the extension from Whitewater Lake to Deloraine. I cannot see what further information hon. gentlemen can require. I can place these two Orders in Council on the Table. There is nothing else but correspondence, which can be brought down if necessary.

Mr. MULOCK. When I spoke on this matter at an earlier stage of the debate I did so from a purely constitutional standpoint. I wanted to know whether we were called on to agree to some obligation binding on Parliament, or whether we were making an expenditure to promote an enterprise. The resolutions recite that the work was constructed, and, therefore, it seems to me that the House is not here to vote the land on the ground that it was to promote railway construction. Therefore, it seems that we were simply being called upon to aid a railway in respect to something that had happened.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Will you excuse me for a moment. When that Order in Council was passed in 1886, and when the arrangement was made by the Government giving the land grant by Order in Council, the railway was not constructed at that time.

Mr. MULOCK. To continue what I was going o say: therefore, my enquiries were simply to ascertain, first of all, the true basis of the discussion—whether we are now being called upon formally to ratify some prior obligation of Parliament, or whether we are free now to consider the question upon its merits; and if we are to consider it upon its merits, that is an entirely different question from one that would depend upon the faith of the country. As I said before I repeat now: nothing can allow me knowingly to allow the faith of Parliament to be violated. I simply wanted then, as I do now, to arrive at a proper understanding as to the true position of the matter, in order to come to a proper conclusion. The Minister was asked on what he rested his arguments in asking Parliament to make this grant, and he stated that his reasons appeared in the Order in Council of February, 1891. That is, of course, a suspicious date. It is an historical period in the history of Canada.

Mr. DEWDNEY. You are always suspicious.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not going to allow suspicions to affect my judgment. I want evidence, and therefore, perhaps, the date may suggest a desire for further information, but only to that extent is the date at all material in connection with this matter. It does seem singular that a business-like corporation, such as the Canadian Pacific Railway, should have made the extraordinary mistake of running 62 miles beyond the point where the subsidy ceased. We are told by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) that the railway in question had a grant for 150 miles, and that by some curious mistake they did not discover that they had built 150 miles until they had built 212 miles, and that because of this mistake, and because Parliament had heretofore granted, under certain circumstances, a land grant of 6,400 acres per mile to other railways as well as to this railway, that therefore that rule carried the implied obligation to make an additional grant for the additional number of miles of road constructed. If that is a sound argument, any railway company having a grant for a certain number of miles can build beyond the limits so specified, and it would have an equally good claim for the recognition by Parliament to whatever extent it builds its road. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot grant relief on any such ground as that. Again, we must come back to the information possessed by the Minister of the Interior. The Minister is the responsible representative on this occasion, and, while the information furnished by the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) and the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is extremely interesting and, perhaps, correct, still they will pardon me if I say that, on a question such as this, the Minister of the Interior is the responsible party, and he is the one who should give the reasons. He has not yet said that any of the reasons advanced by his supporters from Selkirk and West Assiniboia were the true reasons. These hon. gentlemen are not members of the Privy Council. They do not know what reasons moved the Council to pass this Order in Council, and whilst, I dare say, they are both willing to get to the Privy Council, yet we can hardly assume that they yet know all the secrets of that body. The policy of the Government is, I presume, within the knowledge of the Government alone, except in so far as it is announced to the public, and on this occasion I am afraid we must

still come back to the Administration and ask the Administration to tell us whether it was a matter of policy, or a matter of contract, or as a matter of good faith, that impelled them to bring about this Order in Council. The Minister of the Interior has stated in his report to Council :

"That the records of the Department of the Interior leave no doubt whatever that the company's statement, that both branches of the railway were constructed on the understanding that the usual subsidy of 6,400 acres per mile would be provided for the whole length of the road, is well founded."

You will observe that the Minister did not seem to think that the understanding was quite sufficient to move him to make this report, and so he commences to write down his own arguments and his own ideas, which he gives in explanation and excuses. He says :

"Apart from this, however, and in view particularly of the incalculable benefit which southern Manitoba has derived from the two branches of this railway putting in direct communication with the markets of the world one of the richest agricultural regions of the North-West, he (the Minister) is of opinion that the company's claim is a reasonable one."

Now why did he offer this matter by way of inducement in the second portion of the clause, if the railway had a legal, or even a moral, claim upon the country. If they had a right to it, a right such as could be recognized in the great forum of this tribunal, why had he to plead the cause of the railway company and set forth a reason that they themselves did not appear to have advanced ? If we as members of Parliament are here to-day to exercise our undoubted right, as I claim it to be, of hearing all the evidence, then and not till then shall we come to a conclusion, and the Minister of Interior should be the first to insist that at this stage we shall have laid upon the Table all these documents which warrant him in coming to the conclusion that he did, and which documents are necessary in order to enable us to come to a conclusion. I trust that the Minister will not withhold this information until the third reading of the Bill. When he stated he would offer it on the third reading I was at a loss to understand whether he was speaking in an ironical or serious way. The offer to give information on the third reading of a Bill which should be brought down at the first reading of the resolution which is to be the foundation of the Bill is a most extraordinary proposition to make to a deliberative body. Therefore, I will assume that he meant something different when he said he would bring it down before the third reading of the Bill. I can hardly think that he intended to offend the intelligence of Parliament and to outrage the rights of the House by withholding such information until that stage of the proceedings. I, for one, Mr. Chairman, maintain that Parliament cannot too soon re-clothe itself with its full rights. We have been too long a mere registry office of the will of others, and the sooner we arrive at a true recognition of the duties respectively of members of Parliament as a whole, the better for the country. This discussion, therefore, if it will operate as an educating influence to prevent such things as this happening in the future, will not have been without its advantage, whether this information comes to us to-day or to-morrow, or whether it is withheld for all time, as it is proposed to withhold it until the third reading, when Parliament will be in its dying momeuts, and when it will be of little use. At all events, I prophesy, if it is safe to prophesy at all what any Government will do, that Parliament will never again be called upon to deal in a matter of this kind in such a manner as it is asked to do to-day.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When the Canadian Pacific Railway was launched upon the country the subventions given to it were of an enormous character ; and one of the reasons most strongly urged for the granting of all the subventions and privileges bestowed upon it was that the company would not only build the main line, but would, in order to reap a profit, build branch lines all through the country. That was stated again and again in Parliament by the promoters of the railway as a reason why these enormous subventions should be granted. Another strong reason given was that the Canadian Pacific Railway would become an immensely potent immigration agency—that in fact it would be the means of settling up the country. Well, we have had a good many years experience of it ; the railway has been built and the consideration has been paid, and how have these promises been kept ? If the immigrants were brought in by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company they are not there now. In fact, Sir, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and other railway corporations to which lands have been granted, I firmly believe, have done more to drive immigrants out of the country than all other causes combined ; I believe that they have driven out two for every one that they have brought in. Then, as regards the other proposition about building branch lines, we know that almost all the branch lines in that country have fallen into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That can be easily understood, because it is impossible for any branch line, depending upon the Canadian Pacific Railway for an outlet, to maintain an independent existence. But what I wish to call attention to is that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has never built one branch line without getting more than double the cost of building it out of the country. Let us look at the one which we have before us now. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) stated, and I believe he stated truly, that the land which we are asked to grant to-day is worth on the average at the very lowest $5 an acre. What does that amount to ? It amounts simply to this, that we are asked to give that company just three times the cost of building that road. It has been the same all through. It has been granted the cost of building the road, in many cases twice the cost, and then it owns the road and everything connected with it. Apart altogether from the suicidal policy of handing over the best land to railway corporations and withdrawing it from settlement, I think it is time Parliament came to a halt in the matter of locking up these lands. The only plausible reason presented to-day why these grants were to be made at all was that in some way the faith of the country was pledged to them ; and the only serious attempt to prove that such was the case was made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), but the reasoning on which he based his argument was, to say the least, peculiar. He said that an Act had been passed in 48-49 Victoria, granting a certain land subsidy to a certain railway company for the construction of 150 miles of railway. That was the sum and substance of his argument. The company to which that grant had been made was merged in the Cana-

dian Pacific Railway Company, and the branch had been handed over to them. And now mark the reason which he gives. He says that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, taking it for granted that the same policy would prevail with regard to the extensions, went on and built 62 miles more, on the understanding that they would get a similar grant for that extenson. Now, Sir, it does not need that I should point out the absurdity of that proposition. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that the Canadian Pacific Raiway Company are simple enough to take it for granted that without any authority all, without any Order in Council, without any Act of Parliament, when they choose to construct a certain work, for their own benefit, this House is bound to pay them a certain amount for doing so?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They do not. They had Orders in Council for it all, passed on statutory authority.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If these Orders in Council are intended for any purpose at all, they are only intended for emergencies, something like the Governor General's warrants.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but let them show that this is not the constitutional view. An Order in Council is simply made where a certain emergency requires it, such as the probable stoppage of any great work. Well, we are told that the Order in Council was made. Now, I submit that the constitutional rule is that whenever an Order in Council is made the Government must come down at the very earliest opportunity thereafter and ask the sanction of Parliament to that order, and stand or fall by it. Did they do that in this case? I have never heard one word of it until to-day. The last Order in Council was passed after the road was already built.

Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before six o'clock, Mr. Chairman, I was laying down the principle that when a Governor's warrant was issued, when an Order in Council was issued, or when any private agreement was made by the Government with any corporation or individual, it was the duty of the Government, at the very earliest opportunity, to submit that to Parliament and to abide by the decision of Parliament in the matter. The Order in Council we are now considering was made on the 4th of February last. I am not inclined to be suspicious, but, looking at all the circumstances, I am forced to conclude that the whole matter has a very equivocal appearance. It was issued just when the Government had decided to appeal to the country and were anxious to secure the support of the great railway corporation; and, if the information we have is correct, they were paying very high for that support. I am not prepared to say, nor will I venture to say, that any consideration was given by the railway corporation for the issuing of this Order in Council, but, to say the least of it, it looks very suspicious. This is a matter about which the Government ought to be very careful. We have heard the reason given in this House for the issuing of a Governor's warrant for a large amount required to meet important repairs on a great railway, that the warrant was issued because the Government had forgotten to include in the Estimates the amount required, and they asked the House to ratify what they had done. Some years ago, it will be in the recollection of hon. gentlemen that a great wrong was perpetrated on the people of Manitoba, when, in the charter which was granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the agreement which was made with them, under which the company were to be given a very large amount for building the railway, it was stipulated that no competition from outside would be allowed in the unorganized country. That was taken in the House to refer distinctly only to the unoccupied territory. The leader of the Government stated explicitly that it was not intended to apply to the old provinces, that it was not intended to apply to old Manitoba as then constituted, and he used in that connection the memorable words: "We cannot check Manitoba." Well, we all know that a secret agreement had been made by the Government with the Canadian Pacific Railway to disallow all charters granted by the Manitoba Legislature. The Government did so; the people of Manitoba were almost driven into rebellion; there was very near being bloodshed over the matter, and then, when they found the position they had taken was no longer tenable, the Government came down to this House and demanded that Parliament should make a large grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway for giving up a privilege they had never been granted by this House and to which they were not entitled, except under their private agreement with the Government. Some people might be inclined to be surprised that the Government should take such a risk, that they would do anything so unconstitutional, that they would not dread meeting the House with so unconstitutional a proposal; but anyone who has had the privilege of sitting in this House during the last eight or ten years knows from experience that whatever the Government thought fit to do the majority in this House was prepared to ratify, let it be right or wrong, and it was on this subserviency that the Government confidently relied. It might have been expected that this new House, with the disastrous results of so many of the Government projects plainly before them, would have some consideration for the rights of the country and insist on understanding thoroughly just what they were asked to vote, especially in the case of a proposition of this kind brought down in virtue of a secret agreement entered into without the sanction of Parliament. One would naturally expect that this newly elected House would require to know fully all the reasons which prompted that agreement. We may be told, as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) has told us to-night, that the members on the Government side are satisfied with the reasons. How can they be? It can only be by the Government having taken their supporters into their confidence and told them freely and frankly the arrangements they made. I submit that we on this side have a right to the same confidence and the same information; I submit that we are not here to blindly ratify the wishes of the Government and register their

decrees, but that we are here to defend the rights of the people, to look after the property of the people, and that we are standing upon the rights of the people and our constitutional rights as members of Parliament when we demand the freest and fullest explanation of the reasons which prompted the Government to make this agreement and demand the sanction of the House to this claim. That we demand, and with nothing else will we be satisfied. The Government by their majority may vote us down, but we demand, before the vote is taken and before the agreement is ratified, that we shall have the fullest and freest information of the reasons which prompted the Government to make this concession. I have already pointed out to the House the money value it is now proposed to give the Canadian Pacific Railway. A gentleman who is well acquainted with the country in question, the hon member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), stated this afternoen that the land there is worth on an average $5 an acre. If you figure that up, and then take the cost of building a road in such a country as that, you will find that we are handing over to that company a free gift of three times what it cost them to build the road, or within a trifle of $2,000,000. I have referred before to the disastrous results of locking up lands in the hands of speculators and corporatious. I have pointed out to this House before now, this session, that it would be to the advantage of the country materially, as a mere question of money, if we could get settlers into the country, to give these lands to them as a free gift. I need not point out to this House that the speculator, be he a private individual or a corporation, does not add one iota to the wealth of the country. He simply holds the land for a rise, and whatever he gets is taken from the pockets of the people and put into his own. On the other hand, every man who settles upon a lot of land and cultivates it, and produces grain or other produce, adds just so much to the wealth of the country; and looking at it in that light, we can see the enormous advantage to the country if, instead of handing over lands to railway corporations and speculators to keep settlers out of the country, we induce settlers to come in by giving them the land free. I need not tell the Committee that in the old land there is a strong agitation going on at present, occasioned by one of the most remarkable movements of soulless speculators, who are grasping the land into their own possession, and driving off the people, who for ages have defended that land with blood and sword, like cattle. And for what purpose? In order to make pleasure grounds for themselves and turn these happy homesteads into hunting grounds for their own amusement. In the face of such facts, is it any wonder that socialism should make its appearance in the old land? Is it any wonder that the people are beginning to demand that the land be nationalized and that they should have the free use of what the Almighty has freely given them? Are you not perpetrating very much the same thing in this country? Are you not doing the same thing on a large scale, and you will have to be answerable for the results. I have never seen my way clear to accept the doctrine implied in the single tax theory. It does not seem to me to be altogether just, but, if we have to take the choice between locking up lands in the hands of speculators and allowing them to go to the people, I say it is a thousand times better to have a single tax. There is another thing to be considered. There is a power in this universe which makes for righteousness. There is a court of equity before which both individuals and nations must defend their actions. When we are asked to take a certain action we must think what answer we are going to give in defence of that action. We have driven the people who originally owned these lands away from them. It is true that we give them a little calico and a little beef, but the aborigines had the land by the same right as we have—the right of possession. When we appear at the bar of eternal justice, what answer are we going to give in regard to them? There is only one excuse that we can make, and it seems to me to be a valid one. I, at least, am satisfied that it is a valid one, and it is this: that no class of men, be they who they may, have a right to shut up the land and to keep it from improvement and from cultivation. If that is not a valid excuse, we have none to offer. The law of the universe is eternal progression, and no one has a right to shut up the land that God has given from improvement and cultivation. Now, what are we doing? We are doing just the same thing as the aborigines did, on a gigantic scale. We have handed over this land to speculators and railway corporations without any terms of settlement, without any fixed rate at which the lands should be sold, allowing them to wring from the poor settlers every copper they can possibly exact or to keep the land locked up for an indefinite time. Do you suppose that, when these people feel their strength, they will not insist on a rectification of this systam? Happy for us if we do not find the country deluged in blood as a consequence of these regulations. It is time for this country to pause before handing over any more of our public lands to these corporations. It would be better, as I said on a previous occasion, heavy as our public debt is, to have added one-half to that debt and kept the land for our settlers. To-night we stand on our constitutional rights as members of Parliament, and before we assent to this being done we demand that the Government shall tell us why it is to be done, and how far the House is bound, and how far the Government is bound, before we vote this amount.

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman, who seems to think that there is something awful asked in this resolution, I may say that I think he will find there is very little in it. In 1879 a charter was granted to the Manitoba and South-Western Railway, which extended for 152 miles from Winnipeg *viâ* Manitou to a lake called Clear Water or White Water Lake. By the Act of 1879 we promised to that company 6,400 acres per mile. The Canadian Pacific Railway built another line parallel to the line which at present runs between Emerson and Winnipeg, from Winnipeg to Gretna and the boundary. They were anxious to occupy the ground occupied by the Manitoba and South-Western, and they made a divergence to Manitou, which was one of the objective points of the Manitoba and South-Western Railway. They extended their line to Boisevin and thence to Deloraine, and now it has been extended to the Souris coal-fields. Then, as alleged, the Canadian Pacific Railway became possessors of the Manitoba North-Western Railway, or what was known as the old Schultz Railway. It had been already built from Winnipeg to Elm

River or Barnsley, and there was no reason for extending that road to Manitou, their charter allowing them to build the road westward on a parallel line to the south-west. Under the old pledge which Parliament gave to the Schultz Railway they were entitled to 6,400 acres a mile for 152 miles of the road. In 1885, what the Government did was to allow them to extend their line beyond the 152 miles to some distance beyond Clear Water Lake, and did not insist on their building the line between Barnsley and Manitou, because that had evidently become useless, and also to extend a parallel line northerly towards the road which runs from Brandon southerly towards the boundary. In 1885 the Government transferred a portion of the subsidy which the line was entitled to between Manitou and Barnsley to these extensions.

Mr. LISTER. Was that done by Act of Parliament?

Mr. HAGGART. It was done by Order in Council in 1885, and I think that was submitted to Parliament.

Mr. CHARLTON. What Act of Parliament approved of it?

Mr. HAGGART. All I know in reference to the Order in Council is, that it transferred the land grant to the two extensions. At the same time, the Order in Council gave them the land grant attached to the 30 miles which they were not required to build. Now we are asking your approval for a further grant which, by Order in Council, we agreed to give them for the 27 miles beyond the 30 which they have built. Now, objection is taken by hon. gentlemen that we do it by Order in Council. They say that, first of all, we ought to have come to Parliament and got the sanction of Parliament before we entered into the contract. That is a constitutional question, but it seems to me quite clear. We entered into a contract, as advisers of Her Majesty, subject to the approval of Parliament. The usual procedure was followed. Application is made to Council, and it is considered by Council whether the railway is one for which a grant should be made. If it is approved by Council, then we pass an Order, and, before it becomes of any effect whatever, we ask the approval of the Parliament of Canada. Now, this is simply the position of that road: The transfer was made of the acreage of land for 30 miles to the two extensions, northerly and southerly, and we promised them that the 30-mile grant should be applied towards the extension. We come here and ask the representatives of the people to approve of the arrangement which we have made with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and grant for the 27 miles of railway which they constructed over and above the amount of lands which was at our disposal the same rate per mile as we have given for the rest of the railway that they have constructed. Now, the question is simply this: Should we, first of all, have asked you gentlemen for your approval? Is it not the proper function of a Ministry to see, first of all, whether a proposed contract is in the interest of the country? If it believes it to be so, then we come to you and ask for your sanction. That is all that is contained in this matter, concerning which charges are made about the wrong done to the people in the country, the misfortune that has happened to the whole North-West; and an appeal to the Deity was made by the hon. member for Middlesex, to whom we are responsible for the just administration of affairs in this country, and he asks how we are going to account for it in the future. The simple proposition which you are asked to approve is this: Shall we, as representatives of the people, approve of the contract entered into by Her Majesty's advisers? Shall we grant to this 27 miles of railway, which they have built under an arrangement with us, the 6,400 acres of land which they got for the rest of the road?

Mr. LISTER. I would ask the hon. gentleman what authority he has for giving a land grant of 6,400 acres for the 30 miles already?

Mr. HAGGART. It was a transfer of the grant between Manitou and Barnsley to the further extension of the same roads which we had chartered. I suppose the Orders in Council were all submitted to Parliament. I cannot speak for a certainty whether they were all approved.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Orders in Council were all laid on the floor of Parliament within 15 days after the opening of Parliament each year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has made a lengthy statement, and made it in an *ex cathedra* manner, as if nobody understood what they were talking about, and as if he was giving us some new information. He has not given any information to the House that was not in our possession before he spoke. All the points he introduced here had been debated during the afternoon, and had been discussed by the Minister of Interior and by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman knew that the opposition made to the passage of this resolution was based very largely upon the fact that the documents upon which the Minister of Interior reported his opinion to Council, and on which the Council acted, had been withheld from this House, and that this House was asked at the initiatory stage to commit itself to the principle of the resolution before these documents were brought down. That is the point between both sides of the House. When this matter came up I confined myself entirely to that point. I felt, as was well remarked by my leader, that if this House or this country had been committed by the Government to a course of action which bound them morally or legally, the Opposition would not be justified in withholding its support. But we have not yet so far been in a position to judge whether we are legally or morally justified, and if we are not legally or morally justified, we echo the opinion given to-night by my hon. friend from Middlesex, that we have gone too far in this business already. I would like to know if the Postmaster General has taken the trouble to look at the map which the Government very properly, at the request of some members on this side, has placed upon the table. That map I hold in my hand, and it shows the quantity of land that this House has, I hesitate not to say, improvidently granted for the construction of railways in the North-West. I have made a calculation, and I see that we have granted about 47,000,000 acres of land in the North-West for the construction of railways. I take up the plan which the Government have placed in our hands, and I see red lines drawn across the North-West in its most fertile parts, showing that what would appear to be nearly one-

half of the available territory of that country has gone; and if that is true, as it appears to be upon their showing, surely it is time to call a halt. Before we grant any more land we should know on what principle we are granting it. Surely the Opposition cannot be charged with factious opposition if, when they are asked to grant 737,000 acres more, we ask for all the grounds on which the Government ask us to make that grant. Sir, that minute of Council is conclusive. The hon. gentleman says that he has the records in his department which leave no doubt that the Government statement is true, that both branches of this road were constructed on an understanding that the usual grant of 6,400 acres was to be given. If that is so, produce the papers and no more is to be said.

Mr. HAGGART. You will find it in the Order in Council of 1886.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman does not quite understand the point I am putting. I am referring to a statement made by his colleague, in the report to Council made on the 4th of February last, wherein he recommends that the grant be made of the lands which you propose that this House should vote to-night, and he recommends to Council that it should be made because, among other things, he states that in the records of his department there is a document showing that an understanding to that effect existed. Now, the hon. gentleman should understand that we are asking for the data on which he came to that conclusion. He refuses to give it to us. That is the only point between us. It may be that these records, when produced, will justify him; it may be that they would not. We propose to have a say in this matter. In view of the startling revelations which are made in this House, we propose to be careful before we vote any more of the public domain, and not to vote it until we are satisfied that we are bound in honour or in law to vote it. Sir, I repeat what I said before, that the great danger which stares this country in the face is the power that we are vesting from time to time in this huge corporation. This huge corporation to-day dominates and rules this country; it possesses so much of the land in the North-West that it is preparing in the future to become the dictator of this country, if it is not so to-day. It behooves us who represent the people to pause before we give more power to this company, that seems to have almost unlimited power already. We want at the same time to do right. If the company have a right to this land, give it to them; but if they have not a right, I for one will not vote for the grant. They have too much power in this country. They have had voted to them millions of acres, and we have not clogged them with conditions with respect to sale or settlement. They have received the lands as a free gift. If what the hon. gentleman says is true, and I believe he would not have made the statement unless he believed it to be true, they hold these lands for a rise, acting not as a company to develop this great country, but as speculators to put money in their own pocket. They are a corporation with a single eye for their own benefit, like all corporations, and they do not care a curse for this country, except in so far as their interests and the country's interests coincide. They are essentially, as are all corporations, selfish, and they have obtained that power and means of power which make them a danger in this commonwealth. Therefore, before I will vote any more land, which means power, to them, I want to be satisfied I am acting rightly.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman asks the authority by which the grant is made. The Order in Council of 6th April, 1885, shows that that portion of the grant was transferred to those two different lines of railway, one on the north and the other on the south. The extension of the number of miles is mentioned in the Order in Council. Any communication from the railway company on the subject would be a simple request to the Minister to carry out the arrangements the company made with the Government. The Government by that Order in Council I have mentioned transferred that portion of the railway grant to those different lines of railway to be constructed, and with an understanding, as is stated by the Minister, that the same quantity of land should be applied to the whole extension. The only thing hon. gentlemen opposite can possibly ask further is with respect to the promise of the Minister that the land grant would be applied to any portion of the road over and above the 30 miles. There is no doubt in regard to the matter, and the Order in Council speaks as plainly as possible to that effect.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) To which Order in Council do you refer?

Mr. HAGGART. To the Order in Council, 6th April, 1885.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to read the part to which he refers?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have promised to bring down all the papers. We should pass the resolution, and to-morrow I will have all the papers down.

Mr. HAGGART. This Order in Council allows the company to transfer the land grant.

Mr. MULOCK. Why not lay these papers on the Table?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I promised to do so.

Mr. MULOCK. You told me you would place them on the Table before the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. The Canadian Pacific Railway have built 57 miles, 30 miles of which are entitled to the land grant for the 30 miles, and that 27 miles are unprovided for.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We have heard that now for the first time.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood all these Orders in Council were laid on the Table of the House fifteen days after the meeting of Parliament each year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; they were.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) I do not know by what authority they were laid on the Table. There are certain statutes which provide that certain Orders in Council and certain contracts shall have the force of law if they are laid on the Table for one month, and no exception is taken to them by the House.

I never understood there was any provision in the law which says that every Order in Council that a Government may choose to adopt shall be laid on the Table within fifteen days after the meeting of Parliament, and if it is so laid on the Table and no exception taken within one month it shall become law.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is simply in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have received a memorandum from my deputy, stating that all Canadian Pacific Railway Orders in Council are laid before Parliament within fifteen days of the opening of each session. This is done by Order in Council of 1882.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that the Order in Council is for the purpose of carrying into effect the contracts between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government. That is under a statute perfectly clear in its provision. The hon. gentleman is asking this House to legislate. The hon. gentleman should not have laid on the Table an Order in Council not under any statute. If he had done so with respect to this matter, there was no necessity for legislation. But the hon. gentleman is now seeking legislation because he has not the power, and there is no statute giving him authority to pass Orders in Council which will became law if no exception is taken to them within a certain period.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are not claiming that by the fact of these Orders in Council having been laid on the Table they have the force of law. The complaint this afternoon was, that the records of the department ought to be brought down and that the Minister should not proceed until they were brought down. This is the state of the case: The Minister brought forward the Order in Council passed in February last, and inasmuch as that refers to other records in the department, gentlemen on the other side of the House insisted that whatever else appeared in the department ought to be produced and laid on the Table of the House. The Minister was not prepared at the time to comply with that request, although it was a reasonable request, but it will be complied with in due time. Now the Minister says: The reason that I ask you to pass the resolutions at this stage is, that these documents have already been produced in previous sessions and laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. MULOCK. He is not sure of that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; he is.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not of the slightest consequence whether these Orders in Council have been laid on the Table of the House or not. It is not of the slightest consequence that in a Parliament which had been elected before this Parliament, in which there are seventy or eighty new members in the place of those who have been superseded by the result of the last election—I say it is not of the slightest consequence whether these Orders in Council were laid upon the Table during a previous Parliament. The provision of the law with reference to laying Orders in Council on the Table of the House is a provision with reference to Orders in Council that come into operation by the fact that they are laid on the Table, and are not taken exception to for a month. These Orders in Council are not of that class, and it is preposterous to refer to them as if they were, and as if they were giving to the House information by which the House is bound. The Minister of the Interior seeks legislation upon an important subject. He asked this House to grant a certain appropriation to a certain railway that is not built in consequence of the appropriation that is to be granted, but that is to be rewarded by the appropriation of public lands for having constructed a certain number of miles. The Government have not the power to make the grant or it would have been made. The Government have asked the House for power to make that appropriation, and the Orders in Council they have passed are not of the slightest consequence. This House is not bound, nor can it be bound with regard to a matter of this sort, by anything that the Government promised or may have undertaken. The railway company have assumed the responsibility of constructing this line. I do not know when this sixty miles of road were built. It may have been two years or it may have been longer, but, at all events, if the Government promised to make a grant to the railway company I would like to know whether this is the first time they have had an opportunity of bringing that to the attention of Parliament. They did ask this House for an appropriation for 150 or more miles of railway, and that appropriation was made, but this is a new appropriation for the construction of an additional piece of railway. It has no connection with any promise or engagement into which any past Parliament has entered with that corporation. Whether the railway company would have constructed that road or not, if they did not expect that land, I do not know, for there are no facts before us. These are the facts we require, and that is the information which we seek. The hon. gentleman says that information is in his department which satisfied him, and which he has no doubt will satisfy the House, and he asks us, until he gives that information, to suspend our judgment and to place ourselves in the hands of the Government as a mere registering body for what the Government may desire. Now, Sir, that is not a proper parliamentary proceeding. We are here taking an important stage in legislating on this question. The House has gone into Committee for the purpose of considering this matter, and the hon. gentleman tells us that he has not submitted to the House the necessary material upon which they may form a judgment. That information ought to be ready for us. The hon. gentleman, and the railway company, ought to have assumed, and had a right to expect that we would exercise an independent and fair judgment. It has a right to expect what is perfectly fair and just, and it will be, I have no doubt, fairly and justly dealt with by this House; but the House must have an opportunity of forming a judgment for itself, and what is due to the House and what the hon. gentleman should propose to the House is, that the Committee should rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again, and before he asks the House again to go into Committee the hon. gentleman should submit to us the information which he has in his possession, and which will enable us to form a clear judgment on the question, which we cannot do at the present time, because he has denied us the information upon which that judgment

can be formed. That is the only proper course which the hon. gentleman can take. It is not of the slightest consequence to us whether the Government has passed one or two Orders in Council, or whether they were passed three years ago or five years ago, or whether these Orders in Council have been placed upon the Table of the House or not. All these indicate the conclusions to which the Government have come, but we want the material to come to a conclusion for ourselves. I hope, Sir, in this Parliament, that the day of emancipation has come, and that men on both sides of the House will assert the rights of freemen and the rights which belong to representatives of freemen, which hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House have for a long time allowed to remain in abeyance.

Mr. TROW. I would like to ask the Postmaster General, who has stated that he knows all about this line and all about the lands given for the construction of that road, whether the Schultz line is that line which runs thirty miles from Winnipeg to a place called Carmen, or near to Carmen—Maryland, I think, is the point on the road.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes ; that is the piece of road.

Mr. TROW. Well, then, that road must have been constructed ten or twelve years ago. That portion of the road was in running order in 1877, because I was then on that road myself.

Mr. DAVIN. Not at all ; you are quite wrong.

Mr. TROW. I say yes. I travelled on that road in 1877 within four miles of Carmen to a little place called Maryland.

Mr. DAVIN. You are quite wrong.

Mr. TROW. But I know better. You know nothing about it ; you were never there.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The charter was granted in 1879 and the time was extended after that. That portion of the 52 miles which the hon. gentleman refers to was not built until after 1879, so that he is mistaken in what he says.

Mr. TROW. Was that road constructed to Carmen by an American company which became insolvent and gave the land and the railway away ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There were two companies, I think, who were fighting about the charter, and it may be that a company prior to the Schultz Company built a portion of the road.

Mr. DALY. In answer to the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), I may say that it was an American company, under General Hammond, which commenced the construction of the road, and which was subsequently absorbed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in supposing that he was on the road in 1877, because the work of construction was not commenced until 1881.

Mr. McGREGOR. Fifty miles of that road were built by an agent of the Northern Pacific Railway, General Hammond, in the fall of 1881 and the early part of 1882, under an agreement between Dr. Schultz's Company and the Northern Pacific. The parties who were acting on behalf of the Northern Pacific sold out to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and after that the railway was constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is true there was quite a fight in that county at that time, because this railway had the right to run to the boundary and make connection with the Northern Pacific there ; but after arrangements had been made under the new charter, by which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were to prevent it, going to the boundary, it only went as far as Maryland, or within four miles of the boundary.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether, in view of all that has taken place, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are entitled to this land grant as a matter of law, or is it now proposed to give it to them as a matter of discretion ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think they are entitled to it as a matter of bargain between the Government and the company, to be approved of by Parliament.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But it is our right and privilege to know on what grounds the Government made that bargain. You come for our authority for it, and it is your duty to give us all the information in your power as to what induced you to make this bargain ; especially why, after giving away all the territory you have, you propose to add to the complications which notoriously exist in Southern Manitoba, by making an additional grant of 300,000 or 400,000 acres to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is on that point that we require and are entitled to have all the information on this subject in the possession of the Government. The very fact that the hon. gentleman proposes to give the information at the next stage is conclusive reason that we ought to have it now.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I may state that had these land grants not been given the whole of Southern Manitoba would be without railway communication to-day, and it was with a great deal of difficulty, even with the land grant, that the powerful Canadian Pacific Railway Company were able to obtain the means to construct these branches.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I was present at a committee of this House when a proposition was made to build this road without any land grant all, which was refused by the Government ; and I remember Sir Charles Tupper stating that it was with great pain and regret that he refused to grant a charter for a railway that might have been constructed in 1880 or 1881, and his refusal was based wholly on the ground that the construction of that railway would be contrary to the policy of the Government in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Government deliberately cut the throat of Southern Manitoba, and deliberately prevented the construction of a railway in 1880 and 1881, when it could have been done, and when an enormous immigration was rushing into that country.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. Minister say when the bargain was made which he has referred to ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The negotiations have been going on from 1884 up to this year.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say on what he bases the statement that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are entitled to get the land grant as a matter of bargain?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Because when the representations were made on which the company claimed the land grant the Government considered them entitled to it, and agreed by Order in Council to give it.

Mr. MULOCK. When was that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. One in 1886, one in 1885 and one in 1884.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask, was there an understanding between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government that that tract of country was to be held for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that they were to build the railway at their own convenience and get the land grant?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; there was no arrangement of that kind.

Mr. WATSON. Why was not the privilege of going into that country given to other companies, who wished to get charters? Why was the Northern Pacific refused?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know why.

Mr. WATSON. I think the hon. gentleman was Minister of the Interior when the application was made by the Northern Pacific.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think that country had railway communication before the Northern Pacific applied.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman knows that the Northern Pacific made application to this House for a charter, which they secured, and for a land grant, which was refused, for a railway running 300 miles south and east of Brandon to the Souris coal fields, and through the county he represents, the reason given for the refusal being that an Order in Council passed in the previous May authorized the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to extend the time for constructing the road which they are only completing this year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Perhaps that was the reason. I know the land grant was refused.

Mr. DALY. This railway which we are talking about and the Souris Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway are two entirely different things. At the time the Northern Pacific Company applied to the Government for a subsidy the Government had already subsidized the Souris Branch with 6,400 acres a mile to run into the coal fields, and it would have been absurd to subsidize another railway parellel to a line already subsidized; and the Government properly told the Northern Pacific people that, having already subsidized the Canadian Pacific Railway to run to the coal fields, they could not subsidize another line.

Mr. WATSON. The only reason given to the Northern Pacific Company by the Government was that by Order in Council they had extended the time for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build the road, and the people of that section were deprived of railway accommodation simply because the Government saw fit, under some understanding, which we have not yet seen, that that country should be reserved for the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman knows that the people were promised railway communication nine or ten years ago, which they have not obtained yet. The road is only being constructed to-day.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman is mistaken about that. The road is in operation to Melita, and there is not a man living in south-western Manitoba who is not within 12 miles of a railway, and the road is now under construction to the coal fields. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in saying that the Government extended the time for the building of this branch by Order in Council. There was no Order in Council relating to the Souris Branch at all, except that relating to the land grant. The hon. gentleman was referring to the extension of the Manitoba South-Western Colonization Railway, the charter for which expired three or four years ago, and it was in lieu of the extension of that branch of the railway to the coal fields that the Canadian Pacific Railway undertook the construction of their branch from Brandon to the coal fields. That road is now in operation as far as Melita, and before the snow falls will be in operation to the coal fields.

Mr. WATSON. If the hon. gentleman would look at the map and if he had listened to the information given by the Minister of the Interior, he would see that I am correct. The map states that the Order in Council extending the time was renewed in May, 1889. In 1881 and 1882 there were thousands of acres of land under cultivation at the crossing of the Souris, and along the antler creeks large crops were grown, but these people were never able to market their grain, simply because they had no railway communication. A great number of people moved south of the boundary along the Northern Pacific. That I know. I say that country has been abused and the people unjustly dealt with in the south-western portion of Manitoba, simply because the Government extended the time to the Canadian Pacific Railway for constructing the line, and would give no other company the same privileges they are now giving the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. TROW. In reconsidering my previous statement, I find that I travelled through there in 1877, but it was in 1882 that I passed by rail. I merely wish to make this statement because my recollection now is more correct. That was nine years ago, and the question arises, how it is this matter has been lying in abeyance for nine years without having been brought before the House and definitely settled? There have been several elections and Parliaments since then.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It was brought before the House, and 150 miles granted by the Act.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When were these sixty miles completed for which the appropriation is now asked?

Mr. DALY. About four years ago.

Mr. WATSON. Is the Government not exceeding the land grant for the line of railway from Brandon and for all the extensions the Canadian Pacific Railway got this session—that is, from Brandon to the junction of the South-Western, and from the junction of the South-Western back to Deloraine.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That Act was passed last year or the year before.

Mr. WATSON. They are getting that in addition to what we are considering now?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; that is the Souris, which has nothing to do with the Manitoba and South-Western.

Mr. MULOCK. When was the claim first made?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I should have to go really through the whole negotiations from the start to find out. It has dragged on from year to year. When that Act was passed which gave a land grant for the 150 miles it was a direct line, and if it had not been broken there would have been no difficulty, but it was broken by taking these thirty miles almost in the centre. It was after that fresh negotiations were opened to take the land grant from that 30 miles and place it on the Glenora Branch.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is that 30 miles included in the 212?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; the land grant is transferred to two other portions. They exceed 30 miles.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for Selkirk said that all these 212 miles, respecting which the land grant is asked, have been completed for a period of four years. I enquired whether there had been any applications until recently by the Canadian Pacific Railway for this grant, and, if so, when did they make their first application, and why was it not brought before Parliament sooner?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot give you the information until I look at the records, but will do so and bring down any information there is. I do not for the moment recollect, but since I have been here, now some three years, the Canadian Pacific Railway, through their secretary and by correspondence, have been continually in communication with the Government in reference to it.

Mr. MULOCK. What I am trying to get at is whether this claim now rests in contract or is discretionary with the Government? From what the Minister has said, he evidently differs from the member for Selkirk. That hon. gentleman said that the Canadian Pacific Railway had a grant for 150 miles, and by some oversight extended their line 212 miles, on the understanding that the land grant was to be given them for the 212 miles, and that it was not until some time after they discovered the mistake and that there was no land grant provision for the remaining 62 miles. That was the conclusion I drew from what the hon. member for Selkirk said; but the Minister says the rights of the Canadian Pacific Railway are a matter of contract and not the result of some misunderstanding, and that they are here, not as suppliants for favours, but asking for their rights.

Mr. HAGGART. The Order in Council was made in 1885, transferring the land grant of thirty miles. We are asking an approval of that Order in Council of 1885 transferring the 7,483 acres per mile for the thirty miles. That was part of the original 152 miles which was entitled to 6,400 acres of land per mile granted to the Schultz Company, and which was transferred or changed from the right to purchase at $1 an acre to a free gift in 1884. So they claim, as remaining unsettled since the construction of the road, from 1885 to the present day, the additional twenty-seven miles besides the thirty miles, because they completed fifty-seven miles of road. That makes twenty-seven miles unprovided for. The Government thought their claim was a just one, and we ask the approval, not only of the Order in Council of 1885, but the Order in Council of 1891, giving 6,400 acres per mile for the mileage above that provided for by the Order in Council of 1885.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, if the Canadian Pacific Railway's position is that of people demanding their rights, I do not understand the language used in the Order in Council of February, 1891. In that their claim is not placed on that basis at all. That Order in Council states that from an examination of the records the Government have come to the conclusion—looking at the claim of the Canadian Pacific Railway and what I presume might be said against it—that it would be just to ratify the understanding—not a contract, but an understanding. The statement in the Order in Council is wholly at variance with that now made to the Committee, that the railway company is entitled to this land as a matter of contract. If it is, it was wholly unnecessary to use the language set forth in the Order in Council, namely, that there was some misunderstanding growing out of the dealing between the company and the Government, a fair construction of which makes its reasonable to yield to their claim.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is not in the records.

Mr. MULOCK. We are told that the records of the department mean the correspondence. We have so many various explanations that we do not know what to conclude. First, we are told by the Order in Council that it is only carrying out in an honourable way an understanding which is not binding. Then, we are told by the hon. member for Selkirk that this is all a mistake, and that it was by some lapse or error of judgment this thing arose. Then, we are told by the hon. member for West Assiniboia that the records would simply show the argument, and we are told by the Minister of the Interior that the Canadian Pacific Railway made a claim and presented their case in such a way as to convince the Government that they should make the grant. We ought to see the arguments. I think it would be only reasonable that the Government should lay all these papers before the Committee. My sole desire is to ascertain the true inwardness of this transaction, and to see whether we are now adjudicating upon a claim which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is entitled to have granted as a matter of right or whether this is in the discretion of the House. If that company is entitled to it, I have no word to say on the subject; but if this grant is one in the discretion of the House, another question arises, whether we are prepared to inaugurate a new principle and to make grants either of land or money for constructed roads. That is the trouble in my mind, and I think it is unfair that the Minister should press this question to a conclusion to-night when the House is in darkness as to the merits of the case. I make these remarks simply because I desire to be informed in regard to these merits, and I complain of the unfairness of the Government if they insist upon taking a vote without giving us the information. It is making a farce of the whole system of submitting these matters to Parliament unless evidence is given on which

we can act. I again put it to the Minister that this is a matter which should be laid over.

Mr. TROW. If the Minister persists in not laying before this Committee the papers which he says he has in his department, and in not treating this Committee with proper courtesy, I shall move that this Committee rise.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Minister of the Interior a few moments ago brought to the notice of the Committee some Orders in Council bearing on this subject. Hon. gentlemen intimated that these had not been laid on the Table, and the Minister of the Interior explained that in previous sessions these Orders in Council had been laid on the Table of the House. The argument of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was one that could not be seriously put forward. It was that Orders in Council that were laid on the Table during the session of Parliament preceding this one had nothing to do with the business which was now being transacted. In other words, his contention was that whatever took place in previous session had no application to this session. If that be correct, it would be necessary to bring down all the papers for the last twenty-four years and to pass again all the statutes that have been passed during that time. Let us have a fair understanding as to what hon. gentlemen desire, because we have every desire to accede to any reasonable request for information. I understand that the Minister of the Interior brought down the Order in Council in February last, which indicated that there were certain records in his department showing that the contention of the company was well founded, that they had constructed their line on the understand- that the usual subsidy of 6,400 acres a mile would be granted to them, and that the Committee desired that the records of the department should be produced. We are willing to bring down the records of the department, but let us understand what is wanted. The Minister of the Interior and the Postmaster General have stated what the records of the department show, namely, that step by step, as the work of construction went on in these three lines of railway, the company received a promise, under an Order in Council, of 6,400 acres a mile. Is it the production of the Orders in Council that the hon. gentlemen desire? In addition to that, there is a little correspondence stating that the company desire to have that subsidy confirmed by Parliament, and also the subsidy to the extra 27 miles, on the ground that it is an extension of the road to which the Government promised 6,400 acres a mile. That will be produced for what it is worth, but I want to know what we are asked to produce now? The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) declared that these Orders in Council should not be recognized as binding this Parliament to granting a subsidy. That is another question. We are prepared to bring down the Orders in Council and the correspondence for what it is worth, and then we will see, not that this Parliament is bound by these Orders in Council being laid on the Table, but that the claim is a meritorious one in regard to the railway itself, and that it has been customary to grant the 6,400 acres a mile to such undertakings, and that these lines have been built under that understanding. I should like to know from the hon. gentleman what is desired, because very vague statements have been made.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad the Minister of Justice has expressed himself as he has. Speaking for myself only, I would like the Government to lay upon the Table whatever documents they say establish the bargain the Minister of the Interior has referred to. If there is any bargain, I would like to have all the documents which refer to it, in order to see whether the House should be bound by it, and if it is committed to parting with this portion of the public domain. The Minister of Justice will understand the alternative position that might be taken, and, therefore, it is impossible for one actually to define what information we want. I would think it right that all Orders in Council that bear upon the case ought to be brought down. Then, I think the case as presented to the department, which is referred to in the Order in Council of February last, should be produced. For example, if the Canadian Pacific Railway has addressed arguments in favour of the grant, and on those arguments the Government came to a judgment, I think the House ought to be in the same position as the Government, and ought also to be free to form its judgment.

Mr. DALY. It seems to me an extraordinary thing that with the Order in Council of the 4th of February, 1891, before him, the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) cannot find in it all the information he requires. Now, that document reads as follows:—

"The Minister states that, so far as he is aware, no work has ever been done on section 1, as described in the Order in Council of the 6th of April, 1885, that is to say, the 30 miles necessary to connect the terminal point of the 52 miles south-westerly from Winnipeg to Manitou: but in lieu of this the southern branch of the line, that is to say, section 2, was extended westward to Deloraine, near Whitewater Lake, about 20 miles, and the northern branch to be extended westward to Glenborough about 60 miles, and the company asks that these extensions be subsidized in lieu of the 30 miles north of Manitou, for which they claim there was no immediate need. As the necessity for extending railway communication westward was urgent, and as not only was the construction of the 30 miles north of Manitou not immediately required, but two large and important sections of the province, within each of which extensive settlements had been formed, would be given an efficient railway service by the proposed arrangement, the southern branch of the railway being already connected with Winnipeg by its junction at Manitou with the Pembina Mountain Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the request of the Company was acceded to. The Order in Council of the 15th of November, 1886, accordingly made the land grant of the railway applicable to these extensions, and upon the report of the chief engineer of railways of the completion of the additional 20 miles of the southern branch and the additional 40 miles of the northern branch, the land grant applicable thereto, 384,000 acres, was authorized to be conveyed to the company by Order in Council of the 19th March, 1887.

"The total area, therefore, which has been authorized to be conveyed to the company by Order in Council on the 5th April, 1886, and 19th March, 1887, is 1,132,384 acres—that is to say, for 27 miles in excess of the distance for which the Act 48-49 Victoria, chapter 60, provided a land subsidy involving a land grant of 172,384 acres.

"The Minister further states that the company have, however, actually built and have had in operation for some years 212 miles, including the 52 miles south-west from Winnipeg, known and hereinbefore referred to as section 1, and this length of road, at the usual rate of 6,400 acres per mile, would entitle them to a total grant of 1,356,800 acres, being 224,416 acres more than has so far been provided for by Your Excellency in Council and 396,800 more than authorized by the Act 48-49 Victoria, chapter 30."

Now, if the hon. gentleman wants the Minister to bring down any correspondence, that correspon-

dence would only show, I suppose, that the Canadian Pacific Railway discovered that they had only received a land grant for 212 miles less 27, and they requested that this Order in Council should be passed giving them a land grant for the extra 27 miles.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would they be unaware of that until they counted up the miles?

Mr. DALY. Not until they had added up the exact number of acres they got.

Mr. CHARLTON. They are more shrewd than that.

Mr. DALY. I have it on reliable information that that is the exact state of affairs. Then the hon. the Minister goes on to say:

"The Minister further states that the records of the Department of the Interior leave no doubt whatever that the company's statement that both branches of the railway were constructed on the understanding that the usual subsidy of 6,400 acres of land per mile would be provided for the whole length of the road is well founded."

No one supposes, for an instant, that if they were to get, as they did, 6,400 acres per mile for 150 miles, they were going to build the extra number of miles of railway without the same land grant for the further extension; and when that line between Manitou and Barnsley was taken away, and they were given by Order in Council power to extend the land grant for that 30 miles to the Glenborough Branch and Pembina Branch, it seems to me that there is also a reason here.

Mr. MULOCK. Was that Order in Council ratified by Parliament?

Mr. DALY. I presume it was.

Mr. MULOCK. Do you refer to the Act?

Mr. DALY. No; the hon. gentleman says that it was not.

Mr. MULOCK. Then what good is it?

Mr. DALY. It was not necessary, for this reason, that the land grant applicable to that 30 miles was included in the 150 miles, after it received the sanction of Parliament.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) made a motion that the Committee rise. That would have the effect which hon. gentlemen on his side of the House, have already disclaimed several times, namely, of breaking up the measure entirely. Therefore, I will ask him not to press his motion, as I am sure that was not his intention.

Mr. TROW. I have no desire to do any injury to the Canadian Pacific Railway. If they are entitled to that portion of land I shall vote for it. At the same time, the Minister has been obstinate, and says he will not bring down the papers. Why not defer the matter for a day or two, and when the papers are brought down, if the Opposition finds there is no objection, doubtless we will be agreeable to letting the measure pass.

Mr. LAURIER. The object of my hon. friend was not to kill the project. His motion was to report progress and sit again—at least, that was his intention, although, by a slip of the tongue, he might not have clearly expressed it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 109) further to amend the Act 52nd Victoria, chapter 4, intituled: "An Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in land to certain railway companies."

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. WATSON. I beg to move that the following provision be added:—

Provided always, that in consideration of such grant of land the railway company shall not be entitled to charge more than one cent per ton per mile for each ton of coal carried over this road in car lots.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is an amendment which the hon. member moved in Committee of the Whole on this Bill at its last sitting. The hon. gentleman's proposal, in the first instance, is that a certain portion of the Railway Act shall be repeated in this Bill concerning the railway company under consideration. The provision involved in this amendment will contain nothing more than the provisions of the Railway Act referred to, which are clear and distinct as requiring that the tariff on all freight shall, before it is exacted, be approved by a by-law of the company, and that the by-law shall be approved by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. In the next place, if at any time the tolls shall be found excessive, they shall be subject to revision by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, whether too high or too low, without any initiation on the part of the company itself. Under these circumstances, the Government are not in a position to accept the amendment, which would make, in respect to this Bill, entirely special legislation.

Mr. WATSON. When this Bill was before the House on a previous occasion, I felt it to be my duty to move in the direction of the amendment. I consider it is a fair proposition, notwithstanding what has been stated by the Minister of Justice. I should like the Minister to point to an instance in which the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has exercised that power by reducing tolls charged by any railway in Canada. I have never heard of such a case. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman to name any case where they ever interfered with any rates charged by any Canadian railway. We know the power rests in the Government, but it has not been exercised, and for that reason I thought it necessary to move in the direction I have moved, that a fixed rate per ton per mile should be fixed by Parliament. We are giving a large grant of land to this company to build a railway, the principal purpose of which is to open up and develop a coal mine. We have had experience in the past with regard to these matters, and we should profit by it. The House made a valuable land grant to the Galt company to build a line from Dunmore to Lethbridge, and that company have done exactly what the Opposition contended they would do. When that Bill was before the House, I moved that a maximum rate for carrying coal be fixed, but the House rejected my amendment. My contention has since been borne out by the freight rates charged by that company, and, notwithstanding the fact that there are thousands

of acres of coal lands in the vicinity of the Galt mines at Lethbridge, they are worthless, for the simple reason that the Galt company own the railway and only carry coal from their own mine to consumers. The whole region is practically locked up, and that company has a monopoly, simply because we gave them a monopoly in the railway and in the railway freights. It is wise for this House, notwithstanding the statement of the Minister of Justice, to provide as a condition of a land grant being given to this company, that a maximum price be fixed for the carriage of coal. I move that the maximum price should not exceed 1 cent per ton per mile, and I base my argument on the fact that that rate is considered a fair rate by hon. gentlemen opposite. We own and operate the Intercolonial Railway. That road carries coal from the mines in Nova Scotia at $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent per ton per mile. It carries coal a distance of 20 miles odd from Springhill Mines to the steel works at the low rate of $\frac{1}{2}$ a cent per mile. The road now under consideration is 54 miles in length, and I ask the House not to give a land grant to this company except on the condition that they will carry coal at a rate not exceeding 1 cent per ton per mile. We are told by Ministers who should be in possession of the facts that coal can be carried over the Intercolonial Railway at $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent per ton per mile and that it pays the road. I understand that on the Intercolonial Railway the road is difficult to operate in winter on account of the heavy snow storms, and that it is difficult to keep the line clear. We are giving a land grant to a road where they are not troubled with snow storms no less than 6,400 acres per mile, and from what I have heard of the land in that section, the land grant alone will build the road. It will not be fair if the House does not accept my amendment, because consumers will have to depend on coal in the near future for fuel. I would not be doing justice to my constituents and the people throughout Manitoba and the North-West if I did not move in the direction indicated by my amendment. If it can be clearly shown that the Intercolonial Railway, a road much more difficult to operate than a road in Alberta, can carry coal at $\frac{1}{2}$ a cent per mile on a short haul of 20 miles, and $\frac{8}{10}$ of a cent per ton per mile on a longer haul, it is surely not unfair that the House should attach as a condition to the land grant to the railway now under discussion a provision that the company carry coal at 1 cent per ton per mile.

Mr. DALY. In reply to the statement made by the hon. gentleman, I will simply ask how he would expect the price of coal to be reduced in Manitoba if his amendment is carried. This amendment affects this line of railway alone. The contention of the hon. gentleman is that if you provide that this railway of 56 miles long shall not charge more than 1 cent per ton per mile for carrying coal, that that is going to lessen the price of coal in Manitoba, and he contends this, in view of the fact that before that coal reaches the homes of the people in Manitoba it has got to be carried for over 800 miles on the Canadian Pacific Railway, which railway the provision in the amendment will not bind at all. It seems to be ridiculous on the face of it, that any person in his sane moments should make the statement in the House that this is going to decrease the price of coal. How can coal be decreased in price by limiting the rate at which a railway 56 miles in length will carry it? If this railway ran all the way from the coal mines in the Province of Manitoba it would be a different thing. Then the hon. gentleman's contention might go for something, but when as a matter of fact, and he knows it, that so far as his constituency is concerned, and so far as my constituency is concerned, this coal has got to be carried for some 700 or 800 miles on the Canadian Pacific Railway which the amendment will not affect. It seems to me perfectly absurd to propose that, whether the amendment is carried or not, our constituents would be benefited in the slightest degree. I hope the amendment will receive at the hands of this Committee what it deserves, and that is, that it will be voted down.

Mr. WATSON. I am not at all surprised that the hon. gentleman who always poses as the champion of monopolists in this House is opposing this amendment. I would like to ask him in whose interests he is advocating the defeat of the amendment in this House? It certainly cannot be in the interest of his constituents.

Mr. DALY. Can you tell me how it will benefit my constituents?

Mr. WATSON. I say that the high rates charged on the 56 miles of road is the first step, if not the last, to increase the price of coal. I know that the Government are paying for coal at Calgary, a very short distance from the Lethbridge coal mines, $8.50 per ton for coal, when the same coal is sold at Winnipeg, a much greater distance from the mines, at $7 per ton. I know that the whole of the excessive rate is not charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I know from facts which I mentioned to this House a year ago, that the Galt Coal Company do charge an excessive rate, or do charge an excessive price for that coal at Dunmore on the Canadian Pacific Railway. That being the case, I do say that when we know that the coal that is supplied to us in Manitoba that comes from the west, has got to be supplied by branch lines of railway as feeders to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that if they are allowed to charge what they see fit, that they practically will have a monopoly of the coal of that country and will charge every cent that they possibly can. It may be if that amendment is not carried that they will not raise the price, but at all events they can prevent any other company from opening up and developing the coal lands in those different regions, simply because the Act gives the one company the monopoly. We are asked to give a subsidy of 6,400 acres a mile, which I claim is sufficient to build that road and equip it. Are we giving that subsidy for the purpose of benefiting the general public? No; we are not. We are giving it for the purpose of benefiting the particular individuals who own that coal mine, and that railway. I will not say I was surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) because I know his past record in this House, and I know that he is the champion of monopolists here. I would like to know when he defended the interests of his constituents against monopoly?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. WATSON. Hon. gentlemen opposite may not like to hear the question, but the people I represent will understand what I am speaking about.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DENISON). The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WATSON. I am speaking on the question. I know what the question is.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DENISON). Then, I want you to keep to it.

Mr. WATSON. I am keeping to the question. I am surprised that any member from the North-West should make the remarks that the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) has made. He knows that we are obliged to consume the coal from the Lethbridge mines, and I contend that the first thing we should look to in granting these coal mines to companies, and particularly in granting assistance to construct railways, is to see that that coal is carried to consumers at the lowest possible cost. That is what I am here for, and that is what I am advocating, and I am perfectly in order and perfectly right in doing so. I will continue to do so as long as I have the honour of a seat in this House.

Mr. MULOCK. When this matter was before the Committee, some short time ago, some hon. gentlemen who take the same position as is taken to-night by those who oppose this amendment, declared that there was no precedent for any such proposition. I am sorry the member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) is absent, because he was one of those who took that view. In this particular case we are asked to make a free gift of land to a railway, and it is quite within the province of Parliament, and it is part of the duty of Parliament I submit to attach to that grant just such conditions as Parliament in its wisdom sees fit to attach. The Minister of Justice says that we should not make an exception to this particular company, but I would remind him, and I would remind the Committee, that this company is an exceptional kind of company. This is not an ordinary carrying company, but it is clothed with special powers by its charter, and it is empowered to buy coal lands, to sell coal lands and to go into the market and buy and sell coal. This railway company are merchants of coal and miners of coal. It is proposed to give them out of the property of the Crown the wherewith to build a line into the coal district, and when that line is built into the coal district there will never be another grant made by Parliament to build another road in that district. Therefore all the coal that comes out of that district has got to come over this particular line. This coal land company being engaged in coal mining will in that way, having the sole carrying trade, and practically the fixing of the rates, be in a position to render valueless every acre of coal land in that district which is held by other parties. You are practically placing within the grasp of this company all the coal lands that are going to be served by this railway. Other coal lands will be of no value because they will not be able to market their coal except over this railway whose interest it is to destroy all values in coal lands that this company does not own. You are putting this company in a position to destroy all values in coal lands that they do not own, and you are in fact making the whole of that part of the country tributary to this line which can impose just such coal rates as it may think proper. The Minister of Justice says that there is power in the Railway Act for the Government to reduce rates. I agree with him, but that power has ever been, and will continue to be, a dead letter. I do not think that this Government up to the present time has shown that it is any less free from railway influences than its predecessors. We have nothing to warrant us in supposing that they would dare to reduce the rates on coal, except that the company asked for it, and, inasmuch as this company would never be applicants for such a change, there will never be any such reduction made. The change in rates would never arise unless it could be shown that the railway would discriminate, and in this case it is not necessary for them to discriminate. They can charge on all coal, whether it comes from their own mines or from the mines of others, absolutely prohibitory rates. Those rates will not prohibit their own coal coming over, because it is immaterial what rates they charge themselves; it is simply a matter of book-keeping: there is no real transfer of money out of their pockets to other pockets, but simply a change from the right pocket to the left. So that this company, combining in itself trading powers and the powers of common carriers, does not come under the General Railway Act, but must be dealt with specially. That is one point I make. Then, there is a precedent for it. In the case of several railways in the Province of Ontario similar legislation has been imposed. For example, in the charter of the Legislature of Ontario for the Credit Valley Railway, running from the City of Toronto westerly, it is enacted in section 41 that "the said railway company shall at all times receive and carry cordwood or any wood or fuel at a rate not to exceed" a certain rate which is specified. A similar provision is found in the charter of the London, Huron and Bruce Railway, section 34. A similar provision appears in the Act incorporating the Fenelon Falls Railway Company. A similar provision appears in the Act incorporating the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway Company, section 30. A similar provision appears also in the Act incorporating the Toronto and Nipissing Railway Company.

Mr. BOWELL. Is there any provision in any of these Acts compelling the roads to carry the cordwood?

Mr. MULOCK. All the clauses are imperative. For instance, the Fenelon Falls Railway Act says that "the said railway company shall at all times receive and carry." Now, the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) says that because this provision may not affect the price of coal in his constituency, therefore he sees no reason for adopting it. The hon. gentleman's argument is that it will not do any good in Selkirk.

Mr. DALY. Or in Marquette, or anywhere else outside of the town of Calgary.

Mr. MULOCK. Even if it does no good outside of the district served by the railway, that is no reason why we should not pass it. If it produces benefits at Calgary or along the line of the railway, that is a good reason why we should adopt it; and where is the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Davis)? Why is his voice not heard here now? The fact is that this is only a scheme of a set of speculators; it is as hollow as a drum; there is no public opinion at the back of it; it is a plain speculation by a number of persons who have succeeded in acquiring some political influence here, and who are coming here to grab another portion of the public domain; and they do not even live in Canada, but in Eng-

land. We were told the other night that the railway was to fall into the hands of some persons who live in England, with the exception of one person in Calgary. I would like to know how far these people are going to operate the railway in the interests of the people through whose district it may pass. This is a pure speculation, a pure scheme to make money for a few promoters, and we are going to repeat the mistakes which we have made before, as for example when a few years ago we conferred a monopoly on the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway, which now practically controls all the coal lands of the Island of Vancouver. Surely, it is time for us to take warning, and if there has been no precedent established by the Dominion Parliament up to this moment, is there not independence enough in this new Parliament to strike out into a new course for the future? If there is not it speaks badly for the people of Canada. We see with what a lavish hand the public domain is being given away to aid in the creation and perpetuation of monopolies; and that is going to be the outcome of this scheme unless you attach conditions for the protection of the public as a matter of contract, instead of depending upon the good-will of an Administration: for we know now that these Administrations, strong as they think themselves to be, are easily amenable to the influence of railway corporations. The time has come when we have to decide whether the railway companies own Canada or the people own Canada. Is Parliament going to legislate for the people or for the corporations? It looks very much as if the people were losing power, as if the power was, not gradually, but rapidly, passing into the hands of huge railway corporations. Now-a-days individual men seem to have no rights at all or to meet with no favour at the hands of the Administration. I have listened to many a discussion in this Hoouse and in the committees of this House, especially the Railway Committee, and on one and all occasions when the interests of the individual citizens come into collision with those of the railways, the interests of the individual invariably suffer. The unorganized people are crushed to the wall by the great railway corporations; and while this company has not that power at this time, the fact that it comes here under the ægis of the railway corporation appears to be a sufficient reason for hon. gentlemen to surround it with all the power of a great railway corporation, and the consequence is that the people's interests are disregarded for the interests of monopolists. Now, I protest against this or any Administration legislating simply in the interest of railways or corporations. We have too much of that. I never can find when an individual right comes in collision with those of a railway company that he gets fair consideration here, and the surprising part of it is that members of this House, who ought to be free from such influence, who believe they are free from them, seem to hand over their judgment into the keeping of these corporations. For these reasons we should now make a new departure and protest against the people, through Parliament, parting with any powers that are not going to be exercised for the welfare of the whole community.

Amendment negatived: Nays, 61; Yeas, 37.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When the resolution on which this Bill was founded was before the House, I took occasion to draw the attention of the Committee to the enormous quantity of land in the North-West which had been withdrawn from settlement and handed over to speculators and corporations. The fact has come out to-night that more than twice the settled area of the great Province of Ontario has been handed over to railway companies alone, to say nothing of the immense tracts belonging to the Hudson Bay Company and the large areas handed over to the land companies and land speculators. The fact of the matter is we have discounted the future of the country. Instead of keeping it for the people, we have handed it over to speculators and corporations; and now, in order to make it as easy as possible to prevent any more damage, in order to provide that these lands shall be sold at a reasonable figure and prevent corporations from grinding all they can out of the settlers, I move that the two following clauses be added to the Bill:—

The lands so granted shall be sold by the said company at prices in no case exceeding $4 per acre, the said lands, when sold by the company, shall be subject to the same conditions of settlement, improvement and residence as may be now in force respecting homestead lands in Manitoba and the North-West.

Any such lands so sold, on which the said conditions are not fulfilled, shall, at the end of two years from the date of sale thereof by the said company, revert back to and become the property of the Government of Canada.

The reason I move that clause to make the land subject to homestead duties is simply this: When the question was before the House before, the mover of the Bill said that we could not prevent the company from selling these lands to other speculators and to those other speculators holding them as long as they saw fit; but by inserting this clause, and there will be no hardship in inserting it, we provide that the lands sold by the company shall be sold subject to settlement duties, and we make it the business of the company to see that these duties are performed, because if they are not the land shall then revert back to the Government and become the property of the country.

Amendment negatived on same division.

Bill reported.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I want to ask the House to discharge the Order for the third reading of Bill (No. 146) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, and to refer the Bill back to the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of making two or three alterations, not of great importance, but which are necessary to carry out the policy already adopted by the House as regards this measure. I will explain briefly the amendments I propose to add to the Bill. In the first place, there is a clerical error in the Bill, as engrossed, which requires to be amended, and which I need not explain now, as it will be apparent when we come to deal with it in Committee. There is likewise an amendment with reference to the certification of the electoral lists to the returning officer. At present, they require to be certified by the revising officer when required by the returning officer, and I propose to ask the House to agree that they may be certified by the Queen's Printer. These lists are often required in a hurry when the revising officer is away. Last year there was a vacancy in the office of revising officer when an

election was coming on, and it may occur that the revising officer is not accessible, or he may be out of copies of the list, and the Queen's Printer has to be sent to, and he should certify them, as he is the officer who compares them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman propose that they should be certified by the Queen's Printer, or that he should simply be a substitute for the revising officer?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose that they may be certified by one or the other. Then, I think the schedule of fees for returning officers needs to be revised in two or three particulars. The House has laid the duty on the deputy returning officer of returning the ballot box to the returning officer, but we have limited the fees to a certain number of miles, and I propose to allow the deputy returning officer for any actual travelling he may have to undergo under the Act, and, instead of the present rate, which I think is 10 cents a mile, to allow him 12½ cents a mile for necessary travelling. I think also there should be some addition to the remuneration of the returning officers, and in regard to this I am acting on information I have received from officers of the Government, not only as to returning officers in large communities, but also in regard to information furnished by the Auditor General, who has supervision over their accounts and is able to speak authoritatively as to the remuneration the law allows them. I propose therefore that, in addition to the present allowance of $60, they shall receive the amount of $2 a poll when there are more than thirty polls in the riding. In cities like Montreal and Toronto, where the ridings are very large, it is almost impossible to get returning officers to serve for the remuneration which the law allows. Of course, the returning officer has no power to increase his remuneration by increasing the number of polls, because that is regulated by the revising officer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the Minister of Justice whether he has considered the proposition as to the qualification of the returning officers? Of course, where the returning officer occupies an important official position such as sheriff or registrar, there is a guarantee for the discharge of his duties, but we know that many persons have been appointed against whom you might bring an action and get judgment, but they have nothing, and there is no means by which you can enforce the penalties of the law against them. I think, as long as the Crown has unlimited discretion in the appointment of returning officers, there should be some provision by which the person appointed should be amenable to the requirements of the law, and, therefore, some qualification ought to be required. It should be some person holding property in fee-simple to a certain amount, because it might be found very inconvenient to require the returning officer to give a guarantee for the performance of his duty. There should be some protection given to the public and to the candidates by providing for some qualification or other on the part of the returning officer. The Minister has proposed that the Queen's Printer may certify to the list instead of the revising officers. I do not see how he can certify to the list, especially he could not do so if the list was printed elsewhere than in the public department. In the County of Kent, my attention was called to the voters' list in which whole pages were omitted. The names were not there. The revising officer said he did not know how or where the mistake occurred. He believed he had sent the list properly revised to the department here, but the list was not received back properly printed. There were whole pages of names omitted. How could the Queen's Printer say that was a correct list? The revising officer could make a statement of that kind; but I do not see what value the certificate of the Queen's Printer would have. I do not see how any one other than the revising officer or his clerk could certify to the correctness of the lists.

Mr. TROW. I hope the Minister will see that it is made imperative for the revising barrister to make these certificates. In reference to the additional sums to be paid to the returning officers of $2 per poll, it seems to me to be a large increase, because in many ridings there are 60 polling subdivisions, and that would add 100 per cent. to the salary of the returning officer. In scores of instances there are at least 50 sub-divisions, which at $2 each, would make a very considerable sum.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Only for the additional number.

Mr. TROW. Suppose there are 60 sub-divisions.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Then he is paid $120 instead of $60.

Mr. CHARLTON. The history of legislation in connection with the Franchise Bill, is a very interesting one. I do not know whether we will ever get done tinkering with it; but I hope the Minister of Justice will one of these days take the sensible course of consigning it to the limbo of usless things. Now, this proposition to give the Queen's Printer power to certify to the list, I believe to be a very objectionable one. Viewing the Bill in the light of all its antecedents, I am very suspicious of it. This Bill was introduced for the purpose of obtaining an unjust advantage, it was palpably an unjust Bill. After we had been fighting it three or four months, some of the more unjust provisions of the Bill were eliminated, but it is still essentially unjust, and unnecessary, and always will be. Now, the Government has control of the printing of these lists. It appoints the revising barrister who makes these lists. The revising barrister holds office during the pleasure, practically, of the Government, he is their appointee and their creature. He makes these lists which are sent to the Government printing office at Ottawa, and there is no safeguard, no check that can be imposed by the public in the public interest. If that list is to be revised and certified by the Queen's Printer, the whole machinery in that case is in the hands of the Government. The Opposition literally and absolutely are at the mercy of the Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman let us go into Committee?

Motion agreed to, Order discharged, and House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On the second schedule,

Mr. TROW. I think the mileage allowed seems to be excessive. There is one item in which I hope the Minister will make a little change, that in

which he allows $4 for the rent of a hall for nomination. I know that last nomination in my riding, the returning officer, through economy, I presume, hired a very small place. There was a very large attendance, and we were under the necessity of engaging the opera house and paying $10 for it ourselves. It is utterly impossible to get a building of sufficient size to hold the crowds at nomination, for so small a sum as $4.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think the hon. gentleman is correct. In county towns the court house is generally used, but in other ridings where there is no public building it is impossible to obtain a hall for $4. We generally pay more than that for a political meeting. The provision should be "not exceeding $8." I did not thoroughly understand whether it is proposed to pay the returning officer $2 for each poll.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He will receive a minimum of $60, and $2 for each poll above 30. If there are 30 polls, he will receive $60; if there are 40 polls he will receive $80.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not object to the increase proposed if there is a guarantee that the returning officers will be men capable of discharging their duties, and will discharge them. I know in the election of 1887 the returning officer in my county was a man who did not so act, and it was proposed to bring several actions against him for several violations of the law. Such, however, would have been unless, for while judgments could have been obtained, he was a man without means. At the last election in my own riding a similar observation might apply. In more than one riding men were appointed without means, and no man, however grievously the law is violated, can then be reached except for a criminal offence. Under the election law it is very difficult to get at a returning officer criminally, and so practically as regards violations of the law, which sometimes are gross violations, it is only by civil action, and it is useless to bring a civil action against a man of straw. I prefer to increase the fees if men of responsibility are appointed to positions of that kind. If the Minister would compel these returning officers to enter into sureties for the proper discharge of their duties it would be a step in the right direction. The Government should make it a condition of their appointment that these officers should fulfil the law, and the Government should take some guarantee that the law will be carried out and their duties honestly discharged.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We discussed this subject a good deal when the House had before it the proposition to alter the law respecting returning officers. The matter will have to stand over for the present. The leader of the Opposition suggested the advisability of having permanent returning officers, and perhaps that would be an improvement. We decided to consider that suggestion and various other suggestions made, including one from the hon. member for Bothwell in regard to the returning officers' sufficiency as regards property. I think, however, we cannot undertake, in regard to either of these Bills, to do all that is required to be done in the opinion of individual members by way of amendment at this session. We cannot undertake to do more than complete the outline of this Bill this session.

Mr. TROW.

Mr. WATSON. I agree with the proposed increase of the fees. If a man occupies the very responsible position of returning officer, he should be fairly paid: but I would urge that only respectable men should be selected to discharge those duties. This is not only important with respect to discharging his own duties honestly, but also in regard to giving good and proper instruction to his deputies, and selecting efficient deputies. I have known several cases at different polls in my own county where deputies employed in 1882 and 1887 have not to this day been paid for their services, and they had to pay out disbursements amounting, in many cases, to $10 or $15. The Government should see to it that the returning officers are not men of straw, but possess some means and are able to give security for carrying out the duties imposed on them. Unless something of this kind is exacted, the Government should not increase the fees: but it is well worth while increasing the fees if we have a guarantee that the men receiving the appointments will give some security that they will discharge their duties in good faith.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I hope the hon. gentleman is not under the impression that the fees generally are being increased. Only in the large constituencies will there be any change, and it is in those constituencies we have had trouble in obtaining suitable persons.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Under the provision made, the fees will be largely increased, in my own county at least one-half. There are 47 polls, and the returning officer will receive $94 instead of $60, and 12½ cents for each mile travelled instead of 10 cents. Some provision should be made to increase the fees, but at the same time the returning officers should be compelled to give security for the due performance of their duties. In many cases the officers are men of straw. If they make an error, either wilfully or negligently there is no way of recovering anything from them. The returning officer has also the appointment of his deputies. He should be held accountable for what they do. It is hardly fair he should have the appointment of 47 deputy returning officers in one county and not be held responsible for their conduct. This is not a party question, and we want to see good men appointed whether they be Reformers or Conservatives: men who will honestly and faithfully carry out their duties. I, therefore, think that the returning officer should be a man of some substance, who would be responsible for his appointments.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The law says that the lists can be certified by the Queen's Printer, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and the revising officer. That is the law under the Franchise Act of 1890. The errors upon which my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) remarked do not depend at all upon the Queen's Printer. Far from it. They were unfortunately the result of errors committed by the revising officers, which a new system adopted this year will prevent. I have to add to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who just sat down, that the returning officers are probably the hardest worked and the worst paid officials in all the service. I agree that they should be men who have a standing in the community, and I may add that, except in very rare occasions has it ever been complained, by the most exacting of the Government's opponents, that they were men of straw. I agree

with the Minister of Justice that it would be well to introduce a provision in the law so as to make them responsible for their actions.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree with the proposal to make the returning officer give security. I fancy the reason he has been omitted from the list of officers who give security is on account of the old practice of appointing sheriffs and officers who were officials already under bonds. I do not think there can be any objection to paying the returning officers an amount sufficient to induce responsible men to take the position. We ought to pay them substantially and well, but I do not quite like the way in which the increase is made here. The addition of $2 for any polls over thirty is right enough perhaps, but I would prefer to see the returning officer given a considerable increase in his minimum lump allowance, rather than see the mileage increased as in the proposed amendments. This is an increase of 25 per cent. on the mileage, and the mileage being a matter within the returning officer's own control, if he happens to be a man who would look sharp after his perquisites he could increase his allowance considerably by travelling more miles than would be necessary. I do not see, however, what reason there can be for considering the poll clerk underpaid, and increasing his mileage by 25 per cent. also, but I suppose the Minister has a reason. Under paragraph 14 of this proposed amendments it says: "For each mile necessarily travelled for collecting ballot boxes." During our discussion the other night it was well understood that it was the intention of the Government that the ballot boxes should be brought in by the deputy returning officers whenever it was possible to do so. It was urged by several members, of whom I was one, that they should be forced to bring them in in all cases so as to secure the superintendence of a responsible official over the boxes until they were finally handed to the returning officer. I objected then, and I object still, to allowing a returning officer to send out an irresponsible person to bring in these ballot boxes. This increase in the mileage will certainly induce the returning officer to go around and collect the boxes, or to send some one to collect them. The returning officer's own time may be worth 12½ cents per mile each way, but if he sends a man with his own horse for that purpose, the pay is absurdly high, and it is a premium for delay on the part of the returning officer. I find also that there is a provision made for swearing the deputy returning officers after the close of the poll, and if the deputy has to be sworn by the returning officer it is necessary that they should meet and I think it would be better if the deputies would bring in the boxes at once and be sworn. I find also that there is a provision made to pay a reasonable sum to the returning officer for supplying ballot boxes and stationery. I always understood that ballot boxes were furnished by the Government, and I think they should be so furnished to secure uniform and efficient construction of the boxes, and to get them cheaply by having them made in large quantities. Those are all the points which I wish to refer to just now. I put the greatest emphasis upon the objection to the manner of increasing the pay of the returning officer. I should much prefer his minimum salary being increased, leaving the mileage as it was before, so as to avoid the temptation to unnecessary mileage. I also think he should not be allowed to go around and collect the ballot boxes, but it should be the duty of the deputies to bring them in forthwith.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As regards the mileage, I have no personal knowledge. I merely speak from the information given by the Auditor General, who has checked all these accounts, and who has made strong representations for two or three years past that 10 cents a mile is not sufficient to cover actual disbursements; and finding this Bill before the House, although it had reached a late stage, he drew the attention of my officers to the necessity of remodelling the schedule.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Is is intended to pay 12½ cents each way?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; for each mile travelled, the same as before.

Mr. CASEY. I did not say that it was excessive pay for the returning officer if he went himself. I said it was excessive if paid to another man sent to collect the ballot boxes. I merely urged that if his present allowance was thought to be too low, it would be better to make that up by an increased allowance in another form than in the shape of mileage.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the present system will be better. We have to consider the two classes of constituencies, those in the cities and those in the country. In the city constituencies there is a great deal of labour and responsibility involved owing to the large number of polling places, whereas in country constituencies there is a good deal of travel, and on that account a good deal of absence from home and occupation of time. If we adopt the system embodied in the schedule, we give remuneration to the two classes—to the city returning officer a direct allowance by paying him according to the number of polling places, and to the country returning officer a larger allowance in the way of travelling expenses. If we made their allowance a fixed sum all round, we would not apply it proportionately to the amount of work done.

Mr. CASEY. I was not objecting to the allowance per poll.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As regards the travelling allowance, the opinion of those best qualified to judge is that 12½ cents per mile for the mileage actually travelled is a more reasonable allowance than 10 cents. I admit that the schedule requires alteration, and with the permission of the Committee I will make it read thus:

For mileage of deputy returning officer and poll clerk going to and returning from the polling station and delivering ballot boxes, each mile, 12½ cents.

We allow the same rate to the returning officer in case he should have to go and collect the boxes, because we do not make it imperative on the deputy returning officer always to bring them in. We lay that duty upon him, but we do not take the duty away from the returning officer, in case he should have to go, through accident or eccentricity on the part of any deputy returning officer. In such a case it is only fair to allow him the same mileage.

Mr. CASEY. I think that substantially removes the objection.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to the same thing which I tried to explain to this House before. In our cities there are polling sub-divisions where only fifty, or sixty, or seventy votes are polled, and it seems to me that it would be in the interest of the country if the law were amended so as to reduce the number of polling sub-divisions in our towns and cities. They cost the country too much now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was under the impression that the change which the hon. gentleman suggests was made by an amendment to the Franchise Act, which made it unnecessary to provide for polling divisions for less than 300 voters.

Mr. INGRAM. What I complain of is that for instance in a ward having from 200 to 500 votes, there are in some instances two polling sub-divisions. Sometimes a vote for mayor, alderman and school trustee is taken without difficulty in one polling sub-division having from 500 to 700 votes, and it seems to me that in Dominion elections two polling booths would be quite sufficient for a municipal ward, because there are as a rule only two candidates. With two polling booths instead of four the country would save money, and it would be much more convenient for the candidates and all concerned.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. There is another point to which I should like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice. Under the law, I understand, the deputy returning officer and his clerk are not to be paid for more than 20 miles. In my county there is a polling division which is distant about 50 miles, or 100 miles going and coming. The returning officer sent in his account, but was refused payment except for 20 miles, and he had to pay the balance out of his own pocket.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What is the number?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Number twenty-six.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We propose to strike out that limit.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. And there are now the old limits?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. With regard to the remark of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), it is highly desirable that municipal wards formed for municipal purposes should not be interfered with if possible, even when there is so low a number as sixty or seventy voters in the ward. In one of the ridings in my township, there was a division made in 1886 which created great confusion. The judge found it necessary to divide the township into six wards instead of five, and there was any amount of confusion and trouble. Men would go to one poll and not finding their names there go to another, and still not finding their names, go home in disgust without voting.

Mr. INGRAM. I had only reference to cities and towns.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved to amend section 13 by substituting two copies for one copy of the electoral list.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he has considered the point I mentioned to the Secretary of State when the Bill was up before, and that was that the returning officer should have the power, in his discretion, of appointing more than one polling place within a polling division. It happens in the free grant district, and in Algoma, that very often the revising officer, out of a desire not to multiply lists, will make the polling divisions inconveniently large, and it very often happens in the case of settlements in some remote parts of townships, there being no direct communication between the settlement and the polling place fixed for the polling division, owing to the nature of the roads, it is impossible for the people to get to the polling place without great sacrifice. It is hardly worth while to make a separate polling division and separate lists for that particular settlement; but if the returning officer had the power to say that in such a polling division there should be an additional polling place to suit the convenience of the people, it would be a great advantage to that part of the country to which I allude. In my constituency the Ontario Government have multiplied polling places to a greater extent than the Dominion authorities, and voting has been carried on with much greater convenience and much less confusion and loss of time. The only objection to the plan I propose would be the possibility of a repetition of votes, because the deputy returning officer in one township could not be absolutely certain that the voters in the township had not gone to the other polling place and voted there, but that risk is very small and trifling compared with the great convenience which would result from having one or more polling sub-divisions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was not aware that the hon. gentleman had mentioned that subject lately. It was brought to my notice a year ago by the member who then sat for Algoma, and it seems to me that the difficulty of preventing a repetition of votes was the great objection to the plan proposed. Each polling place would necessarily be furnished with a full list for that place, and a person would have the right to vote at either, and I cannot see how that could be avoided unless the lists were divided and then it would be necessary to divide the district itself.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I admit that; but at the same time I think the convenience would be much greater than the danger of repetition, which would be exceedingly small, because the population is scattered, and there is not much likelihood of personation in the localities to which I refer. I quite admit there is danger, but there is as much danger where a man is entered in two polling divisions which are adjacent to each other. I mentioned the subject to the Secretary of State, who had charge of the Bill first, and he promised to consider the matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Would not the division of the polling district be a better remedy?

Mr. O'BRIEN. That involves multiplication of the voters' lists and a good deal of additional expense.

Mr. CASEY. Has the Minister made up his mind to provide the use of sealing wax for closing the envelopes? That is the only means of really preventing the improper opening of the envelopes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That subject was pretty well discussed, and I thought the Committee became finally reconciled to the idea of dispensing with the wax.

Mr. CASEY. The only reason was that the returning officer might not be familiar with the use of wax.

Bill reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 16th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS.

Mr. GIROUARD presented the seventh report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, with minutes of evidence and proceedings.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to ask the hon. gentleman if the report of to-day's proceedings is included, so that the minority report may appear?

Mr. GIROUARD. It is brought down as a portion of the proceedings of the general Committee, together with all the evidence. I was going to ask hon. gentlemen opposite what day would be convenient for the discussion of this report?

Mr. LAURIER. Any time will be convenient to us, to-morrow or Friday.

Mr. GIROUARD. It will take at least a couple of days before the report is translated into French. I do not know whether the discussion can take place this week on that account.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps the proceedings might be translated to-morrow, and possibly Friday might be a good day to commence the discussion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. After a little reflection we can make an arrangement during the afternoon on the subject. It must be remembered the evidence has not yet been distributed. No doubt hon. members have followed the proceedings of the Committee and have read the evidence.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman will suggest a day, the subject may be brought up at 8 o'clock.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

THE MEMBER FOR EAST NORTHUMBERLAND.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to direct the attention of the leader of the House to the report presented yesterday from the special Committee to investigate into the charges preferred against the hon. member for East Northumberland. We have yet to fix a day for the discussion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand we will be able to take that to-morrow.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. SKINNER. As the present Chairman of the Committee, I spoke to the members of the Committee on the other side of the House on the subject, and they said that, other things being equal, it could come up to-morrow.

CANADIAN SEALERS CAPTURED.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I wish to ask the special leave of the House to bring a matter of some importance to the notice of the Government. It is with respect to the seizure of Canadian sealing vessels on the Pacific coast by Russian authorities. I will not have an opportunity of asking information from the Government under the regular rules unless the House will allow me the special privilege of doing so now. Now, I repeat that it is a matter of very great importance. I notice in a report published in a newspaper in my county the following:—

"The startling news has been received in Cape Breton from Victoria, B.C., brought there by a sealing schooner, that Captain Alex. McLean, and his brother Captain Dan, Cape Bretonians, have been captured by the Russians, and are now prisoners at Copper Island. Further, that Captain Dan was caught ashore at Copper Island, and before he and his boat's crew could reach their vessel, which was anchored some distance off, they were fired upon, a ball knocking off Captain Dan's knee-cap and another piercing his left hand, after which he was made a prisoner, but while the Russians were taking him ashore, the crew put off with the boat and escaped with their vessel. It would appear from the following taken from a British Columbia paper, 'that the schooner *Hamilton Lewis*, Captain Alex. McLean, and the crew were seized and are also in the hands of the Russians. The captain of the schooner *Theresa*, which arrived in port to-day, September 2, reports that on Saturday, August 12, Captain McLean, of the *Rich*, was ashore with two boats, and just as they were returning ten Russian guards rushed on them over the sand hills and started shooting with rifles. They fired several rounds, and though many bullets hit the boats, only Captain McLean was struck. His knee-cap was smashed and his left hand pierced. Then both schooners made off to their position, 12 miles from Copper Island. The Russian man-of-war *Alert*, 13 guns, the next day steamed out after the three schooners at full speed. All of them put on every stitch of canvass, and for 12 miles there was a long chase, the *Alert* firing blank cartridges all the time. Then the wind fell off, and she came up to within a mile of the *Lewis*, and fired a ball which smashed the bowsprit in halves and brought her to. The *Theresa* then saw two boats pull off from the *Alert* and board the *Lewis*, which 10 minutes afterwards was taken in tow and rapidly disappeared.' It would appear from the above that Captain McLean, his vessel, crew, and catch of seals are in the hands of the Russians, as well as the wounded man, Captain Dan McLean, whose vessel and crew escaped. The position of the McLean boys is a most unfortunate one and there appears to be no remedy for it, as they were fishing inside of the Russian three-mile limit."

I should like to ask the Government, in view of the circumstances, if it would not be possible to make enquiries with a view of ascertaining whether the report that these men were fishing within the three-mile limit is correct or not; and if, on investigating the matter, any relief can be given to these people? They are people of my own county, and I understand several of the crew are from my county also. It is a matter of very great alarm to their friends, and I beg to ask the immediate attention of the Government to their case.

Mr. TUPPER. I may be permitted to say in answer to the hon. gentleman that the subject in some respects concerns the department over which I preside, and that the newspaper report to which

he has referred I have seen. Our officers have been very active in all matters connected with the sealing fisheries, and I need hardly say that the Government will take proper steps in the matter, and will do whatever is possible to be done in the interests of the Canadians who were seized.

THE OTTAWA STRIKE.

Mr. LAURIER. It was stated in the press of last evening and this morning that the militia had been called out in connection with the strike going on in a part of this city. Can the Minister of Militia give information to the House in this matter?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can tell the hon. gentleman that what was announced in the press last night is correct, and this morning the militia force was called out under the statute. The Government have no possible responsibility in the matter. The militia were called out under the statute, by which it is provided that by the advice of three magistrates the force can be at any time called out to aid the civil power. Hull is practically quiet so far, and there is no trouble as far as I have been able to ascertain.

Mr. EDGAR. What force was considered necessary to send out?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Four companies have been called out, and, as I already explained to the hon. gentleman, the discretion of the Government was not brought into play at all. It was at the request of three magistrates that the force was called out.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In what position do the force and the rioters or persons whom they were called out to quell, stand? Has the trouble been allayed, or has the hon. gentleman any official knowledge of the condition in which these matters are?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is simply what I have been able to ascertain just as he might himself. It is outside my jurisdiction as Minister of Militia, but as I took an interest in what was going on I merely ascertained that everything was quiet. The hon. gentleman on referring to the statute will see that the Minister of Militia has absolutely no responsibility, but that the responsibility rests with those magistrates who called out the force.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are these magistrates from the City of Ottawa or from Hull, or from both cities?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They are from Hull.

THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister of Finance promised the Supplementary Estimates for yesterday.

Mr. FOSTER. If possible.

Mr. LAURIER. Will it be possible to-day?

Mr. FOSTER. I hope so. I have a very strong hope this time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have had occasion in former days to have these Estimates printed in the ordinary way, and I must say that I have never had any trouble in getting them put through in three or four hours. It does appear to me that the Printing Bureau is falling very far short of the expectations, or that my hon. friend's estimates are preternaturally long, which, I presume, is not the case. If the printers are the cause of the delay, they ought really to be stirred up, and the proceedings of the House ought not to be delayed. I am quite certain that in any average printing office a few hundred copies of such a work as the Estimates, could easily be done in a very few hours.

Mr. FOSTER. I must exonerate the Printing Bureau. The last and final item was sent down to the printing office only about fifteen minutes ago, and all despatch will be used to have them here by six o'clock.

Mr. LAURIER. Is that positively the last item?

Mr. FOSTER. Possibly that is the last, and whether they are preternaturally long or not will be seen when they are on the Table.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was that important item?

Mr. FOSTER. It was not Cobourg Harbour.

THE DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved third reading of Bill (No. 146) to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. BARRON. Before this Bill be read the third time I would ask the House to adopt an amendment which I propose to make, and for which purpose I would ask the Bill to be referred back to Committee. If the Committee last night had adopted proposals made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to the effect that the returning officers ought to give security in order to ensure the appointment of really good men standing high in the community, then, perhaps, there might have been no necessity for my proposal. We have seen in the past such extraordinary conduct on the part of returning officers, that I feel the time has arrived when something must be done to secure more efficiency on their part. We know the history of hon. gentlemen opposite, so far as legislation is concerned, has been to take into their hands the appointment of returning officers on the eve of general elections. We know that when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) came into power, in pursuance of the promise he had previously made, he inaugurated an entirely different system so far as returning officers are concerned. He required that the returning officers should be men of position, and he provided by law that the returning officers should be sheriffs and registrars, men standing high in the community, officials who would have some regard for themselves, and for the acts of the deputies for which they were responsible. We find during the regime of Mr. Mackenzie that no trouble ever occurred, and it was never for one moment suggested that any improper act took place so far as returning officers were concerned; but, immediately after the Mackenzie Government were defeated, the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite repealed that law, and took upon themselves to appoint returning officers, and I say, partizan returning officers. Now, if they desired to avoid the excuse they set up for that course, they might have appointed County Court judges to this office, who are officials

appointed by the Government. It was said by the late Premier that the reason he had to repeal the law passed by the Mackenzie Government was, because the registrars and sheriffs were all officials of the Ontario Government, which Government was at that time opposed to the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite. If that was so good a reason, surely there are officials within the different ridings appointed by gentlemen on the other side of the House who could have discharged the duties of returning officer, and as everyone knows officials have some reputation at stake, and they have more regard for what is right, and are more careful not to do that which is wrong. The Government, however, appointed men without any standing as a rule—of course there are exceptions—and without a particle of qualification, so far as property was concerned. What are the results? Time after time we found fraud has been committed, here, there, and everywhere by these returning officers with a view of assisting the candidates of the party opposite. When was there ever a greater fraud perpetrated than in the case of the Queen's County, New Brunswick, election? Because, as I understand, the agent of the returning officer practically handed the money with his left hand instead of the right, because in fact the money was not handed by the officially appointed agent, therefore the returning officer returned to the House a gentleman who had a minority of seventy, and the hon. gentleman who now sits in this House only gets light after a long period of four or five years, as to his right to be here as the representative of the people. Then we have the case of West Northumberland. The hon. member for that constituency (Mr. Hargraft) knows all about it, and perhaps it would be as well for me not to enter into it. But to show you the effect of the criminal carelessness and negligence of the returning officer, I may state that but for the honesty and uprightness of the County Court judge, Mr. Benson, of Cobourg, that hon. gentleman would have been counted out, and the will of the people would have been defeated. I have been told that so enraged were the people at the outrage perpetrated, no doubt with the connivance of the returning officer, that there was danger of bloodshed had the elected candidate been unseated. While the ballot boxes are in the possession of the returning officer, he leaves them everywhere and anywhere, so that they can easily be tampered with; then he closes his eyes and turns his back, so that ballots can be abstracted and others put in their places. In West Northumberland the official declaration was made on the 9th of March, when the hon. member sits in this House for that constituency was declared elected. Then a recount was asked for and held. It was found that in polling division No. 1 of Cobourg six ballots were marked for the hon. gentleman, but they were not initialled, and the counsel for the defeated candidate asked that these ballots be rejected, though the scrutineer and the deputy returning officer were both positive that every ballot placed in the ballot box had been initialled. At polling division No. 2, nineteen ballots were similarly found without initials, of which seven were marked for the hon. member who now sits in this House. At polling division No. 10 of Hamilton, eight ballots were found for the hon. member without initials, although the deputy returning officer and the agents all swore that when the ballots were placed in the box they were properly initialled; and so on all along the line. The counsel for the defeated candidate appealed to the judge, saying: You must see for yourself that these ballots are not the ballots that were placed in the box at the time the election took place. The learned judge said that he could not take judicial notice of that fact; it was perfectly clear that they were not the same ballots, but there were no evidence of the fact, and therefore he very properly refused to reject these ballots. Then, take the case of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). He told us the other night of the iniquitous frauds that were perpetrated upon him—why? Because when a recount is ordered the returning officer carelessly leaves the ballot boxes anywhere, and, as I said before, shuts his eyes and turns his back, and thus practically invites people to come and commit frauds whereby hon. gentlemen in some cases are nearly defeated and altogether defeated in others. We have also the cases of Nicolet and Montmagny. In all such cases frauds have been perpetrated, I will not say actually by the returning officer, but under circumstances of criminal carelessness and negligence on the part of the returning officer. Now, I propose to ask this House to throw upon the returning officer the onus of showing that while the boxes are in his legal possession, he must account for them. In other words, if any tampering with the boxes takes place while they are in his legal possession, the onus is thrown upon him to prove that he is perfectly innocent. Unless we have some such law as this, we shall never have an efficient protection against such frauds as those which have taken place. I know by my own observation that the ballot boxes lay on the counter of the returning officer, and could easily have been got at, and the expressed will of the people defeated; but in that case the returning officer was honest and upright. I do not say that all the returning officers are dishonest; far from it. I had reason to express my perfect satisfaction with the returning officer who presided at my recent election. But the Government opposite seem willing to appoint men as returning officers who are without standing or position, and who do not care what happens so long as their party is returned to power; and so long as hon. gentlemen opposite appoint men of that calibre, we must have some more effective law than we have at the present time. Therefore, I desire to move:

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House to insert therein as an amendment to chapter 8, Revised Statutes of Canada, after the word "fine" in the last line of the 100th section, the following:—"And whensoever it shall be proved before a court of competent jurisdiction, that the ballot box or its contents has or have been tampered with during the time when such ballot box or its contents was or were in the legal possession of the returning officer, election clerk or deputy returning officer, then such returning officer, election clerk or deputy returning officer shall be liable to the fines or penalties, or both, provided by law for offences under this section, unless such returning officer, election clerk or deputy returning officer, as the case may be, proves to the satisfaction of such court that the offence with which he is charged was committed without his knowledge or consent, assistance or connivance."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Bill has been in Committee twice, and the hon. gentleman, therefore, had two opportunities of bringing to the notice of the Committee the amendment he now proposes.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken if he thinks I did not. I not only brought it to the attention of the Committee, but sent a draft of it to the hon. gentleman himself.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I never heard of the proposal before. Grievances with respect to returning officers were discussed repeatedly, and, if the hon. gentleman sent me such a suggestion, I certainly did not receive it. If he mentioned it in Committee, I have forgotten it. Either he is mistaken on that point, or I am; but that, however, is not very material. The hon. gentleman did not move his clause or take the opinion of the Committee upon it, and I think the Bill ought not to be sent back for that purpose now. I will not enter upon a discussion as to the instances which the hon. gentleman has given of complaints against returning officers. Whenever an election takes place, if any irregularity occurs at all, the responsibility is thrown on the returning officer who has the conduct of the proceedings. The hon. gentleman has suggested that certain judicial functionaries should be substituted for these; but we all know that, when the judges were entrusted with duties which appeared to hon. gentlemen opposite to be of a political nature, the revision of the voters' list, we had as emphatic and as strong an attack in the session of 1886 on the way in which these judicial officers did their *quasi* judicial duties as we have had at any time with regard to returning officers. I think it would not be wise to adopt the amendment for another reason. When the question of returning officers was under discussion, the proposition was made from the other side that permanent returning officers should be appointed, and I promised to consider that in connection with other amendments to the Election Act, which no doubt will be brought to the notice of the House before very long again. We are opposed to accepting as returning officers for elections to this Parliament any permanent officers who are under the control of another Government. Whether that Government is opposed to us politically or not, is not to the point. Its interests may be totally different from those of this Government and Parliament. It may be, and it is very likely to be, that on questions not political in the sense of being party politics, a Provincial Government may from time to time have a policy adverse to that which prevails in this Parliament; and we are opposed to giving the control of elections, in so far as it is possible for returning officers to control them, to officers who, not only are appointed by Provincial Governments, but are dependent on them for their offices. As regards many of these officers in various parts of Canada, who, hon. gentlemen opposite have suggested, should be entrusted with the duties of returning officer, they are liable to be dismissed at a moment's notice by the Provincial Governments; and I think it would be unacceptable to the deliberate judgment of any gentleman in this House, that persons whose tenure of office is of that description should be chosen as our officers in the performance of duties in connection with this Parliament. I am not averse to the principle of having returning officers permanent, however, and the question to be considered is whether we can select a class of officers with whose other duties this work might not be inconsistent, and who at the same time possess sufficient independence as to tenure of office to make them perfectly free and fearless as regards the discharge of their duties. If we can suggest to the House a class of officers of that description, the suggestion to have them permanent officers would be very acceptable. We must consider the present position of the returning officer as regards emoluments, and the mode of his appointment, in considering the value of the amendment proposed. The emoluments are very trifling indeed, for active, responsible work extending over there weeks, or a month, or even longer, involving the appointment of a large number of deputies, involving a very considerable activity and work during that four or five weeks, and the utmost allowance we allow a returning officer is $60, for which he has to incur, not only the labours of the office, but likewise very considerable responsibility, civil and criminal. Now, what the hon. gentleman proposes is that when we find anything in the procedure which is improper, the burden of proof is to be thrown upon the returning officer to prove that he is innocent. In other words, these ill-paid and hard-worked men are to be presumed to be criminals if anything improper has transpired in connection with the boxes under their charge, in a legal sense. All I have to say about this is that I think this matter ought to be left to the ordinary rule of law which exists on this subject; of that rule of law, I suppose, there can be no doubt. That rule is, if it has been proved that a criminal practice has been committed with regard to the ballots which have been in the actual custody of the officer himself, there is a presumption created which calls upon him to prove his innocence. But in so far as the amendment would alter that rule of proof, and throw upon the officer the entire burden of proof, involved in the mere presumption arising from the fact of his having had legal possession and control of the boxes, and these irregularities having been committed, I think the rule of evidence ought not to be changed. I understand, from hearing the amendment read, that its effect is that the mere fact of the ballots having been tampered with in the first instance would be sufficient to throw the presumption of criminality upon the officer himself. More than that ought to be done. It ought to be proved that the officer had control of the boxes, that they were in his actual custody and keeping, and that, during that time, reasonable care would have prevented the commission of any such offence. When that has been proved, the presumption of guilt is established by the present rule of evidence, and there is no necessity for such a provision with regard to that state of facts. If less than that is proved, it is cruel and unjust that the burden of proof of innocence should be thrown upon the officer.

Mr. LAURIER. If this amendment be of a nature to commend itself to the sense of the House, I hope the Minister will not press the objection with which he has met it, that it came rather late and should have been moved in Committee. I understand, in any case, that the amendment was suggested to the Minister of Justice and to the Committee. I am sorry to see that the Minister has not yet thought it wise to have the officer who now administers the law in the province, the sheriff or registrar, appointed returning officer. The objection that they are dependent upon another Government seems to me hardly a good one.

When we look at the operation of the American system, when we know that all the elections of the courts are under the control, not of Congress itself, not of the Federal Government, but under the control of the State Governments, it seems to me that offers a very cogent answer to the objection now raised by the hon. gentleman. I would also call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that, during the last two or three sessions of Congress, one of the principal discussions which took place, not only in the House of Representatives but in the Senate as well, was the Force Bill, a Bill which was calculated to remove the control of elections from the State Governments and place it in the hands of the Federal Government. After long discussion, Congress came to the conclusion that the system now prevailing would guarantee more freedom of action than if the authority were placed under the control of the Federal Government. It seems to me, therefore, that the objection the hon. gentleman now raises cannot be supported by any show of authority, and that the argument that, if we were to appoint such officials as the sheriffs, the clerks, or the registrars, we would be dependent on the Local Government, is not a valid one. Those officers have a character and a station in the community, and therefore they offer more guarantee of doing justice than a man who is selected for the occasion. The hon. gentleman says he is considering the propriety of making permanent officers. This proposal certainly has its value, and, if permanent officers were chosen in such a way as to give some guarantee of impartiality between party and party, it would go very far to cure the evils of the present system. This amendment may appear on its face a rather harsh one. It alleges that the ballot boxes have been tampered with. Then there will be a *primâ facie* presumption of guilt against the party in whose custody the ballot boxes were at the time they were tampered with. That may be a harsh disposition, but it is one which is warranted by the evidence we have to-day. The hon. gentleman knows, and the House knows, that the cases of tampering with the ballot boxes are becoming more numerous with each election. There was more of that during the last election than ever before. There was tampering with the ballot boxes in the County of Grey, in the County of Northumberland, in the County of Nicolet, and in North Middlesex, and in every case the returning officer has not been able satisfactorily to account for his custody of these boxes. In every case the returning officer has been guilty of negligence, to say the least. He leaves the boxes within easy reach of evil-doers, as in the County of Montmagny, and the evil-doers tampered with the ballot boxes. If you say that the returning officer who accepts the duty of his office shall be liable to a penalty if he does not properly perform them, he would be compelled to exercise great caution, and then he could rebut the presumption against him by showing that he has exercised all prudence and has taken all proper precautions, and then his liability will cease. But if he is not able to show that he has acted with that due caution with which he should have acted, it is not unfair to him to hold him guilty.

Mr. HARGRAFT. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Barron), in the course of his remarks, referred to the attempt which was made, just after the last election in West Northumberland, to steal my seat, and I cannot do better than explain it to the House, so far as at present known, especially as I claim that it was owing to the carelessness of the returning officer that this attempt was made, and I think the returning officer should be made responsible for the safe-keeping of the ballots while in his possession. On the Monday following the day of the election the ballot boxes were carted to the court house, where the seals were broken and I was declared elected. Since then I have been told that five of the envelopes containing the ballots were open, and the clerk advised the returning officer to seal them up. However that may be, they were all sealed when they came before the judge at the recount. After the declaration the ballot boxes were carted back to the returning officer's office, where they were left all night, and the next morning, when I happened to go in there, I found a son of the returning officer taking the contents out of the boxes, and when I asked him what he was doing he said he was separating the envelopes containing the ballots, from the others, and putting them in the safe for safe-keeping. This young gentleman has since left the country. He went quietly, without even telling his brother he was going. A day or so after this, a recount was asked for and granted, and almost as soon as we attempted to examine the ballots we found they had been tampered with. In the first lot examined, No. 1 of the town of Cobourg, we found there were nine ballots not initialled. The difference between these ballots and the others was very distinct. They were printed on different paper, and the ink was a good deal heavier, and whoever had put them there had not taken the pains to fold them up. They were as free from creases as if they had just come from the press. They could not have been put into the boxes without being folded, and you know that if you once fold a paper you cannot get the creases out. The returning officer called me to one side on the morning of the recount, and said there was no doubt that these ballots had never been in the boxes. There were 48 of these ballots which were not initialled and were on different paper, and every one of these bogus ballots was marked for me. My majority was 36. In polling place No. 2, of the town of Cobourg, there were 19 of these ballots. Immediately after the recount I saw the deputy returning officer of that polling place, and he told me he would swear on any amount of bibles—that is the expression he used—that there had not been one ballot put in that was not initialled. However, about half an hour afterwards, when I sent to get an affidavit to that effect, he said he could not sign one—in fact as soon as he saw the paper he said: "Oh, you need not come here, I am not going to sign any papers for you." Now, in another polling place in the township of Hamilton, a particular friend of mine happened to be deputy returning officer, and he has since told me that he was so particular that before he sealed up the ballot box he placed the ballots all face downwards on the table, and picked them up one at a time, to be sure they were all initialled, and yet we found in that envelope eight bogus ballots. I think the Minister of Justice must admit that we should be protected from the carelessness of these partisan returning officers.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am afraid the provisions of this amendment would not prevent the

operations which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. I presume the returning officer in that case would be in a position to say that these acts were not committed with his knowledge or connivance. If, on the other hand, an officer can be supposed to connive at such a thing, I am afraid he would not have scruple to avail himself of the provisions of this amendment.

Mr. LAURIER. He would be more careful.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think the experience of those who have had anything to do with carrying on elections under the present system, has not been satisfactory, and it is evident why it must be so. The original intention of the Act, as explained in this House, and as I understand it to be, was that the Government only proposed to resort to the appointment of returning officers in cases where it was quite evident, either that the official previously acting was incompetent, or that there was a strong reason to suppose that he would not do justice in the premises; and considering the fact that all these officials were appointed by a Government decidedly hostile to the party in power in this House, there was some reason for coming to that conclusion. Now, I am not at all prepared to say that we ought to go back to the former system. There are many circumstances in which it would be decidedly unfair to make it a rule to appoint the officials of the present Administration in Ontario as returning officers for the Dominion elections. Altogether apart from the general principle very properly laid down by the Minister of Justice, I think that elections to this House ought to be conducted by persons over whom the Government of this Dominion has control. But the present system, I think, is objectionable in many ways. Now, the system works in this way: The candidate of the party in power, whoever he may be, as a matter of course selects a gentleman to act as returning officer; that gentleman, of course, selects friends of his own, or decided friends of his party, to act as deputies. Well, no matter how creditable in other respects that appointment may be, yet if that official so appointed commits any blunder, either through carelessness or through ignorance—and it must be remembered that the duties of a returning officer are by no means simple, by no means easily carried out, it is very easy for the returning officer to make a mistake, it is very easy for him to allow partisan zeal to blind his judgment. But whatever be the cause of any shortcoming on his part in the discharge of those duties, the person who has recommended him to a very great extent becomes responsible for those shortcomings, and consequently the candidate is placed in a very invidious and very unpleasant position. If that returning officer has disputes with his deputies, as in very many cases he has, or if questions arise as to the payment of these deputies, as in many cases they do arise, the sitting member, the man who has been elected, is at once appealed to for his influence and support in dealing with these matters, and altogether, judging from my own experience, the position in which a member is placed under those circumstances, is in all respects a very unsatisfactory one. There is no reason why he should be at all held liable or made responsible for the doings of the returning officer; on the contrary, it is very desirable that he should not be so held responsible, while under the present system it is impossible but that he must be so connected and held responsible. Under these circumstances, I hope the Government will be able to find some scheme for having permanent returning officers. Another great advantage would be that, as I have already said, the duties of returning officer being very onerous, very complex, and requiring experience, the man who has once discharged those duties and understands that he will be called upon to discharge them on future occasions, will be much more likely to make himself thoroughly conversant with his duties, and having discharged them once he will be much more likely to discharge them a second time with greater efficiency. There are many reasons why it is desirable that permanent returning officers should be appointed, and that candidates for whichever party may be in power, should be free from responsibility and from the invidious position in which the present system places them, of being called upon to recommend persons for that position.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not desire to make any reference to the legal effect of the amendment of the member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), but I think that the charges preferred against a large number of efficient officers throughout the Dominion, are altogether unfair. He has said that the Government appoints men without property qualification, without position, and without standing. Now, I feel sure that the hon. gentleman does not even believe his own statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is unparliamentary to say that an hon. member does not believe the statement he has made.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not intend to be unparliamentary. I, therefore, take it back, and say that the charge cannot be laid to the great majority of the men who are appointed. I think there is really no reason for any hon. gentleman in this House to believe that the Government would make such appointments. These appointments are made, I believe, generally, on the recommendation of persons who are candidates in the interest of the Government for the time being, and I feel sure that these men would not be likely, in their own interest, to suggest the name of any man as returning officer who would not do credit to himself and to the party to which he belonged. I have had something to do with the naming of returning officers, and that has been the course I have pursued, and to show how effectual and how well approved my recommendations have been, I need only say that at the close of the last general election, at the close of the meeting for the declaration, there was a motion made by the financial agent of my opponent, tendering a vote of thanks to the returning officer for the impartial and efficient manner in which he had discharged his duties. I feel, therefore, I cannot sit in this House and hear the charges made that have been made by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), of inefficiency and inability, without refuting them. Sheriffs and registrars in the Province of Ontario are usually appointed for political services, and as the Liberal party has been in power in that province for about 18 years, the great majority of these offices are filled by men belonging to that party. I feel that we would not be jus-

tified in throwing the positions of returning officers into the hands of political opponents, and I hold it would be wrong to do so. Take my own county, for instance, where the registrar is a license commissioner. In Ontario the license commissioners are the most active agents of the Liberal party, not only in Dominion but in Provincial elections, and by naming the registrar as returning officer the Government would be naming a most active political agent of hon. gentlemen opposite. I feel, therefore, a wrong would be done, and we should be careful in a case of this kind to allow the Government to make choice of a man fitted in every respect to perform the duties. I do not make charges against those men further than to say that they are usually appointed for political services, and for that reason we cannot reasonably expect to get from them the calm judgment and consideration which would be given by other men who have not received appointments for such services. At the elections of 1887, the Government in their magnanimity did appoint the registrar of my county as returning officer, and I do not wish to say one harsh word against that gentleman, because he no longer is registrar, but I will say this: We know in Ontario the election law is quite different, a man cannot vote at a provincial election unless he is a resident of the county; yet, in some mysterious way, blank forms of oath under the election law of Ontario were placed in the ballot boxes and distributed to the deputy returning officers, and some of the deputy returning officers used them against men who came up to vote for me, no doubt to prevent them from voting. In one instance, a gentleman from Toronto, a lawyer knowing the law, had this oath handed to him and he was asked to take it. He took the oath, saying that the deputy returning officer had no right to submit it, that it was no perjury for him to take it, and he did so rather than be deprived of his franchise. A young man, an income voter, was prevented from voting. In that manner the position was used against me, and this House can readily understand that, when I was defeated by only 9 votes, my defeat could very easily be accomplished in that manner when there were 32 polling places in the county. I feel it would not be fair at the present time to concede the position of returning officer to sheriffs and registrars throughout the country.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire to say a few words as illustrative of my own experience of the inconvenience, not to say injustice, attending the present system of appointing returning officers. I may say that the registrar of the county which I have the honour to represent, has been registrar a great many years, and under the old system he acted as returning officer, acted with intelligence and acceptability. He was never a partisan, in fact I do not know he ever voted for either side, and he was in every sense eminently eligible for appointment as returning officer at the last election. But he was passed over and another gentleman was selected. I dare say a great many members of the House wondered at the time why the election for the County of Huntingdon did not take place at the same time as other elections in the Dominion. Well, it happened owing to the existence of the present system. The Secretary of State, I suppose, consulted some one in reference to the appointment of a returning officer for my county. I have the authority of this gentleman, in a statement made at a public meeting, for stating that he was so consulted. He was not even a resident of the county, but a professional gentleman residing in Montreal. He was consulted, and (perhaps naturally enough under the circumstances) he recommended a gentleman resident in the county, who, it appears, was ambitious to be candidate himself, and he was appointed, as I have his own authority for stating, without being consulted as to whether he was willing to accept the appointment. Indeed, I believe the receipt of the commission and other papers sent on such occasions was the first intimation that he was chosen as returning officer for the county. He declined to accept the appointment; he sent the papers back. I believe, to Ottawa immediately, acting honourably in every way. The Government, instead of acting promptly, as I think they should and might have done, allowed five days to elapse before appointing another gentleman. He took his own time in signifying his willingness to accept his appointment, so it became impossible to bring on the election for the County of Huntingdon at the same time as the other elections. The result of all this was to make this election a bye-election, and it brought to the Opposition candidate all the disagreeable consequences which generally exist in regard to bye-elections. It enabled a powerful Government to bring to bear a great many influences, legitimate, and probably some of them illegitimate, against the Opposition candidate which it would have been impossible for the Government to have brought to bear had the election in my county taken place at the same time as the other elections. It is true the circumstances had their consolation to myself. They brought me many expressions of sympathy from political friends, and in some instances I am glad to say from political opponents. They brought me and my people the distinguished honour of a visit from two prominent members of the Ministry and some other gentlemen, who attended the nomination and endeavoured with the eloquence they possessed to lead my constituents to believe that it would be to their interests to choose some other man than myself as their representative. I have an amusing recollection of some of the incidents of that important day, important to me in more senses than one, amusing, I say, because of the somewhat flowery oration of the Minister of Marine, his grandiloquent announcement that he was there as the representative of another and a better man, a gentleman who was then on his way to Washington to negotiate a reciprocity treaty. When I combine that recollection with the recollection of what attended the visit of that gentleman to Washington, I cannot feel otherwise than amused. The amusing part of the recollection extends a little further. The arrangement made for the speakers that day was that there were to be three on each side, and each of the three was to take 30 minutes. The hon. Minister of Marine, with that strange obliviousness of the flight of time which he sometimes exhibits on the floor of this House, trespassed on the rights of others.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I rise to a question of order. This is a question of the burden of proof.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is travelling out of the record.

Mr. SCRIVER. Perhaps I am wandering somewhat.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend is showing the consequences of the appointment.

Mr. SCRIVER. I have no doubt the Secretary of State will feel pleased at my reviving some of the recollections—some of them (not all of them)—which took place on that day.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I remember one especially, but it might be out of order to tell it now. I have a pleasant recollection of my hon. friend repudiating his leaders and his party on that day.

Mr. SCRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is very easy for the Secretary of State to make such a charge as that, but he did not succeed in convincing my constituents that there was anything inconsistent in the position which I took at that time, and which I maintain to-day. As I am sensible that I am somewhat out of order, I will not trespass upon the indulgence of the House any further than to say that my distinguished friends departed that evening in their palace car, returning to their duties in other places——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is wandering again.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Which car was it?

Mr. SCRIVER. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman: but it was a car well furnished and well provided with refreshments. That I am sure of. Although my hon. friends departed that evening, like the sheep in the nursery tale, they left their tails behind them. These distinguished members, and ex-members of Parliament, and Senators——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I will again try and draw the attention of the House to the fact, that upon a discussion of this kind it is desirable to keep as closely to the question as possible.

Mr. SCRIVER. I will say no more, Mr. Speaker, than that the election resulted, notwithstanding the unfair advantage taken of me in the way I have said, in a manner to afford me, not merely a personal triumph——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SCRIVER—but personal satisfaction; in that it showed that I represent a constituency——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the hon. gentleman is not discussing the question before the House.

Mr. SCRIVER. I am about to close. I can inform the Minister of Justice that I will not speak more than a minute more. In that it showed that I represent a constituency——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would be very glad indeed to allow the hon. gentleman all latitude, but this involves a reply, and we cannot afford time to continue the discussion.

Mr. SCRIVER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to finish my sentence.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SCRIVER. That I have the honor of representing a constituency, the majority of whom have intelligence enough to comprehend——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SCRIVER—that the statements made to them were inaccurate,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SCRIVER—and independence enough to resist the illegitimate influences which were brought to bear upon them.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). After this pleasant little digression I may be permitted to direct the discussion somewhat towards its proper channel.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Ah.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Perhaps the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) thinks there was no digression?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Not a bit.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That may be his idea of order and procedure. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that if the Government is to be congratulated upon any one thing during the present session, it is upon the anxiety they have shown to amend the election law in any particular in which it is found to be faulty. At the commencement of the session several Bills were introduced by private members, and at the suggestion of the Government they were referred to a special committee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Order.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I am leading up to the question. That committee deliberated on several occasions and finally brought in their report. The matter has been discussed on more than one occasion, this among the number, and I think the discussion has upon every occasion resulted in good. I regret that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) did not suggest some improvement in the present law, before he took his seat. He was rather opposed to the system of making provincial appointees the returning officers for Dominion elections. Well, if we are to take the testimony of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) who has just spoken, and if we are to take other testimony which I think would be very easily found, it would be discovered that, simply because a man receives an appointment from a Provincial Government, he, therefore, does not forget that he is a political supporter of that Government. I do not think there is an hon. member in this House who believes that when a man receives an appointment—other than, perhaps, an appointment to the judiciary—that he to any great extent loses that active sympathy which has always characterized him in his support of the Government to whom he is under an obligation for that appointment. Now, Mr. Speaker, I might remind hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), of something which he perhaps has forgotten. I understood him to say that we never heard of any election frauds, or of any misconduct on the part of the returning officer until the advent to power of the present party in 1878. I am sure that hon. gentlemen must have forgotten the very historical case which occurred in the County of Jacques Cartier, when, perhaps, election frauds of the most outrageous character that have ever been perpetrated in this country took place.

Mr. BARRON. Those were alleged frauds.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Just wait a moment and you will find they were proven as well as alleged. These frauds took place under the regime

of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not for one moment intend to reflect upon the Government that made the appointment of that Mr. Valois, although be it remembered Mr. Valois held an official position which in the Province of Quebec is of a very much more important character than in the Province of Ontario: the position of a notary public. He was an official, and if not under his direct supervision, with his connivance at all events, almost under his very nose, there was perpetrated one of the most outrageous frauds that ever has been witnessed in this country in connection with any election. I do not remember just now what the result of the trial was that followed, but, if my memory serves me right, the returning officer and others were convicted and suffered terms of imprisonment.

Mr. LAURIER. Not the returning officer.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I may be mistaken in that. I do not think I am mistaken in my recollection of the fact that some one of the officials, or some one of the parties to that fraud, were punished.

Mr. LAURIER. There were parties punished, but not the returning officer.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I may remind hon. gentlemen of another fact. I notice that when the returns were brought down some three or four years ago in relation to that well-known election that took place in Queen's, N. B., in which Mr. Baird was returned to this House, that one of the objections raised in that case was, that some official was not appointed the returning officer, but that the returning officer, Mr. Dunn, was appointed by this Government, and that it was a part of the system which is being condemned and which it is alleged results in these frauds. Now, a reference to the return brought down to this House at that time will show that a sheriff of that county signed the nomination paper of Mr. Baird's opponent, so that you see it does not follow, if you were to change the system now in vogue, that you would very much alter the circumstances. You would find, Sir, that just the same irregularities would take place under partisan officials who are partisan appointees of Provincial Governments. When I remember that the leader of the Opposition, in looking back at the last election, can only mention three or four cases out of all the elections that took place in this country, I am disposed to think that the results of the last general election ought not to reflect discredit generally upon the system, however, much it may, in particular cases, have resulted in wrong, however much in particular cases returning officers may have lent themselves to the perpetration of crime or offences punishable by our laws. I do not for one moment pretend to condone any offence of that kind, but I do say that under any other system there is just as likely to happen what happened in three or four cases in the last election. I know that in my own county the sheriff and the registrar are active political opponents of mine. I find no fault with that. If either were appointed to the position of returning officer, I believe they would discharge the important duties of that office with just as much satisfaction as did the gentleman whom I have recommended to this Government in the last two or three elections. I make these remarks generally on behalf of the gentlemen who have been appointed by this Government during the last election. In all fairness, I do not believe that they should be spoken of as they have been spoken of by some hon. gentlemen opposite. Specify and particularize if you like, and punish as I think you should those who have been guilty of misconduct, but I believe that among the gentlemen who acted as returning officers during the last election, the large majority are honest men, and the result of the election shows that it was a pure election generally, so far as the action of the returning officers was concerned. I believe that the present law provides ample remedies for the punishment of any person guilty of any violation of the election law. If I thought otherwise, I am quite sure I should be in favour of amending the law in any way that would make it more effective in its operation. I do not believe, however, that any action of ours here will make that law any more stringent than it is now. The provisions of the law as it now stands seem to me to be amply sufficient, and it is well known that the legislation which has taken place within the last month is preliminary to a more thorough inspection and examination of the law with a view to a complete consolidation and change in another session.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not surprised at the speech made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, because, if I remember rightly, he assisted in putting the present law on the Statute-book, and it is perfectly natural that he should defend it. The hon. gentleman says, that sheriffs and registrars are partisans, and that we have no assurance that we should have any more satisfactory results from elections held under these officers than we do under the law as it now stands, under returning officers appointed by the Government for the moment, who, when the election is over, sink back into their original positions—returning officers who appear like Arabs at a caravansary for the night, and when the day comes are gone. Now, Sir, I do not admit the contention of the hon. gentleman: and although he may satisfy himself that, theoretically, the law is quite as satisfactory now as it was when certain officials were designated, the experience of the country is altogether against his view. Ever since this law has been put upon the Statute-book, we have had returning officers acting illegally, and in an irregular and improper manner. Can the hon. gentleman point to instances where misconduct has been charged against sheriffs or registrars appointed as returning officers in the Province of Ontario? Has there been a single case in any local election that has been held since Confederation, in which charges have been made, or candidates have complained, against the conduct of returning officers, where these officials have been designated, such as have been made against returning officers arbitrarily chosen for this special purpose, with no official responsibility except that imposed upon them for the moment by that appointment? I do not know of any such. I call the hon. gentleman's attention also to this fact. In the election of 1874, although I am aware that at that time no law directed that these officials should be chosen, as a matter of fact they were chosen; and there was no charge against any returning officer of having returned the candidate of the minority, or that by any improper conduct on his part a candidate who ought not to be re-

turned, was returned. In the election of 1872 there was a case in one of the Peterboroughs—I do not remember who held that election. In 1878, after the law was put on the Statute-book requiring sheriffs and registrars to be taken as returning officers, an election was held. The friends of hon. gentlemen opposite on that occasion had a majority returned to Parliament: the election was held under their political opponents: and if there had been any attempt to do wrong in any of the constituencies, you may be sure that it would have been dealt with: and yet there was no complaint. Now, that has not been the condition of things since there has been a change in the law. The hon. gentleman has referred to the case of the County of Queen's, N.B., in which a candidate who represented the minority was returned to this House. What was the excuse for the conduct of the returning officer on that occasion? He said that the deposit was made by the candidate and not by his agent, and was, therefore, an improper deposit. An election was held, deputy returning officers were appointed, polls were opened and votes recorded, and my hon. friend who now sits for Queen's had a majority of about 70 votes. Did the returning officer return him as elected? Not at all. He said he had no right to grant a poll. He reviewed his own conduct, and pronounced judgment against himself. He said: As there has been no poll legally held, as everything has been null and void since the day of nomination, as there has been only one candidate legally nominated, I will return Mr. Baird as elected; and Mr. Baird had the effrontery to take a seat in this House. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that under any sheriff or registrar any such conduct ever occurred? There is a vast difference between these officials and the existing class of returning officers. A sheriff or a registrar, who is a permanent official, has some amenability to public opinion, and some sense of responsibility to the law; the Government whose officer he is could not well maintain him in his position if it were clearly proved that he had disobeyed the law and committed a gross offence. The man who holds no official position in the country, who may not have property to the extent of a dollar, who probably owes his position to the nomination of one of the candidates, does not stand in the same position, is not amenable to public opinion in the same way, and an adverse judgment has no terrors for him; he is not afraid to suffer any injury or damage. Further than that, there is a great advantage in having officers who have had training and experience in elections. A sheriff of a county has probably held that position for a long series of years. For a quarter of a century he has had the writs placed in his hands for the province and also for holding Dominion elections. He is perfectly familiar with the law, he makes no mistake, and he makes proper allowance for the want of information and knowledge on the part of his deputy returning officers. He does not rule out the votes given by electors unfairly, as many an ignorant and inexperienced returning officer does, and so you are protected against the mistakes arising from inexperience and ignorance and those that arise from a sense of irresponsibility, which certainly is liable to accompany the acts of a man who has no official position and nothing to lose by his misconduct. But the hon. gentleman says that a sheriff may be a partisan and that a registrar may be a partisan. That is perfectly true. Nobody expects that any party whom you may appoint will be absolutely neutral and colourless politically. It is not the fact that he has his party preferences which unfits him for holding an election, but it is the fact that he has no experience and no sense of responsibility. So you have charges of misconduct again and again made against persons who are unofficial, apart from their appointment as returning officers, that you do not find in the case of sheriffs or registrars. Let the hon. gentleman take the election held in 1882 for Ontario. I think it was mentioned in this House before by the Hon. Mr. Blake, when he was a member, that there was not a single charge and not a single election contest pending in the Province of Ontario owing to any misconduct or irregularity or illegal act on the part of a returning officer, where he was a sheriff or a registrar, but in every case complaints arose where he was an unofficial personage. Take the County of Bothwell, where we have had over and over again elections held by the registrar of the County of Kent, we never had any complaint with regard to the conduct of the returning officer in those elections, either from the candidate on the one side or the other; but when in 1882 the election was held by a party named who had no official position, what was the result? Why, two of the polling divisions were thrown aside because they gave me a majority, and the candidate who polled the minority of votes was returned, thus rendering a legal contest necessary in order that I might obtain the seat to which the majority of the electors had appointed me. And I could name other constituencies where exactly the same result followed. And I say this, that unless you have an official or some guarantee of property or otherwise, you are not likely to have freedom from those mistakes and from all the vexation, worry and expense incident to them under such a provision of law as that which now exists. I admit that if officials, such as the county judge, sheriff and warden, were to meet and appoint a returning officer for an electoral division, and such officer was required either to give security or to possess a certain amount of real estate, that would be an immense improvement, if you are not willing to take the provincial officials; but no matter what the system, the appointments ought to be independent of the Government for the time being, whether the Government be composed of hon. gentlemen who are of our political way of thinking or of that of hon. gentlemen opposite. At all events, experience has shown in every province of the Dominion that the system which now exists, administered by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, is one which is in the highest degree unsatisfactory. The Government make the appointments, but do they know the men they appoint? Do they know their character or standing or anything with regard to them. Not at all. I take my own county and the election held in February last. Who was returning officer then? Why, a gentleman who had been caretaker of the central committee rooms of the Conservative candidate in 1887, who had not been paid for his services and was dissatisfied, and who was appointed by the Government to the office merely to compensate him for services he had rendered before and for which he had not been paid. That man had not a dollar; he was not worth any-

thing; he would not have taken the position and accepted compensation for the services of 1887, if he had been a man of property and standing. I do not complain of any irregularity of action, but I say that after the election was over he did not return me as the law required. He kept back the writ and made no return for a fortnight after the law required him to make it. The law provides redress; it makes him amenable. But what is the good of a judgment against a man who has not a copper. And there are, I dare say, a score of other cases. I do not say that the Government knew anything about the standing or position of this man, but I say they are at the mercy of their candidate, whoever he may be, in every constituency; and great dissatisfaction will arise and great wrong will be done in many cases, so long as the law remains as it is. It is in the nature of things impossible that in a country extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the Administration can know the character or the standing or anything of the man recommended for appointments of this sort, and I say some other method of appointment is required because these appointments are all in the interests of hon. gentlemen opposite. They are not appointments which ought to be in the interests of hon. gentlemen on either side. The holding of an election is a matter in the public interest. It is the exercise of supreme authority in the state by the parties in whom, in the last resort, it is vested, and the regulation of the appointment of returning officers ought to be such as to satisfy their wishes, and promote their interests and maintain their rights, and this cannot be done so long as the law remains what it is. We have not pressed for amendment because we felt assured the whole subject would be taken up and dealt with at another session of Parliament. I think there is great force in the observation which my hon. friend has made, as long as you retain the present system, as long as you have this unusual method of appointment, while nominally the appointment is with the Crown practically it is with the Government candidate in every constituency no matter who he may be. He may be a worthy or a worthless man; he may be an eminently fair man, competent to exercise this trust, or may be utterly unfit to have such a great trust placed in his hands; and once you continue that system, unusual means should be taken to guard the public interest; and if my hon. friend's amendment goes a long way, it is because there is an extreme condition of things arising out of the law as it is, which ought to be met by extreme remedies.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the remarks which have been just made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat had been made by the hon. mover of the amendment, we might have avoided all this discussion, a part of which has gone somewhat out of the record. The Government have admitted that there must be something done, and expressed their intention to try and render the position of returning officer less liable of being suspected to be at the mercy of party feeling and party exigencies. In doing this, in making them responsible either by asking them to give security or appointing them as permanent officers, or by any other means which may be devised, the Government has promised this Parliament they will consider between this and the next session. So we all agree on one thing, that these officers should have their responsibility made more definite, although the instances of defects or of wrong-doing are certainly very few if we judge from the discussion which we have had to-day. We have heard one case which has been brought before the House with great force, but that was the case of a provincial officer, a registrar. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) brought that before the House in the beginning of the session, and the returning officer of whom he complained was the registrar. I am told that, if the Premier of Quebec had not been away in Europe being decorated, and if his friends in Quebec had not been working for profits as he was working for honours, that official would not have been the registrar at this moment. My hon. friends opposite should know that, during the last elections, three officials of the Local Government refused to be appointed returning officers, and one of them stated that, if they did their duty and did not appoint every deputy returning officer and every clerk who would be imposed upon them by the party managers of Quebec clique, they would be dismissed. We were told that if the returning officers did not suit the wishes of the Government of Quebec, they would either be dismissed or would have a joint registrar or a joint sheriff appointed, which happened before in two cases. I agree with my hon. friends on the other side that the returning officers should be men above suspicion in every way. My hon. friend has just quoted the case of Mr. Baird, and said that if the returning officer had been a public officer, we would not have seen the return of a man simply because the deposit of his opponent had been made by the candidate himself instead of by his agent. This was only a legal interpretation. I do not say it was correct. I do not think I voted on that question. But it was a question of law, it was a question of interpreting a statute, and could it not have been interpreted by a registrar, or a sheriff, or an official of the Government as it was by the returning officer in that electoral division? A precedent has been quoted. We know that, in 1878, when Mr. Valois was appointed returning officer in Jacques Cartier, there were two registrars for that district, Mr. Filiatreault and Mr. Sicotte. The Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) appointed one of the two registrars but left the other out. Why did they not appoint the two? Mr. Filiatreault was appointed for the City of Montreal, but Mr. Sicotte was left out, and why? Probably because he was not of their own political creed. I do not blame them. I do not say they were right or wrong, but this rule applies on both sides, and fault cannot be found and the principle cannot be condemned when we have such precedents as that. I had the unpleasant duty of occupying the position of Crown prosecutor when the deputy returning officer, Mr. Forget, a young lawyer, and Mr. Christin, the agent of the Liberal candidate, performed a certain operation in regard to ballot boxes, though I am ready to declare, without the knowledge of the member elected, the Hon. Mr. Laflamme. These were the parties who were found guilty. In regard to my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), it was my unpleasant duty—and it was unpleasant to me for more than one reason, though not for the one which the hon. gentleman said—to go to his county. The hon.

gentleman said I appointed the returning officer. I recommended a good and respectable man, and he was appointed. After his name had been given to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, I had nothing more to do with it. That returning officer at a late hour stated that he would become a candidate.

Mr. SCRIVER. Mr. Sanders received his papers one day and returned them the next day. I have his word for that.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend is not properly informed on that subject. This case came before me early in the session, and it was not the fault of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, or the fault of the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. It was the fault of the system

Mr. CHAPLEAU. But any public officer might have said the same thing, that he would be a candidate. The registrar or the sheriff might be a candidate. My hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) is an old friend of twenty years, and in this House and elsewhere we have always been friends. It was very unpleasant for me to have to go to his county. My hon. friend has recounted amusing scenes in the election. I must say that the result was not amusing to us, but the election was not at all amusing to him either. I know my hon. friend made a promise to his electors: he promised to vote against unlimited reciprocity and discrimination against England; but from the manner he has spoken and voted since he returned to this House, I do not think he has done his best to redeem his pledges made on the day when danger was near him. We have seen him giving a vote in this House, in a sense, exactly contrary to the promise which he made to his electors. Perhaps I am out of order in saying so, or in referring to that election, but I must say that I was surprised at the vote he has given in this House. However, coming back to the question in debate, I think the system can be amended, and as an amendment has been promised, I think the hon. gentleman from North Victoria need not press his proposition upon the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As to whether my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) has or has not redeemed his pledges to the electors, I think he is the best judge, and those who know my friend's upright and consistent conduct for many long years in this House, will not hesitate to believe with me that whatever my hon. friend has stated to his electors, that my hon. friend will be found to have redeemed in this House. However, I am not anxious to enter into the question of the election in Huntingdon. That, as the hon Secretary of State has correctly stated, is a little out of order on the present occasion. But I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Justice in particular to the fact that he admits himself, with very ample reason, that the present mode of appointing returning officers is eminently an unsatisfactory one. I want to call the attention of the House, also, to the arguments that have been adduced by some hon. gentlemen opposite, notably, I think, by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood). His argument is this: The old system under which this matter was entrusted to permanent officials, sheriffs, registrars and the like, is objectionable. Why? Because those officials may possibly be partisans: therefore, by way of improvement he appears to prefer a system under which these officers must be partisans in the strictest and straightest term. They must be appointed on the recommendation of the ministerial candidate of the day. They are, it is well known, appointed by him, not with reference to their experience, not with reference to their standing in the county, not with reference to their general capacity, but for the strictest party reason, and because they have power to appoint a number of minor officials by whose hands, perhaps, more than by those of the returning officers, any improper results that may occur in the course of the election can be manipulated. So that in order to avoid a possible contingency, my hon. friend from Brockville and those like him desire, as I say, to have unmistakably partisan returning officers appointed. I am glad to hear from the Secretary of State, and also, in a certain degree, from the Minister of Justice, that the Government are willing, having seen numerous examples of the evil effects of this system, to do what they can to improve it. Now, the hon. member for Brockville asked, what other plan could be adopted. The Minister of Justice, I think, asked for suggestions on that head, too. Well, Sir, I am going to make a suggestion to him, applicable certainly to my own province, and I think applicable to the most of the provinces of this Dominion. I have no doubt whatever that the people of Canada, or at least the people of Ontario, would be well content that neither political party should appoint these returning officers, but that they should be appointed by a board composed of one official nominated by the Dominion Government, of one official nominated by the Local Government, and of one official nominated by the people, and it can be done very easily. The Government of the day appoint the county judges in each case. The Local Governments appoint the sheriffs in each case, the people of each county appoint the warden: and I will venture to say that in Ontario at large a returning officer appointed by such a board as that, would command the confidence of the country in a very much greater degree than do the present nominees of the Government of the day, whoever that Government may be. For my part, I would be perfectly content that the nominee of such a board should be appointed returning officer. In England, if I remember right, the Government of the day do not attempt to appoint returning officers. Hon. gentlemen opposite are always desirous of imitating English precedents. There, if my recollection serves, the sheriff of the county, who is a very different official from our own, who is a man of weight and position in the county, who is usually a man of large estate in the county is, I think, *ex officio* returning officer: but, where the county is sub-divided, as is usually the case, into numerous constituencies, I think that the mayor, an officer elected by the people, is, *ex officio*, returning officer. Now, it is not convenient for us, it would not be practicable for us, in our different circumstances, to adopt the English custom, but we might adopt the principle underlying it; and if the Minister be desirous, and if his friends be desirous, of obtaining an impartial official in whom the people will have confidence, I venture to think, if that be their object, they could find it easily enough, so far as my province is concerned, and I think so far as the other provinces are con-

cerned, by taking such a board as that, and allowing them to nominate the returning officer. However, I make that suggestion for the consideration of the Minister. With respect to the system itself, I must say that the instances that have been given by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Hargraft) and by my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin), and some facts that might be quoted with respect to some other constituencies in Ontario, go to show in the clearest manner that these returning officers are, to say the very least of it, extremely careless on many occasions in the performance of their important duties. It is within my own knowledge that they have very frequently appointed most improper persons to act as deputies in many counties, and it is within my own knowledge that they have shown themselves excessively careless in the custody of the ballot boxes, and if much more numerous frauds, and much grosser frauds, than have been narrated on the floor of this House in the course of this discussion, have not been committed, it was not by reason of any care or anxiety displayed by these returning officers to protect the interest of the public which had been committed to their charge. With respect to that famous case to which my hon. friend the Secretary of State alluded, the case of Mr. Baird, in Queen's, N. B., who was the returning officer who made that extraordinary finding? Why, Sir, it was proven here that he was a man who, but a few weeks before, had been secretary of the Conservative Association; the most pronounced partisan that could be found in the county was entrusted with this judicial office, on the recommendation of the man whom, in defiance of the verdict of the people, he returned to Parliament. Sir, it is just such abuses as that that we desire to put a stop to, it is just such acts as that of which we complain, it is just such instances of negligence and carelessness as these alluded to just now that we desire to avoid in the future.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. I am not at all surprised at the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite on this question. As a new member of this House, I have come to the conclusion that nothing will satisfy those hon. gentlemen but a law to legislate them into power. I do hope and believe that the representatives of the people in this House will not put on the Statute-book of this country a law which will enable those hon. gentlemen to get control of this fair Dominion. I would not have spoken on this occasion were it not for one remark that dropped from the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), who, looking across the floor at me, stated that he had proof, of his own knowledge, of injustice having been done by incompetent officials. I want to tell the hon. gentleman this——

Mr. BARRON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. I have taken down what the hon. gentleman said. I thought the hon. gentleman alluded to South Victoria, from the way he looked across at me. I want to say this, that my opponent in South Victoria, and his lawyer, and myself and my lawyer and agent, and the returning officer, when the official return was made, all shook hands, and it was said that it was as pure an election as was ever held in South Victoria or any other riding. That remark fell from the lips of my opponent and from his agent also. Nevertheless, they demanded a recount, and through some informality in regard to the deposit, the judge, who was a Reformer and as competent a man as was in the county——

Mr. LANDERKIN. As all Reformers are.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN—I would trust him more than you, I would trust him in any capacity of life—he did not allow a recount. That did not satisfy the candidate and his friends. They went to a protest, and we shall see what we shall see after the protest.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The debate has naturally divided itself into two parts: one on the justice or injustice of the system which permits partisan returning officers to be appointed, and the other more immediately connected with the amendment proposed to the House. On the first part of the debate I am not going to make any lengthy observations, because I am glad to say that, with one or two unfortunate exceptions, the Government have not introduced the vicious system of appointing partisan returning officers into the Maritime Provinces. As a rule, the sheriffs have been appointed returning officers, with one or two unfortunate exceptions that have occurred, and evil results have almost always followed the departure from this wholesome rule. I regret that the Secretary of State seems to have such want of appreciation of the circumstances of the Queen's County case. The hon. gentleman treated it rather lightly, as if there had simply been an error of judgment on the part of the returning officer. But the hon. gentleman must have forgotten all the facts connected with the case. The action of the returning officer was an outrage on all law. In the opinion of hon. members on both sides of the House it was an outrage on all decency. That partisan returning officer did not exercise his judgment as it were upon a point of law, but he deliberately returned the candidate having the minority vote. He accepted the candidature of the majority candidate, Mr. King; he received his money; he had the election held, all the formalities were complied with, and it was not until he found Mr. King had a majority of over 60 votes that he deliberately turned round and returned the minority candidate. There was no excuse, and there can be no excuse for that offence. It was an outrageous violation of law, of duty, of the wishes of the people, and if it was not condemned as it should have been in this House afterwards, it was an unfortunate event for the country. I wish to call the attention of the House for a moment to the amendment which the hon. gentleman asks the House to adopt in case we continue the present iniquitous system. He says truly that it is the interest of every hon. gentleman that the returning officers and the deputy returning officers who are charged with the ballot boxes should be made responsible for their safe-keeping. We have attempted to make them responsible by general language, in which we say they shall be responsible. He attempts to ensure that responsibility. What does he propose? The hon. gentleman asks the House to enact that in those cases where it is proved that ballot boxes have come into the legal possession and custody of the officers, and while they are in their legitimate custody and possession, they are robbed or tampered with, in that case the returning officer or the deputy returning officer in

whose possession the ballot boxes are when this occurs shall be held responsible to satisfy the court that when it did occur it was not with his assistance or connivance. Is that anything unreasonable? The onus to show that tampering occurred rests on the man who makes the charge. The onus of showing it occurred when the boxes were in the custody of the officer rests on the man who makes the charge. All my hon. friend asks is this, that when it is shown that the boxes were in the custody of the officer and that the tampering occurred while in his custody, he must satisfy the court that the action was done without his connivance or assistance. What less can hon. gentlemen ask? No honest officer would be placed in a false position if this amendment were carried. He is bound to take care that the boxes are not opened or accessible to thieves or thugs who go round tampering with ballot boxes; if he is so neglectful in his official conduct as to let the ballot boxes be accessible to those people, he should be held responsible. We know very well that it is absolutely impossible to bring forward positive evidence that the returning officer was a party to that proceeding, but you can bring against him cogent and sufficient evidence to call on him for a reply, and if he has no reply to make he will be held responsible for the outrage. Why should the amendment meet with any opposition? It should be the desire of everyone to punish those people who tamper with the ballot boxes, and to place them in the custody of officers who would know and feel that they were responsible for their safe custody, and if such an officer permitted them to be tampered with, there would be some means by which he could be punished.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I would not detain the House at this hour by making any remarks in regard to the Bill of the Minister of Justice, had the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) not thrown down a challenge to hon. members sitting on this side of the House to produce a case since Confederation of an official in the employ of the Ontario Government conducting an election having been guilty of corrupt practice. I am going to give an instance of that kind. But before I do so, let me offer a few remarks on the appointment of returning officers generally. As a rule returning officers are chosen, as I understand it, from respectable members of the community. They are gentlemen of position and station in the places where they reside. We can only speak from personal experience in matters of this kind, and I must say that my experience has been that the returning officers chosen for the Dominion election in the district that I have the honour to represent have been men of position, standing and means. On the other hand, we are asked, or the suggestion is made, to adopt another course, to adopt the course followed in Ontario, to take the registrars or sheriffs as returning officers in Dominion elections. I will point out as briefly as possible the objections to that course being followed. In the first place, I desire to consider from what class these officials are recruited. Are they recruited from the ranks of independent men of means in the Province of Ontario? No; they are recruited from members of the local House, from unsuccessful candidates for the legislature, or from broken-down political hacks who require positions; and into the hands of these men we are asked to place the duties of returning officers. In the district I have the honour to represent, we have not one, not two, but no less than three sheriffs: not one, two, or three registrars, but no less than four of them. Who would you pick out as returning officer in that district?

Mr. McMULLEN. The best of them.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). With the exception of one of them, they do not fulfil the conditions required by hon. gentlemen opposite: that is to say, they are not men of means and substance, and consequently they do not fulfil the conditions required on that side of the House. In the election of 1883 the registrar of a district was employed by the Ontario Government and after the election was over he was prosecuted in the courts of Ontario for corrupt practices and fined $1,000 for his guilt. That fine was never paid. He was afterwards whitewashed by the Government that appointed him and the evidence is on record that the leader of that Government drew the clause with his own hand that whitewashed that very official. Here we have the case of one of the officials of the Ontario Government convicted of corrupt practices. Would you want to place in his hands the duties of returning officer? Another returning officer in a local election, to my own knowledge, was engaged in distributing campaign literature while performing the other duties pertinent to the office of returning officer in that district. Is that a partisan returning officer or is he not. Now, Sir, I have in my mind another official of the Ontario Government, whom the gentlemen on the other side of the House would like to make a returning officer in the constituency in which he belongs. The constituency is East Northumberland, and the official is Mr. Mallory, the registrar of the county. He probably had nothing better to do, and he hied himself away to the district of Algoma to stump the county in the interest of the Grit candidate at the last election. I was not sorry to see Mr. Mallory there; on the contrary, I would be glad to have him come back again, because the peculiar fact was, that every place Mr. Mallory spoke in I got a majority, so that I have no reason to complain. In the face of these evidences before the House, would it be right for the present Government to take out of their own hands—because there is no doubt about it, the appointment of returning officers is now in the hands of the Government, and through the Government in the hands of the supporters of the Government—would it be fair to take that power out of their own hands and to place it in the hands of violent political partisans? I have not known yet a returning officer in the Federal elections who has been a violent political partisan. I may tell you, Sir, that in Algoma, with the exception of voting, I never knew a returning officer appointed by the Dominion Government, take any interest in a local election unless to poll his vote. Now, that cannot be called a partisan act on the part of the returning officer, but if you take the officials, such as are suggested by the opposite side of the House, you would undoubtedly get the most violent political partisans, because they only get their positions through their partisanship. Should the position be taken out of the hands of an ordinary partisan—because every man must have his feelings and his leanings towards one or the other of the two great political parties of this country—and given to the most

violent partisans that exists in the Province of Ontario to-day?

Mr. McMULLEN. I had no intention of taking part in this discussion had it not been for the remarks which have fallen from the hon. gentleman who his just taken his seat. In the section of the county to which I belong, the returning officer for many years was the registrar of the county. He was not appointed by the present Ontario Government, but by the Sandfield Macdonald Government many years ago. He was a very decent, respectable man. He discharged the duties of returning officer for many years up to and including the general elections of 1882, but after that he was never permitted to discharge the duties again simply because he would not consent to do an irregular act which was suggested to him by the candidate who ran in opposition to me. He was told distinctly then that he would not be appointed returning officer, and he never was since. As far as I am personally concerned I have no complaints to make against the returning officers I have had to deal with. I am glad to say that the returning officer in my county in the last election, is a decent, respectable man, so far as I know; a strong partisan no doubt, but he discharged the duties of returning officer fairly well. In reference to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) I must say that I cannot understand how he could have fallen upon such an unprincipled lot of Ontario officials as he says. He has stated that out of the several officials in the district he belongs to, there is not a man except one that he would be willing to entrust with the duties of returning officer.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I did not say that. I said that out of seven officials, three sheriffs and four registrars, there is but one that I know of who would comply with the conditions required on the opposite side of the House, that is, to be a man of means and substance.

Mr. McMULLEN. That certainly is one condition, but the great condition we should look to is a man of uprightness and honesty, and a man who has a disposition to discharge the duties faithfully and efficiently. It is highly desirable that we should not have a repetition in this country of the acts that have been recited before this House as having taken place in the constituencies of this Dominion during this last election. The transactions connected with the South Grey election are a matter of very sincere regret. The experience of my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) who had to fight through the difficulties that he had had to contend with to get his seat that was honestly won at the polls, is an experience that hon. gentlemen opposite would not like to pass through, nor would I like to see any of them obliged to pass through it. In the provincial elections held in the Province of Ontario there cannot be a single case cited where any such acts as those which took place in South Grey and Northumberland, and in the County of Queen's, N.B., ever were perpetrated in the Province of Ontario by officials who discharged the duties of returning officers. I am pleased to learn that although the Minister of Justice, if not prepared at this very late stage of the session to accept the suggestion now made in reference to returning officers, that he, at least, will take the matter up at no distant date, and provide that men will be appointed who will faithfully, and patiently, and creditably discharge these duties. While we may across the floor of this House and on public platforms discuss the trade question, and other questions of vital importance to this country, at least every member of this House should feel that principle of honesty between each contending party to secure the selection of returning officers who will faithfully, and efficiently, and honourably discharge their duties, and that the registered will of the people should not be thwarted by an unscrupulous, imprudent and dishonest returning officer, who is prepared to submit to the dictates of any man and to do wrong in the discharge of the duties that devolve upon him. I do hope that the law will be placed in such a position, that whenever in future we appeal to our constituents their will shall be recorded honestly and fairly, and not interfered with by partisans who are so unscrupulous as to lend themselves to the abominable and disgraceful acts that have been perpetrated in some constituencies during the last election.

Mr. MURRAY. The hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) has cast some reflections on Ontario officials. I happened to be an Ontario Government official for some three or four weeks myself, and I can assure you that when I hear gentlemen make reflections on the Ontario officials I feel rather sensitive on that point. However, apart from this, Mr. Speaker, I think it is the duty of members on both sides of the House to consider this very important question as to the proper mode of appointing returning officers. If the House is satisfied that the change that has been made is an improvement, that is, leaving in the hands of the Government of the country, whether it be Liberal or Conservative, the power of appointing their own returning officers instead of allowing sheriffs and registrars to act as such—if this House is satisfied that that is an improvement, I can assure you I am not satisfied. The idea of allowing the candidate of the party in power to name the returning officer, because that is virtually what it is, perhaps some strong partisan, such as the president of the Conservative association or the Reform association, as the case may be, instead of the registrar or sheriff, appears to me to be absurd. It is well known that the sheriffs and registrars appointed by the Provincial Governments are permanent officers, generally holding their positions during lifetime, unless some grave charge of dereliction of duty is made against them, which does not often happen; and I believe there are a great many sheriffs and registrars throughout the Dominion, appointed at Confederation, who are just as liable to be in sympathy with the Conservative party as the Liberal party. There has seldom been anything charged against the sheriffs or registrars of this country since Confederation in regard to the proper discharge of their duties. My hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) has made reference to some registrar who did not discharge his duties. I do not remember the particulars; but suppose there was one case of a sheriff or registrar failing to properly discharge his duties, under the present system there is likely to be and has been a deal more wrong-doing. I am glad to see that the Government are disposed to make some change in this matter. They suggest that the position of returning officer should be made permanent, perhaps that would be an improvement;

but the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) suggested a very good mode of appointment, that is, vesting it in the Dominion Government the Provincial Government and the warden of the county. The warden of the county himself might be a good man for the position. I would take chances as to his political leanings. At all events, the present system I entirely disapprove of.

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to say one or two words before this discussion closes, and I am induced to do so by the challenge thrown out by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and repeated by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), notwithstanding the fact that the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) had given one of the most flagrant cases of dereliction of duty, on the part of a returning officer who was an Ontario official, that ever occurred in the country. So flagrant was his conduct that the Local Legislature had to pass a Bill to relieve him of the penalties to which he had rendered himself liable. The hon. member for Bothwell has evidently forgotten a case that occurred in the county from which the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Murray) comes. No doubt he will remember that in 1874 the registrar of that county actually took upon himself the responsibility of deciding whether the parties who signed the requisition bringing a candidate into the field were legally entitled to sign it or not, and that he held in his hands the requisition to so late a period that it was impossible to put in another requisition—even supposing he had the power to do what he did—and returned the Reform candidate, who afterwards sat in this House, without holding an election at all. That was a case in which the returning officer being an Ontario official assumed a responsibility that has never been equalled by any other returning officer in any part of this Dominion. True, the courts set aside the return and declared the election null. But was that registrar punished either by the Local Legislature or by the Government of which my hon. friend afterwards became a member?

Mr. MURRAY. Do you refer to North Renfrew?

Mr. BOWELL. No; I refer to South Renfrew, which is a part of the county in which the hon. gentleman lives. I must say that I agree largely with the remarks of the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies). I care not what system you adopt, you will occasionally find officials who do not perform their duties strictly in accordance with the law, who are such strong partisans that they allow their political feelings to run away with their better judgment. I was pleased to hear the hon. gentleman say that in the Maritime Provinces the appointments made by the Government have been of such a character during the 12 or 13 years that they have been in office, that only one or two cases of dereliction of duty have been pointed out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They were sheriffs.

Mr. BOWELL. In the county I represent, since I have had anything to do with it, I have recommended the registrar, who was appointed by the Reform Administration, as returning officer until the subsequent election; and my reason for not doing it then was this, that though while left to himself he performed his duty honestly and faithfully, yet the Ontario Government officials, and those who assumed to have the power went and threatened him with dismissal from office if he did not appoint just such deputy returning officers as they thought he should appoint. Though I had never had occasion to find fault with him, knowing that he had in the past, when left to himself, appointed deputy returning officers from both parties, and had always selected good and reliable men; yet when I found that the Ontario officials were using the power they had with the Government which they supported to compel him to do that which he otherwise would not have done, I thought it was quite time to use whatever influence I had in recommending some one else for the position. If those people would do that in the case of an officer appointed under the Dominion Government, how much further would they go if he were made the returning officer by law?

Mr. MURRAY. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BOWELL. I need only refer to the case of the returning officer for East Hastings at the late local election, in which the member whom the returning officer tried to deprive of his seat brought the matter before the Legislature upon his own responsibility as a member of the House, and in which the party of hon. gentlemen opposite defended that returning officer by declaring by their votes that no investigation should take place.

Mr. MURRAY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? He says that the Ontario Government interfered with the registrar in his county. Has he any proof of that?

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say so. What I said was that the partisans of the Ontario Government interfered with the returning officer and threatened, after they had discussed the matter in the Reform Association, to have him dismissed if he did not act according to their wishes and appoint such deputy returning officers as they suggested.

Mr. BARRON. What proof have you of that statement?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in the habit of stating what I am not prepared to substantiate when necessary, whatever may be the course of the hon. member for North Victoria in discussing this or other questions. Neither do I desire to be judged by his own standard when I make a statement on my own responsibility in this House. Unless some one is prepared to deny it, the statement of any member made in this House should be taken without the insulting remarks which are constantly thrown across the floor by members of the character of the hon. member for North Victoria.

Mr. BARRON. When the hon. gentleman says partisans, he should give names. I challenge the hon. gentleman to give——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not particular what questions the hon. gentleman asks, or what challenges he throws out. We can accept them, as we are in the habit of accepting the insults constantly thrown across the floor by gentlemen opposite. I think I have kept myself strictly within the bounds of the question before the House. I have answered the challenge thrown down by the hon. gentleman

as to the acts of registrars and other officials in the Province of Ontario; and, having done that, I should not have spoken further had not hon. gentlemen opposite indignantly protested that all their officials are pure. I am not prepared to say that they all are not, or that a large number of them would not do their duty; but while partisanship exists to the extent it does in the Local Legislatures, and while the officials are appointed in the manner they are by the different Local Governments, I contend that the power should be vested in the Government of the day of appointing as returning officers such men as they think fit, who are not only capable, but responsible for the duties they perform.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice what the hon. Minister of Customs has said with reference to irregularities that occurred in the County of Hastings. I am not surprised at irregularities having occurred there; but at all events, whatever Government might have been holding the election at that time, they did not make their returning officer return the candidate who had the minority of votes and who was on their side of politics. The candidate who was on the same side of politics as the Minister of Customs was returned by the returning officer, whether any irregularities occurred there or not; but we have had instances under the operation of this law where the candidates who had the minority of votes were returned by the returning officer. Speaking of the Ontario officials in the riding I have the honour to represent, two or three of them are the most violent opponents I have in the riding. They have been there a good many years and I have not complained of them, as I believe every man has a right to exercise his franchise as he deems best. With regard to the returning officers appointed under the present system, if the Minister of Justice desires to improve this law, he has got to begin with the declarations. Whatever appearance of desire to improve the law he may show, whatever willingness he may evince to have an honest election, if he allows the declarations to run two weeks, that will frustrate every good he appears desirous to do, because it is during that time the villainy is perpetrated. With regard to the returning officer in my case, I do not believe he was as bad as he was weak. He yielded to the importunities of those who were opposed to me, and after he made the declaration he left the riding. The ballot boxes then, I presume, were in charge of the election clerk, and after the recount the election clerk left the riding and the country too. He went to the United States. That is where a good many of our Tory officials have been obliged to go lately. Change of air and scene he thought would improve him. I understand he came back once since, not to the town in which he formerly lived, but met his friends at a distance of fifteen miles from it. If the Minister of Justice desires to improve this law, he must take these matters into consideration and look into the character of the men appointed; and when it is shown that returning officers have committed irregularities and deputy returning officers as well in former elections and were reappointed, that is clear evidence that a change is required. There has never been an instance I know of in all the irregularities that have been committed in Queen's and other counties where the officers have been rebuked by the Government. There was an officer in this House who committed grave irregularities, who was dishonest in his conduct, and unjust to the electorate. Was he reprimanded? No. He was removed to another office and his salary increased some $500 per year. That is the way in which these men are rewarded: and they consequently are convinced that if they will act dishonestly and unjustly, they will probably share the benefits of their action by receiving an increase in salary as in the case of the official I refer to. As long as the appointments of returning officers and deputy returning officers are controlled by the party, they are apt to have a partisan bias. No doubt if the Minister of Justice desired it, he could appoint honest men among his supporters, because many of them are honest men, and that would be a better way than the one the Government have taken of appointing men who have shown they are willing that the greatest laxity should prevail in the administration of elections.

Amendment negatived on division.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Before the Bill is read a third time, I want to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to a section which I think requires a slight amendment.

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

After Recess.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I call the attention of the Minister of Justice to an amendment which I thought ought to be made to the Bill. The 63rd section of the Act has been amended by the Bill now under debate, and it is provided that, in the case of the loss of the ballot boxes, the returning officer shall proceed to ascertain in the best way he can the votes given for the respective candidates by taking evidence and otherwise, and, after coming to a conclusion, he shall report how many votes were given for each candidate. The Act did not provide for any mode of reviewing that determination if it was wrong, and I was suggesting that the same provision for review should be made in this case as in the case of the summing up of the votes. I, therefore, move that the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole House with instructions that they have power to amend the same by adding the following as section 64:—

The judge shall also, if necessary or required, review the decision of the returning officer in respect of the number of votes given for a candidate at any polling place where the ballot box used was not forthcoming when he made his decision, or when the proper certificates or papers were not found therein: and for the purpose of arriving at the facts he shall have all the powers of a returning officer in regard to the attendance and examination of witnesses.

That is not exactly what I proposed, but I understand the Minister of Justice agrees to this.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will not oppose the amendment, because I think it is a useful one.

Mr. MULOCK. I have called the attention of the Minister to section 3 of the Bill and suggested an amendment so that the agents of candidates might have seals affixed to the envelopes containing the ballots, and this idea has been partially adopted in this clause, but I observe that the agent of the candidate is only allowed to write his initials. I was not present when the discussion on that clause

took place, but I will ask why the agent should not be allowed to write his full name across the envelope, because, if the object is to prevent fraud or to prevent some other envelope being substituted, the mere initials might not be sufficient for the purpose of identification. I think an individual would be better able to identify his signature than his initials. I, therefore, suggest that he should be allowed to write his name across the flap. An ordinary agent in the country would not be likely to identify his initials at all. There would be only a couple of letters to swear to instead of his whole signature.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would just ask the attention of the Minister of Justice to this point, whether the words "shall have the power of review" and so on, are the most proper expressions to use as to the powers that are given to the county judge to recount. His right to recount can hardly be considered a review of the proceedings of the returning officer, but rather an independent proceeding which altogether supersedes that of the returning officer. I would suggest the phraseology "and in case a recount is demanded, the judge to whom aplication is made shall have a like power, and it shall be his duty to send for the deputy returning officer, clerk or agents" and so forth.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand the effect of the right of review, as distinct from the right of appeal, to be a right to enquire into the whole matter over again, and to arrive at a different result without being bound in any way by the evidence in the first instance, and it was in that view that I proposed to adopt the word "review."

Bill reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the Bill be now read the third time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will recollect that when we were in Committee on this Bill, I called special attention to the sections which provide that the returning officer may grant certificates to agents to go into other districts than those in which the agents are entitled to vote, and that is, no doubt, a necessary provision. The second section of the Bill now before us provides that the returning officer shall not grant certificates to more than two such agents, and that such agents, when they vote or offer themselves to vote, at a place where they are not registered as voters, shall take an oath which is set out in the statute. When we were in Committee before, I suggested to the hon. gentleman—and if the suggestion meets with his approval I would like to have the Bill amended in that regard—that the oath be amended, and that they be compelled to swear that they are registered on a list in the district. Now, the oath, as it stands, merely declares that "I, A. B., do swear that I am actually entitled to vote for a member of the House of Commons for this electoral district at the present election." I propose that these words be added:

And that my name is duly registered on the list of voters for sub-division No. of this district.

The reason of that will be apparent. Supposing two men are appointed. They apply to the revising officer, and they are appointed for polling district No. 10. They go to No. 10 and produce the sheriff's certificate. Well, they are not on No. 10. They say: "We want to vote, because we have got the certificates." Nobody knows whether they are on the list at all, and if they take a false oath there will be great difficulty in prosecuting for perjury because there is no means of determining whether they are on the list. I think that where a man claims to vote in a sub-division where he is not recorded, there is no harm in asking him to declare in his oath that he is recorded in some particular sub-division of the county. There can be no difficulty about it and no wrong in it. If a man taken from sub-division 1 and put in sub-division 4 presented a certificate asking to vote, he should not only be obliged to swear that he had a vote in the county, but that he had so because he was registered in sub-division 1 or whatever the number might be. I wish to make the affidavit as plain as possible in order that we might have some guarantee that those men who vote outside the sub-division in which they are entitled to vote shall have their right to vote in some degree tested, and that if they improperly take an oath they may be looked after afterwards. In a constituency of 60 or 70 polling places such as I represent, the importance of this provision is obvious. No less than 200 or 300 people might vote in a district where they were not registered and those appointed to watch would have no means of judging whether they were voters or not. If they are allowed simply to swear that they are entitled to vote in the county without saying where they are registered, it is making the matter very loose and not giving those opportunities for watching voters that should be given.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The returning officer has to be satisfied that the person whom he may transfer has the right to vote in the district from which he asks to be transferred, and certifies accordingly. I thought, when the matter of the oath came up, perhaps the better way to regulate the matter would be, and I actually proposed it, that the voter should swear he was entitled to vote in district so and so, filling in the number of the district in which his name appeared on the list. The proposition was very fully considered by the Committee, and this objection was made to my proposition that the list for the district where the name was originally inserted would not be in the polling booth where the person proposed to vote, and that there were no means of checking it. Finally, as a compromise, he took the old provision, declaring that he was entitled to vote, that he was a British subject, that he had not voted before, and had not received anything in the way of bribe. I think we must allow the section to stand as it is, although I still think the suggestion I made would have been the better one.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the Minister of Justice consent to make the declarations one week after the polling?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is a subject we have discussed very fully. The hon. gentleman will see the difficulty of doing it. The declaration will be made in almost every case within that time.

If not made, what is the result? We cannot provide that in such a case the declaration shall not be made hereafter, because, in such an event, we enable the returning officer, by postponing the declaration more than a week, to defeat the return of a candidate. We decided to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to make the time for petitioning date from polling day, and we made that a liberal time, I think 40 days, to cover all possible difficulty.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What provision is made in event of declaration being delayed two weeks? In my riding it was delayed 18 days.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There will still be 22 days to petition. Even during the whole of those 18 days it would be probably well known in the constituency which of the candidates was returned. The petition could be prepared for fyling. On full consideration of the question, both sides of the House agreed that the suggestion of the hon. member for South Oxford was the best possible solution of the difficulty.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending sub-section 2 of section 6, by striking out the words "two weeks," in the last line, and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "One week, except in the Electoral Districts of Algoma, Gaspé, and Ottawa, when the time may be extended if necessary to two weeks."

Amendment negatived on division.

Mr. MULOCK moved:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending section 3 by striking out the words "initialled with the initials," and substituting therefor the words "marked with the signatures," and by inserting between the words "do and cross" the following words: "by writing their signatures."

Amendment agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FOSTER presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1892, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 16th September, 1891.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the Message of the Governor General and the Supplementary Estimates contained therein be referred to the Committee on Supply.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 172) respecting frauds upon the Government.—(Sir John Thompson.)

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 169) further to amend the Act 52 Victoria, chapter 4, to authorize the granting of subsidies in lands to certain railway companies.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

THE SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS.

House proceeded to further consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 138) to amend chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes, intituled: "An Act respecting the Supreme and Exchequer Courts."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the proceedings of the 7th September hon. gentlemen will remember that I took up these amendments, and was proceeding with their consideration, and the House concurred in all the unimportant amendments; but we were stopped and adjourned the debate on the amendment which related to the appeals from the Court of Review in the Province of Quebec. The provisions which are inserted by the Senate with regard to an appeal from the Court of Review I understand to be these, in effect: A suitor in the Province of Quebec has a right to appeal to the Court of Review which consists of three judges of the Superior Court. If the judges are unanimous there is no appeal provided by the Legislature of the province, but there is a right of appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The amendment by the Senate provides that in such cases there shall be an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, and it further limits that appeal in this way: That that appeal shall no longer exist, and this provision shall no longer apply, if the Legislature of the province shall create an appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench in the province, which is the ordinary court of appeal in similar cases.

Mr. LAURIER. The amendment in itself is one to which the House ought not to give a very ready assent. First of all, I must say to the Minister of Justice, that although I am a Liberal of the Liberals I am very much of a Conservative when you have to deal with the constitutional laws of the country. The administration of justice is confined by the British North America Act to the provinces, and the House, I estimate, ought always to be very chary of substituting its own judgment for the judgment of the Legislature in matters which specially appertain to the domain of the Legislature, and such is the administration of justice. In the present instance, it is true, there is an appeal to the Privy Council in the cases referred to by the hon. gentleman; but this appeal has been granted by an Act of the Local Legislature passed about the year 1875 or 1876. At present, if a case is instituted in the superior courts, it is appealable either to the court sitting in review or to the Court of Queen's Bench, according to the option of the appellant. If he takes his case to the Court of Review, and the judgment of the first court is reversed, it may still be carried to the Court of Appeal; but if the judgment in the first instance is confirmed by the Court of Review; it is final so far as the province is concerned; but in such cases it has been enacted by the Local Legislature that though a further appeal is denied to the court of last resort in the province, it may be carried to the Privy

Council. Now, I think that this clause ought to be amended by providing that the same class of cases which are appealable from the Court of Review to the Privy Council should be made appealable to the Supreme Court. I would, therefore, move that the amendment made by the Senate be further amended by adding these words:

And which by the laws of the Province of Quebec are appealable to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

That is, to give an alternative appeal from the Court of Review to the Privy Council or to the Supreme Court. Such is the case now in regard to all appeals from the Court of Queen's Bench, in cases involving future rights or amounts over $2,500.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to accept the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Page 1, line 31,—leave out from "touching" to "provincial" in line 32.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) That seems to be rather an important amendment which the Senate have made. I confess I approach the discussion of these amendments under very great difficulties, owing to the condition in which they are brought before us under our rules. It is impossible to discuss properly a Bill with important amendments of this kind unless we have the Bill reprinted. The section it is proposed to amend reads as follows:--

"Important questions of law or fact touching the exercise of the power of disallowance of provincial legislation."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think it is a substantial amendment, but is intended to prevent misunderstanding. The Bill, as passed by the Senate, reads:

"Important questions of law or fact touching provincial legislation for the appellate jurisdiction."

The Bill, as passed by this House, reads:

"Touching the exercise of the power of disallowance of provincial legislation."

The meaning is the same. It is apparent to everybody that we cannot submit to the judiciary a question of policy as to disallowance; and the apprehension which led to the amendment of the Senate was that possibly the clause might be interpreted as conferring upon the Governor-in Council power to refer to the Supreme Court the question whether an Act ought to be disallowed or not. We intend the Act to be simply in conformity with the present law, namely, that we have the power to refer questions touching Provincial Legislation, relating to interpretation to that court, but not questions of policy. Otherwise the clause might seem to involve the right to exercise the prerogative with regard to disallowance.

Amendment agreed to.

4. Whenever the right to appeal is dependent upon the amount in dispute, such amount shall be understood to be be that demanded and not that recovered, if they are different.

Mr. LANGELIER. This is a most important departure from the present practice of the Supreme Court and the Privy Council, and I do not think it is a wise departure. No doubt the amendment is in accordance with the law in force in the Province of Quebec, according to which the right of appeal is determined by the amount demanded, and not by the amount involved when the appeal is taken out; but I know, as a matter of fact, that the judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, appeal side in the Province of Quebec, are all against the present law, and several of them last year suggested to me that it would be most important to have it amended. The result of the law, as it is in Quebec, and as it will be here under this amendment, is that if a man takes an action of damages for $10,000 and recovers only $100, still the defendant, whose interests are involved only to the extent of $100 under the judgment of the court and the costs of the action, will have the right to appeal to the Supreme Court because the original demand was for $10,000. This is most unwarrantable, as it may ruin the plaintiff. The rule in the Supreme Court and in the Privy Council is just the contrary. The right of appeal to these courts is determined by the amount involved when the appeal is taken out and not by the amount involved when the case was originally instituted. That is a very wise regulation, and I think it is highly undesirable that we should change it. I know that such has been the rule before the Supreme Court in connection with cases from the Province of Quebec. For four or five years after the Supreme Court was established, the rule was that the right of appeal was to be determined by the amount demanded and not by the amount involved when the appeal was taken out, but this provision has been left out. For the last four or five years the Supreme Court has adopted the same rule for the Province of Quebec as for the other provinces, and now the appeals to the Supreme Court are regulated by the amount involved and not by the amount demanded originally.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I speak with great diffidence in regard to any matter of procedure in the Province of Quebec, which differs so much from the other provinces, but I understood that the amendments proposed here were acceptable to the bar of that province, so far as the procedure relates to the appeal. I would like to ask the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Langelier) whether this amendment is not in accord with the law of the Province of Quebec on the subject.

Mr. LANGELIER. I stated that this is the law in the Province of Quebec as to the appeals to the Court of Queen's Bench, but two or three judges of the Court of Queen's Bench called my attention to the opportunity of amending that law and making our law in the Province of Quebec in reference to appeals the same as that in regard to appeals to the Supreme Court and the Privy Council. This is the cause of many futile appeals to the Court of Queen's Bench, and the same will apply, and with greater force, to appeals to the Supreme Court. A great many futile appeals will be taken in which very trifling amounts are involved. I do not complain that this is an injury to the Province of Quebec. On the contrary, this would make the law the same as that which exists in Quebec in regard to appeals to the Court of Queen's Bench.

Mr. LAURIER. It may well be that the view taken by my hon. friend is the right view, but I would put this to him, wherever the legislation here is in accordance with the law of the province, is it not safe to follow the principles adopted in the legislation of the province, and then there can

be no clashing or discontent. My hon. friend says his attention has been called by the judges to the extraordinary result sometimes of the legislation of the province. but when the province has not legislated on this subject, it is safer to adhere to the existing provincial legislation. Supposing it should be attempted here to override the legislation of the province, discontent would be created thereby. Therefore, so long as the Provincial Legislature has not chosen to speak on the subject, and to remedy the evil, if evil there be, the safest plan is for us to adhere strictly to the law of the province and the principles which are there admitted and understood, not only by the bench but by the Legislature itself. There is less danger in my opinion of creating discontent by taking that course than by adopting such legislation as has been suggested.

Mr. DAVIES. (P.E.I.) It seems to me that this section is wrongly worded. It should be "under this section" and not "under the next preceding section."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The difficulty is caused by this being numbered as a sub-section, while it ought to be an original section, and then the wording would be correct as applying to "the next preceding section." We will make this section 5.

Amendments concurred in.

LAND SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

House again resolved itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the granting of subsidies in land to the Manitoba South-Western Colonization Railway Company, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Mr. DEWDNEY. I promised the hon. gentleman yesterday that when this matter was brought up again in the House I would lay on the Table such information as I thought would be necessary in order to bear out the clause of the Order in Council which stated that the records show that the Government were bound to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to give them 6,400 acres of land per mile. I have got here all the Orders in Council and letters which I think will be sufficient to warrant that statement, and I now lay them on the Table.

Mr. LAURIER. That seems hardly what the hon. gentleman promised. He was to give us not only what he thought sufficient, but whatever he had in his department.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I told you yesterday that every document had been laid on the Table, within fifteen days of the commencement of the different sessions. I went through the fyles this morning, and as time allowed me I have taken out what I think is sufficient to give the House the information I promised yesterday. If it is not sufficient, I will bring down the whole of the original fyles and lay them on the Table.

Mr. MULOCK. I want to appeal to the Minister of Justice. When we were discussing this question yesterday the Minister asked what was desired. The Minister of Justice will remember that while several explanations were offered, at last we had the statement from the Minister of the Interior that the railway was entitled to this land as a matter of contract "as a matter of bargain," was the term used. At this stage the Minister of Justice enquired what information was required, and I stated, speaking for myself, that I desired to see whatever documents there were that created any obligation, legal or moral, on the part of Parliament to make this grant. The Minister of Justice assured the Committee that the request would be complied with, that a search would be made and information to that effect would be given to the Committee. I also understood that the Committee rose for the purpose of enabling it to get information before we would be called upon to pronounce on the question. The Minister of the Interior now states that this morning he examined the fyles in his department and made this discovery, and he now lays these papers on the Table of the House when we have no opportunity to examine them before discussing the proposition. I submit to the Minister of Justice whether it is reasonable we should be called on to consider the resolution before we have an opportunity to make a practical use of the information said to be in these documents. There are 100 members present, and how can they inform themselves as to what these documents prove at this stage of the proceedings. It will be but fair to defer the consideration of the resolution until to-morrow at any rate.

Committee rose and reported progress.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 147) further to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have been informed that for the Province of Ontario it is necessary there should be a provision respecting the disposal of election petitions. I move that section 8 be amended by inserting the following:—

It shall not in Ontario be necessary that the two judges before whom in any case the trial shall be conducted shall be the judges that have been assigned for the trial, but the Chief Justice of Ontario, the Chief Justice of Queen's Bench, the Chancellor and the Chief Justice of Common Pleas shall arrange in such manner as shall be provided by the rules of the Supreme Court of Judicature for that purpose for the rota of judges for the trial of such cases, and hearing of such applications.

Mr. MULOCK. I quite approve of the proposed amendment as far as it goes, and it may go as far as I think it ought to go. I would ask the Minister of Justice whether it goes far enough to entitle the judges to assign the petitions to two judges, neither of whom is a judge in the court or division in which the petition is fyled.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand that this amendment in connection with the Act which it amends has that effect; but I should like members of the House who are members of the bar of Ontario to consider it.

Mr. MULOCK. There is this weak spot in it. Under this amendment the petition is assigned according to the rules of court. Suppose the rules of court provided that petitions should be triable by one of the judges of the court or division in which it is fyled, in that case the amendment would not be so wide as is supposed. I, therefore, think

the assignment should be wholly regardless of the court in which the petition is fyled, and the judges should not be at liberty to make rules to the contrary.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am of the opinion that there is not any necessity for this clause. The court some time ago met, and the Chief Justice divided a number of election petitions among the whole court. If that is the object of the amendment it will be found that the Act of 1887 makes all the provision required.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the Act that creates the difficulty.

Mr. McCARTHY. In what way?

Mr. MULOCK. The judges had come to the conclusion that the petition was to be tried by two judges in the same division. The effect would be to interfere with the working of the court by taking two judges out of three. One or two of the judges spoke to me on the subject, and that was the view they took of it. They consider this legislation, or some such legislation, is necessary, in order that they may be free to select judges not out of the same court.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then, the explanation is this: That by reason of the change now made, trying petitions by two judges instead of one judge, it is necessary that this amendment should follow. I thought the amendment merely provided for the distribution of the work. I rather think this latter part will be found inconvenient. Why not allow the Chief Justices to arrange the assignment of judges' business as they now do the distribution, instead of waiting for any rules of the Supreme Court? Before we pass this we should determine whether we propose to leave the jurisdiction to the Court of Appeal, because if it is not to have jurisdiction then the Chief Justice of Ontario would not be one of the judges.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The amendment can stand.

Mr. McCARTHY moved that section 1 of the Bill be amended so as to read as follows:—

The paragraph letter (*j*) of section 2, of the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, is hereby amended by striking out the words "the Court of Appeal for Ontario" in the first sub-section thereof, and the words "for Lower Canada" in the second sub-section thereof.

He said: I explained that the object of this was to confine the jurisdiction in election cases to the courts of first instance, and not to the Court of Appeal. My view has been that the Court of Appeal has now more work to do than it can properly discharge. I mentioned the other day that the Court of Appeal had fifty cases now before it, but in reality there are sixty-seven cases now on the list, and the average number of cases which the court disposes of at a sitting, I think, may be stated to be thirty. Two judges having been withdrawn in the spring for the trial of local election cases, there is really more work now than the court can dispose of during the balance of the year. If the second sitting of the court is to be interrupted by the judges being taken off to try election cases, we can easily contemplate that there will be such a list next year as they can hardly ever expect to wipe off. I think, therefore, it would be better if we did not interfere with the scheme of the Supreme Court, that is, that the Appeal Court shall deal with appellate matters, and the other courts deal with matters of this kind.

Mr. CASEY. That means, so far as Ontario is concerned, that judges of the Court of Appeal shall not be called upon to try in the first instance.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Court of Appeal has spare time, they can be drafted into the different divisions. The object is that the appellate work of the Court of Appeal shall not be interfered with.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the readjustment of the work has already taken place.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understood from the Minister of Justice that he proposed to introduce a clause stating definitely which would be applicable to present proceedings and which would not be. Already there is some difficulty in the minds of the judges about which clause should apply. These petitions are entered in the Court of Appeal, and I do not contemplate that we should interfere with the present litigation.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY moved:

That section 4 of the said Act as amended by section 2 of the Act intituled: "An Act to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act," being chapter 7 of 50 and 51 Victoria, is hereby amended by leaving out the words "Court of Appeal" in the sixth and seventh lines thereof, and the words "the Chief Justice of Ontario" in the eighth line thereof, and the words "said Court of Appeal and" in the eleventh and twelfth lines thereof.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understand that the effect of all these amendments is that petitions must be fyled hereafter only in the three divisions of the High Court of Justice, and that we cannot utilize the judges of the Court of Appeal for the trial of petitions. If we should again have such a crop of petitions as we have at the present time, it will be quite impossible for the judges of the three divisions to dispose of them, and we are depriving ourselves of the services of four judges that we utilize at present. I understand that two judges are to try petitions in future. I approve of that, but it will probably have the effect of confining us to two judges in each division instead of giving us the use of three as at present. If these amendments are not to come into operation till next year or to apply to present cases, I think the Minister of Justice should pause, especially at this stage of the session, before adopting them, and they can be considered next session more carefully and fully than they can be now. I understand that the Minister proposes to consolidate the whole election law next session, and then such amendments might be made as circumstances would seem to justify. But it seems to me it only complicates the matter unnecessarily to press all these amendments now.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that the amendment will not come into operation at once. It will, but it will not apply to petitions already fyled. It says that hereafter petitions shall not be fyled in the Court of Appeal.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then there is the amendment respecting the judges who shall try the cases.

Mr. McCARTHY. That follows on the other. The amendment is not to affect the cases of which the court is seized at present.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If you do not want it to come into operation now, what object is there in pressing it now? You will get this Act on controverted elections so complicated and mixed up that the judges will find it almost impossible to know what they can do.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman's object is that which I understand it to be, I would suggest whether he should not listen to my hon. friend from Huron, and having brought the matter before the House, let it stand for consideration till next session. I do not want to interfere with Ontario practice; I do not know enough about it to do so; but I understand that if you carry all these amendments you will so complicate the Bill that we shall not know what we are passing at all. If the hon. gentleman wishes to provide that in future judges of the Court of Appeal shall not be used as judges in the first instance to try petitions, he can do that next session, I submit, better than he can now. I do not think any of us understand the effect of this amendment on other sections. I understand that the hon. Minister is going to introduce an amendment, saying that such and such sections shall apply to existing petitions, and such and such sections shall not. I think he will find it difficult to do that. If these sections are going to apply generally, how can you say that they are not going to apply to existing petitions? Most of these provisions which refer to procedure and practice were intended by the majority of the House, I think, to apply to existing petitions. Otherwise, there is no object in passing the Bill at this late stage of the session. I take it that many of these provisions are good in themselves, and if an amendment is to be introduced declaring that all these sections which form the beneficial parts of the Bill are only to apply to future petitions, I think we had better not pass the Bill at all.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The Bill originally introduced by the Minister of Justice, I understood, was intended to apply to the existing condition of things, and if so intended, was, in my judgment, a proper Bill. But if he has changed his opinion and does not intend to make it the law of the land at present, there can be no reason why it should be forced through this session, but it would be far better to let it stand until opportunity is had to consolidate the law and make all the amendments past experience shows to be necessary. The hon. gentleman knows better, perhaps, than most of us how difficult it is, when amendments to the different sections are sprung upon the House—without our having the opportunity of consulting the original statute and seeing exactly what effect the amendments will have upon the law—for us to decide upon the necessity or merits of the amendment. It is almost impossible for us to judge with any degree of accuracy the effect of these amendments. Either the Bill should apply to the existing condition of things or it ought not to be pressed through this session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are various provisions in the Bill, and those which relate to mere procedure ought certainly to apply to existing petitions, according to the ordinary rule of construction of statutes. There are certain matters affecting questions of right, which may involve interference with existing rights, and it will be for us to consider how far these should be made applicable to existing petitions. That question can be dealt with when we finish the Bill and come to consider the section I propose to introduce, defining what provisions ought to apply to existing proceedings and what ought to be deferred. In the meantime, the hon. member for North Simcoe comes forward with the statement that the business of the Court of Appeals, in the Province of Ontario, would be interfered with if the judges should be withdrawn from ordinary business to try election petitions, and he proposes that they shall not be so used. The hon. gentleman moved that clause the other night, and I refrained from expressing any opinion: but I begged the members from Ontario, both lay and professional, to consider the effect it might have, to consider whether it would not be withdrawing from the trial of election petitions a number of judges who may be required, and may be more urgently required after the passage of this Bill, inasmuch as this Bill calls for two judges to try every election petition. The Committee, however, heard the reasons advanced by hon. member for North Simcoe, which I certainly was not in a position to controvert, and have now passed that clause. It will be for us to consider when we come to the end of the Bill whether its clauses shall apply to existing petitions or not. I take it for granted that the provision with regard to the Court of Appeal ought not to apply to existing petitions, because petitions have been actually fyled in the Court of Appeal, and we might seriously interfere with questions of jurisdiction were we to decide that the judges of the Court of Appeal shall not try them. That may be decided when we come to the work of closing the Bill. I think there are certain provisions which ought to be made applicable, and I am open to conviction by the Committee as to whether they ought not all to be made applicable to existing petitions. Having accepted the principle of trying by two judges, there can be no difference of opinion as to the propriety of applying that provision to existing petitions. As to the others, it is an open question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is no doubt that the ordinary business of the Court of Appeal will be more promptly dealt with and satisfactorily disposed of, if the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe be adopted. That jurisdiction, however, has been given to the court by another Legislature, and it is a matter over which we have no jurisdiction. We have constituted the judges a part of the general election court of the Province of Ontario, and they are very competent judges, and as there is a very large number of petitions at present it would be highly inconvenient if the hon. gentleman's section were made applicable to the petitions now pending. He says that is not the intention and it will not be made so applicable; but whenever it is adopted we will certainly, if there is anything like the number of petitions fyled in the future that there have been after the recent election, seriously delay the trial of controverted election petitions by the courts in the Province of Ontario when we withdraw four judges from that work, as we will by withdrawing the judges of the Court of Appeal, though I have no doubt we will promote the ordinary business with which the Court of Appeal has to deal. I think there is a great deal of force in what the hon. member for Huron has said, that as the Government do not propose to

apply these clauses to the existing conditions, they might stand over until the whole subject can be discussed at an earlier period next session. The hon. member for Simcoe himself no doubt has considered the Bill very fully, and on account of his large practice before the court has an excellent opportunity of judging what the effect will be on its general business; but at the same time this provision will, for all time to come, unless the number of judges is increased, delay the trial of controverted elections.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that danger is very much exaggerated. The hon. gentleman speaks of four judges being withdrawn. What the courts do is this: They assign two judges, because the provision that the trial must be by two judges has been in force in local elections. They assign two judges from each court, so that this clause will have the effect of withdrawing, in point of fact, one set out of the four sets of judges who would be available for the trial of election petitions.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There would be three in the future.

Mr. McCARTHY. Three in the future instead of four. The question is this: Ought we here, even if we had the power to do it, interfere with the appeal court of the province to that extent, when there are ten judges in the courts of first instance who at present certainly are not nearly as much pressed with work as the appellate tribunal? That tribunal started yesterday with sixty-seven cases. They do not dispose at a sitting of more than about thirty on an average. They ought to have another sitting before the Christmas vacation. Under the present condition of things they cannot hold that other sitting, so they will have more than half the list laid over till January with the whole six months work to add to that, and probably 100 cases on the list, so that cases that ought to be disposed of before the long vacation will not be disposed of for eighteen months to come, which will result in terrible inconvenience to individual suitors. I understand that these two clauses have been already carried, and all this discussion has been out of order; but I say, though I do not want the Committee to take my word for it, that the only two clauses that really need amendment are the first clause which strikes out the words "Court of Appeals," and the other clause which gives jurisdiction to the Chief Justice of Ontario to assign and distribute the work. There is no complication in these amendments. Then there is the 10th section, which we agreed upon the other afternoon, and it was arranged that, instead of amending it, a new section should be introduced. I move that section 10 of the said Act be hereby repealed and the following substituted in lieu thereof:—

Notice of the presentation of the petition under this Act and of the security accompanied with the copy of the petition shall within ten days after the day on which the petition has been presented or within the prescribed time, or within such longer time as the court or any judge thereof, under special circumstances of difficulty, allows to be served on the respondent or respondents within any place in the Dominion of Canada, if service cannot be effected on the respondent or respondents personally within the time granted by the court or judge, it may be effected in such other manner as the court or judge, on the application of the petitioner, directs.

Mr. BARRON. Why has the hon. member for Simcoe left out the words "at his domicile"?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. McCARTHY. The question was that a doubt existed whether a service might be made at a man's house, and I desired to make it clear that the service should be personal unless the judge ordered that it should be made in some other way.

Mr. BARRON. I see it reads "under special circumstances of difficulty." The original Act had the words "or difficulty".

Mr. McCARTHY. The original Act had the words "or difficulty" That was changed in the amending Act, I think by a mistake. I move this amendment:

Section 51 is hereby amended by striking out in the tenth line thereof, the word "one", and substituting the word "five"; and after the word "dollars" "in legal tender or in the bills of any chartered bank doing business in Canada"; and also after the words "ten dollars" in the twelfth line thereof, the words "and such further sums as the record, at the rate of five cents for every folio of 100 words which it contains, may come to."

The object of this is to compel the petitioner to deposit, not merely $100, but the same sum that every other appellant has to deposit, that is, the sum of $500. $100 goes no way at all towards the payment of the costs of an appeal, and I never could understand why we insist on keeping the deposit at $1,000, and when a suit is instituted we go to the opposite extreme and only require $100 as a deposit in case of an appeal. I, therefore, propose to make that sum $500, as it is in all other matters. That is quite little enough to secure to the respondent, if he is successful, the cost of pressing the appeal. The other amendment is to meet a difficulty which sometimes has resulted in great hardship. The registrar of the court is required by this section to certify the record to the Supreme Court on the payment of $10. Now, he will not do that, he says he cannot do it. The trial may last for days, sometimes a week, and he is not able to get the record of the stenographer's notes, and to certify them to the Supreme Court, for $10, and the result is that, in two cases to my knowledge, he has applied to the court and the court has paid the registrar out of the deposit. So when the successful party comes to get his deposit, he finds it has been absorbed in paying the registrar and the stenogragher for the record of the Court of Appeal. Now, I propose to add to the $10, that the sum of 5 cents per folio of 100 words shall also be paid for the record. The 5 cents is for copying. He has to pay it now, but they have in one or two cases paid the stenographer out of the deposit.

Mr. MULOCK. What right have they to take it out of the deposit?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think they have a right, but the court did it.

Mr. AMYOT. Why does not the hon. gentleman say at once that it will be impossible to resist a bad judgment unless we have $20,000 or $30,000 a year at our disposal? Why does he make it impossible for a poor man to get justice in this country? He might go a step further and that only his own political friends shall be appointed judges, and then we would not be allowed to go to appeal, and so he might provide by law that he shall remain in power for 50 years more.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understand the hon. gentleman proposes that instead of the sum of $100 being required as a deposit for going to appeal, the deposit must be $500. I am entirely opposed to that. I do not see why any more than

$100 should be deposited. The hon. gentleman must recollect that respondents and petitioners are not all millionaires, and if the respondent who has already suffered a good deal for his country's sake by running an election and paying the expenses perhaps of a contest, then if he takes the case to appeal, and if there happens to be a judgment against him, he has to lose $500 more. I think $100 is quite enough.

Mr. McCARTHY. What if the appeal is against him?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It does not make any difference. He cannot get the judgment of the highest court of the Dominion without depositing $500. He may be utterly unable to raise the $500. If the judgment of the Court of Appeal is against him, and the costs are against him, you have got your execution. Let him, at all events, get the judgment of the court. Then you have your execution the same as you have against the petitioner. The latter only requires to deposit $1,000, and the costs may amount to $3,000, and the only remedy you have for the balance over the $1,000 is an execution. So with the respondent. I do not believe in throwing obstacles in the way of appeal. I think that the cost in every case ought to be as low as possible. If a man deposits $500 he will never receive a cent of it back, that you may be sure of.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the hon. gentleman keeps looking only at his own side of the case.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No: I can stand it as well as anybody else.

Mr. McCARTHY. I mean the unfortunate respondent, after he has had to pay the election expenses. The hon. gentleman would not be so unjust as to say that if the petitioner appeals he has to deposit a sufficient sum to secure the respondent, but if the respondent appeals he is to be allowed to do so for a sum of $100. We all know that the printing necessary to bring a case to the Supreme Court, and the actual fees of the lawyers, come to that sum, or nearly that sum, much beyond $100. The appellant appeals vexatiously frequently; he puts in $100, and the unfortunate respondent is dragged a step further, and in the end is saddled with a large bill of costs.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Why can he not get this execution?

Mr. McCARTHY. I venture to say that if we called for a return of the petitioners in the election cases now pending, I do not think we would find 5 per cent. of them were worth their salt.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). They do not put up their own money.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then what happens? They can appeal from court to court without giving the slightest security to the respondent against whom they are petitioning. It is to protect the respondent, who, in nine cases out of ten, is able to pay, against actions by the other side that are unequal and unfair. There should be protection to both parties, and litigation should not be permitted without risk to the person initiating it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a good deal to be said on both sides, and we must be careful not to limit the privilege of appeal to the wealthy alone. We hardly judge matters by the same standard as do the people of Ontario. The sum of $500 is a mere trifle to the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), but it is an enormous amount to the poor fellow who has gone through an election and whose election petition is being protested. The other day in my province there were four or five appeals on preliminary objections alone. $100 was quite sufficient in these cases.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not think of the preliminary cases. This should only apply to appeals against final results. $100 is sufficient for preliminary objections.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we should ascertain the feeling of the Committee in regard to the cost of the main trial. Having decided that, it would guide us as to subsequent proceedings.

Mr. McLEOD. If the party against whom the judgment is given wants to appeal, it is only fair that he should put up the same security in this as in any other case, and $500 is little enough. I do not think it is fair and reasonable to deny the right of appeal to the poor man. The law applies to poor and rich alike. When the case has been tried and the judgment of the court has been given against the party, and the defeated party seeks to get rid of the judgment, he should give sufficient security, $500, to pay the costs.

Mr. CASEY. If this is a matter affecting one side or the other to a petition, as if there were a member's point of view and a petitioner's point of view, I fail to so understand it. It is impossible to tell whether the petitioner or respondent is to be the appellant and has to put up the money. This question is merely one as to how much security should be put up to cover the necessary costs and to prevent vexatious appeals. Whether $500 is the right amount or not, legal gentlemen will be better able to determine than a layman.

Mr. BARRON. I am inclined to support the proposition of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). It is perfectly clear the principle he asks to be adopted is the original principle adopted when the original Act was passed. Then, $100 was required to be put up as security for costs. If that sum is insufficient, and it is clear it is, the party should put up such a sum as would afford security for costs, if we carry out the principle of the Act. $100 may not be too small a sum in the cases pointed out by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) agrees that the cost on preliminary objections should be limited to $100, but that on the ultimate appeal the amount should be $500. The respondent should have more protection than he has at present. I am glad to hear from the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that in 99 cases out of 100 petitioners were men of straw. We all know that such is the fact. I know that in cases not very far away from home men of straw are put up as petitioners. They fail. The sum of $1,000 is not one-fourth of the cost. An execution is obtained, but it is against a man of straw. It is all very well for the member for West Huron to say the person has an execution. An execution against a man of straw is worthless. That is the position in which the respondent is often placed. So I say that the amount should not be $500, but whatever is sufficient to cover the costs. I go further, and say that the petitioner should be a man

of standing, and should not only put up $1,000, but fyle an affidavit that he possesses a certain amount of property over and above the amount of his debts, and then we would not have, as is the case now, petitions fyled for the sake of fyling them, and not because any real wrong has been committed.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) points out that the difficulty should be meet by requiring a large deposit on appeal. I think on both sides of the House there has been too much said as if these petitions were like ordinary suits. The Committee must remember that these are not matters of private right. These petitions are prosecuted for reasons that do not very frequently come within private or individual right, and, therefore, they stand on a different footing from other legal rights. There is one danger and that is of petitions of this class falling into the hands of speculative attorneys, who get hold of petitions when men are warm after elections, and do not allow them to use their better judgment in regard to the conduct of those petitions. A speculative attorney can generally control enough funds to deposit $1,000 or $500 for an appeal. The way to strike at him is to make his profits small and cut down the ultimate cost. If by depositing $1,000 he can gain another $1,000 in 6 or 8 months, he will obtain the $1,000 necessary; but if he is only to deposit $100 and only obtains $100, he will not go into the speculation. Whenever petitions are necessary in the public interest, there is always sufficient public interest to furnish the money to carry the case through. The men who carry on petitions are not beggars or paupers. I understand the Committee desire to protect men from vexatious petitions, and this can best be done by reducing the costs that may ultimately be obtained out of these cases.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Whatever may be the experience of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), I think it is not the speculative attorney who gets up petitions in Ontario. It is a different party altogether. If you deal with the central political organizations that exist in the province, you will do a good deal more towards diminishing the number of petitions, than in dealing with any speculative attorneys. It is not by undertaking to cut down the costs, however desirable that may be, that you will prevent petitions such as we are now discussing. We must begin further back than that. It seems to me, as I suggested the other evening, that in order to diminish the number of petitions, and to make the law a punishment to evil-doers as it was intended to be, instead of a vexatious matter to the innocent, it is necessary that there should be some preliminary step taken to obtain the petition. The petition should be founded upon substantial knowledge on the part of the party petitioning, but where you permit a man living 500 miles away to furnish the money for the petition, without knowing anything of the way in which the election is conducted, and get some person who is a voter to sign the petition, you will always have a large crop of petitions and you will have them on both sides, because one side will find it necessary as a matter of precaution in order to prevent vexatious proceedings on the part of their political opponents. It does seem to me that in order to deal with this matter effectually, we must consider the circumstances under which a petition is to be allowed. I do not agree with my hon. friend behind me who talks about the right of petition being confined to a party who is a substantial property holder. Anyone who has a right to vote in an election ought to have a right to protect his vote and to petition, but you ought to be sure that he has a grievance before you allow him to do so. He ought to make it clear to some one that the grievance exists before he undertakes to exercise that right, in order that by the exercise of that right on his part he may not be doing a grievous wrong to some other person. Of course we know by experience that a Controverted Elections Act is necessary; we know that the trial of controverted elections by the judges is much more efficient than their trial by a Committee of this House. Long experience has shown that to be the case, but in the exercise of that right, and to ensure purity at elections, it is not necessary to adopt proceedings that drive every sensitive man out of public life. It seems to me that we ought to give serious consideration to the circumstances under which the petition is to be allowed in order to deal with this subject. I do not know what may be the views entertained by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), but it seems to me that where a party outside the constituency prepares a petition and goes into the constituency, and invites a party to sign it, and furnishes the money, that he is guilty of maintenance, and that the principles laid down in the case of Bradlaugh *vs.* Newdegate would apply. I do not think a petition of that kind ought to stand, and I hardly think it will. That is a question to be decided, and which every member having a petition pending against him will have an interest in having fully considered before it is disposed of. Before we can correct such abuses as these that now exist, we ought to provide that the party who petitions has some knowledge of wrong being done on the part of the member or his agents, before he undertakes to institute proceedings against him.

Mr. AMYOT. I will cite an example to the House to bear out the remarks made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills.) As a matter of fact, in one of the counties near Quebec a meeting took place of the friends of the defeated candidate. They had friends gathered from many parishes, and not one of them could find out a single case of corruption, and they there decided not to contest; but after that they received positive orders from Ottawa to contest the election, and a notary living far away from the county, and not having been in the county at the election, was furnished with the money to contest the election, and some of the electors were chosen and consented to sign the petition which is now before the courts. This is one of the numerous instances in which the rights of petitioning have been abused. We should take care in my opinion that no petitions would be taken unless there was a *primâ facie* case, sufficient to justify a judge to authorize the issue of the petition. When once the petition is in the court, after these precautions are taken, then do not make justice hard to be obtained. Make it as easy as possible to be obtained either by the poor or by the rich. If only a rich man may obtain justice in election matters, or in any other matter, then the principles of justice are wrongly applied. First,

insure that no frivolous or vexatious petition can be taken, exact the necessary preliminary affidavits to show that the petitioners know something about what they sign their names to, and then facilitate the proceedings, when once you are sure that the proceedings are not vexatious.

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire to add to what my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said in reference to the remarks of the member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey). So far as my experience has gone in the profession, I never heard it suggested or suspected that a speculative attorney, or any attorney of any kind, had prompted election petitions for the sake of costs.

Mr. AMYOT. Perhaps you were absent too often.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am speaking of course not with regard to the hon. member who represents the district of Quebec, but I do speak for my own province, and I heartily corroborate what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said, as I never knew a case of the kind. I agree also in what he has said that petitions are often prompted by the central political organizations. As a practical means of stopping election petitions the most available thing we can do would be to have them brought on to a speedy trial. I suppose it is within the experience of all of us that election petitions are taken in a great majority of cases, when if the rule which was spoken of by the hon. gentleman who last addressed the Committee was in force, the petition would not be allowed. In the early period of the thirty days the secrets of the opposite party do not leak out, but it is the delay that takes place that allows the secret to leak out, and affords means to the petitioner to prove his case. If the Act was carried out in its integrity as it is in England, and as it ought to be with us, and if the judges were permitted to leave their ordinary work and to be appointed on rota, and allowed to commence the trials forthwith after the election petitions are fyled, because they are issued within five days afterwards, I think we would all find that many of these petitions would be dropped; but if five or six or seven months roll around, during which a man's wife tells somebody, and the bribers tell somebody, everything will have leaked out by which the petition is expected to be sustained. I do not think it would be practicable to insist on such a hard and fast rule that a *primâ facie* case should be established before a petition is tried; but if the petitions were brought to a speady trial, I think it would be found in many cases that there was not evidence to sustain them, and this would be sufficient to prevent a multiplication of them. As regards maintenance, I think the hon. gentleman's view of the law has a good deal of force in it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would corroborate what my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) has said that it is found in practice that attorneys who are useful in no other cases are useful to promote election petitions. As regards the preliminary step to be taken before fyling the petition, I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for North York is the preferable one, that the petition should be founded upon an affidavit stating that the facts are true to the knowledge of the petitioner, and I think the fyling of an affidavit of that kind would be a wise precaution. I do not agree with the proposed remedy of a speedy trial, because the trial would then take place before the truth came out. I think that is an argument rather in favour of delay. However, we are approaching the hour when most of us are willing to stop work, and I would suggest that the Committee now rise and report progress. It seems that the longer we study the Bill, the greater the crop of suggested amendments, and I think I must appeal to the Committee to consider the propriety of limiting the legislation for this session. I think, perhaps, on the whole I may appeal to it on a future day to limit the present Bill to matters of procedure, leaving the substantive law for consideration next session, at a period when we shall have more time. I suppose we all realize that it is desirable that the House should prorogue some time in October, and I am afraid we cannot do that if we proceed with all the wise suggestions which have been made for amendments in the controverted elections law. In the meantime, I propose that the Committee rise and report progress.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am glad that the hon. gentleman has decided to take the course he mentions. I agree with the suggestion that there should not be too many amendments made to the election law this session; but I think some important amendments which we have made should not be dropped, for instance, that providing that two judges shall try petitions. Then, two or three years ago this House, after a good deal of consideration, decided with reference to treating that an isolated act should not void an election, if it was not done with the knowledge or connivance of the candidate. That principle has been carried a little further this session and applied to other offences committed without the knowledge or connivance of the candidate. If he has tried his best to comply with the law, and to prevent corruption and irregularity, it seems to me a monstrous thing that he should be unseated because some man has paid a dollar to some ragamuffin to vote. I hope the hon. Minister will not drop that provision, which I consider one of the most important of the Bill, and which is intended to protect the candidate who honestly and squarely tries to conform to the law and to avoid committing any offence. In this connection I was going to suggest to the hon. gentleman that his section requires the omission of the words, "contrary to the order," because it is absurd that the candidate should have to go to every elector in the constituency and repeat a positive order. It ought to be sufficient to show that any wrong done was without his sanction or connivance, and that he took all the means possible to prevent it.

Mr. TUPPER. Is that to be retroactive?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No; but it will apply to all cases to be tried.

Mr. TUPPER. That would make it retroactive.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not understand so. Of course, if you are going to legislate in the interest of the man who fyles a petition on spec, so as to make sure that he will get his paltry costs, I can understand you; but if you are removing an unjust anomaly, I want to know why you should not legislate for existing cases. I am going to support that amendment strongly, on the ground of common justice.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish only to repeat the words of the Minister of Justice, by saying that it does not consort with the dignity of this House to pass what will be an *ex post facto* law removing disabilities which we have incurred. However right or just it is, it will have a bad appearance with the public if we are found sitting here as an omnipotent body relieving ourselves of the laws under which the last election was held. We may or may not have violated that law; but if parties have commenced proceedings against us based on that law, I think it would be very extraordinary if we should whitewash ourselves here by minimizing the law in the way which the hon. gentleman who last spoke has strongly advocated.

Mr. MULOCK. We are going to do some whitewashing to-morrow.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then, we had better not have any more of it than is absolutely essential. Permit me to add this: When I suggested that an early, speedy trial would have a deterring influence on the fyling of petitions, I was perfectly aware my suggestion was open to the objection the Minister of Justice has mentioned, namely, that it would be because the truth would not get out. But I was answering the appeal made to the House that no petition should be fyled unless a *prima facie* case was made out. My remedy was at all events not so stringent as that and more in accordance with the spirit of the law that these matters should be disposed of as speedily as possible.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Has the Government decided to fix a day for the discussion of the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That matter will be taken up on Monday. I do not think the members have yet received the evidence and the reports, and I am sure it is not likely that any member has had an opportunity of reading both fully as yet. In view of the importance of the subject, it would be perhaps on the whole better to take it up on Monday, and no time will be lost, as we have plenty of business to keep us occupied in the meantime.

Mr. LAURIER. Then it will be the First Order on Monday, and will be proceeded with from day to day until concluded.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 17th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUBSIDIES OF LAND TO RAILWAY COMPANIES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House again resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the granting of subsidies therein mentioned to railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also thereinafter mentioned.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand that the papers in connection with this matter were handed to the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) last evening, and the members generally have not had an opportunity of examining these papers. I would say, however, in the meantime, that it is highly desirable that this House should investigate closely every proposition of this kind to part with our Dominion lands in the North-West. When we look at the map placed on the Table of this House a few days ago and notice the enormous amount of land which has already been given away, the heritage of the people of this Dominion, not only for the present generation, but for generations to come, and when we consider the fact that we have to protect coming generations against enormous taxation, to provide both for the interest and the principle of our heavy debt, it becomes the duty of every lover of his country to closely criticise the grants of land which are proposed to be made to railway companies or to any other companies. When we consider the fact that we have already granted in the North-West 2,000 townships of 23,040 acres each, to railway companies, including the grant made to the Canadian Pacific Railway——

Mr. DEWDNEY. Half of these.

Mr. McMULLEN. Between what is granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway and what has been granted towards the construction of other lines, including the line that we are now discussing, we have granted 47,230,000 acres, and you will find that that amounts to the 2,000 townships of the size that I have mentioned. When we consider further that this amount of land would give a homestead of 160 acres to each of 295,313 settlers, which is more than we have in Manitoba and the North-West altogether, including Indians, half-breeds and children; we will see that it is a very serious matter.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). It is only 10 per cent. of the whole, and that is a small matter for developing 90 per cent.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman says it is only 10 per cent., but let us consider that in connection with the fact that in the Province of Ontario only one-quarter of the land of that province is now under cultivation, that a very large proportion of the best land is not under cultivation, and that we have only about 22,500,000 acres in the province under cultivation, and then let us remember that we have given away over 47,000,000 acres of choice land in the North-West for the purpose of encouraging railways, which is virtually twice as much as the land now under cultivation in the Province of Ontario. I believe both parties in this country, and the people of the country unanimously agreed that it was in the interest of the entire Dominion that the grant of 25,000,000 acres of land towards the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was a prudent policy, as it was desirable that the road should be built; but, Sir, we should have stopped there. We have no right to give away the heritage of the people of this Dominion for the purpose of developing one section of the Dominion at the cost of the whole. In the Province of Ontario, from which I come, we have been called upon to contribute by

municipalities, by counties, and as a province, towards the construction of every railway line that has been built outside of the Grand Trunk Railway. I contend, that when we constructed the Canadian Pacific Railway through the North-West, the townships and counties in the North-West should have been called upon to contribute towards the construction of their own local lines, in place of our handing over by piecemeal the inheritance of the people of this Dominion to railway companies, at the cost of the entire people of the country. What has been done in the North-West has been done in the east of Canada, and while hon. gentlemen opposite who have continuously, I may say, I believe in many cases blindly, supported the policy of the Government in this regard, the day is not far distant when the people of this Dominion will bring these men to book for the manner in which they have permitted the heritage of this country to be squandered in the interests of railway companies in the North-West. If the whole territory which has been given away to railway companies were laid out in one block, it would be 24 miles wide and 370 miles long; it would extend from Winnipeg to 10 miles beyond Regina. These figures show what an exceedingly important matter this has become. We know the promises which were made this House years ago by men who claimed to be head and shoulders above ordinary people in statesmanship, such as the late Premier, Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Leonard Tilley. They promised that the heritage which we had in the North-West would continuously contribute towards recouping the people of this Dominion for the vast sums of money they had spent in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and in the development of that country. Now, Sir, where is our inheritance gone? Last year we realized from North-West lands only $16,000 over and above expenses, not including the expenditure for feeding Indians, which amounts to nearly $1,000,000 a year, nor the $773,000 a year spent on the Mounted Police, nor the expenses of North-West Government. So that I contend that the Opposition are discharging an important duty to the people of this country in criticising in a very pointed and searching manner the granting of lands in the North-West, which is virtually the only asset we have now left to meet the enormous debt which has been created for the purpose of constructing that road. The grant now proposed amounts to 17 townships for 62 miles of railway. If we were to run railways through that country 12 miles apart and give the same amount of land towards the construction of each railway, deducting the lands granted to the Hudson's Bay Company and those set apart for school and other purposes, we would give away every acre in the whole country.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). And if you got the roads, it would be a good investment.

Mr. McMULLEN. If my hon. friend thinks so, why did he support the statement made in this House some years ago, that our inheritance in that country was going to remove the debt which has been created for its development?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). We are not afraid of the debt.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not hesitate for a moment to swallow such statements one year, and to swallow themselves when the policy of such statements are exposed another year. For the reasons I have given, we consider it necessary to criticise these grants, and I hope that this one will receive, at the hands of the members of this House, the criticism it deserves.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of the Interior was good enough last night to lend me the map and a number of documents which he had laid on the Table. I was anxious to study them, so as to be able to give an intelligent opinion upon this resolution; but I had no idea that it would be made the first order to-day. It was impossible, after the House rose last night, to examine them fully, and to-day I had other work for a portion of the time, so that I have not been able to examine more than a portion of these papers. But so far as I have been able to examine the Order in Council, a great mistake seems to have been made. I have not got far enough in the examination of the papers to find out whether it is explained or not; but it would appear that the Government have granted 100,000 acres of land more than the Order in Council or the Act of Parliament warranted. I do not find anything to authorize more than 4,000 acres a mile on 100 miles; and according to the report of Mr. Burgess 740,000 acres have been conveyed. It may be that the papers explain this. I also find that the Order in Council purports to convey land for a line, the location of which was different from that defined by Act of Parliament, and I am at a loss to understand how that grant can stand good.

Mr. HAGGART. That is what we are asking Parliament to confirm now.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not approve of that system. I think legislation must control. I do not see what right the Governor in Council has to change the location of a railway after Parliament has agreed to a particular location, and to convey land to the company upon the changed location. This Order in Council seems to take a liberty with the legislation of this House. So far as I can see, there is no pledge of Parliament to a grant of land in favour of the direction in which the line was constructed. I do not wish now to express any final opinion from my partial examination of the papers, but so far as I have been able to read them, I cannot see that there is any contract between us and the railway company.

Mr. HAGGART. The increase in the subsidy from 6,400 acres to 7,483 acres per mile, is easily explained. The first grant was 6,400 acres a mile on 152 miles of the Schultz railway. The company completed in the first place 22 miles, and then came to the Government for a portion of the grant; and the Government, in order to ensure the construction of the remainder, said: We will give nothing on the 22 miles, but we will divide the 900,000 acres on the other 130 miles to be completed. That makes 7,483 acres per mile for the 130 miles. They completed the 100 miles for which they were entitled then to the 748,300 acres, and left unfinished the 30 miles of the gap between Elm River and Manitou, which was entitled by the new arrangement to 7,483 acres per mile, which was transferred over by the Order in Council of April, 1885, to the two portions or extension of the line from Elmswater towards the line that was extended south-westerly from Brandon and also westerly on the South-Western Railway. The confirmation of that is what is asked under the present resolution, also the difference between the amount

of acreage transferred to the 30 miles and the 6,400 acres per mile on the amount finished.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not wish to discuss the matter to-day, for I do not feel in a position to do so; but, from the statement that has fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman, it would appear that there can be no valid contract at present between Parliament and the company, and it strikes me, at the very threshold of the whole consideration is the question: Are we now free to do as Parliament chooses in its wisdom, or are we bound by any contract? The two positions are wholly different, and, therefore, the question cannot be properly decided until that matter is thoroughly discussed.

Mr. HAGGART. We are bound by the Order in Council in which we agreed to the transfer to the Canadian Pacific Railway of certain lands. That Order in Council is subject to the approval of Parliament, and is here for your approval.

Mr. MULOCK. As a member of Parliament, I cannot recognize any Order in Council binding Parliament to part with public money or property unless Parliament has sanctioned it. I do not consider that because a company chooses to run the risk of an Order in Council being confirmed, that Parliament is hampered at all by that transaction. The Government have no right to put Parliament in the position of being told that because the Government have chosen to pledge the credit of the country without the authority of Parliament, and the company, relying upon that pledge, has chosen to go on and do certain works, Parliament will be acting in bad faith if it does not ratify what the Government promised. The Cabinet has no right to pledge Parliament in this way. Otherwise, why have a Parliament at all? If that is what has taken place, there has been an entire departure from the proper system of Government, and Parliament is not left free to decide. The Government might just as well pay out money or convey lands away and afterwards apply to Parliament to ratify their act. It is another extension of the system of Governor General's warrants and is practically ignoring all the rights of Parliament. The Government first create obligations, and then come down and tell us it is too late, that we have no option and must ratify what has taken place. The Order in Council is an absolute nullity to begin with, and as such is incapable of ratification. We ought to be free to deal with a question like this wholly untrammelled by what has taken place. I do not wish to discuss the matter on its merits at present. I did not expect the Minister would have pressed it now. I shall not ask for any further consideration now; but when the time comes at various stages we will have opportunities for discussion, and I, therefore, will say no more on the subject at present. I can only say that the reading which takes place to-day of this resolution cannot be considered as anything more than a most formal one given by the House in Committee without our having really knowledge of all the rights and the circumstances. The Minister of the Interior will now understand that the statement he made, no doubt in the best of faith, was unsound in law. He said there was a bargain. If he meant by a bargain a legal obligation, I venture to say he is in error.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not object to the line of criticism the hon. gentleman has taken, and I expected to have been in my seat when the order was called. I am perfectly aware that the subject does require very close reading in order to understand the position. With reference to the hon. gentleman's criticism of the Order in Council, he must recollect that there has not been a single land grant given to a railway except in the way this has been given, that is by Order in Council being passed subject to the approval of Parliament. Not an acre is transferred to any railway company until we have the statutory authority of Parliament, and that is exactly the case with regard to this matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The papers came down yesterday and were handed to the hon. member for North York. I have not had the opportunity of seeing them at all, but I desire to say that I hope to have an opportunity at a further stage of the discussion.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that at the further stages the point will not be raised that the Committee has accepted the principle, but it is understood that the reading now is merely formal.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is the understanding.

The Committee rose and reported resolutions.

THE MEMBER FOR EAST NORTHUMBERLAND.

Mr. SKINNER moved:

That the second report of the Select Committee appointed to enquire fully into certain charges preferred against the member for the East Riding of the County of Northumberland, and submitted to the House on the 15th September instant, be adopted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman not going to explain the report?

Mr. SKINNER. The hon. gentleman has read the report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to know your reasons for asking us to adopt it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is indefensible, and he cannot give reasons.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I regret very much that the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution has not seen fit to explain the reasons to the House why he makes this motion. The papers were only submitted to Parliament last night, the evidence and report were only distributed last night; and I venture to say that very few members of the House have had an opportunity of reading the evidence contained in these reports. I think it would have been well if the hon. member had seen his way to explain the report that he asks Parliament to adopt. This is an important case, one of the very few cases of the kind ever submitted to the Parliament of Canada, and it deserves the gravest possible consideration. It ought to be treated, so far as it is possible on the floor of Parliament, in a purely judicial spirit. So far as I am concerned, I have no desire to do otherwise, nor shall I do otherwise. I may find it my duty to call the attention of Parliament to the charges which have been made against the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), and to point out, as shortly as circumstances will justify, the evidence which leads me to an entirely different conclusion to that at which the majority of the Committee has arrived. I have read the report of the majority,

and I have read the evidence from beginning to end, I had the advantage of hearing the witnesses, and marking their conduct under examination and cross-examination, and I shall find it my duty to draw the attention of Parliament to such portions of the evidence as in my judgment may lead the country to a right conclusion on this matter. I propose to close my observations by moving an amendment in the sense that the motion of the hon. gentleman be not concurred in, but that another report be adopted in lieu thereof. I shall not read the report at present, and perhaps not at all, as the report is a long one, and at this period of the session I do not desire to trespass upon the attention of Parliament more than is necessary to submit to Parliament the important points of the case and the evidence which I conceive bears upon those points. I have read with care the report presented by the majority of the Committee and signed by the chairman; I have read it with that deliberation which I think every man ought to bring to bear when he is considering a case which seriously affects the standing of a member of Parliament. One of the charges was that, the position of lighthouse keeper at Presqu'Isle Point being vacant, a man of the name of Hedley Simpson made application for it, and that it was corruptly agreed by the member for East Northumberland that the position should be given to Hedley Simpson on payment of the amount of $200. It is not necessary that the agreement should have been made directly with the member for East Northumberland, if it was made with his authority. In the report this statement is made in regard to that charge, that Hedley Simpson voluntarily contributed $200 to pay an election debt. It is admitted on all hands, it was not disputed before the Committee, that Hedley Simpson applied for the office. It was admitted that before he secured the office he paid the $200. It is said that this was paid for the purpose of retiring in part a promissory note given for election purposes, for the purpose of paying some costs in connection with an election protest in the Local Legislature. It is not denied that the money was given or that the office was secured, but it is said that the contribution was a purely voluntary one for election purposes. It turns out, by the evidence, that the name of the member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) was upon that promissory note, not the original promissory note which was made eight years ago, but the note for $619.69 which was given later. The hon. member was responsible for paying that note, and this $200 of Hedley Simpson was not a voluntary contribution for election purposes but was used to pay that note. Without saying any more than any person would say in conducting a criminal case before any court in Canada, I venture to say that no one will find in the evidence a syllable which will justify such a finding as the majority of the Committee arrived at. The evidence of Hedley Simpson shows the contrary, and I shall venture to trouble the House with a few extracts from that evidence, and then I will leave it to the House to judge whether it was a voluntary contribution or was one exacted on account of the appointment at Presqu'Isle Point. I may mention that James Stanley was a prominent Conservative in East Northumberland, and that eight years ago the Conservative party in East Northumberland became responsible for over $1,000 for election purposes in connection with the election of the Local Legislature. Originally the amount was $1,700, but it was reduced afterwards. Several attempts were made to wipe off that liability, but they were unable to wipe it off, and at the time this transaction took place the sum of $619.69 of that indebtedness still remained outstanding. That indebtedness was secured by a promissory note made by three or four prominent Conservatives, among others by the member for East Northumberland. Three or four Conservatives constituted themselves a committee for the purpose of raising money to pay off that indebtedness, and the mode that was adopted for that purpose, according to the evidence, was by trafficking in four or five positions upon bridges upon the Murray Canal, and by this lighthouse at Presqu'Isle Point. This committee met at the store of a person named Bullock; this committee, according to printed documents and other evidence, disposed of this lighthouse and other positions for a consideration. Whether the member for East Northumberland was cognizant of that, is another question and depends entirely upon the evidence submitted to the Committee, and now in the hands of members of this House. Upon that subject I quote the evidence of Hedley Simpson, one of the appointees to said office:

129. What did you send Stanley to Cochrane for? Out with it now?—For the appointment.

130. You sent Stanley to Cochrane for the appointment? What appointment was that?—For the lights.

133. I am going to ask you, had you not an interview about the getting of this appointment when you gave these notes?—Certainly.

134. You had in view the getting of the appointment when you gave the notes?—Yes.

139. Would you have given the notes without some understanding about getting the appointment?—Well, I do not understand how I could have paid them.

140. You would not have rendered yourself liable for the notes unless you had got the office that would have enabled you to pay them?—No.

I may mention here before proceeding further, that this $200 was paid, not in cash at the moment, but by giving two promissory notes for $100 each, and that was one of the stipulations made by Stanley upon compliance with which the position of lighthouse keeper was to be given. He gave two promissory notes which were discounted by this James Stanley, and the cash was paid by Stanley.—

141. Would you have given these two $100 notes unless you had got this office to pay for them?—No, I do not think I would.

142. Out of what sum did you expect to pay the notes?—I had no funds.

143. When you gave the notes how did you expect to pay for them?—I expected to pay for them out of the salary I got for the lighthouse.

144. Is that the way you paid them?—Yes.

146. You had not the promise of the appointment, but you expected to pay the notes out of the proceeds of the office?—I did.

147. Then if you had not the promise, did you think it likely you would get the office?—I had no straight promise, but I expected to get it.

149. If you had thought you would not have got the office would you have given the notes?—I could not have paid them if I had not got the office.

150. They would not have been much use if you had not got the office?—No.

151. You could not have paid the notes if you had not got the office?—No.

152. You would not have given them any way?—I could not have paid them unless I had got the office.

195. Did you ever subscribe before this to the party funds?—No.

196. This is the only occasion, according to you, that you ever subscribed?—Yes.

Now, how can any hon. gentleman say that this was a purely voluntary subscription on the

part of Hedle Simpson when out of Simpson's own mouth it is shown that he paid $200 for the lights, that he never had subscribed before for political purposes, and that that was the first time he had ever paid a single dollar? On this occasion this poor man, a man of no means, gave $200, although he was not able to pay one single farthing of that money unless he got the lights. The salary was $400 a year, and this man, in order to secure this $400 a year, had to pay the party $200 in two promissory notes. Now, I would like to know upon what evidence the report of the majority can be affirmed, or upon what evidence it can be justified? It is further stated in the report:

"The said Edward Cochrane not being a party to the original note, and in no way responsible for its payment."

It is true that Mr. Cochrane was in no way responsible for the original note of $1,000, but four or five years ago he became responsible for a part of the original note, the residue of the original note having been satisfied by the Conservative party. He became responsible for $619.69, and the evidence will show that the $200 that Simpson paid was applied in reduction of the promissory note by just so much, and by just so much the member for East Northumberland was relieved from his responsibility on that note. The moment that $200 was paid, as the evidence clearly discloses, that moment the member for East Northumberland ceased to be responsible for any more; his share of that indebtedness was paid, and the other makers of the promissory note became responsible for the balance by a renewal, or something of that kind. At all events, Mr. Cochrane's responsibility then ceased. Then there is another charge in the impeachment presented against the member for East Northumberland, namely, that the office of bridge-tender was sold to a person by the name of Wesley Goodrich, in consideration of $200 in cash, and the giving of a life lease on his farm by Wesley Goodrich to a person by the name of Obadiah Simpson. Obadiah Simpson, as appears by the evidence, had been promised the position of bridge-tender upon the Murray Canal by Mr. Cochrane—so it is alleged, at all events; but Obadiah Simpson was a very old man, about 80 years of age, and it is shown by the evidence that when the time came for making the appointment, it was thought that Obadiah Simpson was too old, but Mr. Cochrane, in his good nature, undertook to provide that whoever got the position of bridge-tender should provide for Obadiah Simpson, and it is alleged, and the evidence sustains it, that Wesley Goodrich got the bridge upon condition of his giving a life lease of the farm owned by his wife to Obadiah Simpson, and his paying $200 in hard cash, and he fulfilled both these conditions. Now, the finding of the majority of the Committee upon that point is as follows:—

"That the only evidence which goes to substantiate even a portion of such a charge, was the evidence of one Arundel R. Simpson, and the Committee find, for reasons best known to the Committee, that the evidence of Arundel Simpson is not to be believed."

In other words, that he was not a credible witness. Now, whether fortunately or unfortunately, I know not and care not, but the fact remains all the same, that the charge does not rest entirely upon the evidence of Arundel Simpson. If it rested upon the evidence of Arundel Simpson, and if Arundel Simpson were a credible witness, the charge would be clearly proved; but the majority of the Committee say that the evidence of Arundel Simpson is not to be believed. But hon. gentlemen will find that the evidence of another witness confirms the story told by Arundel Simpson, beyond any reasonable doubt, that is, the evidence of Wesley Goodrich himself. He was put in the witness box, and he detailed the story as he understood it. Among other things he says:

"You have just told me, I think, that you told Mr. Cochrane you were willing to give a life lease of your farm for a bridge; is that so?—Mr. Cochrane mentioned to me that there was a man by the name of King who wanted a bridge. I said I would give $200 at that time."

I may say, without going any further, that there was not a witness called from the beginning to the end of the investigation that I know of who was not a pronounced Conservative, and a supporter of the hon. member for East Northumberland. The report declares that these men were prominent Conservatives. No attempt was made to discredit a single one of them. It is true that on a minor point the evidence of Simpson was contradicted, but it was on a minor point and of no consequence as regards reaching a proper conclusion. In Goodrich's testimony we read:

3691. You have just told me, I think, that you told Mr. Cochrane you were willing to give a life lease of your farm for a bridge? Is that so?—Mr. Cochrane mentioned to me that there was a man by the name of King who wanted a bridge. Then I said I would give $200 at that time.

Recollect that this is a conversation which took place between Goodrich, a friend and supporter of Mr. Cochrane, and Mr. Cochrane. Here he swears that Mr. Cochrane told him, speaking of the selling of the bridges and what he was to give for them, what I have read. He is asked by counsel:

3692. For the bridge?—For the bridge.
3698. You did pay the $200?—I did, sir.
3699. That was before you gave the lease?—Yes, sir.
3700. To whom did you pay the $200?—I paid it to Mr. Edward Cochrane.
3701. To the member for the east riding of Northumberland?—Yes. It was more convenient for me to go to him than to Mr. Wade. Wade's was a long way out of my way. He told me to take it to Mr. Payne when I offered it to him.
3702. Who told you?—Mr. Cochrane. I said to him, "Are you not going to Colborne soon? It is out of my way if I have to go on purpose." He said, "Wallace is going to-night with the grist.' The team was standing in the yard and I suggested that perhaps Wallace would take it up. He said he could. Wallace went for his overcoat, and I took the money out of my pocket and asked him to count it.
3703. Whom did you ask to count it?—Mr. Cochrane.
3705. What did you give that $200 for? What value did you get for it?—I got the situation—the bridge.
3706. And that is what you gave the money for?—I suppose if you put it in that way, I don't know any other. Mr. Wade told me he was holding it for some money he wanted to realize on it.

There is the evidence of the man who paid the money, who swore point-blank to the fact that he paid the money to Mr. Cochrane. It is true that Mr. Wallace Cochrane was called, and swore that he did not get the money from the hands of his father, but out of the hands of Wesley Goodrich. In so far as my judgment is concerned, it does not appear to me to make any particular difference. Goodrich swore that he went to Mr. Cochrane with $200; Goodrich swore tha the offered it to Mr. Cochrane; Goodrich swore that Mr. Cochrane did not want the money and told him to take it down to Mr. Payne, solicitor for the Conservative committee, to help to pay the party debt. He swore

further that he took the money out of his pocket and handed the money to Mr. Cochrane, that he asked him to count it, that Mr. Cochrane did count it, and gave it to his son, Wallace Cochrane, to take to Mr. Payne. Wallace Cochrane swore that his father did not hand him the money but that Goodrich handed him the money. That certainly is no contradiction which would lead sensible and reasonable men to come to the conclusion that the evidence of Wesley Goodrich had failed. No attempt was made to break down the evidence. Above all, if this were not true, the person who could throw all possible light on the subject was the member for East Northumberland, and he did not pledge his oath to the incorrectness or falsity of a single statement made from the beginning to the end of the investigation. He was not examined. Counsel refused to put him in the box. Although these statements made by his neighbours and friends and appointees to office swore away his character and reputation as a member of Parliament, Mr. Cochrane did not see fit to enter the box and give evidence on his own behalf. Then it is stated further in this report that Goodrich gave the money voluntarily. Hon. members heard the evidence I read, the sworn evidence of Goodrich himself. He was asked: What did you give the money for? He answered: It was given for the position. He was asked: Given for the bridge? He replied: It was given for the bridge. Yet the majority of the Committee state in the report that it was a voluntary contribution on the part of Wesley Goodrich. A voluntary contribution! Is it at all likely, is it possible it can be so? Have my eyes been blinded, so that I am not able to read the English language printed here, or has some one else been blinded? Either the majority or the minority of the Committee must have been blinded, because the evidence was clear and the story was true. There are three or four other charges. There are Clouston, Brown and Robert May, each of whom obtained a position as bridge-tender on the Murray Canal, the two first contributing $150 each, the last named, Robert May, contributing $125. It is stated in the report of the majority of the Committee that these contributions were voluntary contributions, and were not given for the purpose of relieving the makers of the note, including the member for East Northumberland, but were contributions for political purposes. The finding of the majority of the Committee is that:

"The said Clouston and Brown each voluntarily stated that he would pay $150, and the said Robert May voluntarily stated he would pay $125 towards payment of such indebtedness, and afterwards the said Clouston paid about $100, and the said Brown and Robert May each paid $150 for such purpose."

If there was a scintilla of evidence on which to base that conclusion I would not be standing here to-day proposing to move an amendment to the report of the majority of the Committe. I believe no man, be he member or not, should be convicted of a grave charge like this unless the evidence is direct, strong and conclusive. Of course, we have a right to convict, as a jury has a right to convict, on circumstantial evidence if it leads to but one conclusion, and that is that the charge has been proven. Fortunately for the ends of justice the evidence is direct and it is positive, and it is given without any hesitation; and although it was given reluctantly by friends and neighbours of the hon. member for East Northumberland, it appears to have been given truthfully and honestly. So far as I was individually concerned, I had no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that these men swore what they honestly believed to be the truth, and what was the truth. If there was contradiction, it was only on unimportant matters, and in no way affected the general result. It is said that these men made large contributions, $150 and $125, for political purposes. If you, Mr. Speaker, had been present and seen the men you would without a moment's hesitation have come to the conclusion that this story was not correct. They were labouring men. One declared he had a wife and large family, and was living on his daily earnings, and had nothing to support himself with except his daily labour. Clouston gave evidence strong, clear and distinct on the subject of his own position, and as to whether it was a voluntary contribution or not. He said:

2023. Did you pay anything?—I suppose I did.
2024. Do you swear you paid a farthing?—Yes, sir.
2025. When?—I think on two different occasions I gave a dollar.
2026. On two different occasions you subscribed a dollar on the reduction of this indebtedness?—Yes.

Some seven or eight years ago he subscribed one dollar and some three years ago he subscribed another dollar, and yet we are asked to believe that all at once he subscribed $150 for political purposes. Mr. Clouston did not say that, and you will find on reading his evidence that Mr. Clouston would not have given a farthing had he not got the bridge. What does Will Brown say? Does he say that he paid this contribution for political purposes? No. He was asked:

2689. How long before this had you made any contributions to the party funds?—Several years before. It was when there was a protest.
2694. Do you remember how much you gave on that occasion?—I gave $2.
2695. The next payment was $150?—Yes, sir.
2696. Then an interval of 6 or 7 years had elapsed before the first subscription of $2, and the last subscription of $150?—A little length of time: I do not know what it was. It was the time the protest was going on, whatever time that was.
2697. Did you happen to be aware all these years that the party was in debt for these costs?—Was I aware of it? Yes.
2698. All these years you had not contributed anything since the $2 contribution?—No, I had not.

And yet, Sir, all at once, on the spur of the moment, this man is said to have contributed $150 to pay off the debt of the party. Even in that case, Mr. Speaker, I say it is wholly unjustifiable that men in the position these men were in, applicants for a bridge and recommended by the committee I have spoken of, should have been asked to make these donations in reduction of a debt for part of which the hon. member for the riding was responsible. Now, Sir, the motion I propose to move in amendment to this report sets out the facts as gathered by the minority from the evidence submitted to the Committee. It is set out in this report:

2. That the said Edward Cochrane, while he was such member, was and is a supporter of the Administration, and as such had the patronage of the Administration for Government offices in and for said riding.
3. That certain leading Conservatives in said riding, in or about the year 1883, assumed certain liabilities for certain debts, amounting to about $1,000, for certain costs arising out of a certain protested election for the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

4. That such liability, or portion of it, continued down to the year 1890 or 1891.

5. That the said Edward Cochrane, with others, was liable for $619.69 of said debt down until and after the payment by Hedley Simpson, hereinafter mentioned, was made.

6. That about four years ago certain electors of said riding, viz., Messrs. May, Adam, Stanley, Lawson and Bullock constituted themselves a committee for the purpose of raising money to pay off said debt, and the mode they adopted was by recommending certain persons to said Edward Cochrane as fit and proper persons to fill certain Government offices, the said Edward Cochrane then recommending such persons to the Government as fit and proper persons to fill said offices, the persons so recommended agreeing to pay a certain price or sum for said offices.

7. That the said Edward Cochrane was not a member of the said committee, but he knew of the purpose and object of its existence; attended one or more of its meetings, when matters relating to said offices were discussed; acted on the committee's recommendations, and when persons made applications to him for offices he referred them to the said committee for a recommendation, which he acted on.

Now, Sir, is that statement true or false? Is there any independent, impartial testimony upon which it can be shown, that although the member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) was not a member of the committee, that he was cognizant of its existence, knew of the object and purpose of its existence, and that he attended one at least of its meetings when these very questions were discussed? If that is true, I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, it brings the matter home very close to the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane). We have upon that subject the evidence of a man by the name of Mr. Bullock, a merchant residing in the village where the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) principally does his business. He is favourable, politically, to the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), and one naturally would suppose that he would be inclined, so far as would be consistent with his oath, to colour his evidence if he coloured at all, in favour of his member and his friend. Mr. Bullock gives the following testimony. I regret to trouble the House with these extracts; but as the report of the majority of the Committee is altogether contrary to what my judgment leads me to believe it ought to be, I beg to trouble the House with extracts from the evidence sustaining my views on the subject. Mr. Bullock is a resident of the county, a storekeeper in whose store the meetings of the committee were held, and a leading party man in the neighbourhood. He gives the following evidence:—

2406. What were the duties of that committee?—The duties of the committee were to see if we could not appoint somebody on the canal for the bridges there.

2407. How much were each of them to give?—We exacted $150 from every one of them. That is what we wanted.

2409. What was the $150 to be given for?—It was to be given for our influence.

2411. Who was to give $150?—Everybody who got the appointment.

2420. It was the rule that those who were applicants should pay $150?—I think it was.

2516. Did you say that the committee met there after the store was closed?—Yes.

2517. And Mr. Cochrane was there when the committee met?—Yes.

2518. For the whole of the time?—No: not when they were meeting.

2519. Oh, well, did he come in afterwards?—Yes; he came in after the committee met.

2524. Where did the committee transact its business in the store?—I believe it was right in the open store.

2525. Right in there in the main part of the store?—Yes.

2526. And that is where Mr. Cochrane came?—Yes.

2527. Mr. Cochrane was in there with the committee?—Yes; but he was not on the committee.

2529. You have sworn that Mr. Cochrane was there?—Yes.

2530. And you have sworn that he was there while the committee were there?—Yes; that's true.

2548. I mean the committee. What business did the committee do that night?—They talked over different questions about the bridges.

2549. How long did Mr. Cochrane remain?—As far as my knowledge goes, he did not remain very long.

2554. I suppose the discussion was going on while he was there?—The discussion was going on. Yes.

2555. The talk about the bridges was going on while he was there?—Yes.

2556. You were talking about the men who would get the appointments and the amounts they were to pay?—Certainly.

1040. You did tell Mr. Cochrane that Hedley Simpson gave $200?—Yes.

1041. How long after this was it?—I do not know.

1042. Would it be a week?—It might.

That is part of the evidence, and only part of the evidence, Mr. Speaker, that shows the connection between the hon. member for East Northumberland and this committee, a committee recognized by him, a committee not appointed by him but whose functions were well known to him; a committee to which he refers, according to the evidence as it appears in the testimony submitted to Parliament, and to which he referred every single applicant for an office on the Murray Canal. I shall not deal with all the charges because I feel they are too lengthy and would take up too much time, and I will leave that to other gentlemen who may speak after me. I shall, however, refer to the charge of Hedley Simpson. As I have mentioned, the charge with respect to him was that he was appointed lighthouse keeper at Presqu'Isle Point, and that in consideration of his being so appointed he paid the sum of $200. That might all be, and the hon. member for East Northumberland not be implicated; that might all be and the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) might know nothing about it. We have the evidence, however, and the only way to settle that point is by a short reference to a portion of the testimony that bears upon it. We have the evidence upon the subject of James Stanley, whose name I have already mentioned, and who is a leading man on that committee and had a good deal to do with the negotiations. Stanley says this:

693. Then how did Mr. Simpson come to be appointed?—Well, he was recommended by the committee.

694. To whom did the committee recommend Mr. Simpson?—I suppose to Mr. Cochrane.

695. How did this recommendation come from the committee to Mr. Cochrane?—Verbally, I suppose.

696. Then, if verbally, who talked?—Mr. Cochrane happened to be in town, I suppose, and they told him.

702. But you think you did see him in regard to the appointment of Mr. Hedley Simpson, after all this money was paid?—I don't know whether it was before or after.

703. But at all events, either before or after, you did see Mr. Cochrane?—Yes; I may have seen him before or after, but I don't know.

714. Did Mr. Cochrane know anything about the payment of this money?—I don't think he did at the time.

715. Well, when did he?—I think it was some time after.

716. How long after?—I cannot tell you.

717. How did he come to know it?—I don't know but what I told him myself.

718. You might have told him yourself?—I think I did.

720. How long afterwards?—I cannot tell you,

721. Before the appointment was made?—I cannot tell you whether it was before or after.

722. But you do remember now that you had a conversation with Mr. Cochrane, and Mr. Cochrane knew from you that the $200 were paid?—I don't say that. I say I may have had before or after; I don't remember.

There is the evidence given before the Committee

by a friend and supporter of Mr. Cochrane, that not only was this done, but Mr. Cochrane was cognizant of the fact, so far as his recollection went, that $200 was paid by Hedley Simpson for some purpose. The case does not stand alone on the evidence of Stanley; the testimony of Hedley Simpson himself corroborates it. Pending the negotiations for this office between Mr. Cochrane, Stanley and Simpson, Mr. Cochrane wrote to Hedley Simpson a letter, which he sent by the hands of Arundel Simpson, to his relative, Hedley Simpson. In that letter, according to Arundel Simpson's story, it was stated by Mr. Cochrane that on the payment of $200 the office would be given to Hedley Simpson. The witness says that Hedley Simpson did not read the letter, but he carried it to Herbert Simpson, and Herbert Simpson's wife opened it and read it. I am bound to say that Arundel Simpson does not say positively that she read it, but he thinks she did. At all events, he said that some one read it, and he got that information out of it. The woman denies having read the letter, but Hedley Simpson thinks she did, and he swears whether she read it or not, it was a letter from Mr. Cochrane to Hedley Simpson; and Mr. Cochrane did not go into the witness box and deny that he sent that letter nor the contents of it. Now, Arundel Simpson says:

309. I ask you if you had any conversation with Mr. Cochrane, the member, in regard to the appointment of Mr. Hedley Simpson to a position of lighthouse keeper at Presqu'Isle?—Well, along in March I think. I think his father died in October, and I gave him a letter from Mr. Cochrane.

310. Did you see that letter?—No: I saw the letter, but I did not know what was in it. I could not tell you what what was in it.

311. Was that letter read in your presence?—I don't knew as it was. I don't think it was; I could not swear positively, it is quite a while ago.

312. Did Mr. Cochrane tell you what was in the letter?—He told me it was concerning the lighthouse, and wanted to know if I would send the letter to Mr. Hedley Simpson, for him to come and see him.

1857. You say Mr. Cochrane sent you with the letter to your relative Hedley?—Yes.

1860. Did you see Mr. Cochrane after he got the letter?—Yes.

1861. Now in the eighth paragraph of the declaration you said: "Subsequently said Cochrane sent to the said Hedley H. Simpson by me a letter in which it was stated that said Hedley H. Simpson would be required, in order to secure the said appointment, to give security for the payment of $200, which letter I delivered to the said Hedley H. Simpson." How did you know the statement that was in the letter?—Well, I took the letter down to Herbert Simpson; he stays at Whitney, and he said that he would have to pay the money,

1862. Were you there when the letter was read?—Yes.

1863. The letter was read by whom?—I think it was read in the first place by Herbert Simpson's wife. She is the one who read the letter first, I think.

1865. You say that was what was in the letter?—That is what they told me was in the letter. That is what would be required in order to get the appointment.

Mrs. Simpson's statement that she did not read it is the sole contradiction of Arundel Simpson's evidence. But the fact remains that Arundel Simpson swears that he took the letter there, and the purport of it was that if Hedley Simpson would give $200 he would get the lighthouse, and Mr. Cochrane does not deny it. As to the price paid for the office by Hedley Simpson, the evidence of Arundel Simpson is clear, if it can be relied on. It is as follows:—

324. Mr. Cochrane told you that Snetsinger offered him something?—Yes.

325. How much did he say?—I would not be positive, either $400 or $600.

This man Snetsinger was an applicant for the lighthouse, and Arundel Simpson swears that Mr. Cochrane told him that he had offered either $400 or $600 for it.—

326. He said that Snetsinger offered him, either $400 or $600 for the appointment?—I would not be positive which; he told me it was quite an amount.

330. What did he say?—He said that Hedley would get it for $200.

332. Tell us what he said?—He said he would get it for $200.

1812. Who is "he"?—Mr. Snetsinger. He said Mr. Snetsinger would give $600 for the lighthouse, and they only got $200. Cochrane said that to me in the store. He did not say he offered him; he said he would give it. But that Hedley only gave $200.

1813. But that he (Cochrane) would secure the appointment of said Hedley H. Simpson for a good deal less than $600?—He did secure it. This was long after, as Mr. Cochrane knows.

This is not all the evidence by any means or, perhaps, the most important; but it is sufficient evidence, I submit, to show that the report of the Committee is not in accordance with the evidence. There is another charge, namely, that Wesley Goodrich paid $200 and gave a life lease of his farm to secure the appointment of bridge-tender on the Murray Canal. I do not wish to make any observations on that charge; I only wish to submit the evidence given in support of it by the sworn witnesses, all of whom were supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite and friends of the hon. member for East Northumberland. I may say, in fairness to myself, that I am only quoting those portions of the evidence which have a direct bearing on the case, as some portions were wholly irrelevant. On that charge Arundel Simpson swears as follows:—

1519. Did you see Mr. Stanley in 1889, in regard to getting an appointment as bridge-keeper?—I did.

1524. Did he say anything about your getting one?—He said that I could get one by looking after my father and giving him $150.

1528. Did you afterwards see Mr. Cochrane about it?—He saw me about it.

1529. Mr. Cochrane did?—Yes.

1530. You met Mr. Cochrane in Brighton?—Yes.

1531. What took place between you and Mr. Cochrane? Did he send for you?—He called me into the room.

1532. Where was this—in the hotel?—In Mr. Stanley's hotel.

This is the same Stanley who was one of the members of the committee and one of the leading Conservatives in the riding.—

1533. What did he say to you?—He said they had made different arrangements about the bridge. That they were going to make some arrangements for fifty acres of land for my father, and let some one else have the bridge.

1541. What else did he say?—He said that Mr. Stanley could not pay off $900 with four bridges at $150 apiece.

At that time the debt of the Conservative party had been reduced to $900, for which a note was outstanding, and according to the evidence of Arundel Simpson Mr. Cochrane said that Mr. Stanley could not pay off the $900 note with four bridges at $150 each.—

1542. Where was that said to you?—At Mr. Stanley's hotel.

1543. By Mr. Cochrane?—By Mr. Cochrane.

1544. The member for East Northumberland?—Yes.

1691. Did he tell you anything more?—He said, that Mr. Stanley said, they could not pay off $900 with four bridges at $150 each. Mr. Stanley could not pay it off with that amount.

1833. What else were you to do?—I was to get the money for him, I suppose.

1834. Any other condition?—From Mr. Stanley? I don't know as there was, except to see my father—maintain my father.

1846. How much had he paid?—Who had paid?

1847. Whoever had been appointed?—He said that he could get more for it. He could get $200.

1848. No, no; you said before that he could not pay off $900 with four bridges at $150. What did Mr. Cochrane say?—About the bridge?

1849. Yes.—That is what he told me; he could not pay off with four bridges.

1850. Is that all?—He said something about getting more from this man; that is $200.

Now, Wesley Goodrich himself makes use of similar language on the same subject:

3691. You have just told me, I think, that you told Mr. Cochrane you were willing to give a life lease of your farm for a bridge? Is that so?—Mr. Cochrane mentioned to me that there was a man by the name of King who wanted a bridge. Then I said I would give $200 at that time.

3692. For the bridge?—For the bridge.

3698. You did pay the $200?—I did, sir.

3699. That was before you gave the lease?—Yes, sir.

3700. To whom did you pay the $200?—I paid it to Mr. Edward Cochrane.

3701. To the member for the East Riding of Northumberland?—Yes. It was more convenient for me to go to him than to Mr. Wade. Wade's was a long way out of my way. He told me to take it to Mr. Payne when I offered it to him.

3702. Who told you?—Mr. Cochrane. I said to him, "Are you not going to Colborne soon? It is out of my way if I have to go out on purpose." He said, "Wallace is going to-night with the grist." The team was standing in the yard, and I suggested that perhaps Wallace would take it up. He said he could. Wallace went for his overcoat and I took the money out of my pocket and asked him to count it.

3703. Whom did you ask to count it?—Mr. Cochrane.

3705. What did you give that $200 for? What value did you get for it?—I got the situation—the bridge.

3706. And that is what you gave the money for?—I suppose if you put it that way, I don't know any other.

That is the evidence of this man, yet we are told in the report of the majority of the Committee that all these sums were paid as voluntary contributions by these men. If hon. gentlemen, dealing with this question in a purely judicial spirit, as a judge would, upon the evidence I have submitted to Parliament, taken from the sworn testimony given before the Committee of enquiry, see fit to come to the conclusion that these were voluntary contributions, the responsibility must rest upon their shoulders and not upon mine. I can see nothing voluntary about them: I can see no payments made which were not exacted from the parties paying, as a commission for their appointment to lighthouses and bridges. I, being fallible like others, may be mistaken. I would like to see the Minister of Militia, on reading through the evidence carefully, arrive at a conclusion different from that set out in the minority report. I would like to hear his reasons for arriving at such a conclusion. I would like him to read to the House the evidence upon which he based it. If he can convince the House that all traffic in public offices is quite right, or if he can show that nothing of the kind has taken place, I shall be glad to hear him do so. It is no pleasure to me that a charge of this kind should be brought home to a member of Parliament or anybody else. There are three or four other cases. There is the case of William Brown, and I could sustain my argument by his evidence alone. But as I have taken up the time of the House sufficiently, I do not trespass any longer upon its attention, but will leave the other cases in the hands of some other hon. gentleman who may follow me. There is one case, however, to which I will just incidentally refer. That is the case of Thomas Fitzgerald. Now, there was no charge made in Parliament that he had got an office by corrupt means. There was no charge that the hon. member for East Northumberland, or his party, had corruptly given a Government office to Thomas Fitzgerald; but he was called as a witness on behalf of those sustaining the impeachment of the hon. member for East Northumberland and without objection by Mr. Cochrane's counsel, and he swore most positively that he himself had obtained the position of bridge-tender, and had paid $150 for it. If you follow the evidence of Fitzgerald from the beginning to the end, you will find no pretense that the sum paid was a purely voluntary contribution. In fact you must come to the conclusion that it was given solely for the purpose of obtaining the position of bridge-tender. There is also the evidence of Robert May who obtained the position of bridge-tender on paying $125. As he was a brother of one of the committee, he got the bridge at $25 less. There was the case of old Mr. Clouston who obtained a bridge without the intervention of the committee and solely through Mr. Cochrane. The money was paid by him, $150, not directly to Mr. Cochrane, but for the purpose of paying off a portion of his political debt. Now, Mr. Clouston did not pretend to say, although he swore that he was a leading Conservative in the riding and had taken part in the political contests for a long series of years, that he had ever given liberally for political purposes. If my memory serves me right, the outside amount he had given in a number of years for political purposes was $2 or $3. Yet we are asked to believe that these men gave these donations of $150 to $200 for purely political purposes. I do not intend to trespass much longer on the time of the House. I will read to Parliament the conclusion at which the minority of the Committee arrived in respect of this case. Upon all these charges the minority of the Committee came to the conclusion that the evidence pointed in one direction, and one direction only, and so believing they wound up their report as follows:—

That one C. D. Vanalstine (whose name I have not mentioned) corruptly paid the said James Stanley, in order to secure the office of tender of one of the bridges in said canal, the money to be used as aforesaid; that the money was returned to him because all the said positions had been disposed of.

The fact is that Mr. Vanalstine deposited his money, $150, for which he was to get the position of bridge-tender. It then turned out there were not enough bridges to go round, and he did not get the position, but got his money back. Is not that a complete answer to the statement made that the contributions were voluntary? Is it not perfectly clear that the men who paid the money got the bridges, and that those who paid money and did not get bridges got their money back? The minority wind up their report in the following language:—

22. That the said committee was organized for the express purpose of corruptly trafficking in said offices, and did corruptly sell and dispose of the same to Hedley Simpson, Wesley Goodrich, Robert May, Thomas Fitzgerald and J. D. Clouston, respectively, for a money consideration.

23. That said Edward Cochrane was aware of such corrupt sale and disposal of said offices, sanctioned the same, and made his said recommendations with the knowledge that said offices were so sold and disposed of.

24. That the payment by the said Hedley Simpson of the said sum of $200 directly relieved the said Edward Cochrane of just so much of the said Edward Cochrane's indebtedness on said note of $619.69.

25. That the said Edward Cochrane did not present himself as a witness in his own behalf before your Committee, and did not pledge his oath to the incorrectness or falsehood of a single statement made before your Committee by any of the witnesses examined before them.

26. That all said appointees are poor men, although strong Conservatives; some of them never gave a cent for political purposes, and, of the rest, none gave more than $3 each for such purposes for years prior to the payment of said sums.

27. That all the witnesses who appeared and gave evidence before your Committee, appeared to your Committee to be men of truth and desirous of speaking the truth, so far as they knew: and there does not appear to be any ground for doubting the credibility of any one of them.

28. That selling or disposing of offices for a money or other consideration is highly improper and reprehensible: and the parties shown to have been engaged in such a practice here should be proceeded against criminally.

Now, Sir, I leave the matter in the hands of the House, and I move this amendment trusting that the House will deal with it as a court would with an ordinary case, impartially, and without political partizanship and party prejudice. I move:

That all the words after the word "That" in the said motion be struck out, and the following substituted in lieu thereof:—

1. In the year A.D. 1888, there was a vacancy in the position of Government Lighthouse-keeper in the Government lighthouse on Presqu'Isle Point, County of Northumberland.

2. That one Hedley H. Simpson was an applicant for said office.

3. That Edward Cochrane then was, and now is, the member for the House of Commons for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the said County of Northumberland, and a supporter of the Government.

4. That in the year 1888 it was corruptly agreed to, by and between the said Edward Cochrane and the said Hedley H. Simpson, that if the said Hedley H. Simpson would make and deliver to one James Stanley two promissory notes for $100 each, endorsed by some responsible person, he, the said Edward Cochrane, would procure the appointment of the said Hedley H. Simpson to the said office of Lighthouse-keeper of the Government lighthouse on Presqu'Isle Point.

5. That the said Hedley H. Simpson, in pursuance of said corrupt bargain, did make the said two promissory notes for $100 each—procured their endorsement by a responsible party—handed them to the said James Stanley, who received the same and placed them in a bank for the use of the said Edward Cochrane personally or for political purposes.

6. That the said Hedley H. Simpson subsequently paid the said notes.

7. That the said Hedley H. Simpson, in pursuance of said corrupt bargain, received the said appointment.

1. That in the summer of 1889 Obadiah Simpson was promised by the said Edward Cochrane the Government office of keeper or attendant of one of the swing bridges over the Murry Canal.

2. That in the summer of 1889 the said James Stanley, who is a confidential friend and warm political supporter of the said Edward Cochrane, sent for one Arundel R. Simpson to call and see him. He did, when the said James Stanley proposed to the said Arundel R. Simpson, with the knowledge and consent of the said Edward Cochrane, that if the said Arundel R. Simpson would pay $150 and give to his father, the said Obadiah Simpson, the life lease of his farm (as compensation for his not being appointed such bridge-keeper)—he had been promised and had not received the said office—he, the said Arundel R. Simpson, would be appointed such bridge-keeper.

3. That shortly afterwards the said Arundel R. Simpson had an interview with the said Edward Cochrane on the same subject, when the said Edward Cochrane said to him that they could not take the $150 for said office, that Stanley should not have made that offer, that other arrangements had been made with one Wesley Goodrich, who agreed to pay $200 and give said life lease for said appointment.

4. That the said Edward Cochrane then and there corruptly proposed to the said Arundel R. Simpson, that if he would pay said Edward Cochrane $200 and give said life lease he would be appointed. This he refused to do.

5. That subsequently it was corruptly agreed to, by and between the said Wesley Goodrich and the said Edward Cochrane, that if the said Edward Cochrane would procure the appointment of the said Wesley Goodrich to the said Government office of keeper of said bridge, he, the said Wesley Goodrich, would pay the sum of $200; and execute to the said Obadiah Simpson, father of the said Arundel R. Simpson, a life lease on his farm, with a condition in said lease that if said Wesley Goodrich lost said appointment said lease would be cancelled.

6. That in pursuance of the said corrupt bargain the said Wesley Goodrich paid said money and executed said lease, and caused his wife to execute the same, to the said Obadiah Simpson, on part of Lot 18, in the 2nd Concession of the Township of Cramahe, in the said county, for the rent of one peppercorn a year and on the condition that if the said Goodrich should be released by the Government from attendance on said bridge said lease would come to an end and be void, but said condition was not to apply in case said Goodrich should be discharged on account of any act of his own.

1. That Edward Cochrane was, during the last Parliament, and now is the member for the electoral district of the East Riding of the County of Northumberland.

2. That while he was such member it was corruptly agreed to by and between the said Edward Cochrane and John D. Clouston, William Johnson, William Brown and Robert May, respectively, that if each of them would pay to him, or to certain other persons for him or for political purposes, the sum of $200, he would procure for each of them the position under the Government of Canada of attendant or keeper of one of the swing-bridges over or across the Murray Canal.

3. That in pursuance of such corrupt agreement the said several sums of money were paid, and the said persons were so appointed to said positions.

4. That while he, the said Edward Cochrane, was such member as aforesaid, it was corruptly agreed by and between the said Edward Cochrane and one Henry May, that if the said Henry May would pay the said Edward Cochrane, or to other persons for him, or for political purposes, the sum of $200, he would procure for the said Henry May the office or position under the Government of foreman or overseer of employés under the Government.

5. That in pursuance of the said corrupt agreement, the said sum of $200 was paid, and the said office or position duly received by the said Henry May:

Beg leave to report as follows:—

1. We find, that when the transactions hereinafter mentioned took place, the said Edward Cochrane was and still is the member for said riding.

2. That the said Edward Cochrane, while he was such member, was and is a supporter of the Administration, and as such had the patronage of the Administration for Government offices in and for said riding.

3. That certain leading Conservatives in the said riding, in or about the year 1883, assumed certain liabilities for certain debts, amounting to about $1,000, for certain costs arising out of a certain protested election for the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

4. That such liability, or portion of it, continued down to the year 1890 or 1891.

5. That said Edward Cochrane, with others, was liable for $619.69 of said debt down until and after the payment by Hedley Simpson, hereinafter mentioned, was made.

6. That about four years ago certain electors of said riding, viz., Messrs. May, Adam, Stanley, Lawson and Bullock, constituted themselves a committee for the purpose of raising money to pay off said debt, and the mode they adopted was by recommending certain persons to the said Edward Cochrane as fit and proper persons to fill certain Government offices, the said Edward Cochrane then recommending such persons to the Government as fit and proper persons to fill said offices, the persons so recommended agreeing to pay a certain price or sum for said offices.

7. That the said Edward Cochrane was not a member of the said committee, but he knew of the purpose and object of its existence; attended one or more of its meetings, when matters relating to said offices were discussed; acted on the committee's recommendations, and when persons made applications to him for offices he referred them to the said committee for a recommendation, which he acted on. Mr. Bullock, one of said committee, gave the following evidence, on oath, before your Committee:—

2406. What were the duties of that committee?—The duties of the committee were to see if we could not appoint somebody on the canal for the bridges there.

2407. How much were each of them to give?—We exacted $150 from every one of them. That is what we wanted.

2408. What were these people to get for the $150 they were to pay?—I cannot swear to that.

2409. What was the $150 to be given for?—It was to be given for our influence.

2410. Were you to put this $150 in your pocket?—No.

2411. Who was to give $150?—Everybody who got the appointment.

2412. And those who did not get the appointment were not to pay it?—Certainly not.
2420. It was the rule that those who were applicants should pay $150?—I think it was.
2489. Did Mr. Cochrane attend any of the meetings?—He was there once; I do not know whether he had any conversation with me or any of us."
2514. When your store was closed?—Yes.
2515. Then Mr. Cochrane remained there after the store was closed?—He came in accidentally, I think.
2516. Did you say that the commitee met there after the store was closed?—Yes.
2517. And Mr. Cochrane was there when the committee met?—Yes.
2518. For the whole of the time?—No; not when they were meeting.
2519. Oh, well, did he come in afterwards?—Yes: he came in after the committee met.
2520. Now, the committee met after the store was closed, and Mr. Cochrane, having come in after the committee met, must have come in after the store was closed?—He did.
2524. Where did the committee transact its business in the store?—I believe it was right in the open store.
2525. Right in there in the main part of the store?—Yes.
2526. And that is where Mr. Cochrane came?—Yes.
2527. Mr. Cochrane was in there with the committee?—Yes: but he was not on the committee.
2528. I know, but was he in there with the committee?—He was there when the committee was there in the store. I could not swear when Mr. Cochrane came in, but I know he came right into the store when the committee was meeting there.
2529. You have sworn that Mr. Cochrane was there?—Yes.
2530. And you have sworn that he was there while the committee was there?—Yes: that's true.
2548. I mean the committee. What business did the committee do that night?—They talked over different questions about the bridges.
2549. How long did Mr. Cochrane remain?—As far as my knowledge goes, he did not remain very long.
2554. I suppose the discussion was going on while he was there?—The discussion was going on. Yes.
2555. The talk about the bridges was going on while he was there?—Yes.
2556. You were talking about the men who would get the appointments and the amounts that they were to pay?—Certainly.
"1040. You did tell Mr. Cochrane that Hedley Simpson gave $200?—Yes.
1041. How long after this was it?—I do not know.
1042. Would it be a week?—It might.

8. That in the month of April, 1888, one Hedley H. Simpson was recommended by the said committee to the said Edward Edward Cochrane as a fit person to fill the position of lighthouse-keeper at Presqu'Isle Point.

9. That James Stanley, one of said committee, and by its authority, called upon said Hedley H. Simpson and told him of said recommendation, and made it a condition of his getting said appointment that he should pay the said Stanley the sum of $200 to be used in part liquidation of said debt.

10. That thereupon the said Edward Cochrane recommended the said Hedley H. Simpson to the Government as a fit person to fill the said office.

11. That the said Hedley H. Simpson duly paid the said sum, and on said recommendations he duly received said office and now holds the same—and this to the knowledge of said Edward Cochrane—the said Stanley, in his evidence before said committee, swore as follows:—

693. Then how did Mr. Simpson come to be appointed?—Well, he was recommened by the committee.
694. To whom did the committee recommend Mr. Simpson?—I suppose to Mr. Cochrane.
695. How did this recommendation come from the committee to Mr. Cochrane?—Verbally, I suppose.
696. Then if verbally, who talked?—Mr. Cochrane happened to be in town, I suppose, and they told him.
701. Then you think now you did see Mr. Cochrane, as one of the committee?—I say I may have done so; I may have had a conversation, but that was all.
702. But you think you did see him in regard to the appointment of Mr. Hedley Simpson, after all this money was paid?—I don't know whether it was before or after.
703. But at all events, either before or after, you did see Mr. Cochrane?—Yes; I may have seen him before or after, but I don't know.
714. Did Mr. Cochrane know anything about the payment of this money?—I don't think he did at the time.
715. Well, when did he?—I think it was some time after.
716. How long after?—I cannot tell you.

717. How did he come to know it?—I don't know but what I told him myself.
718. You might have told him yourself?—I think I did."
"720. How long afterwards?—I cannot tell you.
721. Before the appointment was made?—I cannot tell you whether it was before or after.
722. But you do remember now that you had a conversation with Mr. Cochrane, and Mr. Cochrane knew from you that the $200 were paid?—I don't say that. I say I may have had before or after; I don't remember.

12. Pending the negotiations between said Stanley, and the said Hedley H. Simpson and the said Edward Cochrane respecting said lighthouse, the said Edward Cochrane wrote the said Hedley H. Simpson a letter respecting said lighthouse, and sent it to him by the hands of Arundel Simpson, who in said investigation swore as follows respecting the same:—

309. I ask you if you had any conversation with Mr. Cochrane, the member, in regard to the appointment of Mr. Hedley Simpson to a position of lighthouse-keeper at Presqu'Ile?—Well, along in March, I think. I think his father died in October, and I gave him a letter from Mr. Cochrane.
310. Did you see that letter?—No: I saw the letter but I did not know what was in it. I could not tell you what was in it.
311. Was that letter read in your presence?—I don't know as it was. I don't think it was; I would not swear positively; it is quite a while ago.
312. Did Mr. Cochrane tell you what was in the letter?—He told me it was concerning the lighthouse, and wanted to know if I would send the letter to Mr. Hedley Simpson, for him to come and see him."
1857. You say Mr. Cochrane sent you with the letter to your relative Hedley?—Yes.
1858. And Mr. Stanley was present at the time, and knew the letter was going to Hedley from Mr. Cochrane?—Yes.
1859. Do you know whether he knew the contents of the letter?—I do not know.
1860. Did you see Mr. Cochrane after he got the letter?—Yes.
1861. Now, in the eighth paragraph of the declaration you said: "Subsequently said Cochrane sent to the said Hedley H. Simpson by me a letter in which it was stated that said Hedley H. Simpson would be required, in order to secure the said appointment, to give security for the payment of $200, which letter I delivered to the said Hedley H. Simpson." How did you know the statement that was in the letter?—Well, I took the letter down to Herbert Simpson: he stays at Whitney, and he said that he would have to pay the money.
1862. Were you there when the letter was read?—Yes.
1863. The letter was read by whom?—I think it was read in the first place by Herbert Simpson's wife. She is the one who read the letter first, I think.
1864. You all were there and heard it read?—Yes.
1865. You say that was what was in the letter?—That is what they told me was in the letter. That was what would be required in order to get the appointment.
1866. You did not read the letter yourself?—No.
1867. The letter was read when you took it there?—Yes.
1868. It was opened there?—The letter was not sealed up.
1869. The envelope was open?—Yes.
1870. In the presence of Hedley Simpson, Herbert Simpson, Herbert Simpson's wife and yourself?—Yes. It was read by Herbert Simpson's wife. Mrs. Herbert Simpson does the business—the reading and everything that is done in that way.
1871. Then the letter, the envelope not being sealed, was read by Mrs. Herbert Simpson in the presence of yourself?—Yes; and Hedley, when he found what was in the letter, asked me what I thought he should do, and I said that he had better take it. Herbert Simpson said no, not to take it. Afterwards, in a day or two, they wanted to know what I thought about it myself.

13. That, respecting the price paid for said office and the said Edward Cochrane's knowledge thereof, the said Arundel Simpson gave the following evidence:—

324. Mr. Cochrane told you that Snetsinger offered him something?—Yes.
325. How much did he say?—I would not be positive, either $400 or $600.
326. He said that Snetsinger offered him either $400 or $600 for the appointment?—I would not be positive which; he told me it was quite an amount.
327. What did he say, then, at the conversation, about giving it to Hedley H. Simpson?—I don't know exactly what he said about it.

328. Did he say anything?—I don't know; it is quite a while ago. He said, I believe, that he would, or they would, let him have it a good deal cheaper.
329. Would let who have it cheaper?—Mr. Hedley Simpson.
330. What did he say?—He said that Hedley would get it for $200.
331. Why do you refer to the word "cheaper"?—I don't know; I suppose that is what he said.
332. Tell us what he said?—He said he would get it for $200.
333. Did he use the word 'cheaper'?—I don't know as he did.
1812. Who is "he"?—Mr. Snetsinger. He said Mr. Snetsinger would give $600 for the lighthouse, and they only got $200. Cochrane said that to me in the store. He did not say he offered him; he said he would give it. But that Hedley only gave $200.
1813. But that he (Cochrane) would secure the appointment of said Hedley H. Simpson for a good deal less than $600?—He did secure it. This was long after, as Mr. Cochrane knows.

1. That in the end of the year 1889 or in the early part of 1890, the said James Stanley, with the consent of the said Edward Cochrane, proposed to one Arundel Simpson, that if the said Arundel Simpson would pay $150 to the said James Stanley for the purpose aforesaid, he, the said Arundel Simpson, would be appointed a bridge-tender on said canal. Arundel Simpson refused to pay anything, and therefore it was agreed to, by and between one Wesley Goodrich and the parties aforesaid, that if he would pay $200 for the purpose aforesaid and give a life lease of his farm to one Obadiah Simpson he would get said appointment, that the said Wesley Goodrich paid said sum, gave said life lease, and received said appointment on the recommendation of said Edward Cochrane. The evidence of said Arundel Simpson on this point is as follows:—
1519. Did you see Mr. Stanley in 1889, in regard to getting an appointment as bridge-keeper?—I did.
1520. What took place then?—Mr. Stanley sent for me.
1521. Well, what else?—I went up there to see him, and he told me they were about to let the bridges.
1522. What was said to you?—He said they were going to let the bridges, and that they intended me to have one.
1523. You say they were going to let the bridges. What do you mean by that?—To appoint the bridge-tenders.
1524. Did he say anything about your getting one?—He said that I could get one by looking after my father and giving $150.
1525. Who told you that?—James Stanley.
1526. Whom did you mean by giving "him" $150?—Mr. Stanley.
1527. When you say that he said you were to look after your father, were those the words that were used, or what did he mean?—He went, in the first place, to see my father, and told him that they had promised him a bridge, but that he was too old to be appointed. He asked him if he wanted one of his sons appointed in his place, and he said yes, and he would like to see me appointed.
1528. Did you afterwards see Mr. Cochrane about it?—He saw me about it.
1529. Mr. Cochrane did?—Yes.
1530. You met Mr. Cochrane in Brighton?—Yes.
1531. What took place between you and Mr. Cochrane? Did he send for you?—He called me into the room.
1532. Where was this—in the hotel?—In Mr. Stanley's hotel.
1533. What did he say to you?—He said they had made different arrangements about the bridge. That they were going to make some arrangements for fifty acres of land for my father, and let someone else have the bridge.
1534. Did he say with whom the arrangement was made?—I do not think he did that night.
1538. What did he say about the $150?—I do not know just what he did say.
1539. Try and think?—He said they had made other arrangements. I said it was all right; I was not very particular.
1541. What else did he say?—He said that Mr. Stanley could not pay off $900 with four bridges at $150 apiece.
1542. Where was that said to you?—At Mr. Stanley's hotel.
1543. By Mr. Cochrane?—By Mr. Cochrane.
1544. The member for East Northumberland?—Yes.
1545. When he said that they had made other arrangements, was anything said in regard to more money?—That is all I heard him say. I heard him say what I have just told you.
1573. How much was he getting from you?—Mr. Stanley wes getting $150.
1578. He gave you to understand, then, that some arrangement had been made by some parties which prevented him from recommending you?—That is what he told me.
1691. Did he tell you anything more?—He said that Mr. Stanley said they could not pay off $900 with four bridges at $150 each: Mr. Stanley could not pay it off with that amount.
1830. What did he say about your father?—He said the old gentleman was too old.
1831. He said the old gentleman was too old, and what else?—He would like to have the money right off, as soon as possible.
1832. How much money?—$150.
1833. What else were you to do?—I was to get the money for him, I suppose.
1834. Any other condition?—From Mr. Stanley? I don't know as there was, except to see to my father—maintain my father.
1846. How much had he paid?—Who had paid?
1847. Whoever had been appointed?—He said that he could get more for it. He could get $200.
1848. No, no; you said before that he could not pay off $900 with four bridges at $150. What did Mr. Cochrane say?—About the bridge?
1849. Yes.—That is what he told me: he could not pay off with four bridges.
1850. Is that all?—He said something about getting more from this man: that is $200.

The evidence of Wesley Goodrich on this point is as follows:—
3682. You talked of the life lease to Mr. Cochrane?—I told Mr. Cochrane what I would do about it. He told me I was very foolish.
3683. You told him about the life lease?—I told him that.
3684. That you were willing to give the life lease of your farm to get a bridge?—Yes, sir.
3685. Did you tell him you were willing to pay $200 besides?—I did not. I have no recollection of it.
3686. At no time?—I won't say at no time. I think I did once tell him.
3687. When?—Some time before that.
3688. How long before that?—I could not tell you.
3689. You told him at that time that you were willing to give a life lease and the $200?—No, sir. Wade proposed that if I got the bridge I should pay $200.
3690. You told Mr. Cochrane that Wade had proposed that you should pay $200 to the bridge?
3691. You have just told me, I think, that you told Mr. Cochrane you were willing to give a life lease of your farm for a bridge? Is that so?—Mr. Cochrane mentioned to me that there was a man by the name of King who wanted a bridge. Then I said I would give $200 at that time.
3692. For the bridge?—For the bridge.
3698. You did pay the $200?—I did, sir.
3699. That was before you gave the lease?—Yes, sir.
3700. To whom did you pay the $200?—I paid it to Mr. Edward Cochrane.
3701. To the member for the East Riding of Northumberland?—Yes. It was more convenient for me to go to him than to Mr. Wade. Wade's was a long way out of my way. He told me to take it to Mr. Payne when I offered it to him.
3702. Who told you?—Mr. Cochrane. I said to him, "Are you not going to Colborne soon? It is out of my way if I have to go on purpose." He said, "Wallace is going to-night with the grist." The team was standing in the yard, and I suggested that perhaps Wallace would take it up. He said he could. Wallace went for his overcoat, and I took the money out of my pocket and asked him to count it.
3703. Whom did you ask to count it?—Mr. Cochrane.
3704. I think you had better tell the Committee again what happened there?—I agreed with Mr. Wade to pay this $200. Mr. Wade lived at Hilton, quite a way from my place, and I went to Mr. Cochrane (he was in the barn-yard at the time when I arrived), and I asked him would he take the money. He told me to take it to Mr. Payne at Colborne, but that was quite a way for me to go. I said, "Are you not going soon," as I knew he went there often. He said, "Wallace is going to-night with the grist." I had noticed the team and waggon in the yard. Wallace was going to the house to get his overcoat and I suggested that somebody ought to count the money. I said, "Would he." He did not answer me, but he seemed not to want to do it. I took it out of my pocket and urged him. He then took it and counted it and then handed it to Wallace. Wallace had got back by this time. He said, "Wallace, give that to Payne." That is as straight as I can tell you.
3705. What did you give that $200 for? What value did you get for it?—I got the situation—the bridge.

3706. And that is what you gave the money for?—I suppose if you put it that way, I don't know any other. Mr. Wade told me he was holding it for some money he wanted to realize on it.

3721. What was the date?—I have no memorandum: I could not tell you the date. It will be two years ago this fall—from the fall of 1889.

3722. You said it was before the lease was drawn?—Before the lease was drawn.

3723. And the lease was drawn on the 15th of October, 1890?—I did not give the lease until after I got the position.

3724. And the payment of the money was before you got the position?—Yes, sir; a year ago last fall it was.

3725. Can you remember how long before you got the appointment it was that you paid the $200?—I paid the $200 a year ago last fall and I got the position a year ago last spring.

3769. How did Mr. Cochrane know that you should take it to Mr. Payne?—I do not know. I did not ask him, and he did not tell me.

3770. Did he appear to know what the $200 was for?—I do not know that he said a word. He said in one of the conversations that I had with him that he had got into trouble over the protest, and of course I understood that the trouble related to the funds. I understood somebody to say that there was trouble over the protest.

3777. I will read you this in order to ascertain if you heard of it before. I am about to read from the statement that Mr. Cochrane made on the 20th of August, 1891, in reply to one of these charges. In the course of his observations Mr. Cochrane said: "It had been understood I would recommend for appointment to the bridge an old man named Obadiah Simpson, and arrangement was made between Simpson and Goodrich by which Simpson was to take a life lease of Goodrich's farm."—Do you know that it had been so understood? Do you know that it had been understood that Mr. Cochrane would recommene Mr. Obadiah Simpson for the office?—I know that there was talk, that Obadiah Simpson had been promised a bridge, and I suppose it had been through Mr. Cochrane.

3778. You understood that he was to get the bridge?—Yes.

3779. And you found that if you were to have the bridge it would be necessary for you to satisfy Obadiah?—Yes.

3780. And it was to satisfy him that you gave a life lease of the farm?—Yes.

3781. Did you tell Mr. Cochrane that you were willing to satisfy Obadiah?—I might have done so. I dare say I did, but I really cannot tell.

3782. Had he mentioned to you that he had promised Obadiah?—I would not say whether he ever did so or not.

3783. Do you remember telling him what you were willing to do in order to satisfy Webb and Obadiah Simpson, and that you had satisfied Simpson with regard to the lease and Webb with regard to the money?—Yes, sir.

3784. You had satisfied the two?—I felt that I had.

3785. The arrangement was satisfactory all round?—Yes. I proposed to do that if that would satisfy them, and they were satisfied.

3786. And you entered upon your duties the following spring—in the spring of 1890?—Yes.

3787. This arrangement was made in the fall of 1889?—Yes: it was a year ago last fall.

15. That in or about the middle of May, 1890, one William Brown was recommended by the said committee to said Edward Cochrane for the position of bridge-tender on the Murray Canal, who recommended him to the Government for the said position. That the said committee exacted from the said William Brown the sum of $150 for said recommendations to be used for the purposes aforesaid. That said William Brown paid said sum and received said appointment with recommendation of said Edward Cochrane.

William Brown's evidence on this point is as follows:—

2561. Have you any position upon that canal?—Yes, sir.

2562. What position have you got?—Bridge-keeper.

2563. How did you come to get that position?—Through the committee.

2564. What committee?—The committee which was appointed to recommend somebody for the position.

2565. You knew a committee had been appointed for that purpose?—I was told by several of the committee they had been appointed, and I was told by Mr. Cochrane also that a committee had been appointed.

2566. You were told by Mr. Cochrane there had been a committee appointed for the purpose of recommending parties for the position of bridge-keeper?—Yes.

2567. Mr. Cochrane told you that?—He did.

2568. Who is Mr. Cochrane?—He is member for East Northumberland.

2569. And it was Mr. Cochrane, member for East Northumberland, who told you that a committee had been appointed for the purpose of recommending different people?—He was the only one that told me I would have to go to the committee.

2570. Then you went to Mr. Cochrane first of all?—First of all.

2571. What did you go to him for?—For a position on the canal.

2572. What did you say to him?—I asked him what my chances were for such a position. He told me he had left the matter in the hands of the committee and that I would have to apply to the committee.

2577. Who did you converse with in regard to the $150?—The first one I had a conversation with was James Stanley.

2578. And who was the second one?—That is all.

2579. You never had a conversation with anybody except Mr. James Stanley regarding the $150?—Outside the committee, do you mean, or the committee men?

2625. But it was arranged before you got the appointment that you were to pay the money?—Yes.

2626. With whom was that arrangement made?—Mr. Stanley.

2627. Do you know that Mr. Stanley was one of this committee?—I do.

2628. The committee to which Mr. Cochrane sent you?—Yes.

2629. Was it Mr. Stanley who told you to pay the money to Mr. Webb?—It was.

2646. Then that $150 had nothing to do with your getting that appointment? It had, hadn't it?—Yes, it had.

2647. When you went to Mr. Webb to pay the money, what did you say to him?—I said I was requested by Mr. Stanley to go and pay him $150.

16. That while the said Edward Cochrane was such member as aforesaid, one Thomas Fitzgerald was recommended by said committee to the said Edward Cochrane for the position of bridge-tender at Trent Bridge, Murray Canal: that the said James Stanley, as a member of the said committee, and by its authority, exacted from the said Thomas Fitzgerald the sum of $150, to be used for purposes aforesaid, for such recommendation and office; that the said Edward Cochrane recommended to the Government the said Thomas Fitzgerald for said office; that the said Thomas Fitzgerald paid said sum, and received said appointment on said recommendation.

In this case said James Stanley gave the following evidence:—

893. You had sent word to these people to assemble there?—Yes.

894. These various applicants, Daniel Vanalstine, Fitzgerald, Brown, May and Clouston, were present on your invitation?—These were the ones the committee recommended, and I sent for them myself afterwards.

895. Were they present at the meeting of the committee?—No.

896. Any one of them?—Not to my knowledge.

897. I asked you to say the first person you appointed afterwards, and you gave me this list of names. The committee recommended all these?—Yes.

898. Thomas Fitzgerald was recommended and he got the office?—Yes.

899. He paid $150 for the office of bridge-keeper?—Yes.

900. Who did he pay the money to?—To me.

901. And you applied that money how?—I put that money in the bank to my credit. I left it there until I got notice from W. L. Payne to send either the money or a draft. I forget which it was I sent.

902. What did you do with the money?—I think I sent on $150 in money or by cheque to W. L. Payne or the Standard Bank, I am not certain, to apply on the note in the Standard Bank.

903. Then Daniel Vanalstine did not get an office?—No.

904. He had paid $150 under the same circumstances?—Yes.

905. And he was repaid that?—Yes; he was repaid.

906. Because he did not get the office?—There were more applicants than there was bridges for them, and we paid the money back.

907. That is curious. Then his contribution was in a sense contingent on his getting the office?—He was giving it voluntarily.

908. You did not think it fair to keep it if he did not get the office?—No.

On the same point the said Thomas Fitzgerald gave the following evidence:—

1206. You live at the Carrying Place?—Yes.

1207. On the Murray Canal?—Yes.

1208. You paid $150?—Yes.
1209. To whom?—Mr. Stanley.
1210. What for?—To help the party through their indebtedness for the Wade and Ferris protest. That was what I was informed. I do not know anything about it.
1211. Who informed you that?—Mr. James Stanley.
1212. And you paid the money to him?—Yes.
1213. Did you see Mr. Cochrane before that?—Yes, sir.
1214. In regard to the appointment?—Yes, sir.
1215. What was the conversation you had with Mr. Cochrane?—I only saw him once. I got a petition from a few men in the riding and showed it to him. He said it was very good; "I will give it to the committee; I have nothing more to say. Whoever the committee picks out, will get it."
1216. That was before you were named by the committee?—I do not know. I had friends who put in the communication.
1217. That was when the petition was being got up?—Yes.
1218. Mr. Cochrane said he left matters entirely in the hands of the committee?—Yes.
1219. Then Mr. Cochrane knew of the committee?—I do not know that.
1220. Did you pay this $150 in cash to Mr. Stanley?—Yes, in hard cash.
1229. You know that you paid the $150?—Yes.
1230. At the time you paid it, were you then a bridge-keeper by appointment of the Government?—Certainly not. I was on the bridge, but not appointed by the Government. I had been on there for years.
1232. When you paid the $150 to Stanley you were not at that time a permanently appointed bridge-keeper by the Government?—Certainly not.
1233. Did you say before that you received a promise from the committee?—I will tell you all I know about it; I will tell it without question and answer. I was asked to go up to Brighton. I was informed by some of my friends there to make application to Mr. Cochrane. He said: "I cannot make you any promise; I leave it entirely to the committee." I merely showed him the recommendations I had, and he said: "They are very good, but I cannot make any promise." I walked away. I was informed to go up and see Mr. Stanley, and Mr. Stanley says, says he: "I understand from what I have heard that the committee has picked you out as a bridge-keeper on the Murray Canal, and you ought to help us on this debt that we are under to the party." I said: "I am willing to do my part," and that is all I said. I said: "When you are ready for me and want my money I will pay it." He said they had some notes to pay and that they were heavy in debt, and I said: "I am a Conservative and will do my duty."

17. That while the said Edward Cochrane was such member as aforesaid, one Robert May was recommended by said committee to the said Edward Cochrane for the position of bridge-tender on the Murray Canal; that Henry May, a member of said committee, and by its authority, called upon him and told him that he was so recommended and exacted from him $125 for such position, to be used for the purpose aforesaid; that on the recommendation of said committee the said Edward Cochrane recommended to the Government the said Robert May for said office; that said Robert May paid said money and received said office. His evidence on this point is as follows:—

2731. Have you got an appointment on that canal?—Yes, sir.
2732. What appointment?—Bridge-keeper.
2733. When did you get that appointment?—In the year 1890.
2736. Who told you that you had got the appointment?—Some member of the committee, I think it was Mr. Hugh McQuoid; I am not sure, however, whether he is the one.
2737. He told you of the appointment?—Yes, sir.
2738. And who else told you?—My brother Henry.
2750. How much money did you pay?—$125.
2751. To whom did you pay it?—To Henry May, my brother.
2752. What did you pay it to Henry May for?—(No answer.)
2753. Why did you pay it to Henry May?—To help pay the debt against the Conservative party.
2800. Was it not, for the purpose of getting that position, sir?—Yes.
2801. How did you know that you would get that position if you paid $125?—I did not know only from the committee.
2802. Then you knew from the committee that you would get that position if you paid the $125?—They told me.
2814. How was it you came to pay $125?—(No answer.)
2815. Somebody must have suggested money to you?—Henry said the Conservative party was in debt, and each one must pay a certain amount.
2816. Each one of whom?—Each one of the bridge-tenders. He said each was willing to pay, and I said I was willing to do the same.
2817. If you got the position?—Yes.
2818. Did you pay the money before or after getting the position?—Before it.
2838. You are a labouring man then?—Yes.
2839. Before you got this office you were working for days' wages?—Yes.
2840. You are a married man?—Yes.
2841. Wife and family?—Yes.
2842. And before you got this office you were working for days' wages?—Yes.
2843. And you gave $125 for the office and for the good of the Conservative party—the two things?—Yes.
2844. When before this had you given a contribution to the Conservative party?—I do not know as I ever did.
2845. How old are you?—Thirty.
2846. This was the first time you manifested your regard for the Conservative party in this substantial way?—Yes.

Henry May, a brother of said Robert May, and one of said committee, swore as follows:—

2885. How was it you asked your brother for $125?—Mr. Stanley told me it was required—that he should pay some money.
3020. And what did you tell him?—I told him (Cochrane) that Robert had got the appointment for the bridge.
3023. And you told him that Robert had got the appointment?—Yes, sir.
3024. You mean by having got the appointment that he had been recommended by the committee?—Yes, sir.
3025. You don't mean that he had been recommended by the Government?—No, sir; I did not mean to tell him that.
3026. You did not mean to tell him he had been appointed by the Government, only that he had been recommended by the committee?—That is it.
3027. And was that not the reason why you saw Mr. Cochrane; to tell him that Robert had been recommended by the committee?—I saw him and told him.

18. That in or about the month of May, 1890, one J. D. Clouston was recommended to the Government for the position of bridge-tender on the Murray Canal by the said Edward Cochrane; that the said Edward Cochrane knew, when he made said recommendation, that the said J. D. Clouston agreed to pay for said office to said committee the sum of $150, and had paid thereon about $100, to be used for the purpose aforesaid—that said J. D. Clouston did pay said sum—and on said recommendation of said Edward Cochrane received said appointment and now holds the same. The evidence on oath of said J. D. Clouston touching the same is as follows:—

1895. How much money did you pay when you got this appointment, Mr. Clouston?—I think some $70 or $75.
1896. You paid $70 or $75?—I think; I would not be positive.
1897. To whom did you pay that money?—To Mr. W. W. Webb.
1898. Did you tell Mr. Webb that you were instructed to pay any moneys—Mr. Webb has been examined?—Instructed?
1899. Yes?—No; I had no idea I was instructed.
1900. What did you tell Mr. Webb as to the balance?—I told him I would pay the balance as I went along.
1901. You told him you would pay the balance as you could?—Yes; the balance. I took it upon myself to pay a certain amount, and I told him I would pay the balance.
1902. How much did you take upon yourself to pay?—I took upon myself to pay $150.
1903. To whom were you to pay that?—To W. W. Webb.
1904. Who told you to pay it to W. W. Webb?—I don't know that anybody told me to pay it particularly to W. W. Webb.
1905. You say that nobody told you particularly to pay it to W. W. Webb?—Yes.
1906. How did you come to go to W. W. Webb?—Well, I was aware that he had a note that had to be arranged and settled up.
1932. You said it was on the 10th May, 1889. When the appointment was promised you, Mr. Stanley told you to go to Mr. Webb, and in the conversation he told you also that the others were paying?—Yes.
1933. That was after the appointment was promised but before you received it?—Yes; before I was notified to fill it.
1934. After you had received the promise, but before you were appointed or directed to take charge?—Yes.

1935. From whom did you receive the promise?—From Mr. Edward Cochrane.
1936. The promise of the position which you ultimately got?—Yes.
1937. But if you received the promise from Mr. Cochrane, it was Mr. Stanley who directed you to go to Mr. Webb?—I say it was by conversation.
1950. Did you see Mr. Cochrane in regard to the appointment?—I was talking with him.
1951. You say you had a conversation with him?—Yes, sir.
1952. You had a conversation with Mr. Cochrane, the member for East Northumberland?—Yes; I say I had conversations with Mr. Cochrane.
1953. And what was said at that conversation, or at any one of the conversations you had with Mr. Cochrane?—I don't know.
1959. But you received the promise of an appointment from Mr. Cochrane?—Yes.
1982. What old indebtedness?—This old protest cost, run up there between Mr. James Ferris and William Wade.
1983. And what others?—Other bridge-tenders.
1984. Mr. Cochrane told you—
1985. When he said to you that others were taking part in this old indebtedness, what others did he refer to?—I said that Cochrane may have said that others were taking part, and I think I said the others were bridge-tenders.
1986. How much did he tell you the others were giving?—He may have said that they were giving $150.
1987. Each?—Yes.
1992. You say he may have told you so on the occasion of that drive, that other bridge-tenders were paying $150. Do you believe now that he did tell you so, on your oath?—I believe he may had said so, as I said before.
1993. To the best of your recollection, you say he may have said that other bridge tenders were giving $150?—Yes.
2023. Did you pay anything?—I suppose I did.
2024. Do you swear you paid a farthing?—Yes, sir.
2025. When?—I think on two different occasions I gave a dollar.
2026. On two different occasions you subscribed a dollar on the reduction of this indebtedness?—Yes.
2032. Did you yourself contribute to the fund at that time?—Yes.
2033. How much?—I gave a dollar at that time.
2034. Was that the first time?—Yes.
2035. When was the next time?—The next time was when the protest was going on at Colborne.
2036. That is the Ferris protest?—Yes, the protest between Ferris and Wade.
2037. That is eight or nine years ago?—Yes, I think the other that I remember was when I saw Mr. Cochrane.
2038. Have you given anything since 1886 until you gave this generous donation of $150?—I cannot tell when I paid that dollar.
2048. Who told you first you were to be appointed bridge-tender?—I said Mr. Cochrane said there was a bridge for me.
2049. Mr. Cochrane was the first man that mentioned to you that you were going to be appointed?—Yes.
2090. I think you said that Mr. Cochrane told you that the other bridge-tenders were helping to pay the indebtedness?—Yes. I think he said so.
2091. Did he or did he not?—I think probably he did.
2092. And at the conversation he told you that you were going to be appointed a bridge-tender?—Yes.
2093. That took place when he told you that there was a bridge for you?—No; I think it was probably afterwards.
2094. Was it in the fall, when you were driving back to Colborne, that he told you that there was a bridge? Was that the time he told you that he had a bridge?—What time?
2135. Then you had no money to contribute until you got the promise of the bridge?—I don't know; I could not say.
2137. Was that the reason?—About.

19. That one other charge was referred to your Committee, namely, that one William Johnson paid $200 corruptly to secure an appointment as bridge-tender on said canal; that said William Johnson, after said charge was made, left Canada for the United States, and that his attendance as a witness before said Committee could not be procured, and that it was resolved by the said Committee that leave be given to withdraw said charge, and that it be considered as not made. Leave was accordingly so given.

20. That as respects that charge in which Henry May was concerned, no evidence was offered sustaining such charge, and that it was therefore not proved.

21. That the said C. D. Vanalstine corruptly paid the said James Stanley, in order to secure the office of tender of one of the bridges in said canal, the money to be used as aforesaid; that the said money was returned to him because all the said positions had been disposed of. Mr. Vanalstine on his oath said:

2245. With whom did you arrive at that sum? Whom did you talk to about the sum of $150?—This man Stanley.
2246. Did he tell you that that was the amount of money each had to pay?—I am not certain about it.
2247. What did he tell you?—He asked me if I was willing to give $150 to wipe the debt off, and I told him yes.
2248. The amount was fixed by him?—I could not say. He mentioned it.
2249. Did you then and there give him the money?—I told you before I gave him $50 at that time, all I had.
2250. When did you pay the balance to him?—Some three or four days after; I did not note it down.
2251. You paid $100 three or four days after that?—Yes; after that.
2252. And this, you say, was to go to pay off the party liability?—I understood it was to pay it off.
2253. You gave it solely with that end in view?—With the object of wiping off the protest indebtedness.
2254. With no other object?—With no other object.
2255. If that was your sole object, why did you let it go?—Other parties wanted the bridge, and they handed me my money back. I would be a fool if I had not taken it.
2256. You did not get the position?—No.
2257. And that is why the money came back to you?—Yes.

22. That the said committee was organized for the express purpose of corruptly trafficking in said offices, and did corruptly sell and dispose of the same to Hedley Simpson, Wesley Goodrich, Robert May, Thomas Fitzgerald and J. D. Clouston, respectively, for a money consideration.

23. That said Edward Cochrane was aware of such corrupt sale and disposal of said offices, sanctioned the same and made his said recommendations with the knowledge that said offices were so sold and disposed of.

24. That the payment by the said Hedley Simpson of the said sum of $200 directly relieved the said Edward Cochrane of just so much of the said Edward Cochrane's indebtedness on said note of $691.69.

25. That the said Edward Cochrane did not present himself as a witness in his own behalf before your Committee, and did not pledge his oath to the incorrectness or falsehood of a single statement made before your Committee by any of the witnesses examined before them.

26. That all said appointees are poor men, although strong Conservatives; some of them never gave a cent for political purposes, and, of the rest, none gave more than $3 each for such purposes for years prior to the payment of said sums.

27. That all the witnesses who appeared and gave evidence before your Committee, appeared to your Committee to be men of truth and desirous of speaking the truth, so far as they knew; and there does not appear to be any ground for doubting the credibility of any one of them.

28. That selling or disposing of offices for a money or other consideration is highly improper and reprehensible; and the parties shown to have been engaged in such a practice here should be proceeded against criminally.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), in the opening part of his speech complained that the mover of this resolution had pressed it with undue haste and had taken him by surprise this afternoon. However well that complaint might sound in the mouths of other hon. gentlemen, it was a singular one to hear from that hon. gentleman, as he had formulated these charges against Mr. Cochrane and therefore was presumed to know all the circumstances and details connected with the matter before he adopted such a course. He was also a member of the Committee and listened to the testimony, and read over the evidence which has since been printed, and he at all events should be fully prepared to meet this question at the present time and to discuss it intelligently. I agree with him in the proposition he laid down at the outset, that these charges were in the nature of a criminal prosecution and that we should

look at them judicially, that it should be proved that there was a corrupt agreement in the giving of these offices and receiving the money, and that it was not necessary to prove that the agreement was made by the hon. member for Northumberland if it was done with his knowledge, his concurrence, or his approbation. There was another remark which he made which I was also glad to hear, that, if there was no evidence to prove that these payments were voluntarily made, he would not here on the floor of this House move this amendment. I take issue with him, and will try to show that the evidence is conclusive on that point, and will cite the evidence of the various witnesses to show that these payments were made voluntarily for the purpose of paying off this old indebtedness. It appears that there was an old indebtedness in this county going back to the year 1883 and growing out of a provincial election, with which the member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) had nothing to do. He was not interested in it at all. For the original debt of $1,700 he was not responsible, and after it dwindled down to $1,000 and a note was given for that amount, his name was not on that note, but the names of several of these people who made themselves, perhaps, somewhat officious in securing these amounts of money from these office-holders were on the note, and were also interested in the original indebtedness. Therefore I think we have the motive shown very clearly why they wanted to have the amount paid off, and why they resorted to the course they did. With regard to the agreement, I maintain that there is not a particle of evidence to show that any agreement was made by Mr. Cochrane or anyone on his behalf. I have refreshed my mind by reading over the evidence carefully, and I say that, as far as Mr. Cochrane is concerned, there is only one individual, that is Arundel Simpson, whose testimony I will call your attention to later, who brings Mr. Cochrane directly in touch with this transaction and these charges, and I am free to say that, if we could possibly believe Arundel Simpson, the charges formulated would perhaps assume a very different shape. As to the voluntary payments, what does Hedley Simpson say? The hon. gentleman from West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has read extracts from the evidence. He read question 127, but he did not read question 122, which comes just before. What does Hedley Simpson say to the voluntary payments? It appears that he gave this $150 towards this indebtedness. He agreed to give that after he was recommended by the committee. The committee had told him that they would recommend him, and after that was done, Stanley sent word to him and asked him to contribute towards this indebtedness, and he agreed to do so. Now, what did he say? He had not the money, and he could not get the money; but Stanley lends him the money and takes the notes. He is asked why he gave the notes:

I gave them to help to pay the indebtedness of the party.

You gave them simply for that?—Yes, sir. Mr. Stanley told me whatever I gave was to be of my own free will.

Mr. Stanley told you whatever you gave, you gave of your own free will?—Yes, sir.

Now, that is the solemn statement made by a man on oath; and still we have been told by the hon. member who has just sat down, that there was not a particle of testimony to prove anything of the kind—of their having been voluntary payments. Again at 130 he is asked:

136. I ask you this: Was the promise of the appointment the reason why you gave the notes?—I gave the notes of my own free will.

Again, in 550 he says:

556. They asked him what he could afford to give to pay off the indebtedness for the old protest.

What protest?—The protest of James L. Ferris and William Wade.

Then, we find at 585 James Stanley is asked about the recommendation of the committee; and at 591 he is asked:

591. Would the committee have recommended him but for his paying the money or giving the notes?—They recommended him before they knew anything about his giving notes or money.

They had decided on him?—Yes.

When they were decided, was there any talk about getting any money from him?—No.

None at all?—No.

Then at 868:

868. Did the committee agree that he should pay $200?—No; they did not agree to that at all.

What amount did they name?—They did not name any at all.

Did they refer to any amount?—No, they did not.

Did they leave that to you?—Yes, they knew a certain amount had to be paid.

They left it to you to make the best bargain?—No, it was not a bargain.

Now take questions 995 and 1006.

995. Then was the recommendation of the committee conditional or unconditional as to the appointment of Hedley Simpson?—It was decided that he should have the appointment.

996. Without any condition?—Yes.

997. Then the decisions having been arrived at by the committee that he should have the appointment without any condition, you undertook the work of collecting money?—Yes.

998. And did you put that to him as conditional?—Yes; I put it to him. I asked him what he would give of his own free will.

999. In that way you got the subscription?—Yes.

1006. But what did you tell him about the condition on which the money had been paid?—Oh, there were no conditions. I did not tell him anything about conditions.

Then, again, Hedley Simpson had a very good reason to expect to get this office. His father had held the office for a long time, and was then an old man unable to perform the duties of the office, and for some years past Hedley Simpson himself had really been the office-holder, and continued to do the work after his father's death; so it was merely, as it were, confirming him in his position. Now, we have evidence here to show that there were no conditions in any of these appointments:

1013. You consider all the names and you conclude of make the recommendations?—Yes.

Now, was there any conditions attached to the recommendations that you were making?—No, no conditions.

The recommendations so far as the committee were concerned were unconditional?—Yes.

Now, we will take the evidence of Fitzgerald. Of course there was no charge made with regard to Fitzgerald; at the same time his appointment has been alluded to by the hon. member who has just addressed the House, and it might be well to see what he says with regard to conditions. Under 1233 he says:

1233. I was informed to go up and see Mr. Stanley, and Mr. Stanley says, says he: "I understand from what I have heard, that the committee has picked you out as a bridge-keeper on the Murray Canal, and you ought to help us on this debt that we are under to the party." I said: "I am

willing to do my part." That is all I said. I said: "When you are ready for me and want money, I will pay it."

Further on he says:

I am a Conservative and will do my duty, and am willing to subscribe towards the debt.

Now take the case of John D. Clouston, who was also on the original note, and therefore may very well have felt himself, if not legally bound—because that note was taken up—at all events, morally bound, to see that the debt was paid. He had certainly an interest in doing his part towards its liquidation. In question 1902 he is asked:

1902. How much did you take upon yourself to pay?—I took upon myself to pay $150.

To whom were you to pay that debt?—To W. W. Webb.

Who told you to pay it to W. W. Webb?—I don't know that anybody told me to pay it particularly to W. W. Webb.

Then how did you come to go to W. W. Webb?—Well, I was aware that he had a note that had to be arranged and settled up.

How were you aware of it?—Well, I suppose I was something like yourself, I was taking an interest in political matters.

He is asked again:

2005. Would you have paid that money but for getting the bridge?—I think in all probability I would, provided there was necessity for it. I think probably I would.

You think probably. Would you?—Yes, I think so.

Then he says further on:

2175. Was there any condition or stipulation attached to the statement that there was a bridge for you? Did he say what you had to do?—Not a word.

Did he put a condition to it?—Not one word.

Did anyone ask you to pay this $150, or was it voluntary on your part?—It was a voluntary offer among ourselves, knowing that the party was involved in the way they were.

Was there with anybody a condition that you should pay the $150 if you got the bridge?—Not that I can bring to my memory.

Now, then, Robert May is asked:

2752. Why did you pay it to Henry May?—To help pay the debt against the Conservative party.

Are you sure that is what you paid it for?—Yes.

Have you had any conversation with anybody in regard to what you have to say here to-day?—No, sir.

So, one after the other, all these men actually come before the Committee and swear positively that they paid these sums for the purpose of paying off the debt owed by the Conservative party, that they did so with their own free will and in a voluntary manner. I am really at a loss to know how the hon. gentleman can make the statement he has made, that there is not a tittle of evidence to prove that these sums were voluntarily paid. I think if the hon. gentleman had paid more attention to this evidence, if his attention had been called possibly to these questions and answers I have mentioned, he, as he said himself, would not have been found on the floor of the House moving this amendment. As I said before, the charge rests to a great extent on the evidence of Arundel Simpson. Indeed, it was submitted at the investigation that Arundel Simpson's evidence was the most important; in fact, it was the crucial point of the whole question. I, for one, after having heard the evidence of Arundel Simpson, would not believe him on oath. Of all the witnesses, his testimony was the least reliable. He not only contradicted himself, he not only gave a great many versions of the same story at the time of his examination, but he had made a solemn declaration, previous to the investigation, which he had sworn and subscribed to, which was entirely opposed to and entirely contradictory of the statement he had made on oath. Again, he was contradicted by other persons in a manner that should have convinced the hon. gentleman who refused to accede to the majority report that he was telling what was not true. Take, for instance, the question of the letter. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) reiterate the statement that Stanley or Mr. Cochrane had actually given a letter to this man, Arundel Simpson, to carry to Hedley Simpson, and in that letter told him he would get the bridge, provided he would pay $150. Let us see what evidence there is on that point. This man Simpson, in the course of his testimony, question 310-11, says:

310. Did you see that letter?—No, I saw the letter, but I did not know what was in it. I could not tell you what was in it.

311. Was that letter read in your presence?—I don't know as it was. I don't think it was; I would not swear positively, it is quite a while ago.

This man on that occasion stated positively that he only saw the outside of the letter, that he never read it, never heard it read, and never heard what was in it. Yet we find in another portion of his evidence, after being examined and re-examined on that point, he again changed his statement. After a lapse of two or three days, and knowing something of the testimony of the other witnesses, and being confronted with his other declaration, he was brought before the Committee; and then he managed to tell this story: He said this letter was handed to him by Mr. Cochrane or Stanley, he did not know which; that he carried the letter to Hedley Simpson; that Mrs. Simpson was present; that the letter was delivered to her; that she read the letter to himself and some one else; and he went on to tell what it contained. That was not only a direct contradiction of what he said before, but Stanley came forward and testified that he had never given him a letter, that he had once sent a verbal message to Hedley Simpson, but he had never sent a message, written or verbal, by Arundel Simpson. Mrs. Hedley swore positively that the letter was never read, that Simpson never brought a letter of the kind either from Mr. Cochrane or Stanley, and that what Arundel Simpson said on the subject was entirely untrue. Yet we actually find, after that contradiction by two or three witnesses, and considering that this charge is of the nature of a criminal charge, that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) not only reasserted the opinion here, but in the minority report sent in by hon. gentlemen makes the statement that this letter was sent and contained the statements that Arundel Simpson at his last examination said it contained. Let me call the attention of the House to another contradiction of Arundel Simpson. As to the two notes already spoken of, given by Hedley Simpson to Stanley for the loan of $200: Arundel Simpson swore he saw those notes, that they were in the handwriting of Stanley; that Stanley was a maker of one of the notes, and not only a maker, but, strange to say, payee, and he swore those notes were both endorsed by Uriah Simpson. What are the facts? They were not in the handwriting of Stanley, that Hedley Simpson himself brought the notes to Stanley, that only one of them was endorsed by Uriah Simpson. Hedley Simpson in his examination said that Arundel never saw those notes, that no individual ever saw them but Stanley to whom he gave them. So we find that Arundel Simpson is contradicted again on a very material point by two witnesses. Then Arundel Simpson said he had several interviews

with Mr. Cochrane. In one portion of his evidence he said he had only one interview, in another portion he said he had two interviews, and, finally, he said he had three interviews. Then he gave different statements as to what occurred at these interviews. In one instance he said they talked first about a bridge and then about a lighthouse; afterwards he said that was not the case, they talked first about a lighthouse and then a bridge. Worse than all; this witness had actually made a declaration, which forms one of the exhibits attached to the report, which is altogether contradictory of the statements he made in his examination. When he was confronted with that declaration he saw no way out of it except to say: first, that he had not sworn to it or declared to it although he admitted he signed, and secondly, that the gentleman, Mr. Gorman, who took it down did not take it down as he said he did.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman pardon me a moment. I would like to ask him if he has come to the conclusion that there was no letter written by Cochrane or Simpson?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I am perfectly satisfied there was not, from the evidence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) By neither of them?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). By neither of them. I am satisfied, because Stanley said there was none and because Hedley Simpson said that he never got any. The statement to that effect is contradicted by two or three witnesses. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not by any means exhausted the reasons, but I think I have shown enough to warrant the Committee and to warrant the House in coming to the conclusion that Arundel Simpson's evidence be rejected entirely from consideration, and that he at all events was not worthy of credence. Nobody, as far as I know of, has asserted that Mr. Cochrane made any agreement himself with any of these parties, but it has been attempted to be proved that he was cognizant of all this, and that it was all done with his knowledge. We must remember that there was a committee appointed in this riding. I do not know if it is worth while to go into the history of the appointing of that committee; the facts are that the evidence is not altogether satisfactory on that point. Some think they were appointed by the general convention, and more say they were self-appointed, but be that as it may, these five or six persons acted as a committee and it was recognized that they were a committee for the purpose of ascertaining who were the proper persons to be recommended for these appointments. Now, the minority report charges, and the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) in his address stated, that Mr. Cochrane, if he was not a member of this committee—I believe that is not pretended—was at least at one or two of the meetings. I take issue with him there, for while it is true that Mr. Bullock gives some testimony which goes somewhat to that effect, yet, when you come to read his testimony carefully, you must see that he does not intend that. It appears that this committee were in the habit of meeting at Mr. Bullock's store. Mr. Bullock kept a grocery store at Brighton, and Mr. Bullock's evidence is as follows:—

2489. Did Mr. Cochrane attend any of the meetings?—He was there once. I do not know whether he had any conversation with me or any one of us.

2490. He was there once?—He was in the store once when we were all there.

2491. Was there any conversation when he was there about these appointments?—No.

2492. Did you ever tell Mr. Cochrane as to the deliberation with regard to the patronage committee? Did you ever inform him?—No.

2499. He was present there at the time the committee was there?—The whole of the committee was not there.

2500. Who of the committee were there?—Well, I can't tell you.

2501. You were there?—Yes.

2502. Was Stanley there?—I do not know, he may have been there.

2503. When was this?—I cannot tell you when it was.

2504. You cannot remember?—No.

2507. How did Mr. Cochrane come to be there?—I cannot tell you.

2508. Did he drop in by accident?—I cannot tell.

2509. What time of the day was it?—In the evening.

2510. How far does Mr. Cochrane live from Brighton?—Five or six miles from Brighton.

2511. And he happened to be there in the evening?—Yes; this evening.

2512. What time in the evening did the committee meet?—I cannot tell you.

2513. Was it early or late?—Not very late. I should say it was after eight o'clock; between eight and nine o'clock.

2514. When your store was closed?—Yes.

2515. Then Mr. Cochrane remained there after the store was closed?—He came in accidently, I think.

2516. Did you say the committee met there after the store was closed?—Yes.

2517. And Mr. Cochrane was there when the committee met?—Yes.

2518. For the whole of the time?—No, not when they were meeting.

2519. Oh, well, did he come in afterwards?—Yes, he came in after the committee met.

2520. Now, the committee met after the store was closed, and Mr. Cochrane, having come in after the committee met, must have come in after the store was closed?—He did.

2522. However, that was after the store was closed?—I think the store was closed.

2523. And it was after this Mr. Cochrane came in?—Yes; it was after the store was closed, as far as my knowledge goes, that Mr. Cochrane came in.

2524. Where did the committee transact its business in the store?—I believe it was right in the open store.

2525. Right in there in the main part of the store?—Yes.

2526. And that is where Mr. Cochrane came?—Yes.

2527. Mr. Cochrane was in there with the committee?—Yes; but he was not on the committee.

2528. I know, but he was in there with the committee? He was there when the committee were there in the store. I could not swear when Mr. Cochrane came in, but I know he came right in the store when the committee was meeting there.

2529. You have sworn that Mr. Cochrane was there?—Yes.

2530. And you have sworn that he was there while the committee was there?—Yes; that's true.

2531. Did he know that the committee was meeting there?—I do not know.

2532. Did he attend there by request?—No; not that I know of.

Now, Sir, the whole story of Mr. Cochrane being present at one of these committee meetings is based upon that evidence; and what does that evidence prove? It proves nothing more than that Mr. Cochrane happened there accidently, that he went to the store and some of the members of the committee were there, that they had a conversation of some kind or other, but this man swears positively there was no conversation about the appointment. The minority base their report entirely upon that evidence that Mr. Cochrane was present as one of the committee, and it appears to me to be a very extraordinary finding. But there is another piece of testimony which sets the whole thing at rest, and that is the evidence of Mr. Stanley, who was one of the members of this committee. If you look at questions 1026, 1027 and 1028 you will find that Mr. Stanley swears positively that Mr. Cochrane was never present at any one of the committee meetings:

1026. Was Mr. Cochrane present at any of these committee meetings?—He was not.
1027. Was he a member of the committee?—He was not.
1028. You say that Mr. Cochrane was not a member of the committee?—No: he was never present.

Now, I think that taking the two pieces of testimony together we cannot come to the conclusion that Mr. Cochrane was present at these committees, and that he knew what was going on; and there is no further evidence to show that he was present at any other committee meeting. That is the only evidence to show that he was present at that meeting, and there is no evidence to show that he was present at any other. Then, Mr. Henry May, who was also one of the committee, says, at question 3044, that he never remembered seeing Mr. Cochrane in Bullock's store at any committee meeting. At all events this clause in the report which has the sanction and approval of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) is certainly improper. The clause I refer to says:

"That the said Edward Cochrane was not a member of the said committee, but he knew of the purpose and object of it, attended one or more of its meetings when matters relating to the said offices were discussed, and acted on the committee's recommendation, &c."

It is quite true that he did act on the committee's recommendation, and he was quite right in so doing. That is a very common thing. In very many ridings and many of the constituencies there are committees appointed who look after the patronage and recommend officials for various positions, and whenever they are appointed it is almost the invariable rule that the members in these various constituencies take the recommendation of these committees. It could hardly be supposed that a member, at all events in an extensive riding, could be as well and thoroughly acquainted with the various persons who are suitable for these positions as members of a committee drawn from various portions of the locality. It is quite true that Mr. Cochrane did take the recommendation of these committees, and that he addressed letters subsequently to the department asking for the appointment of the various persons whose names are mentioned in these charges. So much for the charge against Mr. Cochrane; and I think we should remember that he is the only person who has been on trial. The Committee was not asked, and it was not their duty, as I understand, to investigate anything relating to these other persons. They were not on trial, they were not called on to make their defence, and, therefore, the Committee had nothing to do with any testimony implicating them. It is quite true, none of the Committee, and possibly no member of this House, would approve of the way in which this money was obtained.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear. What harm if it was given voluntarily?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). All the members of the Committee agree as to that, and the two reports are in that respect to some extent similar. This is the report of the majority on that point:

"That the facts which your Committee have reported with reference to the manner of making recommendations for the appointments by the political committee in the riding and soliciting of subscriptions by the committee from the applicants, for the aforesaid purpose, all occurred before the last election of the said Edward Cochrane and were well known in the riding before the said last election, and discussed at the nomination on the hustings and at other places during said election contest.

"Your Committee report that the practice which seems to have been resorted to by the political organization referred to, in order to raise a fund for political purposes, though not connected with Dominion politics, was improper and reprehensible."

Mr. BARRON. It was not my intention until quite recently to take part in this debate, but having read the majority report, I feel it my duty to ask the House to listen to me, and I hope they will listen to me patiently, for a short time, while I set forth the reasons why I consider that report to be wholly at variance with the facts proven before the Committee. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) when speaking to-day, dwelt upon the necessity of one and all who have to sit in judgment on this case, approaching it with a calm, quiet, judicial mind.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Oh.

Mr. BARRON. And although my hon. friend across the floor of the House laughs, still I have confidence in myself, at all events, approaching it in that spirit, and in removing as far as I possibly can the mantle of the counsel, and considering fairly and squarely the evidence which has been adduced before the Committee. I have listened to the last speaker with a great deal of attention. I am sorry that his voice was not strong enough to reach all parts of the chamber, as I did not catch everything he said. But I ask the House to note this, that the beginning of his speech was entirely at variance with the end of it. His beginning was a contradiction of his peroration. He said that these payments were voluntary. If they were voluntary, then there was no harm in them; but out of his own mouth—and I use the word without any offence—he stultifies himself, because the report condemns these voluntary payments. If there was nothing wrong in these voluntary payments, why did the Committee report:

"That the practice which seems to have been resorted to by the political organization referred to, in order to raise a fund for political purposes, though not connected with Dominion politics, was improper and reprehensible."

Mr. Speaker, what is there improper and reprehensible in a man making a voluntary payment for party purposes? Yet out of the fulness of their hearts their mouths speak, or rather their pen writes, that the practice was reprehensible and to be condemned. Therefore, I say that the hon. gentleman has stultified himself by condemning at the end of his speech that which he approved of at the beginning. The hon. gentleman says that we must prove the corrupt acts, that is, we must prove the corruption. The hon. gentleman, I believe, is a lawyer, and I am told one of some standing; and does he not know that we prove the facts and the corruption is inferred? It is our duty here as judge and jury to infer from the facts proven whether they are corrupt or not; and when the hon. gentleman says that we must prove that the act was corrupt, in the sense of actually proving that it possesses the quality of corruptness, he asks us almost to prove an impossibility. The hon. gentleman says that Hedley Simpson did give $200, but that there was every reason why he should have got the appointment, because his old father was there before him. If his old father was there before him and he should have got the appointment, that was a reason why he should not have

been asked to pay $200. That is the reason why, in the language of Bullock, $200 should not have been exacted from this poor man who had his mother and sisters to support on $400 a year. Now, I will consider the charges *seriatim*, because I observe that the report traverses them one after the other. The first is a statement and is conceded. The next one is that Hedley Simpson was an applicant. The hon. gentlemen who prepared the majority report skipped over this fact altogether: they do not notice the fact that Hedley Simpson was an applicant; they handle that particular fact with velvet gloves, because the significant fact that Hedley Simpson was an applicant and sent Stanley to Cochrane, brings Hedley Simpson at once into contact with Mr. Cochrane himself. What says the majority report, which hon. gentlemen opposite ask us to sustain?

"Whatever did take place with reference to the said appointment was between the said Hedley H. Simpson and the said James Stanley."

Do they not know—they do know—that the evidence is that Hedley Simpson sent James Stanley to Mr. Cochrane to get the position for him? Hedley Simpson knew that James Stanley was the intimate friend and close associate of Mr. Cochrane. Let the hon. gentleman look at question 152, on page 6, and he will see that in pursuance of Hedley Simpson sending James Stanley, the intimate friend and close associate of Mr. Cochrane, shown to be such by several witnesses, Mr. Stanley saw Mr. Cochrane. Where did he see him? He saw him at the hotel, and there it was that this celebrated letter was written. The majority of the Committee find that no such letter was written. How was it possible for them to find that no such letter was written? I ask them why they did not put Mr. Cochrane into the box to prove that no such letter was written, when Arundel Simpson said there was such a letter written and Hedley Simpson did not deny it, although pressed to deny it.

An hon. MEMBER. What about Mrs. Herbert Simpson?

Mr. BARRON. Arundel Simpson said the letter was given him on that occasion by Mr. Cochrane, and Mr. Cochrane then said this is in regard to the light. Then Arundel Simpson took this letter, and on the way he met Herbert Simpson, and he thought Mrs. Herbert Simpson read it, but could not swear positively. He heard it read by somebody, he does not know by whom, but he thinks it was Mrs. Simpson. Why did he think so? Because she was the woman who did all the writing and business for these different Simpsons. But the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White), when he argues that that is a contradiction of Arundel Simpson's statement with regard to the letter, argues beside the question, because Arundel said he thought it was Mrs. Simpson, but was not sure. If that letter was not written, why did Hedley Simpson, in answer to the question put him, say he had looked for it? Why did he look for it if none was ever written? But he knew such a letter was written, and because he knew there was such a letter written and called for by the subpœna he looked for it and could not find it because it was destroyed. I say that letter was written at the hotel; and will any hon. gentleman in this House say it was not written, when the hon. member for East Northumberland was at the Committee from day to day listening very attentively, because his political life was at stake, to every word said, and yet, although that letter meant his political death, so unwilling was he to speak that he left the room when the evidence was closed for the prosecution and did not dare go into the box. And what was the reason advanced by his counsel? It was, forsooth, advanced for him that he was afraid to contradict some of the witnesses on account of their being his political and personal friends, and the constituency being a close one he did not like to contradict them, as that would create unpleasantness. Now, Sir, I say that Hedley Simpson does not deny that letter. How shall I prove it? The hon. gentleman who has just spoken sought to create the impression that Hedley Simpson denied having received such a letter. I will ask you to look at question 30 and see what that says:

Q. Then you do not know of your own knowledge whether Cochrane knew about that petition or not? Before you got the appointment, did your brother Arundel bring you a letter from Mr. Cochrane in connection with the appointment?—A. I cannot say. Q. You do not remember?—A. No. Q. You have no recollection of getting a letter from Mr. Cochrane, brought you by your brother Arundel?—A. No. Q. Nor by anybody else?—A. No, sir. Q. Have you searched for letters from Mr. Cochrane to you?—A. Yes.

If no letter was written, why did he search for it? If there was none written, he must have known there was none written, and yet he looks for it. He is asked:—

Q. Why did you search for it?—A. My subpœna told me to bring all papers.

This subpœna suggests that there was a letter, and knowing the suggestion to be true, he looked for it—

Q. You say, at all events, you have not been able to find any?—A. No. Q. And you have no recollection of a letter from Mr. Cochrane?—A. No. Q. Will you swear that you did not get a letter from Mr. Cochrane?—A. I will not.

The next question was objected to by the counsel for the hon. member for East Northumberland, and I was not allowed to get an answer to it. Now I take occasion to say that during the examination we could not get evidence from the witnesses—they being both personal and political friends of the hon. member for East Northumberland—without the greatest difficulty. To get evidence from them was practically like straining porridge through a straw. It was almost impossible to get anything from them. The answer, "I do not remember" was given again and again. "It may have been so, but I do not remember," was reiterated without ceasing, and I say it was like extracting a tooth to get evidence out of the witnesses. But what evidence we did get was of the most convincing character in support of the charges brought by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) and the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). Hedley Simpson's evidence was of a most unsatisfactory nature. His mind was misty on all occasions. He seemed to be entirely oblivious of the facts. He knew the danger to himself of proving guilt in the hon. member for East Northumberland because he would have thereby brought himself within the scope of the decision in Regina *versus* Mercer, decided many years ago. He himself would have been equally guilty with the hon. member for East Northumberland. He would lose his situation and the $200

he gave for it would never be recouped to him, and he would have been left destitute as he was before he got the situation. Now Hedley Simpson says he never conversed with the hon. member for East Northumberland at all. If you will look at questions 34 to 36, you will see from what the hon. member for East Northumberland himself says, he did have a conversation with Mr. Hedley Simpson and in his letter to the department—his second letter to the department—reminding the department that Mr. Hedley Simpson ought to be appointed, the hon. member for East Northumberland says himself that he had at the previous Easter told Hedley Simpson he had got the appointment. How could he have told Hedley Simpson that, unless he did that which Simpson himself in his evidence says he did not do, namely, have any conversation whatsoever with Mr. Cochrane? So much, therefore, for the evidence of Mr. Hedley Simpson. Now, with regard to the notes, the hon. gentleman tries to make a point against Arundel Simpson's evidence, because he does not describe these notes as they were in point of fact, because he did not tell exactly who was the maker and the endorser. Does that negative the fact that the notes were given? Nobody denies that, and, therefore, if Arundel Simpson does not speak accurately, so far as the description of the notes is concerned, that makes no difference, because no one can deny that these notes were given to Stanley, on which the $200 were raised, and they were given to Mr. Stanley and discounted before the appointment was made. All this took place before the notes were given. Mr. Hedley Simpson goes to Mr. Stanley, and in pursuance of his request, Mr. Stanley goes to Mr. Cochrane who was at the hotel. They meet at the hotel, the letter is written which Mr. Arundel Simpson says requested—he having heard that letter read by somebody—that security should be given; and see how his statement is corroborated. Does not his uncle Obadiah Simpson give security, showing that there must have been something as to security, and that something is stated in the letter which was written?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Where was it written? There is no evidence to show that.

Mr. BARRON. There is no evidence to show where it was written, but my contention is that the inference to be derived from the facts which are proved is that Stanley, in pursuance of Hedley Simpson's request, was at the hotel with Mr. Cochrane, where they all three met, and there the letter was written telling Arundel Simpson that it was in reference to the lighthouse, and Arundel Simpson states that the letter expressed the desire that security should be given. That security was given by a note endorsed by Darius Simpson. Now, read the majority report, and what does that say? It states that the said Hedley Simpson applied his money to the payment of a promissory note. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) has set forth the facts as to how Hedley Simpson raised the money, and the report says that he applied that money to the payment of a promissory note in the bank. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken tried to draw a herring across the trail by saying that the $1,000 note was not one on which the member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) was an endorser, but he should have admitted that that note was taken up and another for $618 was given, which was endorsed by the member for East Northumberland, and Mr. Edward Cochrane appeared on that equally liable with other gentlemen. Who were on the original note for $1,000? The son of the member for East Northumberland was on it, and the nephew of the hon. gentleman was on it. He had, therefore, a reason for undertaking a liability of $618 if the original note was redeemed. The report says that Hedley Simpson paid this into the bank. Do not hon. gentlemen know that Hedley Simpson did not know where the money was to go, and, when he raised the money from Stanley on the note, he asked: Where is this money to go for I do not know? That is what the evidence shows. He did not know where the money was to go; but Stanley knew, the intimate friend and close associate of the hon. member for East Northumberland. How did he know? He could only know from the lips of the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) that the note was in the bank at Colborne, because he says he had no communication with Mr. Payne, the solicitor, or with Mr. Larke, the manager. So he must only have known from the hon. member himself that this note was there and was partly to be liquidated *pro tanto* by the payment of this amount of $200, the purchase money of the situation from Hedley Simpson. Then he communicated that fact to Hedley Simpson, who did not go to the bank alone to pay that amount, but Mr. Stanley said, my rig is there at the door: and they went to the bank together, but they found the bank closed and the manager out. Then they paid the money to Joseph Cochrane, postmaster. How did Mr. Stanley know where that money was to go? I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to say. The only inference is that Mr. Stanley knew by the conversation of Mr. Edward Cochrane that Mr. Hedley Simpson was to get the appointment, and, knowing that, the money was paid to the extent of $200. Directly that money was paid, the hon. member's liability was wiped out in connection with that $600 note, because the other gentlemen had received money by discounting other notes on which Mr. Cochrane's name was not at all, because his share was wiped out by the payment of the $200. The hon. gentleman has asked how the balance of the note of $618, or thereabouts, was taken up? The moment the $200 was paid by Stanley and Simpson, Mr. Cochrane's liability was gone, and Mr. Payne, Mr. Pickworth and Mr. Webb raised the balance of the money through Mrs. Strong, a widow in Colborne, and with the proceeds of the second note they paid the balance of the $600, the first part of it having been wiped out entirely by the payment which was made through Hedley Simpson.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BARRON. From the evidence that I adduced to the House before six o'clock, it seems perfectly clear that Hedley Simpson sent Mr. Stanley to Mr. Cochrane, and these latter two gentlemen discussed the matter, and the result of their conversation was that the note in the bank was paid to the extent of $200 by the Hedley Simpson money. Now, to show that Hedley Simpson did not know anything about where this money was to

go, let me quote from the evidence at page 22, where Stanley is asked what took place when Hedley Simpson went with the notes, the proceeds of which he got to the extent of $200 from James Stanley. Stanley is asked these questions:

667. What took place further?—He wanted to know where he should place the $200. My rig was there and I told him to get in and we would go to Colborne, where he deposited the money in the Standard Bank, I understood the note was there.
668. You went to the Standard Bank at Colborne to deposit the money?—Yes.
669. You understood the note was there?—Yes.
670. What was that note?—It was the note that was given by Mr. Wade and W. L. Payne and Pickworth. I believe that was it. I did not see them sign the note.
671. Who else signed the note?—I do not know: I did not see any of them sign the paper.
672. But there was a note there anyway made by some people, which was to be either taken up or paid by this $200?—It was to be endorsed on the note.
673. The $200 was to be endorsed on the note in the Standard Bank at Colborne?—Yes.
674. About what time of the year did this take place?—I could not tell you.
675. Was it in the spring or the fall?—I think it must have been in the spring; I am not certain.
676. In the spring of 1888?—It must have been.
677. Before the Government appointed Hedley?—Yes; he was still in the lighthouse at the time.
678. But at that time he had not been appointed?—No.
679. He was just acting in the place of his father?—Yes.
680. When you went to Colborne with the money, what occurred?—We went to the Standard Bank and it was closed.
681. Well, go on?—From there we went to W. L. Payne's office to give it to him, but he was away. Then we went to the post office, so that it might be paid into the Standard Bank the next morning.
682. With whom did you leave it the next morning?—With the postmaster.
683. What is his name?—Mr. Cochrane.
684. A brother of Mr. Cochrane, the member?—No, a nephew.

So you see from that evidence of James Stanley that Hedley Simpson did not know where this money was to go. He asked James Stanley and Stanley told him; Stanley knew all about it. Why? Because Mr. Edward Cochrane, the member for East Northumberland, in his conversation at the hotel, evidently told him so. How did Mr. Cochrane know? Mind you, at this time the note had been protested; it had been protested on the 9th of December, and Mr. Cochrane received notice of protest, he being one of the endorsers. He knew, then, the note was there unpaid, but he knew further. Why? Because the note was placed by the manager of the Standard Bank in the hands of Mr. Payne, the solicitor, and Mr. Payne was instructed to take proceedings; and he says that, although he himself did not write the letters informing Mr. Cochrane and the other parties on the note, that it was placed in his hands for suit, still, he had no doubt in the practice of his office that the several parties, including Mr. Cochrane, had notice that the note was in suit, and was placed in his hands as solicitor of the bank for collection. In that way Mr. Cochrane knew all about the note, and he it was who told James Stanley all about it. Stanley told Hedley Simpson, the man who paid the money. Why do I so contend? Because in no other way does it appear that James Stanley could have acquired the intimate knowledge that he had acquired in regard to the particular note in question, which was then to be paid, and subsequently was paid, by Hedley Simpson, $200, which he gave for his appointment to office. Now, then, what are the facts that I think I have fairly made out from the evidence in my remarks this afternoon? First of all, we find that Hedley Simpson wants the appointment. Next, we find that Hedley Simpson, wanting the appointment, sends Mr. Stanley, the intimate friend and associate of Mr. Cochrane to Mr. Cochrane. Then we find that Stanley meets Mr. Cochrane at the hotel; then we find that Mr. Cochrane, having conversed with Mr. Stanley at the hotel, sends a letter to Hedley Simpson. Mind you at this time Mr. Cochrane had not seen Hedley Simpson. Mr. Cochrane sends a letter to Hedley Simpson. Mr. Cochrane furthermore then tells Arundel Simpson, the messenger who takes the letter, that the letter is about the lighthouse appointment. Does any hon. gentleman doubt me? If so let him look at page 11, question 312, and there he will see an affirmative answer to my statement. Next, what do we find? The letter is sworn to contain a request that security must be given. Now, it is sought to diminish the value of Arundel Simpson's evidence by seeking to establish that he was an unreliable witness and could not be believed. But do we not find the fact following, that Hedley Simpson does give security: he gets Darius Simpson, his uncle, to endorse the note, and thereby meets the request contained in the letter. Surely, if there was no letter written, Hedley Simpson could say so; but he does not dare to deny that the letter was written. Then, we find that Hedley Simpson goes to Stanley and gives two notes for $200 and raises the money mentioned in the letter. What next do we find? Hedley Simpson does not know what to do with the money; but Stanley, the intimate friend and associate of Mr. Cochrane, tells him, because he had previously acquired the knowledge from Mr. Cochrane. Then they go to Colborne to the bank. The bank is closed, and they go to Mr. Payne, who is out of his office. Next, they go the postmaster, to whom they give the money, with the request that it be paid to Mr. Payne. Mr. Payne is examined, and he admits the fact that this identical $200 was placed by him in the bank to liquidate *pro tanto* the note of $618, upon which note Mr. Edward Cochrane, the member for East Northumberland, was an endorser. So we trace the money, the proceeds of this iniquitous sale, from Hedley Simpson to Mr. Stanley, then to the postmaster, then to Mr. Payne, the solicitor, then back from the solicitor's hands right on into the bank to be applied, according to Mr. Payne's evidence, on this particular note. Then we find Mr. Cochrane had previously received notice of protest. The note was protested on the 9th December. Thereby he knew all about it. The note was placed in the hands of the solicitor for collection. The solicitor swears that though he did not himself write the letters, letters were undoubtedly written, notifying the different parties that the note was there for collection; so that Mr. Cochrane in that way also knew that the note was there for collection. What next do we find? Mr. Stanley acquired his knowledge—that is the only conclusion we can come to, because it could not be acquired in any other way—he acquired it from Mr. Cochrane. Then we find, that having been done, that Hedley Simpson gets the appointment on the recommendation of Mr. Cochrane. That is not denied; it is admitted in the majority report. But here let me say that though these

facts are so undeniably true that they must strike a responsive yes in the heart of the member for East Northumberland, he, who knew all the facts in regard to this matter from begining to end, is as dumb as an oyster, his mouth is shut, he does not say yea or nay in regard to the grave offence with which he is charged. I say these facts only can be adduced from the evidence given, and yet they seem to be entirely ignored by the hon. gentlemen who bring in the majority report. Then what does the majority report say? Why, that these sums were voluntary, and were paid as a contribution to the Conservative party. These different sums which these poor unfortunate men, getting only $1.25 a day for eight months in the year, these sums of $150 in all cases but one, and that man was so poor he could not raise it—these sums, they contend, were simply paid as a voluntary contribution towards the Conservative party, paid by men who never before, with the exception of two of them, had paid a single cent towards the Conservative fund. Why, Sir, it is an insult to the intelligence of men so to contend. It is an insult to the intelligence of this House for hon. gentlemen opposite to ask us to adopt that portion of the report, at all events, which says that these sums were voluntarily paid by these men. Sir, these sums were screwed out of these men; as the witness Bullock says, they were exacted from these men. Sir, if the sums were voluntarily contributed, there is no harm, no wrong done. It is a perfectly right and proper thing. But, Sir, their own report condemns that argument, because it says that the payments were most reprehensible and ought not to be condoned. Hedley Simpson got the position; he paid his money—voluntarily, it is said by hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me ask the House to listen to his evidence. Voluntary payments, forsooth! $200 paid by this unfortunate man on a salary of $400, a man who, by information I possess and which I believe to be true, was unable to pay his debts to W. W. Webb, and was brought up on a judgment summons, and swore in the court that the reason he could not pay Mr. Webb was because he had to pay these notes to Stanley, and the payment of these notes required every cent of his earnings. Yet we are asked to swallow the statements that these payments were voluntarily made by the man who got the office. What does Hedley Simpson say:

139. Would you have given the notes without some understanding about getting the appointment?—Well, I do not understand how I could have paid them.

140. You would not have rendered yourself liable for the notes unless you had got the office that would have enabled you to have paid them?—No.

141. Would you have given these two $100 notes unless you had got this office to pay for them?—No: I do not think I would.

Yet hon. gentlemen opposite say he voluntarily paid this money. The evidence continues:

142. Out of what sum did you expect to pay the notes?—I had no funds.

143. When you gave the notes how did you expect to pay for them?—I expected to pay for them out of the salary I got for taking care of the lighthouse.

144. Is that the way you paid them?—Yes.

Let there be no misunderstanding. I point hon. gentlemen opposite to page 6 and questions 139-144 to see a statement of the reasons why he paid the money; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite say that he voluntarily paid it, that it was not a *quid pro quo* for the situation he got, and that it was not given in consideration of getting the office in question. It is absolutely insulting to our intelligence to ask us to believe that portion of the report, that these poor men having to support their families, not one of whom had any money in his pocket or laid by, who had never contributed a cent before, with the exception of two of them—one of whom had subscribed $1 and the other $2—that these men voluntarily put their hands in their pockets and gave this money without expecting to obtain the offices in question. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they are voluntary payments. I said Hedley Simpson never subscribed before. Let me prove it. Look at question 195, and what is his answer:

195. Did you ever subscribe before this to the party fund?—No.

196. This is the only occasion, according to you, that you ever subscribed?—Yes.

And he was not a prominent man in the Conservative party. When asked the question, he said as follows:

Q. Had you ever taken any interest in politics?—A. Very little.

Here, then, is a man who had never in his whole life subscribed a dollar to party funds and who had never taken any interest in politics, giving $200, and hon. gentlemen opposite want us to believe that there was no bargain and sale of the office he received, and that the payment was voluntary and unconditional. What does Stanley say about it? At page 18, questions 545 and 548, and answers, hon. gentlemen will find he knew that Hedley Simpson was not worth any money himself; and yet a man not worth anything himself, not a dollar, we are asked to believe, for the love of his party, voluntarily contributes $200, when his income was only $400. Look at clause six of the majority report, which says:

"Whatever did take place with respect to the said payment was between the said Hedley Simpson and James Stanley."

I do not want to say anything that is wrong, but it seems to me that that clause in the report is an attempt to shield the member for East Northumberland, because it is not in accordance with facts, as I will prove out of a letter which the hon. member for East Northumberland wrote himself. Look at page 117, question 3416, and what do we find? Let it be remembered that the report says that all negotiations took place between Hedley Simpson and Stanley. The hon. gentlemen have not read the evidence and letter that Mr. Cochrane wrote. What was that letter? It was as follows:—

"Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER,
"Minister Marine and Fisheries.

"DEAR SIR,—I wrote you some time ago about the appointment of Manly Simpson '(It is Manly here)' as light-house-keeper at Presqu'Isle Harbour. I was at your department to-day, and found that the said appointment had not been made. I hope this will receive your earnest attention, as I informed him at Easter that he had been appointed.

"Yours truly,
"E. COCHRANE."

Yet hon. gentlemen opposite say that all the negotiations took place between Hedley Simpson and Stanley, and Mr. Cochrane knew nothing about them and had no conversation with Hedley Simpson. But we have the hon. gentleman's own letter, which gives a most condemnatory answer to hon. gentlemen opposite; for this letter, which I have

read, shows that he acknowledges his own promise to Hedley Simpson. But supposing that my contention is all wrong, that it can be believed that the member for East Northumberland was not a party and privy to the negotiations that went on between Stanley and Hedley Simpson, so that he himself knew nothing about it, we know that Stanley was one of the celebrated committee, if you choose to call it a committee. It shows what a reliable man Stanley is, for he says the Commi tee was appointed at the convention held in the East Riding of Northumberland. Witness after witness came forward and said that was not the case, that it was a committee formed in Brighton, for the purpose, they say, in answer to words put into their mouths by the counsel for the defence, for the purpose of distributing patronage. Here let me point out this significant fact. It is true they did distribute these offices, but they were the only offices they ever distributed. Counsel for the defence tried to make out that this Committee was appointed for the purpose of distributing patronage generally, and hon. gentlemen have tried to make it appear that it was a very common practice to appoint committees for that purpose, that in various ridings patronage was regulated by committees and not by the representatives of the county. That is true. But if it is true in this case, tell me why this committee did not recommend a single other person to Mr. Cochrane except the men who were to get these particular appointments as bridge-tenders and lighthouse-keepers, from everyone of w'iom, according to Mr. Bullock, there was "exacted" a large sum of money. At page 16, questions 256-57, 932-34, hon gentlemen will find that James Stanley is the intimate friend and warm personal associate of the hon. member for East Northumberland. He says there was a committee formed. What was the object of the committee? Let Stanley himself answer the question. At page 32, question 993, when asked the question what did the committee ask him to do, he replied: "They said I had better raise funds to wipe out the indebtedness of the party, if I could." Mr. Stanley swears there that part of his duty as a member of the committee was that he had to try to raise funds to wipe off the indebtedness of the party, if he could. I do not deny that the proceeds of the sales of these offices went to liquidate the liability of the Conservative party, but I do assert that one of the gentlemen who was liable for a part of the liability was the member for the East Riding of Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) now being impeached. Now, Henry May, another committee man, was sworn, and I will read to the House his questions and answers. If you will turn to question 3048 you will find the following:—

3048. What did you learn was the object of this committee?—To settle on the men who were to take the balance of the positions.
3049. That was the work of this committee?—Yes, I think that was it.
3050. Then it had the two-fold object of settling on the men for the offices and of financing to liquidate the indebtedness of the Conservative party?—I suppose that was it.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, that the evidence of Mr. Stanley was that he was requested to raise money by this committee to liquidate the indebtedness of the Conservative party; Henry May, another witness, swears that he supposes it was for the purpose of disposing of these particular offices and financing to liquidate the indebtedness of the Conservative party. Then, what does Mr. Bullock swear, who was another member of the committee. Turn to page 85 and you will find that he swears as follows:

2406. What were the duties of that committee?—The duties of the committee were to see if we could not appoint somebody on the canal for the bridges there.
2407. How much were each of them to give?—We exacted $150 from every one of them. That is what we wanted.
2408. What were these people to get for the $150 they were to pay?—I cannot swear to that.

He evidently thinks that he has gone a little too far and he answers "I cannot swear to that."—

2409. What was the $150 to be given for?—It was to be given for our influence.

The influence of Mr. Bullock! This is too absur l.—

2410. Were you to put this $150 in your pocket?—No.
2411. Who was to give $150?—Every one who got the appointment.
2412. And those who did not get the appointment were not to pay for it?—Certainly not.

The hon. gentlemen, in their report, say that this money was paid voluntarily and for the love of the thing and yet we find from the evidence that men who put up their $150 expecting to get an office, when there were not sufficient offices for all of them, got back their $150. If the money was paid for the purpose of contributing to funds why should it be returned to these men when they did not get an office. Then Mr. Bullock further swears:

2413. Was any money paid do you know, by persons who did not get the appointment? Mr. Vanalstine paid some money, didn't he?—He did not pay it to me.
2414. But he paid it to somebody?—I do not know anything about that.
2415. Did Mr. William Mason pay any money to you?—He never gave me any money.
2420. It was the rule that those who were applicants should pay $150?—I think it was.

Therefore, from the evidence of Mr. Stanley, from the evidence of Mr. May, and from the evidence of Mr. Bullock, each one of whom was a committee man, it is proved most conclusively that the object of this committee was to give these offices out to these different men who would pay $150, and when they did not get the office the money was returned to them. That being the object which they carried out, let me show to this House how Mr. Cochrane himself, the hon. member for East Northumberland, knew all about this committee. Turn to page 30 and see what Mr. Stanley one of the committee swears:

948. You did tell Mr. Cochrane, as a matter of fact, that the committee had made recommendations from time to time?—I think most likely. It might have been a week after.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that I have established that the object of the committee was to dispose of offices and raise money from the men who were to get these offices. Now, I want to prove out of the lips of these very men that Mr. Cochrane knew of that committee, and here is the evidence again:

949. Within a week you did tell Mr. Cochrane what the committee had done?—I may have done so. I think Mr. Cochrane was in Ottawa at the time of the meetings.
950. You said something about his being in during the week, and you may have told him?—I don't know. I won't say; I may have done so.

Then go on to page 40, and what further do you find? Mr. Fitzgerald did get an office, but his case is not one of the charges made. He paid his $150 and he got his solace in the office. Mr. Vanalstine who paid the $150 and did not get the office, had the money returned to him. What does Thos.

Fitzgerald one of the men who did get office and pay money say :

1213. Did you see Mr. Cochrane before that?—Yes, sir.
1214. In regard to the appointment?—Yes, sir.
1215. What was the conversation you had with Mr. Cochrane?—I only saw him once. I got a petition from a few men in the riding and showed it to him. He said it was very good. "I will give it to the committee; I have nothing more to say. Whoever the committee picks out will get it."
1220. Did you pay this $150 in cash to Mr. Stanley?—Yes, in hard cash.

Then go to page 86 and what do we find, showing that Mr. Cochrane knew all about this committee? In Bullock's evidence we find the following :—

2447. You were not appointed a committee by the convention of the riding?—No.
2448. Mr. Cochrane I suppose, often drops into your store?—Why, certainly, he comes in, he trades with me.
2449. He knew that you, friends of his, had formed yourselves into a committee to regulate the granting of these bridges?—I could not swear to that. I could not swear that he knew of this thing.
2450. You are convinced that he knew what was going on?—Yes; I was pretty well convinced, but I cannot swear to it.
2451. But you are convinced he knew you men had formed yourselves into a committee to regulate the granting of these bridges?—Yes.

Then he was questioned by Mr. Osler, one of our most astute counsel who acted for the hon. member for East Northumberland, and here let me say that he could not have got a better gentleman in a particular case of that kind to act for him than Mr. Osler :

2489. Did Mr. Cochrane attend any of the meetings?—He was there once. I do not know whether he had any conversation with me or any of us.

Then Mr. Osler finds that he is treading on dangerous ground, he drops the witness at once because he knew that if he, known to be perhaps friendly to the witness, was to pursue that line the witness would be encouraged to give more evidence as to Mr. Cochrane being at the committee. But he was re-examined, and what was the answer he made. I ask the attention of the House to this evidence of Mr. Bullock because it proves most conclusively that Mr. Cochrane was present at one of the meetings when offices were disposed of and the money talked of which these offices were to bring :

You say that Mr. Cochrane was present once in your store when the committee was meeting there?—Yes; he was in my store once.
When the committee met there?—I think so.
He saw the members of the committee when they met at your store?—I cannot tell you that.
He was present there at the time the committee were there?—The whole of the committee was not there.
Who of the committee were there?—Well, I can't tell you.
You were there?—Yes.
Was Stanley there?—I do not know; he may have been there.

And the hon. member who has just preceded me tries to rebut the evidence of Mr. Bullock by saying that James Stanley says that Mr. Cochrane was never present when he was there. Well, surely Mr. Cochrane might have been at a meeting of the committee without Mr. Stanley being there. Mr. Stanley's statement does not negative the evidence of Mr. Bullock, because Mr. Bullock says he does not know whether Mr. Stanley was at the meeting at which Mr. Cochrane was present or not. The statement of Mr. Stanley that Mr. Cochrane was not present at a committee meeting when he was goes for nothing in the face of the evidence of Mr. Bullock. Then he is asked :

When was this?—I cannot tell when it was.
You cannot remember?—No.
Was it before or after the appointments were made?—Before.
Before the appointments were made?—Yes.
How did Mr. Cochrane come to be there—I cannot tell you.
Did he drop in by accident?—I cannot tell.
What time of the day was it?—In the evening.
How far does Mr. Cochrane live from Brighton?—Five or six miles from Brighton.

And that is important in view of the fact that it was after dark when these meetings were held.—

And he happened to be there in the evening?—Yes; in the evening.
What time in the evening did the committee meet?—I cannot tell you.
Was it early or late?—Not very late. I should say it was after 8 o'clock; between 8 and 9 o'clock.
When your store was closed?—Yes.
Then Mr. Cochrane remained there after the store was closed. He came in accidentally, I think.
Did you say that the committee met there after the store was closed?—Yes.
And Mr. Cochrane was there when the committee met?—Yes.
For the whole of the time?—No; not when they were meeting.
Oh, well, did he come in afterwards?—Yes; he came in after the committee met.
"Now, the committee met after the store was closed, and Mr. Cochrane having come in after the committee met, must have come in after the store was closed?—He did.
Then he did not come in to buy anything?—I cannot swear to that. Sometimes we did not close till ten or eleven o'clock.

Further on he says that Mr. Cochrane was there in the store :

I could not swear when Mr. Cochrane came in; but I know he came right into the store when the committee was meeting there.

Further on he was asked :

How long did Mr. Cochrane remain?—As far as my knowledge goes, he did not remain very long.
How long?—I cannot swear how long.
Half an hour or more?—Well, I cannot say. I do not think he did.
It was not then more than half an hour?—Not so far as my knowledge goes; I do not think it was.
Was it about half an hour?—I cannot say.
I suppose the discussion was going on while he was there?—The discussion was going on—yes.
The talk about the bridges was going on while he was there?—Yes.
You were talking about the men who would get the appointments and the amounts they were to pay?—Certainly.

There is the evidence of Mr. Bullock. He says that certainly Mr. Cochrane was there while they talked about the men who were to get the appointments and the amounts they were to pay. Now, I have shown, first, by the evidence of three committeemen, the objects of that committee, and then I think I have shown by the evidence of Mr. Bullock that Mr. Cochrane not only knew of this committee, but was actually present when they were talking over the dispensing of these offices, and the amount the recipients of the offices were to pay; and yet the majority report says that there was no corrupt bargain, that all was clean, and nice, and healthy, and that the hon. gentleman who sits now as member for East Northumberland should be relieved of all liability attaching to such outrageous acts as I believe have recently taken place in his constituency. Now, in regard to the Obadiah Simpson charge, that in the summer of 1889 the said James Stanley corruptly promised and agreed that Obadiah Simpson should have an office too. On that charge what says the majority report? It traverses the charge, and the answer is :

"That Obadiah Simpson was not promised in the summer of 1889 or at any other time by the said Edward Cochrane the Government office of keeper or attendant of one of the swing bridges over the Murray Canal."

Now, bear in mind the positive connection between Mr. Stanley and Mr. Cochrane. I do not say that Mr. Obadiah Simpson conversed personally with Mr. Edward Cochrane. I will admit on the evidence that he did not; but no man can say that a close and intimate relationship between Mr. Stanley and Mr. Cochrane has not been so indubitably proved that Mr. Cochrane knew all that was going on. Mr. Stanley was in fact one of the committeemen, and an agent of Mr. Cochrane, and what took place between Mr. Stanley and Mr. Obadiah Simpson? At page 133 Obadiah Simpson is asked:

Had you a conversation with Mr. James Stanley at any time?—Yes.

What was your conversation with him?—He came to me and the first I knew about him was—I am getting so I forget everything.

Take your time and don't hurry?—He gave me a right to the canal. You know what I mean—the right to a bridge.

He told you you would be appointed?—Yes; he came to me and appointed me.

That is, promised you the appointment?—Yes; promised me the appointment.

And yet the majority report says that no promise was made by Mr. Cochrane to Mr. Obadiah Simpson. In one respect that is correct. Of course, Mr. Cochrane did not himself personally promise to Obadiah Simpson, although he promised to others, the appointment of bridge-keeper. But there is more than one way of promising a thing. You may promise it through another man; and in view of the close relationship existing between Mr. Cochrane and James Stanley, one of the committee that distributed these offices and collected the money from the recipients of them, and in view of the evidence of Mr. Bullock and the evidence of Henry May, I ask this House how it is possible to disassociate Mr. Edward Cochrane from Mr. James Stanley. You cannot do it. The promise made by James Stanley, proven by the evidence of Obadiah Simpson, was in reality the promise of the hon. member for East Northumberland. Then the majority report denies that Stanley promised a position to Arundel Simpson, and I will read the denial, because it traverses the charge that was made:

"That James Stanley did not propose to the said Arundel R. Simpson, with the knowledge and consent of the said Edward Cochrane or otherwise, that if the said Arundel R. Simpson would pay $150 and give to his father, the said Obadiah Simpson, a life lease of his farm (as compensation for his not being appointed such bridge-keeper, which the charge alleged he had promised and had not received), he, the said Arundel R. Simpson, would be appointed such bridge-keeper."

That is a denial of the charge, a denial presumably based on the evidence. Now, what is the evidence? I ask how it is possible for hon. gentlemen to come to the conclusion that the statement of the majority report is true, in view of the undoubted evidence to the contrary. It seems to me the hon. gentlemen who prepared this majority report had not read the evidence through when this report was brought to them for adoption. I do not say that is so; but if asked to believe one way or the other, I would certainly believe, in view of the extraordinary report brought in by the majority, that the hon. gentlemen who made it had not read the evidence through and carefully digested it before coming to a conclusion. Look at page 53, question 1523. Mr. Arundel Simpson is asked:

You say they were going to let the bridges. What do you mean by that?—A. To appoint bridge-tenders. Q. Did he say anything about your getting one?—A. He said that I could get one by looking after my father and giving him $150. Q. Who told you that?—A. James Stanley.

And yet the majority report says that Stanley never did promise Arundel Simpson anything.—

Q. When you say that he said you were to look after your father, were those the words that he used, or what did he mean?—A. He went in the first place to see my father and told him they had promised him a bridge, but that he was too old to be appointed. He asked him if he wanted one of his sons appointed in his place and he said yes, and he would like to see me appointed.

On page 64 the following evidence is given:—

And what passed between you and Stanley?—A. He said that he was going to make an appointment that gave one to my father and me, and wanted my father to have his share of it.

There is conclusive evidence that Stanley did promise Arundel Simpson a position; yet the report says that was impossible, because Arundel Simpson could not give his father some interest in some land, when he had no land. Hon. gentlemen have not read the evidence. It is true he did not own any land, but he was a tenant on some land, and had the right to transfer his position as tenant to his father, which he would have done had the arrangement been carried out. Now, although I do not think that the reference to Obadiah Simpson and the reference to Arundel Simpson are very important to the charge, I have taken up the time of the House in discussing them——

Hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON.—for the simple reason that hon. gentlemen opposite, in their report, attach importance to it, because they deny the assertions that were made in the charges brought forward on the 20th of August by the hon. member for West Huron. Hon. gentlemen opposite say "hear, hear." I do not attach much importance to their interruption. The hon. gentleman who so interrupts has not been following me, or perhaps he does not attach much importance to the matter. Perhaps his mind is so blurred, perhaps his sense of right and wrong is so obscured, that he does not think it wrong to take $200 out of the pocket of a poor unfortunate devil——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BARRON—who has only $400 a year. Perhaps he does not think it wrong to take $150 out of a man who earns $1.25 a day for eight months in the year. If he sees nothing wrong in that, all I can say is that we have very little hope of convincing the hon. gentleman that the majority report is wrong and the minority report is right. Let me refer for a moment or two to the Goodrich charge. What was that charge? It will be found at page 8, clause 5:

"That subsequently it was corruptly agreed to by and between the said Wesley Goodrich and the said Edward Cochrane that if the said Edward Cochrane would procure the appointment of the said Wesley Goodrich to the said Government office of keeper of said bridge, he, the said Wesley Goodrich, would pay the sum of $200, and excute to the said Obadiah Simpson, father of the said Arundel R. Simpson, a life lease on his farm, with a condition in said lease that if said Wesley Groodrich lost said appointment said lease would be cancelled."

Then the charge goes on to say that the corrupt bargain was carried out. What does the majority report say with regard to that? At page 4, clauses 1 and 2, it says:

"That it was never corruptly or in any way agreed to, by and between the said Wesley Goodrich and the said Edward Cochrane, that if the said Edward Cochrane would procure the appointment of the said Wesley Goodrich to the said office, he, the said Wesley Goodrich, would pay the sum of $200, and excute to the said Obadiah Simpson a life lease of his farm, &c."

I will ask the House to look a page 124, question 3607, and see the evidence upon which these hon. gentlemen came to the conclusion that there was no proof to support that charge. The majority report of the hon. gentlemen, who, I believe, have not thoroughly read the evidence, says that there was no corrupt bargain between Mr. Cochrane and Wesley Goodrich whereby the latter got his position. The question is asked:

Q. Were you aware of the fact that Obadiah Simpson had been promised the position of bridge-keeper? A. I believe so. I understood him to say that he was encouraged in that way.

Q. You understood that from Obadiah Simpson?—A. I understood from some person that he was promised it.

The charge is that Obadiah Simpson was at first to get the office, but being an old man he gave up his right to the office for a lease of land to Wesley Goodrich, who got it and paid $200 in addition for it.

Q. You understood that from Obadiah Simpson?—A. I understood from some person that he was promised it. I think he informed me that Mr. Keeler once told him, but I am not positive. Q. Now you wanted the position yourself, did you not, Mr. Goodrich?—A. Yes, sir. Q. Did you see Mr. Cochrane about it?—A.—

For a moment the witness would not answer, and the stenographer took down "no answer." The witness was looking down to the ground, and he was asked:

Q. Will you kindly look and say whether you saw Mr. Cochrane about it?—A. I spoke to Mr. Cochrane about it. Q. Before you got the position?—A. Yes, sir. Q. What did you say to Mr. Cochrane?—A. I asked him if he could not assist me in the matter and let me have one. Q. That is what you said?—A. I am not positive of the words I used. Q. And what did he say?—A. He said there were others applying for it. Q. What others did he say?—A. He mentioned Mr. King and Mr. Cardington, a farmer, I believe. Q. Any others that he mentioned?—A. I am not positive that he mentioned any others. Q. Did he mention Mr. Obadiah Simpson?—A. I believe he did.

So that Mr. Cochrane knew that Obadiah Simpson was promised the office.—

Q. By giving him a life lease of the farm you were going to get the position of bridge-tender?—A. The position that he said he was promised.

Q. Who was promised?—A. Obadiah Simpson.

Q. You were to take his place and give him a life lease of your farm?—A. Yes.

I ask the House to bear in mind this question and answer:

Q. What did you get for this life lease?—A. I was to get the situation at the bridge if he got it.

Q. If who got the appointment?—A. Mr. Simpson?

Q. Obadiah Simpson?—A. Yes.

So you see that it is admitted that Mr. Cochrane promised him directly the position he subsequently got. Then what else does Mr. Wesley Goodrich say? In addition to getting the life-lease of the farm, which contained a clause that the old man Simpson was to have this for his life, paying no rent, but that it was to be forfeited if Mr. Wesley Goodrich did not keep the office, in addition to that he was to pay $200. The majority report admits that amount was paid to Mr. Edward Cochrane himself. There is a very significant fact in regard to the payment of this $200 by Wesley Goodrich to Mr. Cochrane, and I ask attention to this particular point. That $200 which Mr. Wesley Goodrich paid to Mr. Cochrane had to go into the hands of Mr. Payne, the solicitor for the bank at Colborne. Mr. Wesley Goodrich knew nothing about Mr. Payne, but only acquired his knowledge of Mr. Payne and as to where the money was to go from Mr. Edward Cochrane. Look at question 3704. The chairman says to Mr. Wesley Goodrich:

I think you had better tell the committee again what happened there.

Mr. Goodrich says:

I agreed with Mr. Wade to pay this $200. Mr. Wade lived at Hilton, quite a way from my place, and I went to Mr. Cochrane (he was in the barnyard at the time when I arrived), and I asked him would he take the money. He told me to take it to Mr. Payne at Colborne, but that was quite a way for me to go. I said: "Are you not going soon," as I knew he went there often. He said: "Wallace is going to-night with the grist." I had noticed the team and waggon in the yard. Wallace was going to the house to get his overcoat, and I suggested that somebody ought to count the money. I said: "Would he." He did not answer me, but he seemed not to want to do it. I took it out of my pocket and urged him. He then took it and counted it, and then handed it to Wallace. Wallace had got back by this time. He said: "Wallace, give that to Payne."

Now I ask how Mr. Wesley Goodrich knew that the money was going to Payne, the solicitor of the bank, who had the note in his hands for collection? Afterwards, in answer to Mr. Osler, he says that he learnt that he was to pay the money to Payne from Mr. Cochrane himself. So Mr. Cochrane knew where the money had to go. That is a very significant fact, and shows that Mr. Cochrane knew that this liability to the bank on a note which was in the hands of the solicitor was to be liquidated by these particular payments, and so he told Goodrich that the money was to be taken to Payne. Then the evidence further on shows that Mr. Cochrane, in answer to Arundel Simpson, said he was getting more than Arundel was to pay. He was to get $150, but Mr. Cochrane said there would be $200 to be received from Mr. Goodrich. I pass hurriedly from that to take up another point. It has been said that if the witness, Arundel Simpson, could be believed, the case was brought directly home to Mr. Cochrane, but of course the hon. gentleman says he is not to be believed. The reason given is that his evidence before the Committee is at variance with his declaration previously made. He said in his declaration he had several interviews with Mr. Cochrane, and it was shown that he had only three interviews, and because the three interviews are argued not to be several interviews, it was suggested that he was not worthy of belief. Then the declaration which he made appeared to make him say that before the appointment was made he had several interviews with Mr. Cochrane, and it turned out that he had only one. But it further turned out that the occasions which he looked upon as interviews were interviews which his wife's uncle had with Mr. Cochrane, at which he was present. But because he personally had only one interview alone with Mr. Cochrane before the appointment, it was sought to discredit his evidence. It was admitted that Mr. Cochrane had said that Mr. Snetsinger had offered him $600 for the office. Mr. Snetsinger says that is not true, but that afterwards he might have given $600 for the office. Mr. Cochrane retails that statement to Mr. Simpson, and because Mr. Simpson makes the statement it is endeavoured to discredit his evidence. It is said that Arundel Simpson is not to be believed, but when he states that Mr. Cochrane

told him that four bridges at $150 would not pay $900, does Mr. Cochrane dare to deny that statement? Mr. Cochrane was there hearing what the witness said, but he went out of the room and never offered to give evidence, and he dare not deny that evidence. The witness says he carried a letter from Mr. Cochrane to Mr. Hedley Simpson. Does Mr. Cochrane deny that statement? No; he remains silent and dumb. Mr. Arundel Simpson also goes into the contents of that letter fully. Does Mr. Cochrane deny the statement as to its contents? No; although he was present every minute of the examination of the witness. The witness says: "You handed me the letter in the presence of Stanley, and it was about the lighthouse. The contents of the letter were read." Mr. Cochrane listened to every word that was said, but he dare not go into the box and deny the statement. Arundel Simpson says that Mr. Cochrane told him "that Stanley ought not to have agreed to take $150 from him; that he could get more from Goodrich; that other arrangements were being made." Does Mr. Cochrane deny that statement, although he heard it made? No; he leaves the room. He says that "Mr. Cochrane told him that Snetsinger had said that he would give more, perhaps $400 or $600, for the position." Does Mr. Cochrane dare to go into the box and deny that statement? No. There he was, listening to every word that fell from the mouth of the different witnesses, listening from early morning until late at night; he heard the arguments of counsel, and all; yet Mr. Cochrane dare not go into the box and deny the statements that were made by Arundel Simpson. Yet in face of that, the hon. gentleman who preceded me says that Arundel Simpson was not to be believed. And what was the excuse put into his counsel's mouth for not going into the box? Because some of those witnesses were personal friends of his, were political friends of his, and although his political life was at stake, although if he were found guilty he would be a ruined man, he would be ashamed to hold up his head or look anybody in the face, although he would not dare to go back to his riding if these things were proved, yet because he was afraid to contradict another man he would not go into the box. Does anybody believe that for one moment? Does anybody believe that that excuse, put into the mouth of his counsel, was the real reason? Then there was the Clouston charge. Now, Mr. Stanley, the intimate friend and confidential adviser of Mr. Cochrane, had nothing to do with Clouston. Mr. Clouston saw Mr. Cochrane himself. Look at page 29, questions 924, 925 and 926, and there you will find that Mr. Clouston lives close to Mr. Cochrane, and he went to Mr. Cochrane himself and got a promise directly from the hon. member for East Northumberland of the position of bridge-keeper. Does any hon. gentleman doubt that? If so, let him look at page 69, question 1935. What further do we find? We find that this man Clouston drove in a buggy with Mr. Cochrane to Colborne and back again, and during that time not only were these very bridges talked of, but Mr. Cochrane talked with him about the money being raised; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite say that Mr. Cochrane knew nothing about it. Look at page 70, question 1976, and there you will find the statement of Mr. Clouston, a man who, in giving his evidence, impressed everybody with his truthfulness; there you will find the statement made that in that celebrated drive to Colborne and home again they not only talked about giving these offices, but they actually talked over the fact that these men who got the bridges were paying a *quid pro quo* to the extent of $150 each. There it is brought home directly to Mr. Cochrane, and I challenge hon. gentlemen who follow me to deny these facts. Then Mr. Clouston was told to go and pay that $150—to whom? To pay it to Mr. Webb, the banker. Now, mark you, Mr. Clouston was himself personally liable on the original note of $1,000. But that note had been liquidated at this time, and the note that he was to pay the $150 on was another note entirely, not the original note of $1,000, of which he was one of the makers. That note was paid by another note for which he himself was not liable at all. Then he went to Mr. Webb, to whom he said: "I have come to you, Mr. Webb; I am instructed to pay the money." These were his words. From whom did he get his instructions, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite? Look at question 2090 and following, and you will see the fact stated by this man Clouston that the only man he spoke to in regard to these appointments from the time that he got the promise to the time he went to pay the money was the hon. member for East Northumberland himself. Understand me; he says to Mr. Webb: "I am instructed to pay the money." Mr. Webb says: "From whom did you get the instructions?" It must have been from the only man whom he saw from the time he got the promise until he paid the money, and that was the hon. member for East Northumberland. Then take the case of William Brown. He was recommended by the committee, not by Mr. Cochrane. But Mr. Cochrane knew of the operations of the committee. Look at question 916 and what did Mr. Cochrane tell him? William Brown, the man who paid $150, was told by Mr. Cochrane himself to go to this particular committee; and he says, in the answer to question 2658, that he never would have gone to the committee but for Mr. Cochrane. So Mr. Cochrane knew all a bout this committee, and he sent William Brown and Thomas Fitzgerald to this committee. He did not send Clouston, he promised him directly; but William Brown, who paid for a bridge, and Thomas Fitzgerald, who paid for a bridge, he sent to the committee. Brown says that he was instructed to pay money when he went to Mr. Webb, and Mr. Webb said to him: "Mr. Brown, you do not owe me any money." But Brown says: "I am instructed to pay you $150 on some note," and he described the note and paid the money. Now, I ask, who instructed him to pay this money? It was James Stanley in this case, the intimate friend and close associate of Mr. Cochrane, who instructed him to pay this money, because he knew from Mr. Cochrane where the money had to go, and knowing where the money had to go, and knowing well that Mr. Brown had already agreed to pay him $150, he instructed him to pay it in on this particular note. Hon. gentlemen say there is no bargain and sale about it. Look at page 92, question 2642 and following, and then will hon. gentlemen say there was not a sale of offices? Hon. gentlemen opposite say all these payments were voluntary on the part of these men. Sir, let hon. gentlemen opposite refer to the case of Regina *vs* Mercer,

reported in our old Upper Canada reports, and there they will find that men were convicted of selling offices on not one-half the evidence, not one-tenth the evidence, that we find to-day in this particular case. What is the evidence now with regard to a bargain and sale? Look at question 2642:

Q. Was there any other object?—A. I was to pay $150 and get the appointment.
Q. Would you have paid the $150 if you had not got the appointment?—A. I would have paid it in time, but not just then. I was willing to pay my share in getting the party out of debt.
Q. But whether you got the appointment or not, were you quite willing to pay that $150?—A. Yes.
Q. Quite willing?—A. Yes.

So it is admitted that $150 was paid to get this particular office by William Brown; yet hon. gentlemen opposite say there was no bargain or sale, that he, with others, had paid money of his own free will and choice. How much did William Brown pay to party funds previously? It is suggested in the report that these men earning $1.25 a day during eight months of the year voluntarily paid $150 and $200 to the party funds. Let us look at the record of these men. It is true they are Conservatives; but if they are willing to pay that amount of money as a voluntary contribution to party funds at one time, their records will show that they had previously paid large sums. It appears that Brown paid during his whole life the large sum of $3 towards the Conservative party funds, with the exception of this amount of $150. Yet this man, who paid $3 in his whole life, we are told paid $150 not to obtain an office but simply for party purposes. Take the case of Robert May. Hugh McQuoid was another committee man mentioned by James Stanley; he was sworn to be a committee man by Bullock, and he sent Henry May to Robert May, this unfortunate man, who, when in the witness box, appeared to be in abject poverty, this man with a large family to support, to subscribe $125. The poor fellow had not the money, and so he was obliged to go to his old father, and he went with him to the bank at Trenton to help him to get the money. They obtained there a certain amount, $70. How was the balance to be raised? The poor wife, who had earned her money, had $50 laid by; and he said: Give me that $50; and with the money raised from the bank with his aged father's assistance, and with this money obtained from his wife, he paid $125 and got the appointment. We are asked to believe that this man, who was so poor that he had to take his wife's money to help make make up $125, out of pure choice and for the love of the thing, paid that money to help the Conservative party. Not only is this case as presented by the majority report a crying shame, but I say, in the language of one of the newspapers, that the men guilty of this sort of thing should hide themselves in the narrow crevices of a tooth comb. From these unfortunate men $150 and $200 were exacted, and when the last cent was taken and the $150 could not be made up, they took $125. Robert May, forsooth, gave this money, they say, out of pure love to the Conservative party. Then I suppose his record will show that he had previously given money to the same cause. But his answer is that never in his whole life had he given one cent towards the Conservative party. Then we come to Vanalstine, who had to pay $150. It is said he paid it voluntarily to help the Conservative party. That sum was, however, handed back to him, because he did not get a position.

Mr. TAYLOR. Ten o'clock.

Mr. BARRON. This point cannot be too strongly emphasized, notwithstanding the suggestion made by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), that it is 10 o'clock, because he does not like to hear this, although he approves of it all. It is quite right and proper to take the last dollar from a fellow to pay a subscription to a party fund. He approves of that sort of thing. No wonder he calls 10 o'clock and does not like to hear the iniquities of this transaction revealed. The point cannot be too strongly emphasized against the hon. member for East Northumberland, that he refused to go into the box and disprove the statements, if he could disprove them, made by the several witnesses who had given evidence in a most condemnatory way against him. Does anyone want to make this House believe that if the hon. gentleman's record was clean in this respect, if he had nothing whatever to do with this matter, he would not have gone into the box? No one would believe it. When a man's character is attacked, when evidence is given against him proving him guilty of an outrageous crime, would anyone believe that the man against whom such is proved, would not enter the box and disprove the charge if he could do so? Hon. gentlemen opposite are asking us to believe altogether too much, and the fact that Mr. Cochrane declined to go into the box must be taken as positive evidence, although not sworn evidence, that he could not, under cross-examination, refute the facts proved by the different witnesses, and that the hon. gentleman was guilty, if not actually in point of fact, from these acts being done with his knowledge and consent. The majority report is, indeed, a most unblushing defiance of proper deduction from evidence. I believe the hon. gentlemen who prepared that report had not carefully gone over the evidence, question and answer, and analyzed the evidence as judges should do before they come to a decision on such an important matter as this. I cannot believe they have done so, in view of the fact that the report is entirely mistaken as regards any proper deduction that can be drawn from the evidence. I say, in truth, that if this House approves the majority report, hon. members will be asked to twist the true facts of the case; they will be asked to forcibly wrench the true cause the wrong way. They will ask us to put a premium on this sort of thing, to tell evil-doers to go and do the like again, and if we support the majority report it will go through Canada that men can barter and sell offices, as has been done, and they will have a strong majority behind them to approve and condone the offence, and to declare that the man guilty of it, as is the member for Northumberland, is innocent and pure.

Mr. GERMAN. I certainly expected to hear some hon. gentleman opposite reply to the speech just delivered. Those who usually sit opposite are out of the House. They certainly have not had time to read all the evidence given, and I am forced to the conclusion that they do not care not only not to read the evidence but to hear it adduced in argument. They intend to vote at the dictation of their leader, whether their action be right or wrong. I do not feel inclined to be guided in that way. I

feel it is the duty of hon. members of this House to discuss this evidence and to endeavour, if possible, to arrive at a fair, correct conclusion. It is a matter of serious moment. It affects the honour and position of a member of Parliament, a representative of the people, and we should here discuss whether or not he has been guilty of the charge laid against him. I am surprised that some hon. gentleman opposite has not deemed it advisable and wise in the interest of his fellow member to discuss to some extent these questions. I, Sir, cannot help but think, in discussing this question, of the past record of the hon. gentleman whose position as a member is affected. I have known that hon. gentleman by reputation from boyhood; I have known his past character as an honourable man, and, Sir, I am free to admit, and I do admit, that his record has with me considerable weight. It ought to have weight with every hon. gentleman in this House, and before severely criticising him, and before judging him guilty of the charges which are made against him, we should feel convinced that these charges are clearly and substantially proved. Now, Sir, I think it is not just to him and not just to his position that hon. gentlemen opposite do not see fit to discuss the question. Perhaps they are convinced that he is guilty. If they are, it is their duty to stand up in this House and say so, but if they believe him innocent it is their duty to point out to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House wherein they think he is innocent. There is what is called a minority report before the House. Three gentlemen who compose that select Committee have felt it incumbent on them to declare to this House that they believed the evidence shows that the member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) was guilty of the charges preferred against him. Four members of that Committee have thought otherwise, and I think it is the duty, not only of these four gentlemen who are the majority of that Committee, but of other members on the opposite side of the House, to endeavour if possible to convince us, if they think we are reasonable men and open to conviction, wherein we are wrong, and wherein this man is not guilty of the charges laid against him. We are relieved to a certain extent of the difficulty of our position by the admissions of hon. gentlemen opposite. We are relieved to the extent that it is admitted by them, in the first place, that if the evidence sworn to by Arundel Simpson be true, then the charges, as made, are substantially proven. It was admitted by counsel for the hon. gentleman—and I must say that to me, sitting on that Committee, I thought it singular that the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) did not go into the box—it was admitted by his counsel, however, that if Arundel Simpson was to be believed, then the charges were substantially proved. We have, therefore, only to deal practically with whether or not Arundel Simpson should be believed, and to that point I will endeavour, for a few moments, to direct my argument. Let me preface what I have to say with this: That the committee established in the East Riding of the County of Northumberland, to dispense this patronage, was not a committee of the Conservative Association, and I am free to admit that I am glad of it. I am glad to know that the Conservative Association of the East Riding of Northumberland were not so mean as to appoint a committee who would exact this money from poor men seeking office. It was not a committee of the Conservative Association, it had no right to speak with the voice of authority, and it was not a committee that the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) should in any way recognize. If it had been a committee of the association, if it had been a committee authorized to speak for the Conservatives of the riding, then the member could have very properly said when being referred to: This is a committee of the party, this is a committee that I am bound to listen to, and this is a committee whose recommendations I must attend to. But no; it is sworn to positively by Mr. Payne and by Mr. Bullock, both strong Conservatives, and one a member of the committee, that it was a self-appointed committee; that it was a few men who had got together—leading Conservatives, it is true, in the vicinity of Brighton—to dispense these positions on the Murray Canal in order to exact and collect this money from the people getting the positions. I contend, Sir, that this places the matter in so much the worse light for the member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), from the very fact that he had no right to listen to a self-appointed committee. He had the patronage of the county, he knew that the committee were not appointed by the convention, and he knew they had no right to speak for the people, and that the only right they had was to exact money from the poor men applying for offices. It is admitted and proved to a demonstration that Hedley Simpson paid $200 for his office, that the money was taken to the village of Colborne and paid on a note, on which the member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) was the endorser, and that as soon as that $200 was paid the balance of the money was raised by a new note, from which the name of the member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) was left out. He at any rate was relieved from any further liability by reason of the payment of that $200. Now, Sir, how did it come about that that $200 was paid. Arundel Simpson says: "I took a letter from Mr. Cochrane to Hedley Simpson asking him to come and arrange about the payment of that money." Now, I am quite well aware of the rule of evidence that if you show that a witness is telling an absolute falsehood, if you show that his evidence is not to be credited on one point, you can fairly say that other portions of his evidence should be criticised carefully before believing it. I submit to this House that Arundel Simpson is not contradicted in any essential particular. Arundel Simpson came before that Committee and his evidence stands before this House as the evidence of an honest man. His evidence stands before us unimpeached in any important particular, and we, as judges in this case, cannot hold that he was perjuring himself when he was giving evidence. It has been said that he swears one thing before the Committee and another thing in a declaration that he made. I ask any hon. gentleman to read the declaration that he made in the light of the explanation that he gave, and compare it with the evidence, and you can come to no other conclusion than that he was an honest man and gave honest evidence. If his evidence was not impeached on important particulars, then why should we not believe him? We should certainly believe it on these points as to which he was not contradicted—not contradicted by the declaration, not contradicted by any sworn testimony. As has been well argued, the hon. mem-

ber for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) was present at the meetings of the special Committee to hear the evidence: he was there during the whole time, but he did not see fit to go into the box and give evidence contradicting the testimony of Arundel Simpson. Why was this? The most peculiar reason is given that I ever heard given in a court of justice as to why he did not like to go into the box and contradict some of the witnesses. We were told that his was a close constituency, and it might be necessary for him to contradict witnesses who were political friends, with a large family connection. That is the most absurd reason I ever heard of, when a man's position as a member of Parliament and representative of the people was at stake, and when a man's honour was seriously concerned. What difference was there between his going into the box and swearing that Arundel Simpson was a liar, and coming before this Parliament and saying that Arundel Simpson is a liar. What difference was there between his going into the witness box and swearing that Arundel Simpson was a liar, and having his counsel stand up in the Committee and say so? If he was afraid of the result in the constituency, surely the statement made by his counsel was as damaging as any sworn statement would be? Why did he not go into the box and contradict this man? So far as I know, Arundel Simpson had no political connection that could be injured. All the other Simpsons were friendly to Mr. Cochrane, and gave evidence in his favour, so that so far as I can see Arundel Simpson was the only man who would be seriously affected by showing that he had perjured himself. Then why did not Mr. Cochrane go into the witness box? Apart from contradicting Arundel Simpson, it was not absolutely necessary that he should contradict the statement of any other witness; and it is an insult to the intelligence of this House to ask them to believe that that was the reason why he did not go into the box. I do not believe there is a member of this Parliament who believes that was the reason. The only reason in my opinion was that he dared not go into the box and contradict Arundel Simpson; he knew that Arundel Simpson was swearing to the truth, and he had not the courage to go into the box; he had too much moral feeling of right to go into the box and contradict his testimony; but he asks this House to declare that Arundel Simpson is a liar. He asks this House to declare that the unsupported statement of himself, that of an honourable man heretofore I admit, but a statement not given with the sanctity of an oath, is more to be believed than the sworn statements of these several witnesses. It is asking too much of the intelligence of the members of Parliament; it is asking too much at any rate of my intelligence. Now, Sir, suppose you cast aside altogether the question as to whether or not Hedley Simpson paid the money with Mr. Cochrane's knowledge; suppose you admit, for the moment, that Arundel Simpson is a liar; suppose you admit that he perjured himself in the witness box; what will you say of the evidence of Wesley Goodrich? His evidence has not been contradicted: it is not suggested that he was swearing what was untrue: it is admitted in the report that he paid $200 into the hands of Edward Cochrane—for what? To be handed to Mr. Payne. Wesley Goodrich knew no more about Mr. Payne than he knew about the man in the moon.

Mr. GERMAN.

He said that he went to Mr. Cochrane and gave him the money; he did not know he had to go to Mr. Payne; it was Mr. Cochrane who suggested to him that he should take this money to Mr Payne in Colborne. Wesley Goodrich said he handed the money to Mr. Cochrane, and Mr. Cochrane counted it and handed it to his son. On that point Wesley Goodrich is contradicted. Wallace Cochrane said it was Wesley Goodrich who handed the $200 to him. It is not denied by the son that his father was present at the time, and the report finds that he was present and that the money was handed to him; but the young man says: "I took that money to Colborne: it was in an open parcel; I could see the bills; I handed the money to a man in Mr. Payne's office, not to Mr. Payne." If you are to test the veracity of the witnesses, look at the unreasonable statement made by the son. He said that there was a stranger in Mr. Payne's office, a man whom he did not know, and that he laid the parcel on the desk and said to the man: Hand this to Mr. Payne, without a statement as to whom it was from, as to who he was, or as to whom the money was for. Here is the young man's own testimony at pages 128 and 129: "I gave the money to a man in Mr. Payne's office; I did not know the man; he did not know me; I left the parcel of money on the desk, and came away; I did not tell the man for what purpose the money was to be used; I did not tell him who I was or where the money came from"—the most unreasonable statement I ever heard given under oath by an honest man, a statement that cannot be believed, because no sensible man, and he appeared to be a sensible man, would do such a thing. So I say, as between young Cochrane and Wesley Goodrich in regard to the payment of the money, I prefer to believe Wesley Goodrich, and he says: "I went to Mr. Cochrane; I took the $200 which I had previously told him I would pay; I had arranged about the lease; I handed him the money and he counted it, and he told me to take it to Mr. Payne; I said, I cannot go to Colborne, can't you take it down; he said: 'My son is going down and he can take it.'" And hon. gentlemen want us to say that the hon. member for East Northumberland knew nothing about the payment of these moneys. Then, look at the statement of John Clouston at page 70:

Q. Can you locate the time?—A. I could not. I have been trying to think it over and I cannot.

Q. You can within a year?—A. The year that Mr. Cochrane said there was a bridge for me you want?

Q. Yes? When was that: it must have been before the 10th May, 1890?—More than a year before that, I should say.

So that a year before the 10th of May John Clouston had the most remarkable conversation with Edward Cochrane about the sale of bridges that I ever heard of between two men, one not knowing anything about the sale of bridges.—

Q. When he said to you that others were taking part in this old indebtedness, what others did he refer to?—A. I said that Cochrane may have said that others were taking part, and I think I said the others were bridge-tenders. Q. How much did he tell you the others were giving?—A. He may have said they were giving $150. Q. Each?—A. Yes. Q. Then did he say anything to you about giving $150, because the others were going to give it, you know?—A. I do not recollect how that was. Q. Just try and brush up your memory?—A. You see the way this whole thing came around as I said before. I had been taking an interest in the movement of getting rid of this old indebtedness. I had even gone out in endeavours to collect. Q. I know you were anxious. Did he say anything to you about paying the same sum as the other

bridge-tenders were paying?—A. He may have. Q. Do you not think that he did say so?—A. I do not know that I had better think much about it.

J. D. Clouston, a strong political supporter of the hon. member for East Northumberland, coming here to swear in his favour, standing up in the witness box, answers, when questioned with regard to the corrupt payment of money: "I do not know that I had better think much about it." Then further:

Q. You say he told you, on the occasion of that drive, that other bridge-tenders were paying $150. Do you believe now that he did tell you so, on your oath?—A. I believed he may have said so, as I said before.

What conclusion can you come to from reading that statement than that these two men had a conversation about the payment of this money for these bridges? If Mr. Clouston could have honestly sworn that no such conversation had taken place he certainly would have done so. On the next page he says:

Q. I want to know if you had any conversation with anybody else?—A. No; he was the only man.

The hon. member for East Northumberland was the only man he talked to about the getting of this bridge: he was the only man he talked to about the payment of money, or his undertaking to pay $150, and he said, when questioned on this point, that he did not know he had better think much about what Cochrane told him, but Cochrane may have said that other people were giving $150. Is it not an insult to the intelligence of sensible people to ask them to believe that the hon. member for East Northumberland knew nothing about the sale of these bridges? Here is the sworn statement of Goodrich not contradicted. In face of that, what can you say? Can you say he was lying as well as Arundel Simpson? Or if you do, will you say that Bullock was lying? Can you say that about this man Bullock, who was a member of that election committee? His evidence is not contradicted. What does he say about this matter? He says that Mr. Cochrane came to his store while a meeting was being held, and that while Mr. Cochrane was there they were talking about the appointments to these bridges and the payment of money. He says he did not know whether Mr. Cochrane took any part in the conversation, but that he was there about half an hour and saw what was going on. The hon. gentleman who spoke this afternoon said that was contradicted by Stanley. That is a peculiar statement. Bullock does not say that Stanley was there, but that he did not know whether Stanley was at that meeting or not. Stanley says that Cochrane was at no meeting he was at, but Stanley does not say that Cochrane was not at the meeting Bullock says he was at, because for all we know Stanley was not there at all, so that Bullock's evidence is not contradicted in that particular. What are you going to do about that? Are you going to say he was lying? If he told the truth, the hon. member for East Northumberland knew that these men were paying money for the bridges, and was present at the meeting of this election committee and saw what was going on. He knew these men were being fleeced out of their money to pay this old indebtedness. Can you cast aside all this evidence? Can you say all these men were swearing to what was untrue? and if any one of them swore to the truth, the hon. member for East Northumberland stands convicted of the charges made against him. Lay aside Arundel Simpson if you will, and you cannot do so honestly; lay aside Wesley Goodrich if you will, and you cannot do it honestly; but you cannot lay aside the evidence of Bullock, a Conservative of the Conservatives in that riding, a strong supporter of the hon. member for East Northumberland, a gentleman who would not come here and give evidence detrimental to his interests if he could have avoided it. But he was bound, as a truthful man, to come and state on oath what was correct, and he said that the member for East Northumberland was present at one of the meetings and knew what was going on. You cannot get rid of such evidence as that. Even if there were no corrupt bargains between the hon. member for Northumberland and these men, even if he did not go to them or if they did not come to him, even if they did not agree corruptly that this money was to be paid, if he knew that this was going on he countenanced it, and should be condemned and censured. He certainly knew it was going on. Why, Stanley himself, on whose evidence hon. gentlemen opposite rely, says: I told Mr. Cochrane either before or after the money was paid, but certainly before the appointment was made, that Hedley Simpson had paid $200. That is Stanley's own evidence, see pages 20 and 23. He says he sent for Hedley Simpson and they saw Mr. Cochrane. So that there is conclusive proof from their own witnesses which show at any rate that the hon. member for East Northumberland knew this money was being paid, and he knew it before the appointment was made. Would an honest man, would a man who was not doing something that is improper, would a man who was not willing to engage in an improper transaction and who knew that these $200 had been paid by Hedley Simpson—by a man who could not afford to pay it—would not such a man have said this must be stopped; would he not have sent for Hedley Simpson and enquired into the facts, and have told him: You should not have paid these $200, as you can not afford it; you can have the appointment, but must take back your money. You did not pay it voluntarily, you cannot afford to do it. Why did the hon. gentleman not do that? He knew that Wesley Goodrich was paying $200; he knew before the appointment was made; he knew that Goodrich could not afford to pay the money; why did he not, as a member of Parliament and an honest man, deal properly and honestly with his associates, and say to this committee: This thing must be stopped; you cannot bargain and sell offices in this way under my control; you cannot fleece these poor men out of this money. He should have done that, but he did not do it. If there was nothing more than that in his action, it was censurable. If there was nothing more than the very fact that he knew the money had been paid before the appointment was made, he should have put a stop to it. All along the line the same facts appear. Now, if the hon. gentleman knew that these men were bargaining for bridges, he is guilty and should be censured. If we want to establish a standard of morals above that of the pot-house politician, if we want to establish in this House a standard that will be an example to the country, we should censure such conduct. But we are not censuring it by the report of the majority. I say that the people of the country to-day are looking anxiously for the verdict of this Parlia-

ment. I say that to-morrow they will look with interest for the report of this debate and the report of the evidence on this question, and I say that this new Government, with its new leaders, are to-day on trial as to what they will do in the future. To-day we find here a charge against an hon. member of this House, a charge which is true; and not a member of the Government, not a member on the Government side, but one, has stood up to express an opinion, and that one has opposed the charge. Will they stand up and vote against it? I say the people are looking to this House to see whether this Government is starting out with a clean record, but they will look in vain if the majority in this House will vote for this majority report. To warn hon. gentlemen opposite of the result which may follow their decision to-night, let me read a statement from one of the leading Conservative papers in this country, which will show whether or not the temper of the people at this time can be trifled with. I say that, when you have seen what the newspapers of this country are saying, not only the Liberal newspapers but the Conservative newspapers, you will hesitate before you vote for this majority report. I have here a statement made by the London *Free Press*, and that should be considered very carefully by the members of this House before they record their votes. I think I have shown that the evidence of Arundel Simpson is not impeached; that I have shown to reasonable men who desire to vote conscientiously on this subject, unbiassed by party feeling, that the evidence of Arundel Simpson is not impeached. Supposing a defendant in a court of justice made the excuse which has been made by the member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) for not appearing in the witness box, is there a judge in the land who would not say to the jury: It may be true that the evidence on that part of the prosecution is not very strong, but it is uncontradicted by the defendant, who has been sitting here in court all the time. We may criticise this evidence severely, but there is the defendant, and, if the evidence is not true, why does he not contradict it? I ask hon. gentlemen to view this matter in the same light. If the statement of Arundel Simpson, of Wesley Goodrich, of Bullock, is not true, why does not the member go into the box and contradict it? He was there all the time. The statement that he did not want to offend friends with large family connections will not answer. Here is a statement made by a strong Conservative newspaper, written after the evidence had been given. The London *Free Press* says:

"But the evidence put in on Thursday and Friday left no doubt of two important and damaging facts: First, that Mr. Cochrane was intimately associated with the operations of his committee, and second, that in one case he actually received two hundred dollars, paid into his own hand in return for the position of bridge-tender on the canal. It is of little consequence that he immediately sent this money to the man who was in charge of the notes that were to be redeemed. It is of no consequence that he advised Goodrich not to pay the money. The fact remains that a man who could not get the recommendation on his own political merits succeeded in getting rid of one aspirant by giving him a life lease of his farm, and ultimately got the position by paying two hundred dollars into Mr. Cochrane's hands. When this case is considered in the light of some six or eight other transactions of a similar character, we can see no room for exonerating Mr. Cochrane from blame. There were undoubtedly mitigating circumstances, but it is not enough, and quite apart from what Parliament may do, we shall hold to the view that Mr. Cochrane should forfeit his seat. No earthly good can come from looking with leniency on a case like this, either from a party or a public standpoint."

I ask hon. gentlemen opposite what they will do in the light of the views expressed by Conservatives from the western part of Ontario, not only by this paper, but by the Hamilton *Spectator* and others, condemning this transaction. I ask hon. gentlemen to vote to-night against the report of the majority in this Committee.

Mr. MASSON. This matter, as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. German) has remarked, is of great importance, inasmuch as it involves not only the question of yes or no in regard to these charges, but it affects the reputation and standing of an hon. member of this House. If there is one thing which our legislators can feel proud of it is that they have established a court where charges affecting members of the House can be tried by a proper tribunal. It is almost too much for human nature to listen to hon. gentlemen opposite when they pretend to look at the matter from a judicial standpoint and then proceed to make vindictive harangues. The one important thing for this House to consider is what the charge is which is laid against the hon. member, and in doing so I start from the outset by saying that the charge is no less than the commission of a criminal offence. The hon. member is charged here with corruptly selling a position in his gift. He is charged with corruptly entering into such and such agreements. The first charge, shorn of its verbiage, is that it was corruptly agreed by and between the said Edward Cochrane and the said Hedley Simpson that, if he would deliver to the said Stanley two notes, and so on. Now the gist of that charge is that there was a corrupt agreement. The making of a corrupt agreement is a criminal act under the statute. An hon. gentleman opposite referred to the case of Regina *vs.* Mercer as evidence that both parties to a transaction were liable. Now, I will deal with this point later on, but for the present I wish to consider the fact that this is a criminal charge, and to be dealt with as such. If this House were to adopt the amendment that has been submitted to this report, we would not only condemn Mr. Cochrane of being guilty on a criminal charge, but we would be virtually recommending that he should be prosecuted for that act. Therefore, I do not understand what the hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat, means when he says that there is no judge in the land who would not say that this is a weak case. I admit that it is a weak case, but weak as it is, why has not the defendant denied it? Now, we all know that when we come to deal with a criminal case we have to apply an entirely different rule of law from civil cases. The argument of the hon. gentleman would be right and proper in a civil case; it is entirely wide of the mark in a criminal case. Therefore the whole line of argument, whereby he attempted to show the corrupt connection of the hon. member in these transactions, is altogether irrelevant. I will not take up the time of the House in going over the evidence in detail on that point, but I will say that wherever they have argued that circumstances point to his knowledge they assume that this House, sitting as a jury and trying a criminal case, is to presume guilt. Now, it is said that it is right to draw inferences. Is it right to draw in-

ferences or to presume guilt unless we are imperatively obliged to do so? It certainly is not. It is one of the fundamental principles of British law by which courts are guided, and by which this House must be guided in the present case, that a man is to be presumed innocent and not to be presumed guilty. You are not to gather in hearsay evidence, little tid-bits of stories told here and there, what one person has told to another person, and so on—it is not on such evidence that you are to assume guilt. Such is not the rule in criminal law, nor even in that respect would it be the rule in civil law. Then this being a criminal charge, and it being our duty to consider it in a judicial manner, what does the hon. gentleman mean by his references to the newspaper press of the country? Is that a judicial argument, or is he using it for the purpose of browbeating some weak member who may fear public opinion? Is he holding it as a rod over the backs of some who may consider that they have to face their constituents shortly, and that they had better beware of public opinion? If such is the case, the hon. gentleman has no right to call it a judicial argument. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that in using such arguments as that he has mistaken the calibre of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. There may be slaves who dare not do right, but they are not to be found here. There may be slaves who dare not be in the right, because those in the right are few in numbers. There may be slaves who will bow to a wave of public opinion without considering whether that opinion is well or ill-founded. But I tell the hon. gentleman opposite, who has paraded a variety of newspaper articles before the House, that we all know the press of the country is fond of things sensational, that they delight in exaggerating all kinds of charges, whether they be against a member of Parliament or against the humblest individual accused of crime. The newspapers delight in showing the worst side of a question. It has come to be a disgrace to the press of our country that no sooner is a man charged before our criminal courts than he is tried and found guilty by the press.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is pretty hard for the press.

Mr. MASSON. It may be hard for the press' but every honest man connected with the press will admit that there is too much truth in it. Now, I will say that this being a criminal case, we are not to deal with it as if it were a civil case, but we are to insist upon the strictest proof. The whole gist of all criminal charges is the corrupt intention under which the act is done. A corrupt intent is the very spirit of the offence. We have penal statutes, the courts of law deal with such cases, and where no actual guilt is proved the jury have reason to presume that no actual guilt existed in the mind of the accused, and juries in such cases are not only permitted, but they are directed, to acquit. Now, I wish to refer to the law as laid down on that point by the very best authority in this country. I will show how the courts construe statutes according to the spirit and the practice of natural justice. Cases may possibly arise in which a person, according to the letter of the law, may be liable to a penalty, yet the court will direct a jury to acquit, the accused not having offended against the spirit and the intention. In a case where that is the judgement of a court, I will quote the language of the Chief Justice:

"In these cases it may be contended that the words of the Act affording no latitude, conviction is inevitable, and the defendant must apply to the mercy of the Crown, which he will doubtless receive. I think he is more satisfactorily protected by the genius of our laws, and the spirit in which they are administered; I think he his entitled to an acquittal under such circumstances, from the verdict of a jury, and not driven to appeal to clemency, where there has been clearly no guilt."

Now, this being a criminal case, and that being the spirit in which we should consider it, I wish to take up, point by point, the amendment that has been moved to the report. At this hour of the night I will not trouble the House with going over the voluminous evidence, but merly confine myself to pointing out the weakness of the amendment proposed. Now, in the 7th paragraph of the finding, as suggested in the amended report, I find these words:

"That the said Edward Cochrane was not a member of the said committee, but he knew of the purposes and object of its existence; attended one or more of its meetings."

What is the meaning of that? There is a distinct admission that he was not a member of the committee, and we must therefore take it for granted that he was not a member of the committee. It has been stated that Mr. Cochrane was aware of the purposes and objects of its existence. What were those purposes and objects? We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that the purposes and objects were not to dispense patronage, but to collect money. If we look carefully at the evidence we find that Stanley said the appointment of that committee was for the purpose of distributing the patronage. He says, not that the committee was actually appointed by the convention of the party, but it was recommended by that convention. That is the effect of his evidence. It is no use reading pages of questions and answers to come to that conclusion; his evidence means nothing more or less than that it was suggested that the patronage in the south end of the riding—because hon. gentlemen must remember that this is a string riding, narrow and long—should be distributed by a committee, as several appointments would have to be filled shortly after Mr. Cochrane's election. The convention met. Mr. Cochrane was in Ottawa, or it is said he was not present, and that recommendation was made to the convention. It was to the effect that the chairmen of township societies should be on the committee, if they were convenient. We are told there were two or three put on. They met at the south end of the riding; consequently, those at the north end could not be there, and their places were filled by seven prominent members of the party. It is said they were self-constituted. Be that so or not, it was a committee organized for the purpose of recommending to Mr. Cochrane persons who should receive the patronage; and if they took upon themselves other offices they did so without the recommendation of the convention, and without the knowledge and consent of Mr. Cochrane. There is not a tittle of evidence to show that they consulted Mr. Cochrane as to what they should do. There is a quantity of evidence to show that Mr. Cochrane did not know they were making these demands. There is the evidence of Stanley, who emphatically says so. There is the evidence of May, and of other wit-

nesses, who spoke of the doings of the convention, and no word was told to Mr. Cochrane as to what the committee was doing as to levying money. If the case was that the object of the committee was to raise money, then this finding which hon. gentlemen opposite would ask the House to adopt is not correct, for it is not accurate to say that Mr. Cochrane knew the purposes and objects of that committee, if those purposes and objects were not only the dispensing of patronage but the levying of money therefor. Then we come to another statement, that Mr. Cochrane attended one or more meetings on that committee. There is not a tittle of evidence that he attended any meeting as such. It is useless to refer to the evidence of Bullock. I do not wish to make any disparaging remarks in regard to that gentleman. He is said to have been a member of that committee, and a leading Conservative on it. Unfortunately, as was remarked by counsel prosecuting these charges before the Committee, he was not in a very capable state that morning. We have the evidence of Mr. Bullock for what it is worth. What does it amount to? Simply this, that Mr. Cochrane dropped accidentally into the store while some of the committee were there, that he remained some little time—how long, the witness would not pledge his word—and it is sought to make us believe that they were discussing this matter. It is clear from a close scrutiny of the evidence that this was not his intention. The question is this:

Q. Did Mr. Cochrane attend any meeting of the committee?—A. He was there once. I do not know whether he had any conversation with me or any of us.
Q. He was there once?—A. He was in the store once, when we were all there.

This witness says later on they were not all there; when asked to give their names, he could not do so. The evidence proceeds:

Q. Did you ever tell Mr. Cochrane as to the proceedings of the patronage committee. Did you inform him?—A. No.
Q. How did Cochrane come to be there?—A. I cannot tell.
Q. Did he drop in by accident?—A. I cannot tell.
Q. What time of the day was it?—A. It was evening.

Further on, he says:

Q. He did not come in to buy?—A. I cannot swear; sometimes we do not close till 10 or 11 o'clock.
Q. It was after the store was closed?—A. The store was closed. Yes; it was after the store was closed, as far as my knowledge goes.
Q. Did the committee transact the business in the store?—A. Right in the open store.
Q. Right in the main part of the store?—A. Yes; that is where Cochrane came.
Q. Did he know the committee was there?—A. I do not know.
Q. Did he attend at their request?—A. No; not that I know of.

Then the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, who was a member of that Committee, put this leading question to the witness:

Q. What part did Mr. Cochrane take in the discussion?—A. No part whatever.

There, spreading over two or three pages of evidence, you can cull but one meaning out of it, the story told by the witness, namely, that Mr. Cochrane dropped in there accidentally only, that he took no part in the discussion; and he even was uncertain as to whether Mr. Cochrane knew it was the committee that was meeting. Before leaving this point, let me refer to the more emphatic evidence of Stanley:

Mr. MASSON.

1024. Did Mr. Cochrane know that you were collecting or getting any money from the parties recommended for the bridges?—I do not know whether he did or not. If he did, he did not know until the parties were all appointed.
1025. Did he know it from you?—No; he did not.
1026. Was Mr. Cochrane present at any of these committee meetings?—He was not.
1027. Was he a member of the committee?—He was not.

I will not detain the House longer on this point, as it may have to be referred to in reference to other findings. I say, therefore, that as regards this important finding, the first point of any importance for the House to consider is that Mr. Cochrane was not a member of the committee, and the assertion that he knew its object is true only to the extent that he knew of the one object of dispensing patronage. That he attended one or more of the meetings is absolutely incorrect, and it would be an improper and unjustifiable thing for this House, or for the Committee, or for any court of enquiry, to say that the incidental dropping into a place where the committee was sitting was an attendance at the committee. Therefore, I am satisfied that the House will have no hesitation in rejecting that finding. I attended the special Committee of the House during its deliberations, and I heard the address of the counsel who prosecuted these charges, and I also had the pleasure, if pleasure it may be called, of listening to a repetition of that speech here to-night. On both these occasions I heard great stress laid on the fact that Mr. Cochrane was actually five miles away from home after dark, and consequently it was urged that the Committee in one case, and that the House in the other, should assume from the fact that M. Cochrane was five miles away from home after dark there was some felonious intent lurking around somewhere. The hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Barron) pointed out that Mr. Cochrane had stolen away from home after dark and entered into a store in a country village while some three or four men were sitting around on the counter. Surely no judicial mind would ask that guilt should be assumed under such circumstances as that. Before leaving this subject, I wish to refer to the ingenious, I will not say the improper, arrangement of the evidence in this connection. We are told at the close of this finding of the minority in the report of the proceedings which have been printed for the instruction of the members, that this finding is based on certain evidence, and it states that Mr. Bullock, one of the committee, gives the following evidence. It then goes over a number of questions and answers given by Mr. Bullock, and then without any charge or without any preface it launches into the statements made by Stanley, and reading these together it would lead to a conclusion which reading both in their proper shape would not be arrived at. Those who have the report and look at this finding will see that the questions running down to number 2556 suddenly break off, and then we have question No. 1040. 1040 is not Mr. Bullock's evidence, as stated here, at all, but the evidence of Mr. Stanley, given under entirely different circumstances and relating to a different matter and a different time, and should not be read in the connection set down in this report. The 8th section of the finding which we are asked to adopt is as follows:—

"That in the month of April, 1888, one Hedley H. Simpson was recommended by the said committee to the said

Edward Cochrane as a fit person to fill the position of light-house-keeper at Presqu'Isle Point.

"9. That James Stanley, one of the said committee, by its authority, called on Hedley Simpson and told of said recommendations, and made it a condition of getting said appointment that he should pay the said Stanley the sum of $200, to be used in part liquidation of said debt.

"10. That thereupon the said Edward Cochrane recommended the said Hedley Simpson to the Government as a fit person to fill the said office."

These clauses contain only one thing that may be a finding of importance, namely, that James Stanley, one of the committee, by its authority went to Hedley H. Simpson and told him of the recommendation, and made the payment on condition as to his getting the said appointment. The evidence on that point has been gone over two or three times to-night, and it was very fully entered into by the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White). I will not trouble the House in going through it in detail again, but I would simply recite briefly what the evidence on that is. The evidence is that James Stanley was not authorized by the committee to put on any condition to the appointment. James Stanley positively swears, and we have no evidence to the contrary, that the committee recommended Hedley Simpson for the appointment, and attached no conditions whatever to that appointment; that they did not authorize him to demand any sum; that he did not demand any sum; that he told Hedley Simpson of his appointment, and after telling him that he had received the appointment, he spoke to him about the debt, and asked him what he could give to assist in clearing it off. It is sworn to that Hedley Simpson said he would be willing to give what he could, but that he had not the money; that he asked him (Stanley) where he could borrow it, and that Stanley offered to lend it to him, and the whole thing was completed there. Now, there is no evidence connecting Mr. Cochrane with that. The evidence before us is that Stanley was not authorized to make this bargain; he was authorized only to communicate what the committee had done, namely, to secure him the appointment so far as they could. He did that, and he took on himself to do what he could. The statement, therefore, contained in the ninth clause, that it was made a condition of his getting the appointment that he should pay to the said Stanley a sum of $200 to be used in the liquidation of the debt, is not borne out by the evidence, and it would be absolutely improper for this House to accept it. The eleventh clause of this report says:

"11. That the said Hedley H. Simpson duly paid the said sum, and on said recommendations he duly received said office and now holds the same—and this to the knowledge of said Edward Cochrane—the said Stanley in his evidence before said committee, swore as follows—"

Now, as to that we have no evidence whatever except that of Stanley. We have no evidence whatever as to what the committee were to do; we have no evidence whatever that Mr. Cochrane knew anything about it. It is not very plain what the last words mean where "and this to the knowledge of the said Edward Cachrane." What does this phrase refer to? If it refers to the fact that Mr. Cochrane knew that Simpson was appointed to the office and still holds it, the statement is true. That is the plain English interpretation of the phrase, but I fancy that is not what the framers intended it to mean. As these hon. gentleman opposite are aiming at bowing down to public opinion, and wishing by threats and presure of the press to cause others to bow down to public opinion, I have no doubt that the phrase is put there for the purpose of conveying the idea to the public that all these things were done by Edward Cochrane, of which there is not a tittle of evidence to show. Now, the next charge of importance is section 12:

"Pending the negotiations between said Stanley and the said Hedley H. Simpson and the said Edward Cochrane respecting said lighthouse, the said Edward Cochrane wrote the said Hedley H. Simpson a letter respecting said lighthouse, and sent it to him by the hands of Arundel Simpson, who in said investigation swore as follows:"

Now, to say what Arundel Simpson swore on that point would be to say a great deal. In the first place, Arundel Simpson swore positively enough that he got the letter, giving the time and place. He described clearly that he met Mr. Cochrane on the street; that Mr. Cochrane asked him to go into the hall of a hotel; that in the hall of the hotel, in the presence of Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Stanley gave him a letter. First, he made the statement that Mr. Cochrane gave him the letter; then he said Mr. Stanley gave him the letter in Mr. Cochrane's presence. Before giving this testimony he had made a statement saying what was in that letter; but he astonished the hon. gentleman who was leading him in his examination before the committee by saying that he knew nothing of the contents of the letter. Here is what he said. It has been read before, but I will read it again:

Q. Did you see that letter?—A. No. I saw the letter, but I do not know what was in it. I could not tell what was in it.

Could there be anything more emphatic than that to show that he did not know the contents of the letter?

Q. Was the letter read in your presence?—A. I do not know as it was. I do not think it was. I would not swear positively. It is quite a while ago.

Q. Did Mr. Cochrane tell you what was in the letter?—A. He told me it was concerning the lighthouse, and wanted to know if I would send it to Hedley Simpson for him to come and see him.

So far the evidence was read by the hon. gentleman who first addressed the House from the other side; but, strange to say, the hon. gentleman stopped there. The next question is:

Q. And that is all you know about the letter?—A. That is all I know.

There is his positive statement. It will be noticed that in his examination in chief and in his cross-examination he tells two different stories- one, that he got the letter directly from Mr. Cochrane, the other that he got it from Mr. Stanley in Mr. Cochrane's presence; but through all the examination and cross-examination he sticks to the point that he did not know what was in it. By following closely the proceedings we find that he is dismissed, that other witnesses are called, that the Committee adjourns. After a long delay he is called again, and right at the commencement of his examination a statutory declaration, a document having all the solemnity of an oath, which he had made before, was placed in his hands by the counsel for the prosecution. This was objected to, and properly objected to; and no member of this House, be he lawyer or layman, will deny that that was a most improper mode of examining a witness —to place in his hands a declaration in which he had told a different story, in order by the pressure of that document to lead him to say what it was

otherwise impossible to get him to say. However, the document is produced, and he is examined: and follow his examination in chief carefully, question by question, page by page, and you will find that he tells an entirely different story from that which he told in the declaration. Then comes the cross-examination extending over several pages, before the document is placed in his hands, and he tells a story the direct opposite of what he had told on the previous occasion only a few days before, when his statement was reduced to writing. During that examination and cross-examination it was clearly established that in connection with the lighthouse he had only one meeting with Mr. Cochrane, that he was asked at that meeting, either by Mr. Stanley or by Mr. Cochrane, to take a letter. That is the sum and substance of all his evidence before this document was introduced. He had only three meetings altogether—one about the lighthouse, when he was asked to take a letter, one when he applied himself for a bridge, and one about things in general, when he was making complaints against Mr. Cochrane because all the appointments to the lighthouses and bridges were filled. Then this document was placed in his hands, making it clear that he had several conversations. The first clause of importance I read is this:

"I assisted the said Hedley H. Simpson in his efforts to secure the said appointment and had several interviews with Edward Cochrane, then and now member of the House of Commons of Canada for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Northumberland and a supporter of the Goverment, in connection with such appointment."

What is his explanation of that? His statement was that he had not assisted, that he had not canvassed for him, that the only thing he did was at Mr. Cochrane's request to carry a letter telling him the appointment was made. He did not present the petition. It was urged that in that clause there was only a trifling variation, because it had been taken down that he did this himself, whereas the interview was by his uncle and his wife's uncle, and he was present. Now, his statement is that he was not present with his uncle. It is clear on that point. An hon. gentleman pledged his word that the evidence shows he was present with his wife's uncle. On page 63 there is the following evidence:—

Q. The fifth clause of this declaration of yours, which has been acknowledged by you as bearing your signature, reads as follows:—"At one of the said interviews the said Edward Cochrane informed me that he would not sign the petition hereinbefore referred to, and that if Hedley H. Simpson sent said petition to Ottawa he would not assist him in obtaining the said appointment, but if Hedley H. Simpson would leave the matter in his hands he (Cochrane) would secure the appointment for him." Is that true?—A. Will you let me explain? Q. Tell me first is that your statement that you made to Mr. Gordon?—A. No; not that I had an interview with Mr. Cochrane about the matter.

There is his positive statement that he had not an interview. But it is pleaded for this innocent man that he may have been misled into saying he had not an interview because he stood by while his wife's uncle had one. Can that interpretation be put on the evidence?

Q. You did not understand your making such a statement as that before Mr. Gordon?—A. I made such a statement; but I did not say I saw Mr. Cochrane.

Then he was not present with his wife's uncle to hear Mr. Cochrane, for he did not see him. That, surely, is clear. Then the whole question was put to him again:

Q. Recollect that this paragraph contains three statements: that you saw Cochrane and he would not sign the petition, and at that interview Cochrane told you that if Simpson sent a petition to Ottawa direct he would not assist him in getting the appointment; and third, if he would leave it in his own hands he would get him the appointment. These are the three distinct statements contained in that paragraph. Are they yours?—A. No.

He says further on: "to a certain extent they are." He is asked:

Q. What is your explanation?—A. He asked me if I ever——

Q. Who asked you?—A. Mr. Gordon. Understand, Mr. Gordon was asking me questions and I asked him to put them down. He asked about the petition and I told him my wife's uncle, Mr. Simpson, went to him with the petition and he would not sign it; that it would make no difference. I told him it was my wife's uncle who went there.

No hon. gentleman, acting in a judicial capacity as a judge, trying with judicial fairness a case of this kind, will argue from that testimony that that man went there with his wife's uncle and heard what passed, and consequently it was only by inadvertence he made the statement that he had an interview, that it was only a trifling inconsistency or evasion of the truth, and not one by which he could be convicted of speaking falsely. You have only to follow that cross-examination through a few more pages to find that, section after section, Arundel Simpson contradicts one day the statements he made the previous day and the statements he made in that declaration. So thoroughly did he contradict himself that it would be waste of time to point out the contradictions. Through a number of pages we meet with contradiction after contradiction, until at the end we hardly know what story the man wishes us to believe. And yet we are told that on such evidence, unsupported as it is, we are to convict an hon. member of this House of a criminal offence and direct the country to prosecute him for it. I say that is a statement that even did it stand there alone, shattered as it is by his cross-examination, contradicted as it is by his own sworn statement, would be unworthy of belief, and it would be improper for any judicial committee to decide against a defendant charged with a criminal offence based on such evidence. Not only is it unsupported, but contradicted in every possible way. That story about that letter meets with contradiction from first to last wherever it touches on another person. It is said to have been taken to Herbert Simpson's house, but he recollects nothing of it. He never heard of or saw such a letter. It is said to have been read by Mrs. Herbert Simpson. Mrs. Herbert Simpson says most emphatically that she did not read such a letter, that she never saw such a letter and never heard of such a letter. Language cannot be more emphatic than hers. She is put in the box and asked these questions:

Q. You are the wife of——?—A. Herbert W. Simpson.

Q. It is said, Mrs. Simpson, that you read a letter which purported to come from Mr. Edward Cochrane, the member, and was addressed to Hedley Simpson; that letter in transit being carried by Arundel Simpson, or in the hands of somebody, was brought to you and read by you. What do you say to that?—A. I never read any letter of the kind; I have never seen it, so of course I never read it.

Q. You never read a letter that passed between Mr. Cochrane, M.P., and Mr. Hedley Simpson?—A. No.

Q. Did you ever see a letter from Mr. Edward Cochrane?—A. I never saw any letter from Mr. Cochrane to any person.

She is pressed very hard, as if she had been primed to say that, and she says emphatically that she did not know Mr. Cochrane, and would not know him on the street, until she saw him that morning. Then they revert again to this letter, and it is attempted to draw out what she heard after these charges were noised abroad, and after this declaration had been made, but she states emphatically how she heard about this matter:

Q. You heard of the letter from Mr. Cochrane?—A. I heard you speaking of it.

Q. Are there any other persons from whom you heard it?—A. I have heard it talked of since these proceedings commenced, but I never saw the letter.

Q. A letter from Mr. Cochrane to Hedley Simpson?—A. That is what you tell me.

Q. You say you never read such a letter?—A. Most certainly: I think I have told you that already.

Q. Do you remember having read the letter that Arundel brought to the house?—A. No: he never brought a letter to the house, to my knowledge.

Instead of being supported or corroborated in any way, Arundel Simpson is contradicted first in the statement that Stanley gave him the letter. How did he know the contents? He says he did not know the contents, and we are asked to believe that he did. Take the statement put in his mouth by the hon. gentleman who first addressed the House on the other side, that he heard it read by some body, and that it was Mrs. Simpson. The hon. gentleman who makes this statement is a lawyer. Would he in any civil case presume in any court to give evidence of the contents of a letter by calling somebody who had been told of its contents? If the document could not be produced, would he not put the person in the box who wrote the letter or who read it, and not the person who heard what its contents were? This would not be accepted by any court of justice in a civil case, and yet we are asked to accept that statement in condemning a member of this House and finding him guilty of a criminal offence. I think we have here a thorough contradiction of the statement which has been made that:

"Pending the negotiations between said Stanley and the said Hedley H. Simpson and the said Edward Cochrane respecting said lighthouse, the said Edward Cochrane wrote the said Hedley H. Simpson a letter respecting said lighthouse, and sent it to him by the hands of Arundel Simpson."

We cannot sustain that finding. The next clause is:

"That respecting the price paid for said office and the said Edward Cochrane's knowledge thereof, the said Arundel Simpson gave the following evidence."

And we are treated to more of Arundel Simpson's evidence. Strange to say, they cull the evidence from one place and another; but notwithstanding that, in about half a page we have three differents stories told. One is that Mr. Cochrane knew all about it because he told this man so. The question is:

Q. Mr. Cochrane told you that Snetsinger offered him something?—A. Yes.

Q. How much did he say?—A. I would not be positive; either $400 or $600.

There is the first statement, that the amount was mentioned. A few questions further down it goes on:

Q. Did he say anything?—A. I don't know; it is quite a while ago. He said, I believe, that he would, or they would, let him have it a good deal cheaper.

Q. Would let who have it cheaper?—A. Mr. Hedley Simpson.

Q. What did he say?—A. He said that Hedley would get it for $200.

Q. Why do you refer to the word "cheaper"?—A. I don't know: I suppose that is what he said.

There, again, is a statement in reference to what Hedley Simpson was to get it at. The next statement is "he said he would get it for $200," not cheaper, but for $200. Then this is as to what Mr. Snetsinger said:

"He said Mr. Snetsinger would give $600 for the lighthouse, and they only got $200."

What are we to gather from all these selections which they have culled from the evidence to show that this man is to be believed, and that Mr. Cochrane had knowledge that they relied upon Arundel Simpson's evidence in support of these assertions? These assertions analyzed point to three different statements. Then, as the cap of the whole matter, we find they ask:

"But that he (Cochrane) would secure the appointment of said Hedley H. Simpson for a good deal less than $600?—He did secure it. This was long after, as Mr. Cochrane knows."

They stop there. Why did they not quote further? Because it would show another story contradicted. Therefore, the 13th statement of the findings which the House is asked to pronounce upon, to the effect that Edward Cochrane had knowledge of all these transactions, is not proved, because Arundel Simpson's statement does not prove it in the first place: and secondly, if it does, it is not worthy of belief. Then we have charge No. 14:

"That in the end of the year 1889 or in the early part of 1890 the said James Stanley, with the consent of the said Edward Cochrane, proposed to one Arundel Simpson that if the said Arundel Simpson would pay $150 to the said James Stanley for the purpose aforesaid, he, the said Arundel Simpson, would be appointed a bridge-tender on said canal. Arundel Simpson refused to pay anything."

Now, that statement as it stands, although containing inaccuracies, the House will see at once makes no allegation against Mr. Cochrane. It does, however, say in the first allegation "with the consent of the said Edward Cochrane proposed to one Arundel Simpson." Was that proposal made by Stanley to Arundel Simpson with Mr. Cochrane's consent? If so, where is the evidence of Arundel Simpson to prove it? Stanley does not prove it, nor has any other witness said anything on which this House can be asked to base a finding that what took place between James Stanley and Arundel Simpson was done with Mr. Cochrane's consent. There is also the same ingenious attempt—I will not say improper attempt—made to mislead by putting under the head of one witness the evidence of another, where the number 1691 is changed to 1830. Their evidence is hearsay evidence only. Yet the same personal pronoun is carried through as if the conversation was going on with Mr. Cochrane, whereas the conversation is with Mr. Stanley, and only as to him. The fifteenth allegation is that Wm. Brown was recommended for a position on the Murray Canal, and got the appointment. In that there is nothing wrongfully charged against Mr. Cochrane, and I will dismiss it. Now, coming to the 18th clause that we are asked to adopt as the finding of this Committee, it states:

"That in or about the month of May, 1890, one J. D. Clouston was recommended to the Government for the position of bridge-tender on the Murray Canal by the said Edward Cochrane; that the said Edward Cochrane knew when he made said recommendation that the said J. D. Clouston agreed to pay for said office to said committee the sum of $150, and had paid thereon about $100, to be used for the purpose aforesaid—that said J. D. Clouston

did pay said sum—and on said recommendation of said Edward Cochrane received said appointment, and now holds the same."

And it gives the evidence. The examination of that evidence shows clearly how very carefully they selected it. Mr. Clouston, an honest old gentleman, is put in the box. He is anxious to tell his story in a straightforward manner. He is cross-examined from the first, and almost every question put to him is a leading question. Finally, at question 1954, he breaks out and tells his story in a concise statement of what took place :

Q. You told us you had received the promise of an appointment from Mr. Cochrane. That is correct, is it not?—A. Well, now, I hardly know how to give it. In the first place, it is nearly a year ago. I first asked Mr. Cochrane if he was successful in being elected—that was after Mr. Keeler died. Mr. Crouter was here one session, and then Mr. Cochrane after that defeated Mr. Crouter. Going to the nomination, when there was to be nominated candidates, I asked Mr. Cochrane if he was successful I would like him to remember me, in the way of getting me a bridge on the canal. Mr. Cochrane never made me an answer aye, yes or no, at that time. The conversation you are trying to get at was years after that. Mr. Cochrane and I drove to Colborne on that day. On our return in the evening he said: Clouston, I suppose you remember saying something with regard to an appointment on one of the bridges on the Murray Canal. I laughed. I says: Yes, Cochrane, I thought you had forgotten it because you did not mention it since. He says: I gave you no answer at that time. I says: I know you did not. Well, now, says he: There is a bridge for you on the Murray Canal. That is all the conversation.

Now, this evidence merely shows that these men were old friends, they were near neighbours, and Mr. Clouston and Mr. Cochrane went to a nomination, taking place some eight or ten years ago. On the journey he asked Mr. Cochrane to remember him if he got elected, and to give him a place on the bridge. Years after that, when driving home, as neighbours would, from an adjoining village, Mr. Cochrane voluntarily asked him if he remembered having asked him about a position as bridge-keepeer and then and there, without condition and without any bargain as to price or anything else, Mr. Cochrane says to him: "There is a bridge on the Murray Canal for you." Now, that is the whole story as gathered from Mr. Clouston, but nothing is shown that it had anything to do with his appointment. The hon. gentleman said, and I think the last speaker reiterated the expression: How could this man know about this debt unless Mr. Cochrane had told him? How could he know that Mr. Webb had this note unless Mr. Cochrane told him? Why, I have no doubt that Clouston knew as much about this debt as Mr. Cochrane did. In the first place, he had more to do with it than Mr. Cochrane. He was one of the signers of the original note, he was one of the promoters of the original protest under which this debt was incurred; and it is all nonsense to say that he must have received his information from Mr. Cochrane. He tells us positively that he knew all about it, that he was one of the parties who took an active interest in these things. All these things go to show that what Clouston did, he did voluntarily. He knew that these moneys were being raised. It is sought to be shown that he learned that information from Mr. Cochrane, but he does not say so. It has not been shown that Mr. Cochrane knew it, and it is improper to assume that he obtained such information. It is clear that if hon. gentlemen opposite rely on the evidence, which I may say they quote in garbled form, it is not right to assume that Mr. Cochrane knew when he made the recommendation that Clouston had agreed to pay the amount in question, because he had only agreed with himself to pay, but had never spoken of it to anyone; he simply went to the holder of the note and said: I have come to pay you. He had evidently asked where the note was. There is no evidence, however, as to an agreement with Mr. Cochrane or any one else that he should pay it. As regards Henry May, there is no evidence whatever. We come now to the 22nd paragraph :

"22. That the said committee was organized for the express purpose of corruptly trafficking in said offices, and did corruptly sell and dispose of the same to Hedley Simpson, Wesley Goodrich, Robert May, Thomas Fitzgerald and J. D. Clouston, respectively, for a money consideration."

There is no evidence to sustain that assertion. In fact, the whole evidence shows that the committee was not organized with the express purpose of corruptly trafficking in offices, that it was organized for the purpose of recommending persons to such offices, and that if other duties were assumed by the committee they exceeded the instructions and duties for which they were organized. The minority report also asks us to declare :

"23. That said Edward Cochrane was aware of such corrupt sale and disposal of said offices, sanctioned the same and made his said recommendations with the knowledge that said offices were so sold and disposed of."

I again repeat that there is not a tittle of evidence to support the charge that Mr. Cochrane knew those parties were corruptly selling those offices, or that when he made any recommendation he was aware that any corrupt bargain had been made. It is urged, very positively, that as regards Hedley Simpson, Mr. Cochrane certainly knew about it. It was said money passed through Mr. Cochrane's hands. In regard to Goodrich's money, it is said that that passed through Mr. Cochrane's hands. I would refer to what Goodrich himself said on the subject. It was urged by hon. gentlemen opposite that Goodrich did not know what to do with the money: that he did not know anything about Clouston and other parties, but he learnt it from Mr. Cochrane. Unfortunately for that contention, Goodrich gave evidence to the contrary. He states :

3732. With whom did you arrange this matter as to the payment of the $200?—With Mr. Wade.
3733. How long before you had paid this money was the arrangement made?—It was not a great while, but I have no dates.
3734. Who, besides Mr. Wade, had you the agreement with?—Mr. Obadiah Simpson.
3735. The old gentleman?—Yes, sir.
3736. Wade is his son-in-law?—I understand so.
3737. And is that the Wade who is said to be the member of the committee?—I don't know who the members of the committee were.
3738. You were to pay $200, according to your agreement, to Mr. Wade?—Yes, sir.
3739. Were you aware at the time whom you were to pay it to?—No, sir.
3740. What did you say about Mr. Payne?—I said that when I presented it, Mr. Cochrane told me to take it to Mr. Payne, to give it to him.

That is the statement he made in examination in chief. What follows :—

3741. Why did you present it to Mr. Cochrane?—I knew he frequently went to Colborne and it was most convenient to me.
3742. You did not want to go to Colborne?—No, sir.
3743. If you had gone, who would you have paid it to?—To Mr. Payne.
3744. Had Mr. Wade told you to?—I would not be sure whether it was Mr. Payne.
3745. If you had gone in to pay it to Mr. Payne—would it be because of an arrangement you had made with Mr.

Wade?—I understood, but I cannot say who told me that the notes were in Mr. Payne's hands for payment. I got the idea somewhere.

There is the statement of a man who was evidently intending to tell the truth; that the money was to go to Colborne, and it was because Mr. Cochrane went there frequently that he called on Mr. Cochrane. It was the statement of a man who had got the idea from Mr. Wade or some one, and it was that which took him to Cochrane. We have the whole transaction carried out, and it is clear that Mr. Cochrane knew nothing of the transaction; that Mr. Goodrich went to Cochrane; that he applied for a situation; that he was told there was none. He had, however, made up his mind to secure one of the places, but Mr. Cochrane told him the positions were all filled. He then made the statement that he would give $200. Mr. Cochrane told him he would have none of his money and would not take a dollar. Is there evidence of corruption in Mr. Cochrane's conduct? Goodrich then said he would give a life lease of his farm. Mr. Cochrane advised him against doing so. Without going over his evidence, I may say it amounts to this: That on two occasions he spoke to Mr. Cochrane, once on the road and once elsewhere, and both times Mr. Cochrane advised him not to give a life lease of his farm and not to give $200. But Mr. Wade learning, as he told us, from Mr. Cochrane at a funeral that this man was very anxious to get the place, and knowing that if the parties were appointed in the way recommended by the committee of which Mr. Wade was a member, that the old man, his father-in-law, would be left destitute because Arundel Simpson would not be able out of his pay at the bridge to keep the old man, and so he said himself he was afraid the old man would be thrown on his hands, he acted upon that knowledge, which he had obtained innocently enough. We cannot state that Cochrane had any design in talking to his neighbours about these appointments. No one suggested to Wade what he should do. But he sees the old man, his father-in-law and Goodrich, and he is the instrument in working up an agreement by which Arundel Simpson took a life interest in the farm. Mr. Wade tells us frankly that having heard that this man was willing to give $200 he made a proposition that that should go towards liquidating the indebtedness, and it was done. Until the whole affair is completed, there is no evidence of knowledge on Cochrane's part. One of the hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to argue that it made no difference whether knowledge of a criminal transaction, such as was charged, came before or after the event. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it makes all the difference in the world whether a person is an accessory before or an acessory after the fact, and a court or jury trying Mr. Cochrane upon the charge that he was a party to that transaction would have to be satisfied that Mr. Cochrane not only knew the facts, but that he knew the criminal intent, and failing to satisfy the court upon that a conviction could not be pressed. Yet this House is asked on just such evidence as that to find Mr. Cochrane guilty of being aware of these corrupt sales and disposal of the offices. We are asked to find in the broad language of the minority report:

"24. That the payment by the said Hedley Simpson of the said sum of $200 directly relieved the said Edward Cochrane of just so much of the said Edward Cochrane's indebtedness on said note of $619.69."

That was the statements made by the gentleman who made the charge; but the two gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House have taken a wider and bolder stand, and have said that Mr. Cochrane was discharged *in toto* from that indebtedness, and that Mr. Cochrane was no on the new note that was made. There is not evidence as to whether Mr. Cochrane was on the renewal of that note or not, and notwithstanding the fact that some hon. gentlemen appeared to be under the impression that note for $619 was the note upon which the $200 was paid, the evidence does not state that at all, and when the banker was brought before the Committee, we find that there was no $200 paid on that note, but that the note was paid in one sum. Let us deal with the language of this finding:

"That the payment by the said Hedley Simpson of the sum of $200 directly relieved the said Edward Cochrane of just so much of the said Edward Cochrane's indebtedness on said note."

Now the evidence is quite to the contrary effect. The evidence is to the effect that there was a note of $1,000 placed in the bank with some twenty names on it, that it was kept in the bank for several years, that during one of the many elections in that riding Dr. Willoughby, the local representative, and some three others of the twenty makers on that note were sued, and that these parties being sued, measures were taken to liquidate that note. It is clearly proved in evidence that Mr. Willoughby and other gentlemen were the makers of that note, and that Mr. Cochrane and other gentlemen were the endorsers. Bear in mind that the first note was a joint and several note in which all the parties were makers. On such a note as that it would be fair and reasonable to assume that it went to remove the indebtedness, but when we find the note made by two of the four parties who were sued, and endorsed by two parties who are not sued and who are not on the note, we have every reason to assume that the legal position of the parties on that note is the correct one, and that the note is not Mr. Cochrane's indebtedness, nor was it Mr. Cochrane's debt originally. Dr. Willoughby and another are the debtors on that note, and Mr. Cochrane at most is only a guarantor. Therefore, I think such a finding as that cannot be sustained from the evidence. If there were a liability which Mr. Cochrane had reduced, and even if he had even been the maker of the note, it would have to be brought to his knowledge that that money was corruptly obtained before he could be held in any way accountable for the use it was put to. We have heard a great deal on the subject that Mr. Cochrane did not present himself as a witness. As I remarked at the outset, it all depends on whether you deal with this matter on the principles of civil or criminal law. This being a criminal charge, created a misdemeanour by an old Imperial statute, and as the finding acknowledges is to be a criminal charge and directs that all parties connected with it ought to be prosecuted, it is proper to deal with this as a criminal case, and in dealing with it by any rule of criminal law it is an impropriety to comment upon the defendan not making a statement. The next clause of the finding is as follows:—

"27. That all the witnesses who appeared and gave evidence before your Committee appeared to your Committee to be men of truth and desirous of speaking the truth, so far as they knew; and there does not appear to be any ground for doubting the credibility of any one of them."

With one exception, I think that every member of the Committee would endorse that, but there is a very important exception, and that is Arundel Simpson, whose testimony is not worthy of belief, and cannot honestly be believed by any one member of the Committee. The twenty-eighth clause corresponds very closely with the clause of the report we are asked to amend, and it says:

"28. That selling or disposing of offices for a money or other consideration is highly improper and reprehensible; and the parties shown to have been engaged in such a practice here should be proceeded against criminally."

It is not only reprehensible, but it is criminal. They need not have stopped short there, for were the parties shown to be engaged in that practice they should be proceeded against criminally. I would point out that the report which we are asked to amend declares the same thing:

"4. Your Committee report that the practice which seems to have been resorted to by the political organization referred to, in order to raise a fund for political purposes, though not connected with Dominion politics, was improper and reprehensible."

The hon. gentleman from North Victoria (Mr. Barron) said that my hon. friend from Shelburne (Mr. White) had stultified himself in the report of the majority by saying that these were voluntary subscriptions, and at the same time saying they were reprehensible, and he stated that if they were voluntary they were quite proper. He announced the policy of his party when he said that it is quite right to go to the occupant of an office and solicit from him voluntary subscriptions for election purposes. That is the policy and practice of the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs, to go to office holders and office seekers and get from hem voluntary subscriptions, and the hon. gentleman endorses that policy when he says that if these subscriptions were voluntary they were all right, and he says that the majority of the Committee are stultifying themselves when they say they were reprehensible. If the hon. gentleman had read the report he would have seen that these gentlemen go further than this. They do not say that if they were voluntary it was no harm. On the contrary, they condemn the soliciting of subscriptions from office holders unconditionally. They do not condone the offence because it is voluntary. It was shown by the various applicants that what they paid was paid voluntarily; they were given to understand that this payment was not a condition of their appointment; nevertheless, the report of the Committee says that it is improper and reprehensible to solicit subscriptions in that way. That is as far as the report goes, and as far as the evidence warrants this House in going. But they say that it has not been shown that these things were done with the knowledge or consent of Mr. Cochrane, and I submit that that is the report that should be adopted. The evidence warrants its adoption, but the evidence does not warrant the adoption of a single finding of fact of any importance set forth in the amendment which we are asked to adopt.

Mr. FLINT. I regret very much that the hour is so late, and that the time which it would be reasonable for me to place at my disposal in dealing with this matter is necessarily limited. But at the same time, being indirectly connected with this case, as one of the members of the House responsible for making some of the charges upon which evidence has been taken, and concerning which comments have been made and probably will be made on both sides of the House, I would ask your indulgence for a short time while I make some observations in reference to these charges. I do not propose to go at any length into the charges connected with the name of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron), because the evidence in regard to them has been very thoroughly summed up by the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. I will, however, comment briefly upon the report of the Committee so far as it is connected with the charges made by myself; and I may say there was a certain appropriateness in my bringing the charges rather than perhaps some other hon. gentleman, for these reasons, that the constituency I represent is at a long distance from the constituency in which these unfortunate events have taken place, that my personal relations with the hon. gentleman who has been charged with certain offences and breaches of privilege here have been of the most agreeable kind, and, therefore, no other motive could have animated me than a proper motive, to defend the privileges of this House and bring forward for the consideration of the proper parties the grave charges which were laid before me; and I may say that no person in this House will be more gratified at the disproof of any of the charges that have been made than I shall be myself, because I have nothing but the kindest personal feelings towards the hon. gentleman, and I have a very strong anxiety that the credit of the constituency he represents should be spared and the reputation of this country should be protected as far as possible. I regret very much that intimations should be made that the person bringing charges of this kind renders himself liable to be censured by this House; and although the charges in some respect may have failed, and where they have failed I am glad of it, yet no matter what the risk may be to the personal position of any hon. member of this House, it is his duty to take that in his hands and endeavour as far as he has the opportunity to preserve the character and integrity of the House of Commons of Canada. The charges which I brought had reference to the cases of John Clouston, William Brown, Robert May, Henry May and William Johnson. The case of William Johnson has not been examined into, because that person was not within the jurisdiction of the subpœnas issued by authority of this hon. House, and it would be improper to comment on any of the reasons which may have actuated that person in placing himself beyond the jurisdiction of the House or its Committees. Therefore, our opinion cannot be pronounced one way or the other upon the charge made against him. The charge against Henry May was not proved, and I think the majority of the Committee would have discharged their duty amply had they made that simple statement. But they have gone beyond the record. As to the charge that it was corruptly agreed by and between the said Edward Cochrane and one Henry May, that if the said Henry May would pay the said Edward Cochrane, or to others for him, or for political purposes, the sum of $200, he would procure for the said Henry May an office or position under the Government, and so on, the Committee say:

"Your Committee find that such charge is wholly unsustained."

In this statement I agree, and I think the opinion of the majority of the Committee should have ended there. But they have seen fit to go further, and implied censure upon the gentleman who brought the charge before the House:

"Not only was there no evidence to warrant such a charge, but the testimony given clearly showed that the office referred to was not one within the recommendation of the said Edward Cochrane, or within the gift of the Government, but was under the appointment of the superintendent of the canal, without reference in any way to the Government, and the evidence further disclosed that the said Henry May had not had any communication with the said Edward Cochrane in regard to said position, and that the said Edward Cochrane had not intervened in anyway whatever with regard to the appointment of the said Henry May, and that such charge was not only groundless, but that the same had been made without information from the parties, who could have shown that no reason existed for making the charge."

With regard to any agreement between the hon. member and Henry May, I am perfectly willing to admit that the charge was not proved, and I apologize most cheerfully. There is no man in this House who, if the evidence brought forward does not sustain the information placed in his hands by those interested in purifying the House of Commons, would make more cheerfully any apology or reparation in his power than I would. I admit that it is the duty of every member to express his regrets when he has brought forward an unfounded statement, but it is also his duty to bring forward a charge, whatever may be the intimacy or friendship that may exist between him and the hon. member charged, if he believes in his heart that the evidence placed in his hands warrants him in making it. The Committee state in the majority report that there was no evidence to warrant such a charge. What right have they to make such an assertion? What warrant have they, without a particle of evidence, to go behind the records and state that the men who made the charge had no warrant for making it? How do they know what warrant he had? There is not a man on that Committee who can say that there was no evidence and that I had no warrant in making the charge. They would be only justified in saying that the evidence did not support the charge, but the statement that I had no warrant in making it is a false and impertinent allusion on the part of the majority of the Committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FLINT. And I take the responsibility of that statement from my place in the House. They furthermore go on to say that the same had been made without information from the parties who could have shown that no reason existed for making the charge. What warrant has the Committee in making that assertion? The evidence before the Committee bore out the statement, greatly to the surprise of the Committee, that the foremen or overseers on the works must be appointed by the superintendent, whereas the bridge-tenders are appointed by the authority of the Government. Into this grave constitutional question I do not pretend to have investigated. When the papers were laid in my hands, the evidence before the Committee showed that even those persons living in the neighbourhood are not aware of this distinction between the high and dignified position of overseer or foreman of works and that of a bridge-tender. Consequently, the assertion on the part of the Committee that I had no warrant for making this charge entirely falls to the ground. It was a little too strong in stating that there was no evidence to show any foundation for bringing the charge in connection with Henry May, although I cheerfully admit the charge is not sustained. It is proved by May himself, and by James Stanley, that Mr. Webb received money for his brother in connection with the appointment as a bridge-tender and paid money on certain notes or obligations given by the Liberal-Conservative party in that constituency. There is abundant evidence that he was a go-between between the person appointed as bridge-tender and the committee who recommended the appointment and the person who held the obligation of the party. So that there was strong evidence to presume at any rate that Henry May was paying thi money for his own position, although the evidenc did not sustain that presumption. There was strong *primâ facie* case which any reasonable man would be prepared to admit, unless explained, would have connected him with that charge. But it turned out, afterwards, that he paid the money for his unfortunate younger and poorer brother. There are two or three remarkable points in connection with this unfortunate affair. In the first place, let us look at the *dramatis personæ* of this comedy, or tragedy, or serio-comedy, as you may please to call it. We find on the one hand a supporter of the Government in this House, the chosen representative of the constituency of East Northumberland, and we find on the other hand half a dozen poor peasants, honest, faithful fellows, looking for humble positions on a public work, and between these two extremes, the power and patronage of the one and the poverty and the necessities of the other, we find a committee formed, a sort of buffer between Parliament and the courts, to screen the men and to screw the last farthing out of these poor men and their wives and families, as the price of securing some position on the public works. The statement is made that these contributions were voluntary. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) dwelt on that with great unction. James Stanley, the manager of the conspiracy—because, if the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite is correct, it was a conspiracy on the part of these men to befool the representative of the constituency and to twist this money out of these unfortunate people—swears that these were voluntary gifts. So might the highwayman, when he stands in the shadow of the forest with his bludgeon or pistol pointed at your head, swear that when you hand him over your purse you made a voluntary contribution. It is a voluntary contribution in the same manner as is that which the shipmaster makes when he throws over valuable cargo to save life and property. These men, anxious to secure positions on a public work—two or three of them sailors and labouring men upon farms—we find giving for political purposes the huge sum, to them, ranging from $125 to $200. An effort has been made all through this evidence to show that they were in the habit of making contributions to assist the Liberal-Conservative party. But they were all humble, faithful followers of the party in power, and all the evidence reveals with regard to their former subscriptions is that one man gave $2, another $3, and another $5, previous to these large payments. And we are asked to believe that all of a sudden, voluntarily, without

any ulterior motive, but solely to assist the great Conservative party, these humble peasants contributed large sums of $125, $150 and $200 for positions as light-keepers or bridge-tenders in that county. Is it not an insult to our intelligence for hon. gentlemen gravely to argue that the evidence will bear out any such interpretation of facts? Let us see the position of the hon. member himself. He was under personal obligation to pay a certain portion of this money; he is besides under strong political obligations to his friends to get these notes paid up, and we find from the evidence of Webb, the evidence of the manager of a bank, the evidence of the solicitor of a bank, that the hon. member himself had been pressed to see that these amounts were paid. He was liable himself upon one note for $619, and liable morally to these people, and he had generally to see that these obligations were retired. He promised on two occasions that it would be attended to and would be paid soon, and it was paid soon, as soon as these bridges and lighthouses were supplied with attendants. Now, the whole case for the majority of the Committee seems to depend, in their opinion, very much upon breaking down the testimony of one Arundel Simpson. That ground has been thoroughly gone over by gentlemen who have preceded me, and it seems that this man, who, as he stated himself, is uneducated, stood the ordeal of the examination and cross-examination very well, and, although he was contradicted on one or two minor points, and may, as it is stated, have contradicted himself on some minor points, his evidence in the main is thoroughly in line with the points which are admitted in the case from beginning to end. But we will throw out his evidence altogether, and the case is still as strong if not one word of Arundel Simpson's testimony is taken into account. The first person whose evidence I shall refer to is William Bullock, a storekeeper- and I was sorry to hear the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Masson), and who laboured hard against wind and tide to make a case for his friend, who tried to find here a flaw and there a current to help him up the stream—I was sorry to find that he was under such a stress of weather that he had to charge the leading member of the committee in Brighton, one of the great friends of the hon. member for East Northumberland, with having been under the influence of liquor during his examination. It is the first time that I have heard this insinuation. I was present in the Committee, and, although that witness was suffering from a certain degree of nervousness, he gave his evidence with a degree of candour and honesty which did him credit. The only point they make is that Arundel Simpson, who is a Conservative and has been a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, is a perjurer, and that another leading Conservative in the riding is a drunkard, and that their testimony should be thrown out. I regret that they find it necessary to slander these honest men and try to destroy their character in this way. Take the evidence of Bullock, and see if it bears out the interpretation placed upon it by the hon. gentlemen. I will only read a few passages. The hon. gentlemen tell us that there is no connection between the hon. member for Northumberland, against whom these charges are made, and the committee either before or after they carried out these arrangements, and that it was done without his knowledge or connivance. Mr. Bullock is a leading merchant in the village, the committee meetings took place in his store, and he is the most influential member of the party there, next to James Stanley. Here is what he says as to the members of the committee. They consist of Stanley, Henry May, Adam, Lawson and Bullock. Mr. Bullock, one of the committee, was asked:

Q. What were the duties of that committee?—A. The duties of the committee were to see if we could not appoint somebody on the canal for the bridges there.

I may remark that the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) seemed pleased at the thought that this committee was not necessarily connected with the great Conservative party of the county. I would hope, for the sake of that influential party, that it could be shown that there was no connection between it and this committee, and I think no connection has been made out, although the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) stated that it was true that this committee was appointed by the Conservative party there for this purpose. That statement is contradicted by the leading lawyer in this matter, Mr. Payne, and is not admitted by the leader of the gang of conspirators, but it cannot be doubted that the convention as a whole were in accord with the committee. It seems to have been a committee self-constituted in the neighbourhood of the residence of the member-elect, and for this purpose alone, because there is no evidence to show that it acted in any other way. The contention on the other side is that the actions of the committee were honest and honourable, but the majority of the committee have expressed a mild disapprobation of that committee dabbling in appointments to public offices. If that association was honourable and honest, I would call your attention to the very peculiar association between the committee and the hon. gentleman who is charged in connection with this matter. We find that David Bullock says:

Q. The duties of the committee were to see if we could not appoint somebody on the canal for the bridges there.
Q. How much were each of them to give?—A. We exacted $150 from everyone of them. That is what we wanted.
Q. What were these people to get for the $150 they were to pay?—A. I cannot swear to that.
Q. What was the $150 to be given for?—A. It was to be given for our influence.
Q. Were you to put this $150 in your pocket?—A. No.
Q. Who was to give $150?—A. Everybody who got the appointment.
Q. And those who did not get the appointment were not to pay it?—A. Certainly not.
Q. Was any paid, do you know, by persons who did not get the appointment? Mr. Vanalstine paid some money, did he not?—A. He did not pay it to me.

There is evidence afterwards from Vanalstine and Wade that Vanalstine deposited money, and it was paid back to him when he did not get what he wanted. The hon. member who preceded me laid great stress upon the fact that there was no evidence that the member for East Northumberland took part in that committee. I am willing to admit that there is no evidence that he was a member of the committee. Now, the only occasion upon which there is evidence that he met the committee is mentioned by the gentleman in whose store the committee met; he details all the circumstances with great vividness, and to this I will call the attention of the House. The hon. member who preceded me undertook to ridicule the idea that so much should be made of the member being in the village late in the evening and meeting with

this committee. Let me point out the peculiar features of this case, upon the basis of a guilty knowledge, of a guilty arrangement. The hon. gentleman lives five miles from the village. It was after dark. The lights were lit; the store was closed for ordinary purposes; the committee was meeting in that store. The evidence is given on pages 88 and 89. The committee was meeting in this store, and the shop-keepersays that James Stanley, to the best of his recollection, was not there; consequently, when Stanley afterwards gives his testimony that he did not see Mr. Cochrane at the meeting of the committee, it is quite in line with the evidence given by Bullock, because Bullock swears that, so far as he can recollect, James Stanley was not in the store that evening. Four or five members of this committee were in the store, and the hon. gentleman for East Northumberland, who lives five miles distant, came into the store that evening. The evidence is very peculiar here. Can any hon. gentleman in this House imagine that he, as the representative for his riding, would drop into a store in the evening where four or five members of his advisory committee were present, while they were discussing an important matter to him and to his constituents, and that he would not utter a syllable? That not a word was said by Mr. Cochrane to those gentlemen that evening? Look at the extraordinary case. What would be the natural and honest thing to be done on an occasion of that kind? We know the greetings, and the pleasant words, and ordinary chit-chat that goes on between a representative and a meeting of his friends, or of any small or large body of electors. And yet the hon. member for East Northumberland dropped accidentally into the store—which certainly might have happened, but if it did happen, what more natural than that he would greet these gentlemen and talk with them upon this important subject? He dropped into the store accidentally, said not a word to anybody, and retired after a short time. I say the evidence upon that point is more conclusive, almost, than all the other evidence given in this book, to any impartial mind, that there was a guilty arrangement, and a guilty knowledge, and a silence more eloquent in meaning than large quantities of the evidence which has been placed upon this record. Let me quote from page 89:

Q. What were you doing that night?—A. Attending to my business.
Q. I mean the committee. What business did the committee do that night?—A. They talked over different questions about the bridges.
Q. How long did Mr. Cochrane remain?—A. As far as my knowledge goes, he did not remain very long.
Q. How long?—A. I cannot swear how long.
Q. Half an hour or more?—A. Well, I cannot say. I do not think he did.
Q. It was not more than half an hour?—A. Not so far as my knowledge goes, I do not think it was.
Q. Was it about half an hour?—A. I cannot say.
Q. I suppose the discussion was going on while he was there?—A. The discussion was going on. Yes.
Q. The talk about the bridges was going on while he was there?—A. Yes.
Q. You were talking about the men who would get the appointments and the amounts that they were to pay?—A. Certainly.
Q. What part did Mr. Cochrane take in the discussion?—A. No part whatever.
Q. He was a quiet listener?—A. I could not swear to that.
Q. He was listening, if he did not take part in the conversation?—A. I could not swear to that.

Let any person picture such a scene and imagine it consistent with ignorance of the situation and an absence of a guilty knowledge of what these men were talking about, and the purpose of their meeting. Run through the whole of this evidence from one end to the other, and remember the difficulties that the Committee had in ascertaining who communicated the decisions of the committee to the member for East Northumberland, and you have some idea of the position of the committee at the time. Let any impartial person run over this portion of the evidence, and he will see that the committee took the utmost pains to conceal the facts, and the names of those whom the sitting member should recommend to the Government for these petty offices. On the last page we find the list of appointees, an official list drawn from the records of the public department. We find the names of Wm. Brown, recommended by E. Cochrane, M.P.; R. May, the same; J. Clouston, ditto; W. Goodrich, ditto; J. Fitzgerald and W. Johnson, ditto. All of these, except Johnson, who left the country for good or other reasons, are proved to have paid this committee, or the chairman, or the leading members of this committee, a sum of money to be applied upon a debt for which the sitting member was either personally or morally responsible, because he was appealed to by persons holding these obligations to see that they were paid. Now, I will just call your attention to some evidence given by J. D. Clouston, a man past middle life, a man who stated that he had been a long and devoted supporter of the Conservative party. On page 67 he says:

Q. Do you occupy any official position on the Murray Canal?—A. I am a bridge-tender.
Q. When were you appointed?—A. I can scarcely tell you with regard to the appointment.
Q. You are under the superintendent?—A. I consider myself so, but I do not know.
Q. How much money did you pay when you got this appointment?—A. I think some $70 or $75; I would not be positive.
Q. To whom did you pay that money?—A. To Mr. W. W. Webb.
Q. Did you tell Mr. Webb that you were instructed to pay any money? Mr. Webb has been examined?—A. Instructed?

Mr. Webb, in his evidence, stated that when Clouston came to him to pay money, Clouston informed him that he was instructed to pay him this money:

Q. What did you tell Mr. Webb as to the balance?—A. I told him I would pay the balance as I went along.
Q. Who told you to pay it to W. W. Webb?—A. I don't know that anybody told me to pay it particularly to W. W. Webb.
Q. How did you come to go to W. W. Webb?—A. Well, I was aware that he had a note that had to be arranged and settled up.

It turns out afterwards that it was Stanley who told him to go to Webb, and many questions are put to elucidate that fact:

Q. Do you wish the Committee to understand that nobody sent you to Mr. Webb to pay this money?—A. Nobody in particular. I was under no compulsion in any shape.
Q. How did you know that you were to pay this money to Mr. Webb?—A. I knew because I was aware of the indebtedness, and that we were all to contribute in order to liquidate the indebtedness.
Q. If you were directed or informed, tell me who informed you or directed you?—A. I was informed by the general conversation that took place between one another. If I were to name the parties I would say that every bridge-tender had talked about the matter without exceptions.
Q. And you had only conversation with them?—A. With different ones. I might have had a conversation with Mr. Stanley.
Q. What did he tell you?—A. He told me that the others were doing this.

Q, Doing what ?– A. Paying towards the liquidation of these notes.
Q. After you were appointed or before ?—A. Oh, after I was promised that appointment.
Q. After you had received the promise, but before you were appointed or directed to take charge ?—A. Yes.
Q. From whom did you receive the promise ?—A. From Mr. Edward Cochrane.
Q. The promise of the position which you ultimately got ? —A. Yes
Q. But if you received the promise from Mr. Cochrane, it was Mr. Stanley who directed you to go to Mr. Webb? —A. I say it was by conversation.
Q. Yes, but you mentioned Mr. Stanley ?—A. Well, I had a conversation with Mr. Stanley at his place.
Q. Did you see Mr. Cochrane in regard to the appointment ?—A. I was talking with him.
Q. You say you had a conversation with him ?—A. Yes, sir..
Q. You had a conversation with Mr. Cochrane, the member for East Northumberland?—A. Yes: I say I had conversations with Mr. Cochrane.
Q. And what was said at that conversation or at any one of the conversations you had with Mr. Cochrane ?—A. I don't know.

Mr. Cochrane had apparently given some promise of this position long anterior to the subsequent negotiations for the securing of a bridge. Mr. Cochrane said on a later day: "There is a bridge for you on the Murray Canal."—

1955. That was years after the first conversation, you say?—Years after the first conversation.
1956. Can you locate the time?—I could not. I have been trying to think it over and I cannot.
1974. Was there any conversation about raising party funds at all ?—No, sir.
1975. Not at that time ?—Not a word.
1976. Had you any conversation with Mr. Cochrane since that time about raising party funds ?—I may have had.
1977. How were they to be raised according to your conversation ?—I thought I explained that.
1978. I say, according to your conversation with Mr. Cochrane, how were they to be arranged ?—I do not remember that we had any conversation particularly, but I say we may have. I do not recollect that we had any particularly.
1979. Did you have any conversation with Mr. Cochrane about raising party funds ?—We may have spoken of it. No doubt, we have.
1980. Now, you have no doubt you have had conversations with Mr. Cochrane about raising party funds ?—Altogether likely.
1981. If you had conversation in regard to it, how, according to the conversations, were the funds to be raised? —I think he may have said that others were talking it over in regard to this old indebtedness—that others were taking a part of it. He may have said that.
1982. What old indebtedness?—This old protest cost, run up there between Mr. James Ferris and William Wade.
1983. And what others?—Other bridge-tenders.
1984. Mr. Cochrane told you——
Mr. Osler objected.
1985. When he said to you that others were taking part in this old indebtedness, what others did he refer to ?—I said that Cochrane may have said that others were taking part, and I think I said the others were bridge-tenders.
1986. How much did he tell you the others were giving ?—He may have said that they were giving $150.
1987. Each ?—Yes.
1988. Then did he say anything to you about giving $150 —because the others were going to give it, you know ?—I do not recollect how that was.
1989. Just try and brush up your memory?—You see the way this whole thing came around, as I said before—I had been taking an interest in the movement of getting rid of this old indebtedness. I had even gone out in endeavours to collect.
1990. I know you were anxious. Did he say anything to you about paying the same sum as the other bridge-tenders were paying?—He may have.
1991. Don't you think that he did say so?—I do not know that I had better think much about it.

The whole line of this evidence goes to show that Clouston and Mr. Cochrane had talked about these matters, about the amounts being paid, and that the common rumours which most of these witnesses seem to have known were matters well understood and known by the sitting member.—

2010. Are you a member of this committee of the Conservative Association there?—Which committee do you refer to?
2011. This standing committee which they have for the purpose of making recommendations for political purposes generally: do you know anything about a political committee in that riding at all?—I believe there is a committee.
2012. Do you know it as a matter of fact?—I never dealt with them as a committee: I had no conversation with the committee.

Then, being pressed, and being anxious to satisfy the line of reasoning pursued by the sitting member and his friends, that these were voluntary contributions, he stated that he had contributed before. It was learned from him that this strong and devoted friend of the Conservative party had contributed two or three dollars during the past 7 years and that without any other improvement in his worldly condition beyond that of obtaining the position of a bridge-tender, he suddenly increased his subscription to $150. I need not read the evidence at length, because much of it has been read by the hon. gentleman who preceded me. But there are one or two portions so intimately connected with the payment that I would not do justice to the prosecution if I did not read them. We find the following evidence:—

2071. Did Mr. Cochrane tell you?—Perhaps he did. Very likely.
2072. You know whether he did or not?—We have all sorts of conversations on one thing or another. I don't know that we had on this particular affair.
2073. I want to know if Mr. Cochrane told you the amount of the balance due on the note?—He might have done so.
2074. That is not an answer. He might have gone to Jericho, but he didn't. What did he tell you?—Supposing I say I don't know.
2075. Well, do so?—Then, I don't know.
2076. I am sorry I suggested that to you. Will you swear that Mr. Cochrane did not tell you?—I won't swear that he did not, nor will I swear that he did.
2077. Will you tell me anybody who told you the amount due on the note?—I had conversations with others.
2078. I know you had conversations with others. Who were the others?—Stanley was one.
2079. Did James Stanley tell you before he went away?—I think, very likely, he did.
2080. I don't want you to think. I want you to be certain. Had you any conversation with Stanley about it at all?—I think I had.
2081. Will you swear you had?—I won't swear either way.
2082. Had you any conversation with Stanley about the amount due upon the note?—It is quite likely.
2088. You simply told Mr. Webb that you would pay the balance?—I told to Mr. Webb "I am going to pay it up as I can."
2089. Pay the $150?—Yes.
2090. I think you said that Mr. Cochrane told you that the other bridge-tenders were helping to pay the indebtedness?—Yes; I think he said so.
2091. Did he or did he not?—I think probably he did.

Hon. gentlemen must remember the position of this witness, a poor man, who, so far as I can judge, is an honest man, holding a position which is his all, and if he does not act, so far as his conscience will permit him, in favour of the men who placed him there, he need not expect to remain in office one hour; and we see how he was placed between his interests and his memory, and between what we can all read as the true facts of the case underlying this hesitating way in which he gave his testimony.—

2092. And at the conversation he told you that you were going to be appointed a bridge-tender?—Yes.

2093. That took place when he told you that there was a bridge for you?—No; I think it was probably afterwards.
2094. Was it in the fall when you were driving back to Colborne that he told you that there was a bridge. Was that the time he told you that he had a bridge?—What time?
2095. The time you were driving from Colborne?—Yes.
2096. Can you charge your memory to tell what took place on the subsequent conversation with you?—Oh, we talked about a good many things.
2097. You talked about bridges particularly?—No; not particularly at all.
2098. Did you not talk about bridges?—I think I got a statement with regard to further bridges.
2099. I think I understood you to say that Mr. Cochrane was the only man you had a conversation with until you went to pay the money?—Well, "until" I think I said that.
2100. This is what you told me, that Mr. Cochrane was the only man you had a conversation with about the bridge until you went to pay the money?—He was not there when I went.
2101. He was the only man you saw until you went?—Yes: that I can remember.
2102. You say that you were informed or directed to pay the money to Mr. Webb. Mr. Webb says that you were instructed. You say you were informed or directed to pay the money to Mr. Webb?—It was a voluntary affair.
2103. But you said you were informed or directed?—I suppose that is correct.
2104. You suppose that is correct?—Yes.
2105. Then Mr. Webb is inaccurate in saying that you were instructed?
Counsel objected.
2106. Then you were directed, or informed, to pay the money to Mr. Webb?—I could not exactly say I was told, because it was more of a voluntary movement of my own.
2107. How did you come to pay it unless somebody told you to do it?—I don't know that anybody told me to do it.
2108. How did you arrive at the identical sum the other bridge-tenders were paid?—I could not tell you. We had conversation one with another, between ourselves.
2109. You learned that was the tariff?—In a kind of a way.
2110. Who did you learn that from?—From a conversation between ourselves: I could not tell you any one in particular.
2111. Then you must have had conversations with other than Mr. Cochrane before you paid?—I dare say I did.

That evidence is conclusive as showing that Mr. Cochrane was perfectly familiar with the whole *modus operandi* from the beginning to the end of these extraordinary transactions.--

2148. Do you know a man named William Brown, who is a bridge-keeper?—Yes.
2149. You know him pretty well, don't you?—Yes.
2150. How long have you known him?—I have known him since the 10th of May last, when I first began work.
2151. You know how much he was paid?—I don't know anything about what any other person done, more than what I done myself.
2152. Did you ever hear that Brown was going to make a payment on a note for the party indebtedness?—I think probably I did.
2153. Did you hear what amount he was going to pay?—I do not know as to that.
2154. Do you know how much he did pay?—I do not know that he paid any.
2155. Did you ever hear that he agreed to pay $150?—I think some of my neighbours told me he was doing that, or had done it.

I quote this, not as evidence that Brown paid the amount, because we have other evidence in regard to Brown, but to show that it was a well-known thing in the community, and there are at least four places in the testimony where it is mentioned that this matter was talked about and well understood, and the majority report states that it was well known in the riding before the election, and referred to and discussed at the nomination and on the hustings. It was well known in the community and by all men who wanted the positions; by Brown who did not get a position, Vanalstine, who gave money and had it returned; they knew the tariff that was fixed and to whom to apply in order to get the position. There is the evidence of Wm. Brown, some portions of which I will read, to show not only that it was well known in the community what the functions of the committee were but that the relation of the sitting member to these payments was also well known. With the exception of the fact that the hon. gentleman was relieved of the pressure of outside influences to get rid of the debt, I admit there is no evidence that any of the money went for his personal use. Although that may to a small degree screen him from the contempt and indignation which must be felt if such proof were forthcoming, which I cheerfully admit is not forthcoming, it does not condone the immorality and contemptible character of the transaction as connected with these poor men and the political committee which undertook to squeeze from them large subscriptions towards relieving the whole party of that section from a troublesome debt. William Brown is the bridge-keeper, and he got his position from the committee. He deposes:

2563. How did you come to get that position?—Through the committee.
2564. What committee?—The committee which was appointed to recommend somebody for the position.
2565. You knew a committee had been appointed for that purpose?—I was told by several of the committee they had been appointed, and I was told by Mr. Cochrane also that a committee had been appointed.

I think it need not be enlarged upon at all as to the knowledge that Mr. Cochrane had of this committee and of its function. The only debateable point is as to whether the committee had authority from him, or that he had knowledge that they were exacting these sums of money from these applicants for office. There are at least two cases throughout the evidence in which he sent applicants directly to the committee. The evidence is clear, unequivocal and repeated on that point, and consequently the only point at all in issue between the majority and the minority of the Committee is as to his knowledge of these exactions, or as to the share that he had in exacting them. The witness goes on to state:

2566. You were told by Mr. Cochrane there had been a committee appointed for the purpose of recommending parties for the position of bridge-keeper?—Yes.
2567. Mr. Cochrane told you that?—He did.
2568. Who is Mr. Cochrane?—He is member for East Northumberland.
2569. And it was Mr. Cochrane, member for East Northumberland, who told you that a committee had been appointed for the purpose of recommending different people?—He was the only one that told me I would have to go to the committee.
2570. Then you went to Mr. Cochrane first of all?—First of all.
2571. What did you go to him for?—For a position on the canal.
2572. What did you say to him?—I asked him what my chances were for such a position. He told me he had left the matter in the hands of the committee and that I would have to apply to the committee.

There is scarcely any tangible evidence as to the communication between the committee and the sitting member, so timid were the members of the committee in giving evidence. We find from the evidence that the committee among themselves had agreed upon a certain amount, and then there is a gap in the evidence. We find afterwards, however, that the sitting member had recommended these workmen to the Government, but so frightened were those men to give evidence that a wild horse could scarcely drag from them the slightest information as to how the sitting member received these communications which he placed before the Govern-

ment. Had this been an honest and straightforward transaction such as ought to exist, and I hope does exist, between the members of this House and their leading supporters, do you not suppose they would be anxious to give the whole tenor of the communications between themselves and the member in regard to making these applications for office? Here there has been a gap that we have been unable to a very great extent to fill by straightforward evidence, but the very fact that the Special Committee have not been able to extract this evidence is almost conclusive proof that there was that guilty arrangement between the parties which lead them to conceal or evade giving the particulars of it. The witness continues:

2590. Had you seen any of the committee before you went to Mr. Cochrane?—No, sir.
2591. You went to see Mr. Cochrane first?—Yes.
2592. Had you heard anything about money being required for these bridge-keepers before you went to Mr. Cochrane?—No, sir.
2593. You are quite sure of that?—Yes.
2594. And when was it you first heard of money being paid in connection with these offices or situations?—The first I heard of it was from Mr. James Stanley.

Mr. James Stanley was the bosom friend, the *fidus Achates*, of the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane); the chairman and manager of the committee, a prominent member of the convention and holding intimate relations to the parties who held these obligations, a petitioner against members of the Liberal party who had been attacked in their seats, and in fact a clever leading man in connection with the political affairs of the neighbourhood. The witness goes on to say:

2600. You say that Mr. Cochrane told you you would have to apply to the committee?—Yes.
2601. And in pursuance of that instruction from Mr. Cochrane, did you apply to the committee?—I did.
2602. To whom did you apply?—To Mr. Stanley.
2603. How did you know that he was one of the committee?—I enquired around and I found out who the committee men were.
2618. Had you any conversation with Mr. Cochrane except at that one time when you asked him for the position?—In regard to the position?
2619. Yes?—No: I have not seen him since about it.
2620. Then you paid how much to Mr. Webb?—$150.
2621. In cash?—In cash.
2622. That is Mr. W. W. Webb?—Yes.
2623. You got the money from W. H. Powers?—No, sir.
2624. Did you pay this money before you got the appointment?—Let me think. I cannot say whether I paid it before or after.
2625. But it was arranged before you got the appointment that you were to pay the money?—Yes.
2626. With whom was that arrangement made?—Mr. Stanley.
2627. Do you know that Mr. Stanley was one of this committee?—I do.
2628. The committee to which Mr. Cochrane sent you?—Yes.
2629. Was it Mr. Stanley who told you to pay the money to Mr. Webb?—It was.

And so it goes on through this whole wretched story which it is positively sickening to read and to load upon the record of *Hansard;* this paltry haggling between the committee and the poor labouring men. So it goes on, page after page of this testimony and I will now lay it down and read it no further. I will call the attention of the House to the salient features of the case as it has been proved on the records before this Committee. The hon. member who preceded me undertook the very labourious task of showing that this was a criminal charge, and that every item and detail of it must be made on positive testimony. Upon this point I take distinct issue with the hon. gentleman. In the first place, this is not a criminal court and we are not trying a criminal charge, although there may be features in it of a quasi-criminal character. We are trying a charge of breach of parliamentary privilege, of a breach of the position of the gentleman from East Northumberland as a member of Parliament and his position as a powerful and influential supporter of the Government in regard to these appointments to office. I need not enlarge upon the iniquitous character of the charge itself. No matter who benefited by the exactions from these poor men, once it is admitted that such things can be done with impunity in this country, then we have reached a pass at which honest men must blush and at which patriotic men must tremble for the future of this country. It is bad enough for men in high places to make use of their position to extract here and there percentages from large transactions, but when curruption reaches down into the home of the poor man, upon whom the whole structure of our national and political existence is based, then, indeed, is the country in a dangerous position. This canker will eat into the body politic and will ruin it more surely and more certainly than even the corruption which may be proved, or suspected to exist in much higher places. I trust for the honour of Parliament and for the honour of the people of this country, that although we have lifted but a corner of the veil, that it is not an indication or a sample of what is going on in many other portions of the Dominion of Canada. We have proved conclusively that there can be no doubt as to the payment of money; that the member had a knowledge of the payment of this money can scarcely be doubted by any impartial student of the record before us; that the understanding between the committee and the applicants for these positions was that if they failed in securing the position the money was to be returned as proved in the case of Mason and Vanalstine. All the features of the case convince me that a grave mistake has been made by the majority of this Committee in not pronouncing more strongly than they have done in regard to the salient features of the case as proved before them. They state:

"Your Committee report that the practice which seems to have been resorted to by the political organization referred to, in order to raise a fund for political purposes, though not connected with Dominion politics, was improper and reprehensible."

Which seems to have been resorted to. With this evidence before them, having heard these witnesses one after another repeat this sickening story with all its variations of absurdity and weakness, and even of crime, the Committee are contented with calling it a practice that seems to have been resorted to. I agree with the hon. gentleman who preceded me, who defended as well as he could his colleague and friend, that the Committee did not use sufficiently strong language in characterizing these transactions, but tried to ignore or minimize them, trying in the language of the press, to whitewash the hon. member and his partisans in East Northumberland. I cannot but feel that they are doing a grave wrong to the credit and reputation of this Parliament, and to the people of this country who are looking eagerly for the verdict of the House of Commons upon these transactions. Although there have been great difficulties in the way of dragging to the light all their foul details, yet I trust that, in view of the interest which has been excited

throughout the country, and the high moral feelings which must be appealed to when people contemplate the possibilities of the vast majority of the offices throughout this country being made the subjects of barter and sale by politicians for the sake of holding themselves in power or securing political influence, the terrors which this investigation must have evoked will suffice to prevent such bargaining and selling in future, and that the fair fame of this country will not again be smirched by an intimation that such things are possible throughout the Dominion of Canada. The sordid character of this system appeals rather to our feelings of disgust and contempt than to any stronger feelings. Imagine the poor unfortunate men, who are not the guilty ones, but only the victims of the system, which I hope had only begun in the constituency of East Northumberland; and I trust that the honest, noble-hearted Conservatives, of whom there must be many in that section of the country, will before twelve months have rolled around repay those poor men every dollar of the money which has been exacted from them by those political harpies in order to bolster up their influence and sustain themselves in power. I have not had it in my heart to use any harsh language towards the hon. member for East Northumberland, for whom I may say I have had no reason, as far as my personal acquaintance goes, to regard otherwise than with respect; but I cannot rid myself of the conclusion, honestly formed, that he had connection with and intimate knowledge of these transactions which constitute a breach of his high and responsible position as a member of the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. SKINNER. I very much regret to have to rise to address the House on this question at so early an hour. I am not to blame for that, as the debate I take it will have to be finished by common consent to-night, and that must be my apology for speaking on the question at all. I would not address the House did I not consider it my duty, owing to my connection with the Committee, to explain in a few words the view of the Committee on the whole question. It must be borne in mind that the charge against the hon. member for East Northumberland was divided into a series of charges that may be grouped together for the purposes of description in this way. He is charged with having sold offices for his own pecuniary benefit, that is to say, with having received money for those offices, either for his own personal use or for his political use. He is charged with having done this himself; that should be borne in mind by any person who wants to come to a fair and impartial conclusion. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken upon this question to-day, really argue that the charge which has been proved against the hon. member is that he had a knowledge that this was done, and that having that knowledge, he was connected with it. They do not pretend, so far as I understand their argument, that it has been proved that he did it himself, but they say that he had a knowledge of what was going on. In reply, I say, suppose he had this knowledge; that should not lead to his conviction under the charges which have been made. It may very well have been that he did know what others were doing; but who will say that he ought to be found guilty on that account, simply because he was the member for the county and took the recommendation of those persons who made it to him. That was not the charge made against him or sought to be proved against him; but there is an endeavour to convict him of a charge that was never made against him. Now, what is the evidence which hon. gentlemen opposite have against the hon. member for East Northumberland? As they set out the evidence, it comes from the mouths of three witnesses—Arundel Simpson, Goodrich and Bullock. Just briefly pass under your minds the evidence of these three witnesses, and see how it stands? The evidence of Bullock is this: He was present at a meeting in a store at Brighton, and he says that Mr. Cochrane came into the store while they were there. He does not go substantially beyond that. In reference to Bullock being under the influence of liquor, it was not Mr. Osler who first drew the attention of the Committee to that; it was the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron), who appeared as counsel for the prosecution; and I may say here, parenthetically, that I suppose that hon. gentleman will not now think of voting on this question on that account. When he came to discuss Bullock's testimony, he used the phrase: *in vino veritas*, signifying, as we know, that the witness being more or less under the influence of liquor, he got the truth out of him. He introduced the matter, and when Mr. Osler, for the defence, came to address the Committee in regard to the amount of credence to be placed on the evidence of Bullock, he referred to that fact, as, of course, it was his duty to do, as lessening the value of Bullock's testimony. You see how slim, even according to hon. gentlemen opposite, is the evidence of this man Bullock. All he says is that the hon. member for Northumberland was there. Stress is laid on the fact that the member for Northumberland lived five miles away from that place, But what has that to do with it? And significance is sought to be attached to the closing of the store. But whether he came in before the shutters were up or not what difference does that make? All that is mere by-play, mere reaching out and endeavouring to get a man convicted whether he ought to be or not. All that is but a lawyer's arguing, endeavouring to have a man found guilty whether the proof is sufficient or not. Let us turn to the evidence of Goodrich and Simpson. All that Goodrich says with reference to the hon. member for Northumberland is that he took the money which he was going to send to Colborne, that he called in at Mr. Cochrane's place of business and asked him to count the money, and Mr. Cochrane counted it; that after Mr. Cochrane counted it, Goodrich then handed it to his son to take on to Colborne. Would that constitute a payment to the hon. member for Northumberland? Will any one say that he should be considered as having received the money? He was asked to count it and that was all that he did. Turning from Goodrich's testimony to the son's, let us see what the son says. He said that when he came into Mr. Cochrane's place of business he was on his way to Colborne and had his rig prepared to go. Goodrich asked him, when he went in, to take that money up to Colborne for him. What does this young man's testimony prove? It proves that the hon. member for Northumberland simply counted the money and handed it back to

Goodrich, and Goodrich gave it to the young man to take up to Colborne, and that is the whole story. I ask disinterested gentlemen if on these two testimonies there is anything to convict the hon. member for Northumberland. The hon. gentleman, who has just sat down and who seemed to make up in malignity what he lacked in argument, said there was enough in these two testimonies to convict. I do not think any disinterested person will come to that conclusion. What is the other evidence relied on to connect the hon. member for Northumberland with the case? It is the evidence of Arundel Simpson; and I admit that his testimony was the great field of conflict between the parties. If it is to be believed, of course there is a great deal of it to connect the hon. member for Northumberland, not only with the knowledge of but actual participation in the whole matter. The majority of the Committee report that they do not believe Arundel Simpson. That was within their right, supposing they looked upon the matter honestly. It does not at all arise that they are wrong because the other gentlemen on the Committee did believe him. There must be certain points in his testimony, at all events, that they do not believe. An hon. gentleman on the other side took the ground that although Arundel Simpson may have stated what was false in some particulars, we ought to sift his testimony and find out what is true, as if we ought to go into a pool of falsehoods to fish for the truth. How could we tell what was true or what was not? We knew that the hon. member for Northumberland was accused of crime, or, as an hon. gentleman opposite said, of quasi crime. He was entitled at all events to the benefit of the doubt; and no one could convict him on the testimony of a man who admittedly was telling lies. I propose to draw your attention to a piece of testimony that leads us to believe this man was not telling the truth:

Q. You didn't see him?—A. No: I do not think I did.
Q. You did not canvass him or talk with him over Hedley's appointment?—A. No.
Q. It would not be correct to say that you did—if anybody came up and said so, that would not be correct? A. No; I think not.
Q. You would contradict him?—A. Well, I don't recollect now.
Q. If I had a witness that would go into the box, and swear that you canvassed Mr. Cochrane for Hedley's appointment three or four times, you would contradict him?—A. I would.

Remember he there swears that if a person swore to a thing he afterwards himself swore to, he would contradict that very person, or, in other words, contradict himself. Referring to the petition he says:

Q. This was your signature? You have already said it was?—A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember signing a document like this in Mr. Gordon's office? (Document fyled as Exhibit No. 4)?—A. Yes.
Q. Now, this is what you stated—every word in this declaration is given over your signature?—A. Yes.
Q. Did Mr. Gordon read over every word to you when you signed it?—A. Yes.
Q. The fourth paragraph says: "I assisted the said Hedley H. Simpson in his efforts to secure the said appointment and had several interviews with Edward Cochrane, then and now member of the House of Commons of Canada for the electoral district of the East Riding of the County of Northumberland, and a supporter of the Government in connection with such appointment." Now, is that statement which is contained in the fourth paragraph true?—A. I did not say that to Mr. Gordon. I do not think that is what I signed.
Q. Is it true?—A. I did not say that to Mr. Gordon.
Q. That is your signature?—A. Yes, that is my signature.
Q. Well, is what you have stated there true?—A. I don't understand. I had several interviews with Mr. Cochrane. I don't recollect this.
Q. Is it true?—A. Part of it.
Q. You say: "I assisted the said Hedley H. Simpson in his efforts to secure the said appointment, and had several interviews with Edward Cochrane." Is that true?—A. I did say so.

There you see on a vital point of the case, he actually swears one thing in his affidavit on which hon. gentlemen opposite base their case one way and in the court, before the Committee, swears exactly the opposite. There is plenty more similar testimony from the cross-examination, but I only give that as a specimen of how you may judge and look upon his evidence. We must, therefore, conclude that the Committee were justified in not believing him and had every reason in coming to the conclusion they did. Then, that being the case, what do we find? We have good reason for setting the evidence of Arundel Simpson aside. We come to the evidence of Bullock and Goodrich, and their evidence is so slight that no one would have any chance to find against the hon. member on that. The Committee could not do anything but what they did, and everyone will know that he is not straining anything when he sustains the report of this Committee, and the country, when they understand it, will justify the Committee and the House in reference to this matter. The hon. gentleman who spoke, being a member of the Committee himself, intimated that we were too partial, and that we did not come to the consideration of the question with a fair mind, and he claimed that those who were acting with him were acting judicially and impartially. But where did he get in a few moments? Acting as a judge, he stretched his hands to some of his friends and got hold of a newspaper, and asked if we would dare to give a verdict contrary to what the newspapers said. Imagine a judge who, after the lawyers had spoken and the evidence had been taken, looked at a newspaper, and told the jury they should be governed by what it said. Hon. gentlemen think they are impartial, but they may be running in most partial ways. I think the Committee were entirely correct in coming to the conclusion they did, and in not believing the testimony of Arundel Simpson. There are a few things which have been said by the hon. gentleman that I will refer to before I close. Some attempt has been made to throw ridicule as to these subscriptions being voluntary. I do not pretend that they were voluntary in the ordinary sense, but I say that that portion of the report was based strictly upon the testimony. It must be remembered that the witnesses who were brought there were brought by the gentlemen who were conducting the prosecution, and one after the other said they gave their subscriptions voluntarily, in this sense, that they were about to get the appointments and were asked if they would assist in paying off this debt, and they made their subscriptions voluntarily. I admit that I do not think they would have given the money unless they were going to get the positions, but what they said was, while they thought they were going to get the positions, they did this willingly and as a meritorious act. Hon. gentlemen laugh at it, but these men thought they

were doing a meritorious act. I do not say they were doing a meritorious act, neither did the Committee say so, but these witnesses said they thought they were doing a meritorious act. The hon. gentleman who just sat down drew a picture of want and desolation on the part of these men who got those offices. They did not say so themselves. They did not give any intimation that they were hardly used. They did not seem to have any regret about this matter. They did not make any complaint. The only man who made any complaint was the informer, and that was for some reason which we may never have explained. These men never wanted the sympathy which the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) seems to throw over them as a mantle. More than that, these men evidenced that this was a common affair up there. It was not done with any secrecy. The member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) was charged with doing this corruptly, and unless he did it corruptly there is no offence made out. One of the hon. gentlemen opposite asked if we wanted him to prove the corruption. No; the act itself will prove the corruption. Just as you charge malice in law, if you prove sufficient facts the law will infer the malice, and so in this case you will infer the corruption. But you have to take the environment into account, and, when this was publicly done and no secrecy was observed, what do you find? You find that these people did not think they were doing wrong as the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) says, and as it might appear to a great and generous intellect like his, coming from the sounding sea, with the sound of the billows in his ears, and being anxious to condemn this poor inland town. They may not have reached the great moral altitude which he has reached, and, if the hon. gentleman was not thirsty for the ruin of the hon. member for East Northumberland, he would not have soared as high as he has to-night. He has not brought home to the member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) the charge of doing this corruptly. As to this word "voluntary," I think it took from it almost entirely the idea of corruption. The House should look at it from this standpoint. When the charges were made, no doubt the hon. gentlemen thought the hon. member for East Northumberland had put money into his own pocket. He did nothing of the kind. He was looking after nothing for himself, he made nothing for himself, he in no way used his position except in regard to that matter of the note, and so searching were hon. gentlemen in their enquiries that, if there was a single point on the horizon which they could see they would have used it to injure the hon. gentleman. It turned out accidentally that the son of the member for East Northumberland had driven away a cow, and I think a pig, from one of the farms, and they immediately threw out the insinuation that this cow and pig had been given to the member for Northumberland in some corrupt way. But when evidence was brought before the Committee it was shown simply that his son had purchased these animals, had given his promissory note for them, and had paid more than half the note, and the transaction was as honest as any transaction could be. That incident shows the overweening desire on the part of the hon. gentleman conducting the prosecution to fish out, anywhere and everywhere, anything that would injure the hon. gentleman that he was prosecuting. Therefore it shows clearly to the Committee that the prosecution was not animated by those noble motives that animate a true Crown prosecutor who is carrying on the Queen's business and the Queen's court. Now, as to the member for Northumberland not going upon the stand. An hon. gentleman opposite who spoke earlier in the evening alleged that the reason why he did not go upon the stand was that he did not want to offend persons in his constituency that he might swear against. I have nothing to do with that one way or the other, but I can suggest a very good reason why, under the circumstances, a man like him would not want to go on the stand. Supposing he had gone there and had sworn against these parties, what would the hon. gentleman conducting the prosecution have said? He would have turned around and have charged him with perjury therefore, in all probability the man would have come down with his character blackened by charges of that kind, in addition to what was said against him in the Committee. Surely he was at bay before his enemies. I will say to the gentlemen on the other side that whilst I think they were fair and reasonable, and conducted the case very properly from their standpoint, yet from the record what do we find? That, after the prosecuting counsel had got all the evidence that he could, they looked everywhere, they ransacked the mind of every witness, they looked into every intellectual crevice they could find, in the hope of discovering some testimony against the member for East Northumberland, and they did all they could to bring out evidence and pile it up against him in order to get this conviction. What did it bring about? The member for Northumberland stood, probably, at the very crisis of his life. A charge was made against him that he never had any idea would be made: he was in face of his enemies, verily, and they were seeking for his destruction with all the power and energy they could command. Will any gentleman on the Committee sitting opposite, will the gentleman who conducted the prosecution, also sitting opposite, say that they were not ardent in their search for testimony in order to convict him? There was, also, the prosecutor from Yarmouth, the gentleman who prides himself in living remotely from the place where this matter arises, and, therefore, being disinterested. He has endeavoured to draw a picture of himself before this House to-night. He says that because he was 800 miles away from the scene, therefore he is disinterested, impartial, fair, honest, and all that sort of thing. If he had stopped there, one might say that that was an argument, but as he developed his remarks and drew his conclusions, he disclosed that his heart towards this man was as full of wickedness, so to speak, as the hearts of any of the prosecutors could possibly be. And that gentleman was on that Committee, sitting by the window, drinking in every bit of evidence that came out, and seemingly wanting to have this case prosecuted with the utmost energy that could be brought to bear, he being a lawyer, and knowing where any weak spot in the case would be, and where he could give the most and the best information that would be required. Then, in addition to that, the hon. member for Northumberland finding himself so prosecuted—what would he say? I presume he would say this: These charges are made against me. My enemies are seeking for my destruction. Let them prove their case, I will stand here and let my case go to my peers; let them judge

of it upon the evidence that may be brought out, from the witnesses that may be produced. That is one reason why I brought up these facts just now as to how this prosecution was conducted. They had no feeling of sensitiveness towards Mr. Cochrane. The hon. member for Yarmouth, if he could have got another nail to put into that man's political coffin, would have sprung forward with his hammer and nailed it there with a rapidity that would have been remarkable. They were not animated by any feeling of respect for the man. They were doing all they could to destroy him, they were getting evidence wherever they could get it. Why did they not call him themselves? It was within their power to do it. They had gone into his county and taken out his friends and acquaintances and brought them into court. Why did they not call him also, if they were going to make any remarks about it? They had as much power to call him as to call anyone else. I do not think myself that the presence of Mr. Cochrane upon the stand would have made any difference at all in this case, judging from the evidence that has been brought before the Committee. Now, a good deal of stress has been laid upon Mr. Bullock's testimony in reference to the member for Northumberland attending the Committee. Now, the member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) when he was examining James Stanley, put this question (1028) and got this answer:

Q. You say that Mr. Cochrane was not a member of the committee?—A. No, he was never present.

Well, it may be said that there is some other evidence the other way. I want to remark that this was evidence introduced by the prosecution, and we are called upon to give our decision upon all the testimony; and if the prosecution in one portion of the case proves that the man was never present, by a reputable witness, as no doubt this man was, then I say it is evidence for us to show that he was never present and never had anything to do with the committee. But you take that in connection with the charge that the prosecuting counsel made against Mr. Bullock, *in vino veritas*, and the evidence of this man will stand upon that point, and I would say it proves conclusively that Mr. Cochrane never had any connection with the committee. Now, if he never had any connection with the committee the case is narrowed down, as I said before, to the evidence of Goodrich, and that is so weak as really not to be worthy of attention. Then, when the testimony of Arundel Simpson fails, the case becomes clear, and the member for Northumberland passes out of the ordeal without any reproach, or at all events, without any such reproach as would call upon this House to put the hon. member in a position to be expelled from Parliament. Surely we have a right to look at these things from the standpoint of reason, even from the standpoint of justice and sympathy. That is one of the appeals that may rightly be made in all cases. Supposing that an offence had been committed by the hon. member for Northumberland, and that, in view of the whole circumstances, such a calamity should occur as that he should be liable to be expelled from Parliament; would it not be within our province to take that view? Here we administer law upon right principles, as right-thinking men. Here we have a right to listen to justice, and to allow the element of sympathy, to a certain extent, to enter into our deliberations. Therefore if Parliament concludes that even if an offence had been committed, if there was no corruption intended, and if the penalties would be too severe, if we were to accept the document which we are now asked to adopt as the judgment of this House, we would be perfectly right in taking a merciful view of the case, if it was right to invoke mercy under these circumstances. The paper that hon. gentlemen opposite ask to be substituted instead of the report of the majority goes like a stream of fire over the hon. member at every point. Every turn of the testimony is twisted into severity, every point is taken against him; every conclusion is forced to its ultimate end, and, so to speak, the evidence is strained until the whole line breaks into tatters in order to sustain the various conclusions at which hon. gentlemen opposite had arrived. That is not right and is not merciful, even if the crime were worse and if the proof were stronger; but in a case like this, standing as the member for East Northumberland does, this matter having been discussed among his constituents at the election, it having been a matter of public notoriety—taking the whole case together the hon. member for East Northumberland comes out of it with clean skirts, and if not entirely clean, they are as clean as is necessary for his protection in this House when justice is tempered with mercy.

Mr. MULOCK. Oh.

Mr. SKINNER. Hon. gentlemen opposite may have their laugh if they will. I should like that their laugh should go out and sound through the country as it is heard here. I would not say it was like the laugh of something looking for its prey, but if that laugh could be phonographed and sent over the country, it would tell much more loudly than any evidence that could be given.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner), by way of an appeal to the merciful feelings of this House, says that if the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) has not come out of this enquiry quite clean, still he has come out of it with skirts quite clean enough for this House. It is not whether the hon. member has come out of it with skirts clean enough for this House, the question is whether he has come out of the enquiry according to the proper views that ought to be entertained in respect to the duties of members of Parliament. What are the rights, privileges and obligations of members of a deliberative assembly such as this? The hon. gentleman has given a blow to the present Parliament by his closing observation, because in it he hinted that, even if the hon. member for East Northumberland had been proved guilty of some offence, still, having regard to this particular Parliament, this House must not regard it as an offence. The hon. gentleman in making that remark has, unintentionally I am sure, lowered the dignity of this particular Parliament, and the sooner we endeavour to get back to a healthy view of our obligations the better it will be both for this and future Parliaments. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) seems to have entirely misapprehended the nature of the charges, and in saying this I, perhaps, might be allowed to offer an excuse for the finding of the Committee. The Committee's report is, no doubt, as the hon. member for St. John seems to imply, open to very serious criticism,

and if I should offer an apology for it, it would be this: That one could hardly expect it to quite meet the requirements of the case, inasmuch as it was prepared before the evidence was closed, and before one word of argument had been addressed to the Committee——

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). It is not true.

Mr. MULOCK—and before the Committee had conferred. Did an hon. gentleman say it was not so? I would remind him that on Thursday morning, the last day evidence was received, we began our evidence at 10 o'clock in the morning. We continued, with a short interruption for lunch, until well on in the afternoon, and when the evidence was closed the argument followed immediately. When the argument of counsel was closed, the chairman produced from his pocket the draft report, and said it was a report which he had prepared; but we determined not to dispose of it at that moment, for it was nearly six o'clock. At half past eight we met, and he read it to us; and that was the report signed and presented to this House. I say that the report presented to this House was a report prepared when there were quite a number of witnesses to be examined, who were examined, and before one word of argument on the merits of the case had been adduced by counsel, and before the Committee had conferred. Therefore, if there is any defect, I offer this as a slight justification—

Mr. SKINNER. I would say that the hon. gentleman's remarks are not entirely true.

Mr. MULOCK. Correct me where you believe I am wrong?

Mr. SKINNER. The chairman of the Committee, who was under great stress of appointments to leave Ottawa as soon as he could, sat down and prepared his views on some of the questions, but the report was not finished, and on quite a number of questions the findings were left open. That far the chairman went, but no further. When the hon. gentleman says that the report as signed is the report he prepared, he is in error to that extent.

Mr. MULOCK. I should be glad to be corrected, but I am sure if I appealed to the chairman, and if he were present he would corroborate all I have said. The chairman told us, at half past 8 o'clock, that that was the report he presented between 5 and 6 o'clock, and the report he presented at that time he told us was one he had prepared some days before, for there had been no meeting of the Committee for some days: that was the only meeting that week, and he took advantage of the interval to prepare that report. Not one word was added to that report, according to my belief. The report now before the House is the report prepared before Thursday, on which day we examined about half a dozen witnesses, and heard arguments, and had our conference. I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me. However that may be, I would just say that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) has, in my judgment, first, entirely misapprehended the charges, and, in the second place, the proper view to take of such charges. He says the charge is that the hon. member for East Northumberland, for his own pecuniary or political gain, took the action complained of. It is not necessary in order to have corruption under such circumstances that the sitting member should be a gaining party. The first question is the public service, and the theory in reference to appointments is that men are recommended to public offices by reason of their fitness for office, and that no other consideration should be allowed to enter the minds of those who have the patronage. If any bargaining or selling takes place, even if the patron, he with whom the appointment rests, does not profit, if he allows others to profit, if he allows his appointment to be influenced by considerations of gain, that is equally an offence in law as if the sitting member himself was an agreeing party. A man seeking office offers a consideration to some parties of influence, and that influence so purchased procures that appointment to office. If the person who has the power of appointment is aware that he who asks him for the office, the middleman, has purchased it for a reward, there is a corrupt bargain. If you take any other view of it, where do you land? The public service is entitled to an honest recommendation on the merits. If instead of that a member of Parliament can say: I appoint an irresponsible committee, or I am willing to be governed by the recommendation of an irresponsible committee, abdicating my functions, and my responsibilities, where does the safeguard of the public come in? The committee is not responsible; the committee's influence is to be bought, and in this case Mr. Cochrane says all through that he has nothing to do with the appointments, as they rest with the committee. The committee can be purchased; it has the appointment *de facto*; the member is denuding himself of his real obligation to select the best men for the service regardless of other considerations, and he chooses to accept the recommendation of a purchased committee. When he does a thing like that he has got to take the recommendations of that committee with all the responsibilities that attach. He has, as it were, given a blank power of attorney to that committee; he has assigned the power of appointment to that committee, and having so assigned it he is responsible for that abuse of the power of appointment. That is what occurred here, and I again tell the member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) that he is entirely in error in his view of the law. If the man buys that office, whether the purchase money goes into the pocket of the member who recommends him or to some middleman, if the member who directly appoints the man enables that fraud to be committed upon the public service by his culpable negligence in lending himself to this scheme, then he assumes all the responsibility that attaches to it. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) says that the whole thing rests upon the evidence of two or three witnesses, but he abhors details. I do not wonder at his avoiding details in this case. He skims gently over the evidence of three witnesses, and he says that the evidence of the other twenty-seven witnesses that were examined before the Committee has no bearing on the case. The hon. gentleman says the delivery of the money to Cochrane by Goodrich was not sufficient, and that Cochrane was simply an accountant to check off the money. He forgets that Mr. Cochrane on that occasion did something very much more important than counting the money. When Mr. Goodrich took the money to Mr. Cochrane to count, Mr. Cochrane counted it, and what did he do with it? According to the uncontradicted testimony of Mr.

Goodrich, Mr. Cochrane took the money, and he told his son to take it to Mr. Payne, at Colborne.

Mr. SKINNER. You should not say uncontradicted, because it was contradicted.

Mr. MULOCK. You will remember that the Committee reported before young Cochrane gave his evidence. The Committee have reported against young Cochrane. They have accepted practically the statement of Mr. Goodrich.

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, no.

Mr. MULOCK. Who said "no?"

Mr. WALLACE. I did.

Mr. MULOCK. You do not know.

Mr. WALLACE. I heard the evidence.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, we will see what the report is. According to young Mr. Cochrane the money was never paid to the old man, but to the young man direct by Mr. Goodrich. Young Mr. Cochrane says that Mr. Goodrich took the money to him and handed it to him and asked him to take it to Colborne. Goodrich says he went into the yard, handed the money to Edward Cochrane, the member, who counted it, and without any further reply passed it on to his son and told him to take it to Mr. Payne in Colborne. That is what the evidence is, and what does the Committee find:

"When the said Goodrich was about taking the $200 which he said he was willing to contribute towards the payment of said indebtedness, to W. L. Payne, he asked the said Edward Cochrane to count the money for him, and he, the said Goodrich, to save time and trouble in travelling, sent the money to W. L. Payne by Wallace Cochrane, a son of the said Edward Cochrane, who was going on other business to Colborne, the place where said Payne lived."

Here your report has found that Goodrich handed the money to be counted to Edward Cochrane, the member.

Mr. SKINNER. That is right.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, that report is against the evidence of young Cochrane. Goodrich's evidence is, therefore, not contradicted, when he says that Cochrane, the member, told his son to take it to Payne. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) says that the bridge-keepers have not complained, and therefore he wonders who should complain. He says they have not found out that they were injured or that they have done anything wrong. Are we here to be governed by their standard of morality? We are not trying the bridge-keepers; we are ascertaining whether a member of this House did anything wrong or not. I agree with the hon. gentleman when he says there was no secrecy. It was impossible that these various schemes should have been conducted secretly, and because they were not conducted secretly they must all have been known to the sitting member, and being known to the sitting member there is the explanation of his not taking the witness stand. What had he to fear from perjury if he told the truth? A truthful man has nothing to fear from telling the truth in the witness box. He says he was afraid of being accused of perjury. Did he propose to go into the witness box and perjure himself when he was confronted by a dozen witnesses, a great many of whom he would have to contradict? He was on the horns of a dilemma, and the hon. gentleman has told us what the dilemma was. He either had to admit the truth or take the consequences, or adopt the alternative and be liable to a charge for perjury, and so he took the middle course, of keeping out of the witness box. There can be no possible excuse offered for his not having given his own testimony. A *primâ facie* case of the strongest kind was made against him, and at this stage, just as the member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) said, this is a criminal charge. It happens to be a criminal charge in the sense that the accused is a competent witness, and with this strong charge made against him, at this stage is was his duty if he desired it, to have offered his testimony to the Committee. He has chosen not to do so, and, not having done so, a large quantity of the evidence implicating him seriously in this case stands uncontradicted by the only man who could contradict it. His conduct in that regard is in itself an admission of guilt. Now, Sir, the circumstances connected with this case afford some key to the problem. We have it in evidence that Mr. Cochrane had been a candidate some years before for the Local Legislature, and his party had become involved in debt at that time, and this debt has continued to the time when these difficulties began.

Mr. WALLACE. Not at all. It was a protest of Dr. Willoughby that created the debt. There was no debt connected with Mr. Cochrane's candidature.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, I accept the correction. It is immaterial whether Mr. Cochrane was a candidate or not; the party, by a number of leading men, had become responsible for a considerable sum of money, and this debt took the form of a promissory note. That note was signed by a number of friends and some relatives of Mr. Cochrane. One or two of his sons I think were parties to it. At last that note was changed into several smaller notes. But there was a note for $619, dated November, 1887, payable at 20 days, on which note Mr. Cochrane was one of the parties liable. At that stage an opportunity occurred for doing a stroke of business. A vacancy occurred in the lighthouse at Presqu'Ile, and that was the first transaction dealt with. The total debt we are told was some $900 odd, and we have it that that debt was ultimately wiped out by payments made as follows:—Hedley Simpson paid $200 and got a lighthouse; John Fitzgerald paid $150 and got a bridge; William Brown paid $150 and got a bridge; Robert May paid $125 and got a bridge; John Clouston, paid $75, and I think gave a promissory note for another $75, and got a bridge; William Goodrich paid $200 and gave a life lease of a farm to another man, and got a bridge; and altogether these contributions made up some $900 odd, which went to liquidate the debt in question. There was the party with this debt hanging over it and a number of offices about to be filled. The canal was approaching completion, and here was an opportunity to utilize the situation for the good of the party, and to get rid of this debt. Those moneys were paid, and Mr. Cochrane recommended every one of those men to office after they had made their payments or promised to make them, and they got their offices, the party got the money, and the notes were paid; and we are now enquiring how comes it that this money was paid under these circumstances through the assistance of Mr. Cochrane? The programme appears to have been

this. The committee was the buffer ; it made the promise ; it pretended to have the right of appointment, and as soon as it had selected a favoured person as the nominee that person was informed that he had got the good-will of the committee, and that they were going to recommend him. But still the man did not get the office. The committee had no real status, but it prevented the sitting member having to meet and deal with the parties; and this committee having made the promise, Mr. Stanley or some other person suggested to the nominee that it would be a good thing for him now to do something for the party ; and at that stage, before the nominee got his appointment, he suddenly became generous and made this voluntary gift. If he made it, the news was passed on to Mr. Cochrane, and the appointment was made. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) says that this was done without any secrecy. Of course it was done without any secrecy ; Mr. Cochrane then knew of the deal ; and it is immaterial whether he pocketed the money or not, although in one instance he practically did pocket a portion of the money. But it is wholly immaterial, so long as he knew that there was corruption, whether the corruption inured to his benefit or to the benefit of some one else. If his recommendation to the Government was procured by these improper influences the public service was damnified to that extent, and that is where the crime comes in. Now, with regard to Hedley Simpson, what is the evidence? Hedley Simpson got his appointment. He made his payment on the 25th January, 1888, and his money was paid on a note in the Standard Bank, on which Mr. Cochrane was a party. This note was a 20-day note. The bank had evidently got tired of carrying this paper, and had come to short dates ; and on the maturity of that 20-day note, namely, on the 7th of December, 1887, it had been placed in the hands of the solicitor of the bank for protest and collection. Hedley Simpson paid the $200. On the 24th of January Hedley Simpson, having received the promise of the committee that he was to get the lighthouse, takes the $200 to Colborne, and the next morning it is paid into the bank on the note of Edward Cochrane and three others. That payment went directly to the benefit of Edward Cochrane the member. There is no conflict of testimony on that point. The matter was traced beyond dispute or contradiction. The $200 that Hedley Simpson paid to get the recommendation of Edward Cochrane for the lighthouse was paid on a note that Edward Cochrane was about to be sued upon, and on which he was liable. He got the benefit of the scheme to which he was a party. That was on the 25th of January, 1888. Mr. Stanley says, in his evidence, that he told Edward Cochrane of that payment when it was made. He tells us that Edward Cochrane came to Colborne, where Stanley lives, several times a week for his mail. He lived near Colborne and it was his trading town, and Mr. Stanley's hotel was the place where Mr. Cochrane put up. It was Mr. Cochrane's practice to see Stanley, who was a particular political and personal friend of his, and therefore it is incredible that Stanley omitted for years to communicate this fact to Edward Cochrane. On the contrary he tells us that he told him about it. What did Mr. Cochrane do after he learned of this transaction? What should he have done, supposing he were innocent? He had created the scheme and made it possible to have a sub-committee, for without his consent there could not have been any such committee. He made it possible for such a committee to do such a work as this ; and after he learned of the committee's operations, after he learned of the collection from Hedley Simpson and that it had been used to retire partly a note of his own, did he repudiate the transaction? Did he say this was an improper transaction and refuse to dispense public patronage under any such circumstances? No. Had he done so, he could not have been blamed, and his duty would have been to refund the payments. But what did he do? He adopted the whole transaction. If you will look at the evidence of Mr. Smith, Deputy Minister of Marine, you will find that three months afterwards, the 26th of April, 1886, Mr. Cochrane wrote to the department requesting the appointment of Hedley Simpson to the office in question, and the department appointed him. If that is not bringing this transaction home to Mr. Cochrane, there is no possible way of bringing it home to him. I would ask whether, in view of the overwhelming case made against Mr. Cochrane, it was not his duty, if he were innocent, to have pledged his word of honour to his innocence. Were a judge charging a jury, under such circumstances, I think he would tell the jury but one thing. Mr. Cochrane preferred not to add to his offences another. He could not conscientiously commit the other crime to which my hon. friend has referred, and he preferred to leave his case with the jury in the hope that they might perhaps differ in their finding. However that may be, it is proved that Mr. Cochrane learned of the improper use being made by this committee of the power he had vested in them before he had made a single recommendation. Then, when there still was a *locus penitentiæ* open to him, he should have repudiated the action of the committee and refused to accept any of its recommendations thereafter. But what did he do? For two years or more that committee continued to make its recommendations, and on the 2nd of May, 1890, nearly two years and a-half after this first wrong, Mr. Cochrane wrote a letter to the department asking the department to appoint to office a whole batch of his friends, who, in the meantime, had been dealt with similarly by the committee. Can any reasonable man believe that Mr. Cochrane was not aware on the 2nd of May, 1890, of the bribery by Hedley Simpson in 1888, through which he obtained his office? Is it possible that two years and a-half after that transaction, going in and out of Colborne several times a week, being in constant communication with his intimate friends on this committee, Mr. Cochrane was not aware of the practices this committee was resorting to? What had become of this note? It is to be remembered that this note of $616 to which I have referred, on which he was liable and on account of which $200 was paid, was retired from the bank by this payment of $200 and by another note for the balance, and Edward Cochrane was discharged with regard to the balance. So that this $200 paid on this $600 note left the hon. member for East Northumberland out of the whole transaction. He knew in the month of February, because the renewal note was put in during that month, that his debt had been paid by this means.

Mr. WALLACE. He was an endorser.

Mr. MULOCK. Of course he was. They were all joint sureties on the note, and it is immaterial whether a man is a maker or an endorser, he is responsible in law. They were all sureties together. It is immaterial in a debt of that kind what position the parties occupy upon the note. However that was, the note was protested and all were liable upon it. So that when Mr. Cochrane became discharged from liability, he must have learned of his discharge. He must have learned that money paid for these offices went to take up his note, and he recommends the party who paid the money to office. I cannot conceive of a clearer case, especially when we bear in mind that the witnesses who proved this charge are all strong supporters and friends of the hon. member. Mr. Hedley Simpson was biassed in his favour. Mr. Payne, the solicitor for the bank, Mr. Stanley, his leading supporter and intimate friend—these are the men who established the charge. Had they been willing witnesses of course we might have had something further from them. But that is the way the case was left. Arundel Simpson's evidence has not been contradicted by Mr. Cochrane. There are some points upon which Mr. Cochrane alone could contradict that witness, and it was due to the Committee, it was due to the House, it was due to East Northumberland that, if Mr. Arundel Simpson was not telling the truth, the only man who could contradict him should have gone into the witness box, and that man was Edward Cochrane. I listened to Arundel Simpson and I considered his evidence appeared to be reliable. He may not have had the astuteness of some witnesses, but he was truthful to a degree, and you can understand readily how a simple man like that could be twisted about and made to contradict himself. At all events, I think Mr. Cochrane would have aided the search after truth if he had given to the Committee and the House the benefit of his testimony. We are told that there was a petition in circulation for the benefit of Hedley Simpson. No doubt it was, and it was also in evidence that Mr. Cochrane desired to anticipate that petition, and why? He did not desire that the community should aid Mr. Hedley Simpson's appointment except through him and this machine, and so he took steps to crush out the petition. Mr. Arundel Simpson says that Mr. Cochrane told him he would look after the matter and there need be no petition. Why did not Mr. Cochrane go into the witness box and contradict Arundel Simpson on that point? Mr. Arundel Simpson asked if Mr. Cochrane said anything. He swears that Mr. Cochrane told him Hedley Simpson could have the appointment for $200. Should not Mr. Cochrane have contradicted that statement if it were untrue. I congratulate my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Skinner) on the simple manner in which he considers evidence when he thinks these contributions were voluntary because the witnesses say they were. There was one who made a voluntary deposit, but, when it turned out that there were not enough offices to go round, the money came back to him. He said: No bridge no money. Mr. Vanalstine got his deposit back. Could there be anything clearer than the evidence that these moneys were given for a consideration? Mr. Cochrane repudiates any responsibility for the payments. They are not his acts, but the acts of a committee which he has appointed, and which in fact is his attorney. He cannot approbate and reprobate that committee at the same time. Having appointed the committee, he must take the responsibility for their acts. After the recommendation of Stanley, but before the appointment, he asks the man how much he can afford to give, and because the man says it is a voluntary gift, are we to assume that it really was voluntary? Men who had never given more than $1 or $2, men with wives and families, are asked to give $150 apiece for small offices which they have to secure, in some cases by getting friends to endorse notes for them and in others by mortgaging their effects, and we are asked to believe that these were voluntary gifts? And thus we notice the illegal transaction, Mr. Cochrane makes his recommendation, and the Government act upon it. Now Fitzgerald had a conversation with Mr. Cochrane, and he testified as to Mr. Cochrane's views of the status of this committee. Fitzgerald testifies thus:

1215. What was the conversation you had with Mr. Cochrane?—I only saw him once. I got a petition from a few men in the riding and showed it to him. He said it was very good—"I will give it to the committee: I have nothing more to say. Whoever the committee picks out, will get it."

Then Fitzgerald is picked out by the committee, he pays his $150, they recommend him to Mr. Cochrane, who recommends him to the Government and he gets the office. Then William Brown appears upon the scene. On the 20th January, 1890, he pays $150. When did Mr. Cochrane learn that? We are told by the member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) that these things are not kept secret. Mr. Cochrane did not make the recommendation all at once, but he waits until the 2nd of May, nearly four months. Is it to be believed that Mr. Cochrane did not know in the meantime about this transaction? He had learned clearly that Fitzgerald had made his payments. Then, we come again to Stanley's evidence, who testifies as follows:—

1519. Did you see Mr. Stanley in 1889, in regard to getting an appointment as bridge-keeper?—I did.
1520. What took place then?—Mr. Stanley sent for me.
1521. Well, what else?—I went up there to see him, and he told me they were about to let the bridges.
MR. OSLER—I object to the witness stating what Mr. Stanley said.
1522. What was said to you?—He said they were going to let the bridges and that they intended me to have one.
1523. You say they were going to let the bridges. What do you mean by that?—To appoint the bridge-tenders.
1524. Did he say anything about your getting one?—He said that I could get one by looking after my father and giving him $150.
1525. Who told you that?—James Stanley.

Now, we come to his conversation with Mr. Cochrane:

1528. Did you afterwards see Mr. Cochrane about it?—He saw me about it.
1529. Mr. Cochrane did?—Yes.
1530. You met Mr. Cochrane in Brighton?—Yes.
1531. What took place between you and Mr. Cochrane? Did he send for you?—He called me into the room.
1532. Where was this—in the hotel?—In Mr. Stanley's hotel.
1533. What did he say to you?—He said they had made different arrangements about the bridge. That they were going to make some arrangements for fifty acres of land for my father, and let some one else have the bridge.
1534. Did he say with whom the arrangement was made?—I do not think he did that night.
1535. Did he at any other time?—I do not know that he did. I could not say that he did.
1536. Just try and think, because you say he did not say that night?—I do not think Mr. Cochrane ever told me.
1538. What did he say about the $150?—I do not know just what he did say.
1539. Try and think?—He said they had made other arrangements. I said it was all right; I was not very particular.

1541. What else did he say?—He said that Mr. Stanley could not pay off $900 with four bridges at $150 apiece.
1542. Where was that said to you?—At Mr. Stanley's hotel.
1543. By Mr. Cochrane?—By Mr. Cochrane.
1544. The member for East Northumberland?—Yes."

There we find in the evidence of this man, that Mr. Cochrane told him they could not pay $900 with four bridges at $150. He tells them there is a bridge for sale, but Mr. Cochrane does not go into the witness box to deny that. What is the probable presumption to be drawn? There can be but one inference—that he cannot deny it. His silence is an admission. Then we have the evidence of John D. Clouston. He paid $150 for a bridge, and he was appointed in May, 1890. He testifies as follows:—

1993. To the best of your recollection, you say he may have said that other bridge-tenders were giving $150?—Yes.
1994. On the occasion of that drive from his house to Colborne?—I do not say that.
1995. When was it, then?—I think it was along in the fall.
1996. What fall?—The fall of the same year. I think it was a year ago last fall.

I am not aware that anybody has reflected upon the veracity of John D. Clouston. He gives it as his opinion that a year ago last fall, before he had got his recommendation, before he had made application, Mr. Cochrane had told him that the bridge-tenders were paying $150 apiece. Now, if his evidence was untrue, why was not Mr. Cochrane put into the box to say so? It is evident, from reading his testimony, that Clouston was not anxious to tell any more than he was compelled to; but Clouston tells us that before he got his appointment, before he made his payment of $150, Mr. Cochrane told him what the tariff was, that the bridge-tenders were paying $150 apiece. I ask hon. gentlemen how they can get over that statement? They have endeavoured to show that Mr. Clouston was a very strong party man, but he admits that with the exception of this $150 that he paid, prior to his appointment, he had only contributed, in all his life, but one dollar on two separate occasions, for the cause. He goes on to say:

2090. I think you said that Mr. Cochrane told you that the other bridge-tenders were helping to pay the indebtedness?—Yes; I think he said so.
2091. Did he or did he not?—I think probably he did.
2092. And at the conversation he told you that you were going to be appointed a bridge-tender?—Yes.

Could there be a clearer invitation to make his contribution? Mr. Cochrane tells him that the other bridge-tenders are paying $150 apiece, and he says: "There is a bridge for you." What was his object in telling Clouston that the others were paying $150, unless he meant that he was to do the same? And we have him doing the same. There can be but one inference drawn, I fear, from that evidence. Mr. Osler tries to draw a different conclusion, and this is the way Clouston gives his evidence of a voluntary contribution:

2172. How long before the 10th May, 1890, had you been told by Mr. Cochrane that there was a bridge for you?—I think this was in May, and it must have been as far back as July or August of the year previous.
2173. Ten months before, in the year 1889?—It was just after my daughter was buried.
2174. It would be some time in the year before?—Yes.
2175. Was there any condition or stipulation attached to the statement that there was a bridge for you? Did he say what you had to do?—Not a word.
2176. Did he put a condition to it?—Not a word.
2177. Did anyone ask you to pay this $150, or was it voluntary on your part?—It was a voluntary offer among ourselves, knowing that the party was involved in the way they were.
2178. Was there with anybody a condition that you should pay $150 if you got the bridge?—Not that I can bring to my memory.
2179. You say that Mr. Cochrane told you that you could have the bridge without conditions, and considering the way the party were involved you concluded voluntarily to pay the $150?—That was the way I undertook it, as far as I was concerned.

That is the result of the best explanation that Mr. Osler could get the witness to make of the fact that Mr. Cochrane had told him that the bridge-keepers were paying $150 each, when Mr. Osler wanted, if possible, to drag Mr. Cochrane out of the scrape, and put a better character upon the transaction. Bullock has been referred to. I will not dwell on his evidence; it has been dwelt on at sufficient length already. I understand he is a merchant in business in Colborne, an intimate, personal and political friend of the member for East Northumberland, and there is no reason to discredit his evidence in any way. He told us with candour the practice of the committee, which was to sell their influence for money; to sell the patronage which Mr. Cochrane had delegated for money. That statement stands uncontradicted. William Brown says Mr. Cochrane told him he had left the matter in the hands of the committee, and he should have to apply to the committee. He goes to the committee. What occurs? He is asked for $150. He is asked whether he did it in consequence of his conversation with Cochrane, he replies in the affirmative. He applies to Mr. Cochrane and he tells him that he must apply to the committee. He applies to the committee—in what form?

Q. Who did you converse with in regard to the $150?—A. The first one I had a conversation with was James Stanley.

He pays Stanley $150—Stanley to whom he goes in consequence of this interview with Mr. Cochrane. Brown's payment was made to Wade. Wade held one of the notes of the party, and Brown's $150 was paid on 20th January. After that no appointment was made for some time. On 2nd May, something over three months afterwards, Mr. Cochrane wrote to the department recommending Brown. Is it credible that he had not learned of the whole job, although he said he had nothing to do with the appointments and recommended Brown to go to some one else? But after he had paid $150, the recommendation came, and with it the office. Brown says:

2658. You never would have gone to the committee but for what Mr. Cochrane told you?—No answer.
2659. The first you heard of the committee was from Mr. Cochrane?—Certainly.
2660. And, in pursuance of your conversation with him, you went to that committee to pay the money?—Yes.

In pursuance of Brown's conversation with Mr. Cochrane he goes to the committee and pays the money, not because of any conversation between Brown and the committee, but in consequence of a conversation between Brown and Cochrane. What was that conversation that led him to pay the money? Is it not clear that Mr. Cochrane was bound at this point to offer an explanation? I think Mr. Cochrane at that stage was bound to tell us whether it was true or not, that he had such a conversation with Brown as led Brown to go and pay that money. Robert May paid $125 for the purpose of obtaining a position. He says:

2800. Was it not for the purpose of getting that position, sir?—Yes.
2801. How did you know that you would get that position if you paid $125?—I did not know, only from the committee.
2802. Then you knew from the committee that you would get that position if you paid the $125?—They told me.
2803. Who told you?—Some of the committee."

What was the object of this committee? Some hon. members said it was only patronage. This committee really was in existence for a different purpose altogether. Patronage was but a means to an end. The debts that have been over the party for over 8 years had to be wiped out, and an opportunity was presented, and a machine was invented in order to accomplish that end. I am not aware that anyone has discredited Henry May's testimony. He is a Government appointee, and is in the employ of the Government at the present time. He evidently is in favour with the Administration, for he obtained employment without having to pay anything. He was of the inner circle, a member of the committee himself, and so he obtained a position without paying for it. When asked as to what was the object of the committee he gave his version of it as follows:—

3050. Then it had the two-fold object of settling on the men for the offices, and of financing to liquidate the indebtedness of the Conservative party?—I suppose that was it.

I suppose that is it. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) referred to a charge which I think the report of the majority of the Committee suggested that we should consider as not having been made. If the hon. member had not dwelt on it, I would not have made any reference to it. I refer to a charge made against William Johnston, and notwithstanding the evidence given, I am of the opinion that the case still needs investigation. The suggestion, I understand, was that Johnston gave cattle and stock for an office. What is the evidence of what occurred? Mr. Cochrane's son, a man who is notorious as worth nothing, who had sworn he was worth nothing, obtained a large amount of stock from a man who was seeking an office, stock aggregating in value about $160, or just about the price of a bridge appointment. This stock was not paid for; it was handed over to a man who was not good for it. Johnston was in the employment of the Government. He had a position at one of the bridges; but when he was wanted as a witness he crossed over the lake to Rochester. The excuse offered at some period of the enquiry was that he was absent in consequence of the illness of his son. But it was also in evidence that as his son was better, apparently there was no necessity for his absence, but, nevertheless, he continued away and what occurred as far as the evidence went was this: The son who was examined as a witness said that he owned some stock on a little farm of his, and that the son authorized the father to sell it and that his father sold it to Mr. Cochrane's son. He never got a farthing down for it, but he took the notes of Mr. Cochrane unendorsed and unsecured; the first one at a period fourteen months distant, and the other somewhat later. Not one cent was paid on these notes which were made by a man who was not worth the paper he was giving. He got a valuable stock worth $160 from William Johnston's son, and William Johnston got a recommendation and got his office. There was not a cent paid on those notes until a charge was made in respect to them during the last general election, and Mr. Cochrane having denied anything wrong in connection with the matter, just before voting day, a payment of $40 was endorsed on one of these notes which is produced. My own opinion was that it was a very suspicious transaction at least, but it could not be properly disposed of except that William Johnston was examined. It is well known that some matters of that kind can be cooked, and it had all the appearance of that, and I think it would have been just as well had the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) not referred to it. It was a charge on the face of it of a most suspicious character, and I would like to know how it came that the Government did not produce the absent William Johnston and allow the charge to be properly investigated. It is still open for investigation if the witness can be produced. Now, in regard to Wesley Goodrich. He had dealings with Mr. Cochrane too, and he told Mr. Cochrane that he was giving a lease and $200 to another person to get him out of the way. It appears that one Obadiah Simpson has got a promise of the office, and it was necessary to satisfy Obadiah Simpson. He was to be satisfied by getting a lease from Goodrich, and it was also necessary to pay tribute to the committee, and that was to be accomplished by the payment of $200. Now, Mr. Cochrane knew that Goodrich was buying the influence of the committee. He said on page 127:

3691. You have just told me, I think, that you told Mr. Cochrane you were willing to give a life lease of your farm for a bridge? Is that so?—Mr. Cochrane mentioned to me that there was a man by the name of King who wanted a bridge. Then I said I would give $200 at that time.
3692. For the bridge?—For the bridge.
3693. What did he say?—He said he did not want the money. He said he would not have a dollar.
3694. Did he refer you to anyone else?—I am not sure whether he referred me to Obadiah Simpson or not.
3695. Did he refer you to the committee?—No.
3696. Did he refer you to Webb?—No.
3697. Or to Stanley?—No, sir.
3698. You did pay the $200?—I did, sir.
3699. That was before you gave the lease?—Yes, sir.
3700. To whom did you pay the $200?—I paid it to Mr. Edward Cochrane.
3701. To the member for the east riding of Northumberland?—Yes. It was more convenient for me to go to him than to Mr. Wade. Wade's was a long way out of my way. He told me to take it to Mr. Payne when I offered it to him.

Now, do you not think that when Mr. Goodrich said he gave that money to Mr. Cochrane and that Mr. Cochrane assumed dominion over it, by not only taking possession of it, but saying what should be done with it?

Mr. SKINNER. It is scarcely fair to read the part of the testimony on page 127 without reading the whole of it.

Mr. MULOCK. Do you want me to read further?

Mr. SKINNER. Yes; read below what you were reading on the same page.

Mr. MULOCK. Very well, I will read:

3702. Who told you?—Mr. Cochrane. I said to him: "Are you not going to Colborne soon? It is out of my way if I have to go on purpose." He said: "Wallace is going to-night with the grist." The team was standing in the yard and I suggested that perhaps Wallace would take it up. He said he could. Wallace went for is overcoat, and I took the money out of my pocket and asked him to count it.
3703. Whom did you ask to count it?—Mr. Cochrane.
3704. I think you had better tell the Committee again what happened there?—I agreed with Mr. Wade to pay

this $200. Mr. Wade lived at Hilton, quite a way from my place, and I went to Mr. Cochrane (he was in the barnyard at the time when I arrived), and I asked him would he take the money. He told me to take it to Mr. Payne at Colborne, but that was quite a way for me to go I said: "Are you not going soon," as I knew he went there often. He said: "Wallace is going to-night with the grist." I had noticed the team and waggon in the yard. Wallace was going to the house to get his overcoat and I suggested that somebody ought to count the money. I said: "Would he?" He did not answer me, but he seemed not to want to do it. I took it out of my pocket and urged him. He then took it and counted it, and then handed it to Wallace. Wallace had got back by this time. He said: "Wallace, give that to Payne." That is as straight as I can tell you.

3705. What did you give that $200 for? What value did you get for it?—I got the situation—the bridge.

3706. And that is what you gave the money for?—I suppose if you put it that way, I don't know any other. Mr. Wade told me he was holding it for some money he wanted to realize on it.

3710. How did you arrive at the sum of $200?—I offered him at one time that I would give him that, and he said he would not take a dollar. Mr. Wade, I suppose, had heard that I offered $200. I did not ask Mr. Wade how he knew. I offered it myself, it was my own offer.

3712. You were willing to give $200?—I was, and to give the lease of the farm to anybody who had the promise of the bridge.

3713. How did you discover it was necessary to pay $200 to get the position?—Well, I had heard some time before that there had been a protest between Mr. Wade and Mr. Ferris and there was a deficiency there and they wanted to try and raise money to meet it. I thought if they wanted some help to raise it I would help them.

Then further on he says:

3738. You were to pay $200, according to your agreement, to Mr. Wade?—Yes, sir.

3739. Were you aware at the time whom you were to pay it to?—No, sir.

3740. What did you say about Mr. Payne?—I said that when I presented it, Mr. Cochrane told me to take it to Mr. Payne, to give it to him.

The evidence of Mr. Goodrich, where he swears that Mr. Cochrane told him to take that money and give it to Mr. Payne, is not contradicted. He says again:

3769. How did Mr. Cochrane know that you should take it to Mr. Payne?—I do not know. I did not ask him, and he did not tell me.

3770. Did he appear to know what the $200 was for?—I do not know that he said a word. He said in one of the conversations that I had with him, that they had got into trouble over the protest, and of course I understood that the trouble related to the funds. I understood somebody to say that there was trouble over the protest.

3771. What do you mean by getting into trouble—getting into debt?—Yes, I took it that way.

3772. You say you told Mr. Cochrane when you went there to leave the money with him, that you had made an arrangement about your place, and that they were satisfied?—Yes.

3773. You are sure you used the word "satisfied"?—Yes.

3774. What had you agreed to give at that time?—I had agreed to give the old gentleman a life lease of the place and pay $200 for the debt of the party.

Then Mr. John Wade gives evidence to the same effect and shows that Cochrane was aware of the doings of the committee. When the lease was given in order to get one man out of the way and let another man in, Cochrane was a party to the transaction, and I say again it was immaterial in law whether this consideration went into his own pocket or not, so far as a consideration was given in order to procure a verbal recommendation, either from him or from a committee, which was the same as from him. Well, looking at all that evidence, what do we find? We find a large number of witnesses connecting Mr. Cochrane with this transaction. Hedley Simpson swears to Mr. Cochrane's connection with it; Arundel Simpson does the same; Walter Simpson does the same; Stanley does the same. He says he told Mr. Cochrane about Hedley Simpson paying the money; John D. Clouston does the same; Bullock says he is convinced that Mr. Cochrane knew all that was going on; Brown says that Mr. Cochrane knew of the bargain and what he paid the money for; Wesley Goodrich says he knew of the $200 that he was paying. Eight witnesses in all connect Edward Cochrane with this transaction; and he does not go into the witness box to deny it. Could there be a greater accumulation of evidence? Is there not a formidable case made against him? And consider with that the circumstance that he will not take the book in his hand and pledge his oath to the untruthfulness of any of these statements or attempt to explain them away. Under these circumstances, the finding of the majority of the Committee is not, in my judgment, according to the evidence; and if this House condones this offence by adopting their report, it will not bring credit upon itself or upon the members of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MULOCK. Hon. gentlemen may not think that to-night; but I think they will live to regret any action they may take in endorsing these dealings in public offices. I cannot conceive of clearer evidence being brought out; I cannot conceive of a case more flagrant, even if the transactions are small in themselves; and, being of that opinion, as a member of the Committee, I feel it my duty to give the conclusions and inferences which I have drawn from the evidence, and to say that, in my opinion, complete justice will not be done in the premises by adopting the report of the majority of the Committee.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I never trouble the House at great length and I ask its indulgence for a few moments, late as the hour is. Hon. members of this House who desire to give an intelligent and impartial vote on this question are placed at this disadvantage, that this voluminous mass of evidence was placed in their possession only a few hours ago, and it is impossible for those who were not members of the Committee, and who did not pay close attention to its proceedings from time to time, to give an intelligent vote on the question before us. Under these circumstances, one is compelled simply to be guided by the evidence adduced in the two reports before us, and by the little knowledge that one is able to gather during the debate in this House. But, first of all, I desire to say that this question is not and ought not to be regarded on either side of the House as a party question. It is not one that involves the existence of the Government, and I trust that it is not one that involves the credit or reputation of the Conservative party. It is a question that involves the reputation and standing of this House, because the reputation and standing of a member of this House are concerned in it. In that sense, and in that sense only, I want to deal with it. Now, Sir, from the conclusions which I have been able to draw from the evidence, I feel disposed not to agree to either report. I do not believe that the evidence, so far as it has been adduced, justifies the very strong and decisive conclusions set forth in the report which has been placed before the House by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron). I think that the evidence, so far as I have been able to form an opinion upon it, does not justify the conclusion that there has been proved absolutely

that guilty knowledge on the part of Mr. Cochrane which that report avers. It is argued that this is a criminal offence, and in that regard it may fairly be questioned whether this case is one that ought to be dealt with by this House—whether this House is a competent tribunal to deal with a matter of this kind—whether we can in such a matter divest ourselves of all party feeling, and give to it the time and attention which would enable us to arrive at a verdict, on which should depend, not only the reputation of an hon. member of this House, but to a great extent the credit and character of the House itself. However, we have been called upon to give this vote, and give it we must, and we ought to give it as honestly, as free from party convictions, and with as due a regard to the evidence before us as possible. If this is to be treated as a criminal case, and if the hon. member for East Northumberland is before us as one charged with a crime, we are as much bound as any court to give him the benefit of any doubt; and giving him the benefit of all the doubts which I think exist in the evidence, notwithstanding the arraignment of him made by his opponents, I feel justified in coming to the conclusion that so far as his knowledge of these transactions is concerned the case is not proven. But when we pass beyond that we have to deal with the report made by the majority of the Committee, and I have no hesitation in saying that it is a miserable piece of special pleading. It utterly fails to grasp the questions which ought to have been dealt with by that Committee. I think we have before us evidence that most of the persons concerned in these transactions are—I will not say innocent—but I think had not the slightest idea of the gravity or the possible consequences of the transactions in which they were engaged. I do not believe that the men who made these contributions to pay off this old debt had any idea, or at least anything more than a vague and misty idea, of the nature of the transactions in which they were concerned; and it would be exceedingly hard, under the circumstances, to deal with them as criminals. But when this matter is brought before a Committee of this House, I think they should deal with it in a different manner and spirit than this Committee have done. They should give this House and this country to understand, in the plainest terms, that would leave no doubt, the serious nature and consequences of these transactions; but this Committee have stated their conclusions in terms which I think under the circumstances are contemptible. The simple remark at the end of the report that these transactions were reprehensible fails altogether to give the country a true idea of their nature; and the voters of East Northumberland, when they read that report, will naturally come to the conclusion that the transactions in which they have been concerned are venial offences, and will not consider it very great harm to undertake similar transactions in the future. There are many words used in that report which I think bear out this conclusion. It lays a great deal of stress on the word "voluntary." If I buy a horse and pay a hundred dollars for it I voluntarily pay the hundred dollars for it, but if I do not pay it I do not get the horse; and that is exactly this case. I find fault with the report because it lays stress on the word "voluntary," and in that respect it is calculated to mislead the electors, and the conclusion they will draw from it is, that when a man gives a contribution voluntarily he is perfectly justified, in return for that consideration, in taking an office if he can obtain it. I say that the use of the term in that report, the manner in which it is used, is calculated to convey an erroneous impression, and fails to bring home to the people of the country, as it should, the nature of the transaction with which that report deals. Taking the evidence altogether, I think that the Committee is not justified in the absolute conclusion to which it has come, that there is no evidence of these charges, and no evidence of complicity on the part of the hon. member for East Northumberland with regard to them. I say that the case against him is not so conclusively proven as to prevent our giving him reasonably the benefit of the doubt; but on the other hand, we are not justified, on the evidence before us, in coming to the conclusion that there is no proof in support of the charges. Taking all these circumstances together, taking the paltry, inadequate conclusions which are arrived at, under circumstances which would have justified, and not only justified but called for a very distinct, emphatic and clear expression of opinion as to the character of such transactions, and also taking the terms or expressions used with regard to them throughout the report generally, and which do not convey properly, to my mind, the nature of the transactions, but make it appear as though the offence was a mere venial and trifling one, under those circumstances I am not prepared to accept the report in amendment to that of the Committee brought in by the hon. member for West Huron, nor am I prepared to sanction, by my vote, the report which the Committee have presented.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Cameron (Huron):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Harwood,
Allison,	Innes,
Amyot,	King,
Armstrong,	Landerkin,
Bain,	Laurier,
Barron,	Leduc,
Beith,	Légris,
Bernier,	Livingston,
Bourassa,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bowers,	McGregor,
Bowman,	McMillan,
Brodeur,	McMullen,
Brown (Chateauguay),	Mignault,
Cameron (Huron),	Mills (Bothwell),
Campbell,	Monet,
Carroll,	Mulock,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Murray,
Casey,	Paterson (Brant),
Christie,	Perry,
Colter,	Préfontaine,
Davidson,	Proulx,
Davies,	Rider,
Dawson,	Rinfret,
Delisle,	Rowand,
Edwards,	Sanborn,
Flint,	Scriver,
Fraser,	Savard,
Frémont,	Semple,
Gauthier,	Simard,
Geoffrion,	Somerville,
German,	Spohn,
Gibson,	Sutherland,
Gillmor,	Trow,
Godbout,	Truax,
Grieve,	Vaillancourt,
Guay,	Watson, and
Hargraft,	Yeo.—74.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Baker,
Bergeron,
Bowell,
Burnham,
Burns,
Cameron (Inverness),
Carignan,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Coatsworth,
Cockburn,
Corby,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davin,
Davis,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Algoma),
McAllister,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McKay,
McLean,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Madill,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Montague,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Pelletier,
Pope,
Prior,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Skinner,
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Tarte,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
White (Cardwell),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westmoreland).—99.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Barnard,	Mr. Welsh,
Mr. Earl,	Mr. Fauvel,
Mr. White (Shelburne),	Mr. Forbes,
Mr. Mackintosh,	Mr. Hyman,
Mr. McKeen,	Mr. Borden,
Sir D. Smith,	Mr. Mackenzie,
Mr. McCarthy,	Mr. Edgar.

Amendment negatived.

House divided on main motion:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Baker,
Bergeron,
Bowell,
Burnham,
Burns,
Cameron (Inverness),
Carignan,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Coatsworth,
Cockburn,
Corby,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davin,
Davis,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Algoma),
McAllister,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McKay,
McLean,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Madill,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Montague,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Pelletier,
Pope,
Prior,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Skinner,
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Tarte,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
White (Cardwell),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westmoreland).—98.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan,
Allison,
Amyot,
Armstrong,
Bain,
Barron,
Beith,
Bernier,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Brown (Chateauguay),
Cameron (Huron),
Campbell,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Christie,
Colter,
Davidson,
Davies,
Dawson,
Delisle,
Edgar,
Flint,
Fraser,
Frémont,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gibson,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Hargraft,
Harwood,
Innes,
King,
Landerkin,
Laurier,
Leduc,
Legris,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
McGregor,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Mulock,
Murray,
O'Brien,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Préfontaine,
Proulx,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Savard,
Scriver,
Semple,
Simard,
Somerville,
Spohn,
Sutherland,
Trow,
Truax,
Vaillancourt,
Watson, and
Yeo.—75.

Report concurred in.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3.45 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 18th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LAND SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Report of Committee of Whole on a certain proposed resolution respecting the granting of subsidies in land to certain railway companies (Mr. Dewdney), read the first and the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 173) to authorize the granting of subsidies in land to certain railway companies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 147) further to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McCARTHY. I beg to move the amendment which was discussed the other evening, increasing the deposit in case of appeal to $500 instead of $100.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Very often you desire to appeal merely on a question of law. The law allows you to limit your appeal as you please, and it is for us to consider whether, if an appeal be taken simply on a question of law, the appellant should be obliged to deposit $500. The first consideration should be that the right of appeal should be protected. The Act works well as it is, and I have not heard of any great hardship having arisen under it.

Mr. DICKEY. I brought up the other night the question whether or not the costs of appeal should not be limited, and if the Committee are of opinion that the costs of appeal should be limited to a smaller sum than $500, it would be useless to insist on a deposit of $500. I intend to invite the Committee to come to the conclusion that the counsel fees allowed on appeals, that is the fees over disbursements, should only be $100, and in that case this deposit of $500 would be more than is required, I think we should be willing to fix it at $250 or $300.

Mr. MULOCK. I cannot regard an election trial as a contest in respect of a private right. The consequences are really criminal. If the petitioner succeeds, somebody has violated the law and is liable criminally. In any event, it is a question for the people, and that being the case I do not see why private suitors should be in the position of parties to an action in respect of private rights. That being the case, I think that at no stage should there be any costs at all, but in deference to the opinions of other members, not wishing to propose something so radical, I prefer to propose in regard to the costs of the main trial that there should be a maximum, and I think that in regard to the costs of appeal there also should be a maximum. Whilst I would give the respondent the right to ascertain what the principle of law is and what the merits of the issue are by placing no unnecessary obstruction in his way, at the same time I would limit the costs, no matter what the consequences might be, of the appeal. I, therefore, think that the proposition to increase the deposit as a condition precedent to the right of appeal is legislation in the wrong direction. The proposal is that the deposit shall amount to $500 and the rate per folio for all the pleading. I cannot tell what that rate may amount to, but added to the $500, it means practically that no appeals will be taken to the Supreme Court. The Committee decided at an earlier stage that it was not inclined to do away with the appeal to the Supreme Court. Why do in an indirect way what we refused to do in a direct way?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not desire to prevent an appeal.

Mr. MULOCK. No; but the effect would be that the appellant would have to deposit $500, and 5 cents per folio as well, which may amount to a very large sum. We are legislating in the wrong direction. We are in the first place preventing a person from taking his case to appeal, and, secondly, we are increasing the costs, no matter what may be the issue, because this 5 cents additional is to be added to the costs of somebody. I think the proper way would be to provide for maximum costs in appeal, and limit the deposit to that. If the proposition be adopted that the outside costs be limited to $100, that should be the measure of security in the first instance. If there are no costs allowed in the appeal, there should be no deposit required. The deposit is only an indemnity at the best, and should not exceed the possible demand upon it.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is mixing up two questions which should be kept separate. The 5 cents a folio is a fee to be paid to the officer of the court, and at present there is no means of compelling him to certify to the finding of the Supreme Court, because, if he goes to the judge, he declines to give the notes of evidence, and he goes to the stenographer and he refuses to give it unless he is paid for it. The stenographer's fees have been paid out of the deposit, so that the security which was given and intended to be for the benefit of the respondent was often paid out in fees.

Mr. MULOCK. That was illegal.

Mr. McCARTHY. That has been done twice to my knowledge, and the court has decided it in that way. My hon. friend may have a very strong opinion on the subject, and I also have a very strong view that it was not within the statute, but that will not stand against the positive decision of the judges. You give a man the right of appeal and he deposits $10. I go to the judge to get a copy of his notes, and he has not got it. I go to the stenographer, and he says: If you pay me I will give it to you but not otherwise.

Mr. MULOCK. How is the registrar paid?

Mr. McCARTHY. By the fee of $10.

Mr. MULOCK. But how is he paid for his other services?

Mr. McCARTHY. The registrar is the chief officer of the court and does not get anything. It is no use to say that he is to do this for $10, because he cannot.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that this officer is an officer of the court and is paid a salary. If anything is to be paid to him in these matters, let the Government pay it. Why should an officer of the court, whose whole time is engaged for a salary, have a right to a perquisite of this kind, which would go into his own pocket?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; it would not go into his pocket. Take Mr. Grant, of the Court of Appeal. He is required to certify to these documents, but first he has to pay this amount to the stenographer.

Mr. MULOCK. The stenographer is an officer of the court.

Mr. McCARTHY. There ought to be a provision for the payment of the stenographer out of the general funds. There is no such provision, but he gets paid out of the deposit, and what I want to arrange is that this payment shall not encroach on the security put up for the sitting member.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the proper way is to provide that the stenographer shall be paid out of the general funds, but not by the parties. He is an officer of the Crown. It is the people's cause that is being litigated. There is a great deal in what my hon. friend says, but he is putting the saddle on the wrong horse. I do not think the parties should be charged with this payment to the stenographer.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is a very good suggestion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I). I think there is a good deal in what the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says, as to the appellant providing enough money to enable the record to be obtained. I see nothing unfair in his being required to pay sufficient money to enable the officers to prepare the record, but that being so, and involving the expenditure of a good deal of money, would it not be doing justice and fair-play by leaving the law as it stands as to the deposit of $100, and amending in the direction which he suggests, by providing also for the payment of the $10 and 5 cents a folio for all the documents he requires? In that way the officer would be guaranteed against any loss, sufficient money would be deposited to ensure the record being made, and then, I think, the deposit of $100 would be reasonable under the circumstances. In a long trial, the party may have to pay $200 or $300 for the record.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would prefer to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), if the Minister of Justice could see his way to accept it. When this Act was passed there were no stenographers in the courts. The judge took the evidence himself, and it was very simple to have the evidence certified. Now, in our province, at all events, it is always the stenographers who take the evidence, and if they were called upon, as in the provincial courts, to certify to this evidence, then the $10 would be ample. As it is, I think they should be paid by the Government, as the judges are.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that system prevails only in one province, and to carry out the suggestion I would have to begin by resolution, and we could not prorogue within two weeks.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the suggestion of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is a proper one. It is no more just to charge the parties with the salaries of the stenographers than with the salaries of the judges. Election trials are trials in which the public are interested as well as the parties, and, if the public were always right, there would be less cause for these election trials.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the best way would be, for the present, to reduce the amount required to $200, $300 or $400.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A compromise might be made. Suppose the hon. gentleman made the deposit $200.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not care in the least, but it seems to me that a man who has been harassed in the court below and makes an appeal should not have to pay the costs after he wins the appeal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Make it $300.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well.

Mr. DICKEY. With regard to section 51, I would like to take the sense of the Committee on a provision limiting the costs payable to counsel on appeal. That would come in properly, I think, as an amendment to section 51, and I propose to limit the counsel fee payable on appeal to the sum of $100. My reason for suggesting that is to prevent, as far as this House can legitimately do so, an abuse of the right to appeal. I think that no one here wants to prevent a legitimate appeal. Of course, at the same time, we want to prevent, if possible, an abuse of the right to appeal, and I think that the best way of doing that is to limit, so far as we can, the ultimate reward that may be obtained by counsel. I, therefore, move the addition of a sub-section to section 51, to this effect:

No sum greater than $10 shall be taxed against either party as costs of, or incidental to, an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, besides taxes and disbursements.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman is acting a little hastily. Nobody desires that abnormal fees should be paid to counsel. In the first instance, the counsel fee is fixed by the registrar in court, and it must necessarily depend to a large extent upon the importance of the case, the importance of the issues discussed, and the length of time counsel is engaged. You cannot fix an arbitrary fee, and say a man can only get $100 if he is there for one month arguing the case: it would be absurd. The result would be that if a man appeals and loses his case, his opponent will have to pay the fee of his counsel. If I appeal improperly and lose my case, why should my opponent have to pay it out of his pocket: why should I not have to pay it myself? Why should he have to pay counsel if I appeal wrongfully? You cannot, by an arbitrary rule of this kind, obtain the confirmation of justice. You must leave it to the discretion of the court which, according to the circumstances, determines how much the counsel fees shall be. In some cases $100 might be too high; in other cases that sum would be absurdly low. I have known cases to last for days and days, perhaps ten days, or fifteen days; and if a man travels a thousand miles to come to this court and stays here for fifteen days arguing a case, I think you will hardly say that he is paid when he gets $100. I think it is better left to the registrar who, subject to appeal to the court, determines what counsel fee is reasonable.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The proposition is not to confine the counsel fee to $100; it is only to confine the costs and disbursements. The counsel fee, I think, comes under the head of disbursements.

Mr. CURRAN. No.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I feel a good deal of sympathy with the proposition to restrict the costs which may be recovered on appeal, because it is supported by the argument that sometimes these petitions are fostered for the purpose of costs. But it seems to me this is going in the other direction, and that you are encouraging appeals.

Mr. DICKEY. What I had in my mind was this, that limiting these fees to $100, without stopping appeals absolutely, would have a tendency to make a man careful before he appeals. But if it is not the sense of the Committee, I will not press it.

On section 5,

Mr. MULOCK moved that:

Section 5 is hereby amended by inserting in sub-section "*a*" after the word "relates" the following words: "And who, if not the candidate of such election, is at the time of the presentation of such petition the owner of real property situated in the electoral district for which said election was had, of the value, according to the last annual assessments, of at least five hundred dollars over and above all encumbrances thereon."

He said: The meaning of the amendment is that a petitioner shall not be a man of straw, and while I will not say that the ownership of real estate in the riding to the value of $500 is the best guarantee that can be obtained of a man's *bonâ fides*, yet it is some guarantee. At present it would appear, if an examination were made, that most of the petitioners are men who have taken no real interest in the matter. Their names have been obtained simply because they are men without property, and that is an abuse of the Act. I do not wish to prevent the proper operation of the Act, but it should not be open to abuse. I do not think the machine part of politics should be allowed to go into a riding and discover some irresponsible man, who happens to have his name on the voters' list, and use him as a petitioner, unless he chooses to take an interest in the matter. If you cannot get a man of some substance to a petition, there has not been any great wrong; and, therefore, it is one safeguard, which I would suggest to the Committee, that the petitioner be the owner of some real estate.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The petitioner has to deposit $1,000 in cash, and it is now proposed that he be a man worth $500 besides. My opinion is that the law on this subject is all wrong. I do not think a man should be called on to deposit any money in cash, but he should give two sureties worth at least $2,000 and enter into bonds for that amount to pay the costs. It is quite clear at present that $1,000 is not sufficient security, for the costs in most of the contested cases exceed that sum, and it is equally clear that in most of the cases the petitioners are wholly men of straw. As a general rule they are men of no means and are selected because they are such, and where the costs exceed $1,000 nothing can be got out of them. If the law were so amended as to compel the petitioner to give security—not a deposit of money—to the extent of at least $2,000, and two sureties worth at least $1,000 each, it would, in my opinion, meet the evil, and petitions of that kind would not be presented unless there is reasonable ground for their presentation. It is well known that at present many of these petitions are speculative on the chance of something turning up before the case is tried or on the chance of pairing off with someone else.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It seems to me that the remarks made by the hon. gentleman are very pertinent to the question, and there is no doubt that many of these petitions are fyled to annoy and harass the sitting member. Responsible men of a political party desiring to petition are afraid to come forward and unwilling to put their names to the petition, and so they pick up some irresponsible person, who knows nothing about the case whatever. He comes to a lawyer's office to sign the paper and he does not know whether there is a word of truth in the petition or not. This is a very improper proceeding. We amended the law during the time of the late Administration with regard to proposing members. Then the same objection was made that, at nomination, men came forward to propose a candidate merely for the purpose of annoying the person who was certain to get elected, and with a view of obviating that evil the law was amended so as to require twenty-five electors to sign the nomination paper. Now, why should we not require more than one petitioner? Surely one man ought not be able to upset a whole constituency and to put it in that political turmoil and fever that is done by the contestation of an election. Why not provide that five or ten men should come forward to sign a petition. I think that would be a good plan, and then if these men know they are responsible for the costs you will probably find that out of these five or ten men there are some who are worth it. At all events, they have to put their names forward to guarantee the *bonâ fides* of the petition.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) While intending, as I hope we all intend, to legislate in the direction of preventing improper petitions being fyled, we are in danger of going too far in the other direction. I cannot see why a voter in an electoral district should be deprived of his right to petition against the return of a candidate simply because he does not own a certain amount of real estate. I doubt the propriety of that proposition a good deal. The possession of $500 worth of real estate does not necessarily guarantee that a man takes more interest in public life than a poor man who may be more intelligent, and if a man is properly qualified as an elector I do not think he should be deprived of his right to petition. I notice that the hon. gentleman has got on the Paper another amendment which seems to be directed in the proper channel, and which, in my opinion, will obviate the difficulties he is seeking to overcome much better than the proposal now before us. What we want to do is, I take it, to prevent petitions being fyled which are merely speculative, but you do not want to legislate so as to prevent men from signing *bonâ fide* petitions simply because these men do not own real estate. The section to which I refer says:

"That at the time of the presentation of the petition there shall also be presented therewith a solemn declaration by the petitioner to the effect that he has good cause to believe, and verily does believe, that the allegations contained in the petition are true."

I believe the adoption of that amendment would be a step in the right direction. I do not think we should limit the right to fyle a petition to the owners

of property alone. Every elector should have the right to fyle a petition, and if you take measures by a provision such as the one I have read to secure that the petition shall be *bonâ fide*, you are legislating in the right direction. I think the hon. gentleman's proposed affidavit may be amended so as to carry it still further than he suggests, but I believe he is on the right track in this amendment, and I respectfully submit that the amendment requiring a real estate qualification is not proper.

Mr. SPROULE. The principal result of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) would be to give a bone for the lawyers to nibble away at. If you made the property qualification $4,000, I am sure the lawyers would manage to keep the contest going on for a long time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it is better to leave out the real estate qualification.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Committee does not desire, it I will not press it. I will move:

That section 5 be amended by the following words:—"At the time of the presentation of the petition there shall also be presented therewith a solemn declaration by the petitioner, made under chap. 141 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled, an Act respecting Extra Judicial Oaths, to the effect that he has good reason to believe, and verily does believe, that the allegations contained in the said petition are true."

Mr. BARRON. I cannot altogether approve of that. In any case, it ought not to be a solemn declaration, but an affidavit. People have got the idea that by merely signing a paper they are not taking an oath, but the formality of taking the book and kissing it gives more security. I submit it should be an affidavit.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not think that an affidavit or declaration will accomplish any purpose whatever. I venture to say that there never was a political party defeated in a constituency where you could not get fifty men to make a solemn declaration that they believed the election was carried by bribery and corruption. I believe there is not a petitioner who has presented one of the numerous petitions fyled in the courts at present who would not make a declaration that he believed that the statements in the petition were true. It will accomplish no purpose unless you go a step further: Apply the same law that you do in the case where you want to arrest a man. There you make an affidavit and set up the facts upon which your belief is founded, and then you get an order to take the necessary proceedings. But the bare and naked affidavit which we used to have in our practice, stating that you have good reason to believe and do believe that the statements are true, will deter no man from fyling a petition. What I should like would be to require an affidavit to be presented to a judge of the court, and if it appears to him from the affidavit that there are reasonable grounds for the presentation of a petition, he should make an order granting leave to fyle a petition. That, in my judgment, is the only safe plan. I am prepared to stand by the adjudication of a judge on the subject, providing that if a *primâ facie* case is made out by the affidavit a petition may be fyled, and not otherwise.

Mr. FRASER. I see a difficulty in the proposition of my hon. friend from Huron. I do not think the petitioner ought to be asked to state the grounds on which he makes the application; that would be simply asking him to give away his case. I think there would be a gain even in the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North York. As an example, I know a case not very far away from the county I represent where a petition was sent to a solicitor in a village, and he was asked to get a man to sign it. I venture to say that if he had to make the affidavit proposed by the hon. member he would not do it so easily. I think most people have an idea of what an affidavit is. You can get some men to make an affidavit without good grounds, but there is a general understanding everywhere that certain results will follow from such an affidavit. I would prefer to leave the law as it is, rather than adopt the proposition of the hon. member for West Huron.

Mr. BARRON. It does seem, after all, that this question of the affidavit is creating some difference of opinion, and I think the proposal made by the hon. member for Frontenac, that there should be a certain number of petitioners instead of one, is a very good one. We recognize the principle in different proceedings, such as nominations, acknowledging the importance of avoiding silly and vexatious proceedings, such as many of these petitions no doubt are. Only this morning I received a newspaper in which there was an advertisement of a petitioner asking leave to withdraw a petition, because he had been persuaded to sign the petition by a candidate who offered him a situation if he would do so. That man was a man of straw, and now, because the candidate who bribed him has broken faith with him, he wishes to withdraw. I venture to say that many petitions are fyled under similar circumstances. I venture to say that 75 per cent. of the petitions fyled are vexatious, entered upon the beginning without the least tittle of evidence to support them; and then there is a sort of trust-to-luck policy of trying to find out between the time the petition is fyled and the time it is tried whether there are not cases which would unseat the successful candidate. I think that should be stopped, and I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Frontenac is a most excellent one, that a petition should be signed by five or ten voters.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would propose in section 5, of chapter 9, of 49 Victoria, to strike out the words "any one or more of the following persons," in the sixth line, and in sub-section (*a*) to strike out the words "a person," and insert the words "five persons." That would make the law read that a petition should be presented by five persons who voted or had a right to vote at the elections, or by a candidate. If a candidate chooses to come forward, I think he should have the right to fyle a petition.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We shall have to consider this a little. I think we are adopting a good many restrictions on petitions. We have yet to consider what kind of a Bill Parliament can pass with regard to sitting members. We must not lose sight of the fact that we are requiring petitioners to put up $1,000 in money, and the policy of the Act was to regard that as the great safeguard of the responsibility of the proceeding. Then, all we did was to ascertain that somebody should petition who had the right, either the candidate or a person entitled to vote. If, in addition, we charge five men with the responsibility of the cost of the peti-

tion. I think we shall be going altogether too far. I think it is questionable whether we should make any change in that regard. If we do, I think we ought not to insist on more than two names.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The change which has just been suggested may have its merits or it may not, but it is a most radical departure from the policy which we have hitherto pursued: and there is a danger, and a considerable danger—knowing as we do that corruption has undoubtedly been practised pretty extensively on many occasions in elections in this country—about making the process of getting election petitions too difficult. I think this is one of these amendments which, if considered at all, ought to be considered next session and not now. It cannot affect any election case that is going on at present: it cannot affect any hon. gentleman whose seat is contested one way or the other. I do not profess to express a positive opinion at present. This has been sprung on the House at too late a period to be properly considered, and it would be better that the hon. member should withdraw it, and we could consider it calmly and deliberately at the commencement and not at the close of a session.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think, too, it is a departure we should be slow to adopt without full consideration. I have not much faith in its efficacy. I think it is as easy to get five men as one man.

Mr. MULOCK. Ten men would have saved Sodom and Gomorrah.

Mr. McCARTHY. If we required ten men, we would be practically making it prohibitory. The affidavit suggested by the hon. gentleman is a declaration copied from the Ontario election law, and will be of no practical utility. That has been in force in Ontario, and I do not think there has been the slightest difficulty in getting a petitioner to say that he has good reason to believe and does verily believe the petition is well founded. A man who is prepared to sign a petition is equally prepared to swallow that affidavit. With regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for Huron, I think that what the hon. member for Guysborough has said with reference to it has great force and requires careful consideration. In the proceeding with which the hon. member for Huron illustrated his arguments, which at first sight seem to be almost on all fours, there is a very great difference, as the hon. gentleman will see on reflection. What is required to set out in the application to which he alluded, namely, to obtain a capias, is, first, the cause of action, and, secondly, the grounds which induced the party to say that he believes the defendant is about to abscond. That does not at all interfere with the suit. It does not disclose his case. But what would this affidavit require to set out? That bribery had been committed. It would not do to say bribery merely, but you would have to say such-and-such a man had been bribed by such-and-such an agent. You would have to go into that detail; and when you have to draw your witnesses from the opposite camp this would make your difficulties in proving your case almost insuperable. You would find these men either spirited away or not in the same mood to speak, and it would be impossible to sustain your case. I think the suggestion last made a wise one, and that is to let the matter stand over.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there is a great deal to be said in favour of allowing it to stand over. There can be no practical advantage in discussing it now. The objection of the hon. member for North Simcoe to the affidavit at the time of the petition is an objection which lies against the present proceeding, because before the trial the other party might enquire as to the character of the evidence on which he relies, and the petitioner must give the information.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is only a few days before the trial.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Long enough to spirit witnesses out of the way.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. If the Committee thinks this important amendment is being sprung on them too suddenly, I will withdraw it, and consider whether I will bring it up on the third reading or wait until next session.

Mr. MULOCK. With regard to my motion, which is the real motion before the Committee, the hon. member for North Simcoe says there is such a provision in the Ontario Act. I think that is rather an argument in favour of the proposition. We have not heard of petitions being filed right and left on speculation in Ontario.

Mr. McCARTHY. How many were filed after the last election?

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know.

Mr. McCARTHY. Almost as many as after this.

Mr. MULOCK. At all events, I see no reason why an affidavit should not be required. Not being aware whether in each province there was a provision for the making of affidavits before there was a case in court, I preferred to adopt the form in the provision respecting extra judicial oaths.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Better use the word "affidavit."

Mr. MULOCK. I have no objection to make it "affidavit," and the amendment will read as follows:—

Add to section five the following words: at the time of the presentation of a petition there shall also be presented therewith an affidavit by the petitioner that he has good reason to believe and verily does believe that the several allegations contained in the said petition are true.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MULOCK. I beg to move:

That no greater counsel fee or fees shall be taxed, as between party and party, in respect of or in connection with the trial than $50, and when the trial shall continue beyond one day a further sum not exceeding $40 for each additional day the trial shall continue, whether one or more counsel be engaged at the trial."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You are inviting people to fyle petitions. A member may employ counsel and keep him ten or fifteen days, and pay him $500, and he cannot ask that the counsel fee be taxed against the petitioner as well as the other costs. I do not see why you should offer undue facilities for the fyling of election petitions. A member has sufficient difficulties to meet now. It costs sufficient in legitimate expenses to get elected, and if we have to fight for our seats afterwards and pay the costs out of our own pockets we will have to get an additional indemnity.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me that this clause is a proper one. Unless

you can make the reasons for unseating a member much less strict than they have been in the past, it is almost impossible for anyone to go through an election trial without being unseated. If this is adopted, men will not enter a protest unless they have some valid reason for doing so. I think the clause is a good one, though I would reduce the amount to $100 or strike it out altogether. I think these protests should be entered on public grounds, and that the public should bear all the expense, each party paying its own costs. That would prevent many lawyers from taking up cases simply because they expect to get their fees out of them.

Mr. GERMAN. I think this question of costs is somewhat misunderstood. I suggested an amendment the other day, not because I desired that the costs should be restricted absolutely to the amount of $300, but because I think it is absurd that the petitioner should be liable to pay only $1,000 of costs in the event of his losing the action, while the respondent has to pay any amount of costs which may be taxed against him. I am prepared to take a fair fight with anybody, but, if the petitioner is only liable for $1,000, it is unfair that I should be liable for the whole of the taxed costs. If he is liable for the full amount of costs I am prepared to accept the same responsibility. Whether the amount for which the petitioner would be liable were $300 or $3,000, it would not make any difference. If the amount is limited to $300 the petitioner would only have to pay that and his taxable costs, but if there is no limit he would have to pay the whole taxable costs of the other party. My suggestion is that both parties should be placed on the same basis. If the petitioner is only responsible for $1,000, then the respondent should only be responsible for the same amount. It may be said at this time that anyone who has a petition filed against him may talk feelingly on this matter. That is true enough, and I have one filed against me. A man of enormous wealth may be the real petitioner, but he may get a man of straw to appear as the petitioner. I may be mulct in the costs, but if the man of straw is to pay the costs I may be unable to get them from him. I think, if a man of straw is made the petitioner he ought to be compelled to give bonds for the full amount of costs that may be taxed against him.

Mr. GILLMOR. I observe that the public mind seems just now to be alive to all these matters, and I might suggest that we should settle this question by doing away with all the protests now existing and commence anew, because we are all now in the right frame of mind to adopt a measure which would be just to everybody.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It might shorten the discussion if we where to agree that no man who has a petition fyled against him should take part in the debate.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am afraid that in that case there would not be a quorum.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There may be a good deal in the argument of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). The object of the amendment is to remove an existing evil. During the last few years petitions have been entered for frivolous reasons, for spite, and in order to make money, or, in other words, for blackmail. I think the argument of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) was well founded. If the parties were put on equal terms it would be more fair: but, where a petitioner is put forward who has no responsibility, it is not only a hardship on the candidate who is petitioned against, but is an injustice to the public. I believe the amendment will have the effect, not as the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) thinks, of encouraging protests, but, on the other hand, if a member has gone through a fair election, a protest will not be entered against him on any frivolous ground. I think that, in justice to the country and to the candidates, the party who petitions should be made responsible either by a sufficient deposit or in some other way. I believe that these frivolous petitions have had a worse effect on the people than any corruption which has taken place. Worthless people have been put in as petitioners, and the result has been that the candidates have had to make settlements with parties behind the scenes. Not being a lawyer, I cannot state what is the best way to remove this evil, but there is no doubt that the evil exists. I have had personal experience of these things, and I think it is the duty of the Minister of Justice and of this Parliament, if it be possible, to remove by some legislation the existing evils. I think this amendment will to a great extent effect that result. My own opinion is that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) is right when he says this should be made a criminal action, and that if a man has been found guilty of corruption in election matters he should be prosecuted at the expense of the public. There have been many cases where men have combined to make a protest simply out of speculation, and their object is not to go on with the trial, but to find out how much would be paid to have the petition withdrawn. Such cases ought to be provided against, if possible, and I hope this amendment will be adopted and tried, and if it does not prove effective, then I hope the legal gentlemen in this House will devise some other means that will protect both the candidate and the public from this abuse.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was very much impressed with the proposition made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). It is admitted on all sides that the present Act is faulty, and I think we cannot do better than to spend another day and look into this matter thoroughly, and have it perfected at this session of Parliament, for the reason that I believe there is something over a hundred protests pending at the present time. These cases will, no doubt, be tried, and the seats of many hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House may be declared vacant. They will have to run another election, and we will have the same difficulty to contend with after these elections are over. Other protests will be fyled on the same terms that present protests have been fyled, many of them vexatious. I know in my own case a protest was fyled simply because it was rumoured that a protest was going to be fyled against the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Grieve). I understand that on the Saturday preceding the last day allowed for fyling a petition Mr. Preston came down to Kingston and stated there that as the seats of the hon. members for North York and North Perth were going to be protested a protest must be fyled against the late Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald and myself. Mr. Preston

returned from Kingston, having had a protest prepared to be fyled against Sir John A. Macdonald. He sent a young lawyer down to Gananoque on Monday morning to have one prepared and fyled against myself. They could not get a party there to go to Toronto by special train on Monday to sign the petition. Telegrams passed to Toronto, and at last a man was secured in Toronto, who is an elector, to sign the petition, and afterwards he put in his own declaration, stating that he did not know what he had signed, and it was fought out on preliminary objections.

Mr. GERMAN. What about your doing the the same thing in the western part of Ontario?

Mr. TAYLOR. I say that members on both sides have a right to complain. Now, I have no objections to the proposition of the hon. member for Frontenac limiting the right of protest to the candidate, and if any person else than the defeated candidate may protest the right should be limited to at least five or six electors, men of standing, freeholders, and men responsible for the costs. I suggest that this Committee could not do better than to rise and report progress, and let a couple of leading lawyers on both sides come together and frame a clause that will cover the point suggested by the member for Frontenac, namely, that the defeated candidate, and no other person, unless five responsible electors combined, shall be allowed to petition, so that we may avoid the practice of parties putting in petitions merely for the sake of being able to pair them off with petitions on the other side, when there has been no corrupt act committed in the election. I think we should deal with it now, in view of the number of protests that are pending, and that will eventuate in many new elections.

Mr. MULOCK. The particular clause now under discussion provides that counsel fees shall be limited to $50, or if the trial lasts for more than one day, that the fees shall be not more than $40 for each succeeding day. In the Province of Ontario counsel fees have grown to an enormous amount. In an election trial a counsel is engaged on each side, and it would not be an unusual thing for the court to allow $100 to the first counsel and perhaps $50 to the second counsel. No matter which party succeeds, suppose the petitioner succeeds, he gets taxed against his opponent $150 for a day's work for the two counsel, and his opponent has to pay a similar amount to his own counsel. The counsel fees that then fall upon one of the suitors for one day amount to $300, or thereabouts. If the case lasts two or three days more the costs may swallow up a whole farm. If the petition lasts for a week $1,000 would not be anywhere near enough to pay counsel fees alone. I do not like to see farms run away in costs in this manner.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it is due to the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution to say that when I spoke a little while ago I quite misunderstood his resolution. I thought he was limiting the counsel fee to $50 entirely, but I see he is limiting it to $50 for the first day and $40 for every subsequent day. The resolution is aimed at a grievance that exists in the Province of Ontario which I know nothing about; therefore my remarks are not applicable to the resolution as I now understand it.

Mr. SPEAKER. When the hon. member for North York, the other day, gave notice that he intended to move this amendment, I thought his object was to limit the costs to the respondent.

Mr. MULOCK. The subsequent section in the Chairman's hands does provide for such limitation, but we are now on the question of counsel fees, which is a very large item of the disbursements.

Mr. SPEAKER. I see it is all included.

Mr. MULOCK. The printer has made a mistake.

Mr. SPEAKER. I want to say that I am afraid the amendment which the hon. gentleman is proposing will defeat its own object. I could understand a proposition that a larger amount of deposit should be made than $1,000, so that the costs, if they went against the petitioner, could be taken out of the deposit in the court. But I am quite sure that my hon. friends will agree with me that so far as the parties themselves are concerned, this amendment, if it is adopted, will not induce counsel on either side to take a less fee from the party employing them than they would if no such provision as this was made. Now, what would be the effect of it? To my mind, the effect will be that the petitioner will know that $300 at the utmost—only $50 for counsel fees for the first and $40 for each subsequent day—can be levied against him in the event of his fyling a petition and in failing in it. But if my hon. friend lived in the Province of Ontario he would know that he cannot secure the best talent in that province for any such amount. My opinion is, that instead of this proposition having a deterrent effect, it would rather encourage the fyling of petitions, because it limits the costs to the petitioner, in the event of his failing, that could be levied against him. I presume that everybody who is dealing with this question will admit that if a candidate is improperly elected his election ought to be set aside. The proposition here made has only reference to those petitions that are fyled simply for the purpose of harassing the elected member. So far as I can judge of the amendment, I confess that my view of it is that instead of its relieving the sitting member of the embarrassment and annoyance to which he is now subjected, it would have a contrary effect.

Mr. SEMPLE. I think the hon. member for North York deserves credit for bringing this motion forward. The costs charged by eminent counsel are enormous. They mete out justice but no mercy, and some eminent counsel have made fortunes out of the misfortunes of others. It will be a good thing in some respects that it should be laid down that these exorbitant fees be not allowed. To make litigation as cheap as possible is in the general interest. Much has been said in regard to the unfortunate position in which some candidates are placed on election trials. It was agreed to, almost unanimously, that the Bill regarding controverted elections, introduced by the Minister of Justice, was a good one, and there was scarcely a word of dissent from its provisions. In my opinion, there is no measure on the Statute-book more disgraceful than this Controverted Elections Act, because a candidate may wish to conduct the election as purely as possible, he may not wish to spend any money except for lawful purposes, and would rather be defeated than run the risk of being

elected by improper means, yet there are always people in the constituency who do not understand the law, and owing to their actions he may be unseated. I hope the same treatment will be extended to candidate, agents, and everyone else taking part in elections.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If the amendment of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) would have the effect of lessening counsel fees I would give it my hearty sympathy and support. It will not, however, prevent counsel charging any fees they can exact from either respondent or petitioner. The only effect it will have, so far as I can see, is that the unsuccessful party will be called on to pay so much less, and the successful party will have to pay out of his own pocket the difference between the counsel fees he can exact on taxation from the unsuccessful party and the fees he is called upon to pay. On reflection it appears to me that this will be no benefit to the sitting member, nor will it prevent the fyling of petitions. On the other hand, as Mr. Speaker has well said, I am rather inclined to think it will encourage the fyling of petitions. A petitioner is now required to deposit $1,000. He does not know but that every farthing will be exhausted, and more than exhausted, if he fails in his petition. But if, under this amendment, there is only exacted a counsel fee of $50 for the first day and $40 for the second day, he knows that all the costs taxable against him will not amount to $1,000. He therefore risks so much the less; he does not risk $1,000; and, unfortunately, the sucessful party, because in that case he is unfortunate, has to pay all the difference for his own counsel and solicitor's fees out of his own pocket. I am afraid that will not have the effect of preventing the fyling of petitions, and I am afraid it will not have the effect of protecting the sitting member. The only way, in my judgment, to prevent the fyling of vexations petitions without justification, or petitions on pure speculation —and we know there are many of them fyled—is to compel the petitioner to give security for a larger amount than he is compelled to deposit now, and allow the costs to stand as at present. The man in the wrong will then have to "pay the piper," and the man in the right, the sitting member, will not have to put his hand in his pocket and purse. Make the petitioner give security for $2,000, two good sureties in the sum of $2,000, that the costs will be forthcoming when required, and I believe that will have more effect in stopping the fyling of petitions than any law Parliament can pass limiting the amount of costs. I admit that the costs are excessive and that counsel fees are very large. Who can help it? If you want to secure the services of eminent counsel you have to pay what they charge. If not, they simply say: Employ some other counsel. I know that in a case in the Supreme Court, with which I had a little connection, the counsel fees—there were two counsel—amounted to $800, and the case only occupied one day. The successful party could not tax that fee, and had to pay it out of his own pocket. That fee was paid because the successful party thought fit to employ one or two counsel who might look upon themselves, perhaps, as at the head of that branch of the profession in Ontario, instead of employing other counsel, who would probably have handled the case as well and as successfully. If a man will select his own counsel, he must pay for doing so. This amendment will not, I repeat, deter people from fyling petitions. The only way to do so is by compelling them to give security. What have we now? I do not speak of one party more than another when I say that whenever an election is over the election agents from Toronto, travelling over the whole of Ontario, beg that a petition be fyled against the sitting member, whoever he may be. I know that in my county the Conservative Association passed a solemn resolution that there should be no petition, and as a matter of fact the agent of the Conservative party was in the riding at the time and said that was all right, unless he got orders from headquarters to the contrary. The matter was left over to the last hour of the last day, and then a petition was fyled. If the petitioner had to give security, securities who are well known and respectable men, petitions of that kind would not be fyled. I do not make this observation as being applicable to one side more than another, but it is the fact. I do not object to a petition being fyled when there are reasonable and just grounds for so doing, but I object to speculative petitions being encouraged, and I am afraid we will encourage the fyling of speculative petitions by limiting the counsel fees to $100 or $200. which will result in the successful party having to pay the balance out of his own pocket.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I agree with much that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) has said, but I differ from his conclusion. It is true this Bill will not prevent counsel earning the fees which they are entitled to demand, and if it did I would be very much inclined to oppose it. It is likewise true that it will not deter the fyling of petitions, nor should we adopt any section which would do so. When we look at the mischief complained of, these two sections together, which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) proposes, are found to give a practical remedy for a practical evil. The practical evil is said to be this: In legislating about ordinary litigation he may regard the parties as evenly balanced, but this is a class of litigation in which the petitioner is very likely to succeed. The law is of such great stringency that the success of the petitioner does not depend on the criminality of the sitting member, but on thousands of irregularities and accidents almost out of the power of human vigilance to control. Under these circumstances, the danger is, that this kind of litigation may be seized on for the purpose of making costs, and for the purpose of making vexatious costs. If that be the fact, and I think it is well established to be the fact, the practical remedy is, to make it profitless to cultivate that kind of litigation as regards professional men who seek to make profit out of it. There may be also a complaint of this kind, that when a petition is well advanced, and when it is found likely to succeed, especially when there are charges of personal corruption against the sitting member, professional men engaged in the case summon a great number of witnesses, far exceeding those which are sufficient to prove the case on which the petitioner eventually rests his case, and summons witnesses in many cases on mere suspicion as to what they can prove. In that case he swells his own fees for subpœnas and everything of that kind. This will

have the effect of meeting that grievance, and for that reason I think it would be well to adopt it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I must say that I have heard nothing in the discussion here which would induce me to oppose the amendment of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). I fully believe that it is a step in the right direction. I am fully sensible of the difficulties in the way, and I fully realize that it may not be a complete cure for the evils which we now suffer, on account of the excessive counsel fees allowed. Members of the bar outside of the City of Toronto, in this Province, have very little chance and are very seldom called upon—perhaps on account of their inferior ability, or on account of the big counsel from Toronto, who seem to absorb very much of this business. I think that is owing to a large extent to the fact that very large counsel fees are allowed. I am not insensible to the argument made by Mr. Speaker, but I think he omits to consider this: that whilst it is true that the petitioner may have to pay out of his own pocket costs which he cannot have taxed against the respondents, at the same time he can use this argument to his counsel: you should not charge me such excessive fees, because in the event of my being defeated I cannot tax this large fee you are charging me.

Mr. SPEAKER. Would that have any effect?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think it would. As it is now, the counsel would say to him: It matters not to you what fee I charge. I can get very large counsel fees, and it will come out of the pocket of the other party. It is equally bad if it comes out of the pocket of the other party in the case, because the other party may have, and probably has, proceeded in perfect good faith. Looking at the whole case, and viewing the evils which we now have to face, I shall support the amendment of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) with great pleasure.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think, so long as the lay members of the House understand the effect of it, that those of the profession to which I have the honour to belong ought perhaps not to press their views very strongly on the Committee. It is quite true what the member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) says, that this is not going to cut down counsel fees one iota. To-day there is not the slightest trouble in getting counsel—I will not make any personal allusions—who are quite willing to accept a much smaller fee than those counsel to which my hon. friend refers, and the counsel fee is only such as is paid in ordinary cases, and not always that, by any means. But the people prefer other counsel, and there is no law that can be passed anywhere that will prevent a man paying to the counsel what the counsel chooses to ask and what the man chooses to pay——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. We do not want to do that.

Mr. McCARTHY. If you do not want to do that, realize that a successful member who is in the right, and who has been successful in his petition, notwithstanding that he has succeeded, has got to put his hand in his own pocket and pay a large sum of money. If that is understood by the Committee, then they will vote intelligently upon the question that I submitted; but what appears to be opinion of the lay mind is, that if we pass this amendment, saying counsel fees should only be $50 the first day and $40 the next day, counsel fees will be reduced accordingly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It will help.

Mr. McCARTHY. Nothing of the kind. I agree with what the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) has said; but why not in election cases, as cases where security for costs is required, if the man is out of the jurisdiction, give the power to the judge to say that the deposit shall be increased if the litigation requires it?

Mr. MULOCK. That is not the point.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is connected with it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Why not do that in the first instance?

Mr. McCARTHY. Because, in an ordinary case $1,000 ought to be sufficient; but if, as the case proceeds it would seem to involve a greater amount than that, then there ought to be power to apply to the court for a stay of proceedings, or that the judge should have power to say that a further amount should be deposited. That is only applying the ordinary practice to the practice in election cases.

Mr. MULOCK. This amendment for $1,000 will be enough.

Mr. McCARTHY. It will be enough, but the sitting member will have to put his hands in his pocket and pay more.

Mr. DICKEY. That is the case, anyway.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not able to answer my hon. friend, because my connection with election cases has been as counsel, and I have had nothing to do with the settling up.

Mr. MULOCK. We all know that the larger the estate in issue the longer the case, and we know that the suit terminates as soon as the estate gives out.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I think we are perhaps a little wide of the mark. This seems to be a discussion as to what has to be paid and what must be paid in the Province of Ontario; but I would remind the Committee that Ontario is not the whole of this Dominion. I say that the question whether or not you cannot get a first-class man less than so much ought not to weigh in this discussion. I contend that the sum mentioned in the amendment is a fair remuneration, and what is ordinarily got, for example, in the Province of Nova Scotia. More than that, it is what is ordinarily got here in the Supreme Court. I know that I had a case in the Exchequer Court, and had to go to Sydney, away from home, for a fortnight, and to Halifax, to conduct the argument before the court there, and the whole costs as taxed, exclusive of witness fees and disbursements, did not amount to $300. That is the case as between private parties, and why should there be given in an election petition the power to tax a very much larger sum? Why are election petitions fyled? Is it for the maintenance of solicitors? No; it is in the interest of the public, and when you lay down a rule that beyond a certain amount these will not be collected, the effect will be that you will not have to pay very many of these dearer counsel, because there will not be so many petitions fyled. We seem to be arguing that the better counsel—and I hope no man will misunderstand me when I say that the

better counsel always will get employment and larger fees—but we are arguing as if there are going to be as many petitions if you curtail the costs as there would be otherwise. I maintain there will not be. I maintain that in many cases there is such a thing as election petitions being filed in which more than the electors are interested; in which, unfortunately, solicitors are more interested sometimes than the electors, and we must meet that case just as well. It has always been a question with me as to whether or not we should not adopt, in part at least, the rule that prevails over the border. There are not very many things that we can learn from them, but there is one thing that we might learn, that is, that all the costs in a case piled up will not go against the unsuccessful party—that if a man goes to law he must understand that there are certain expenses which he will have to bear himself. I do not say that that is the better method; but there should be a mingling of the two, so that any person who chooses to go to law will not get everything from the other side. We must remember also that many parties have been brought into court on election petitions who are not able to pay the bill of costs, and very often they are not the worst men. While we should do all we can by legislation to provide that elections shall be conducted in the purest possible way, we should make such provision that even if an election is set aside the candidate will not be required to pay everything. I claim that $50 a day is enough. It may not be for Ontario, but Ontario should not decide everything for us. There are counsel in Ontario who not only get these large fees, but are entitled to them; but such fees are not paid in the smaller provinces. If you make it impossible to charge more than just fees you will find that there will be fewer election petitions, and better results will follow. For that reason, I am in favour of the amendment.

Mr. CASEY. I am fully in favour of the amendment. I quite see, as the hon. member for North Simcoe says, that no amendment can prevent any client agreeing with his counsel to pay him as much as he chooses; but if it were known beforehand that the client must himself pay all above $300 out of his own pocket, that provision would have this effect, that a man who knows that his case is sound will not go to any unnecessary expense; so that the most costly experts will not be engaged, except by the man who has a poor case. In this sense I think the amendment will undoubtedly reduce the cost of election trials, although it cannot interfere with any agreement between the counsel and his client.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I wish to know if this amendment applies to existing election petitions, because, if it does, it may be unfortunate for those persons who have worked them up.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MULOCK moved the following amendment:—

Except as to such witness fees and other actual disbursements in respect of evidence taxable in ordinary actions between party and party, as may be valued by the judgment or order of the court apportioning costs, no greater sum, including counsel fee, than $300 shall be taxed or taxable against either party as costs in the cause.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 8, sub-section 2,

Mr. LAURIER. This provides that if the judges differ the election is maintained and their judgment is final, or rather the absence of judgment is final. I drew the attention of the Committee to this point the other day. It seems to me that no reason can be advanced why, if an appeal is allowed where there is a judgment, you should not allow one where there is not a judgment. If an appeal is granted when the judges agree, still more, by parity of reasoning, there should be a further hearing of the case when the judges do not agree. Therefore, I propose this amendment to section 50 of the Act:

In all matters whatever to be heard and determined by two judges, if after the case has been argued such judges state that they are unable to agree upon such a decision, it shall be open to any party who thereby feels aggrieved to have the case heard and decided by the Supreme Court of Canada, and for the purpose hereof all the rules applying to and governing appeals shall also apply.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am afraid that the amendment will be hardly workable. If the two judges disagree there is no result of the trial, and one of two events, it seems to me, must follow, either that the petition shall drop, or else it shall go to trial again, as if a jury had disagreed and another jury had to be summoned. I do not think the procedure of appeal would be applicable or useful. The judges of appeal would not be exercising the functions of judges of appeal; they would be endeavouring to try the case, and to try it without hearing the witnesses, which is a very serious drawback indeed. It may be that the judges differ in their views of the weight of the testimony given, as derived from their observation of the demeanour of the witnesses, or from local knowledge of their character. Judges in appeal have not an opportunity to form an opinion on these things, and they are continually insisting that they should not be treated as judges trying cases. The more philosophical provision would be that in the event of the judges disagreeing the case should go to trial again before two other judges, and it is for Parliament to consider whether that course ought to be pursued in *quasi* penal actions like these, or whether the practice which prevails elsewhere of allowing the defendant the benefit of the doubt indicated by this agreement ought not to be established here. What I propose is just the course followed by the English Parliament. If the judges differ, there is no conclusion and the petition drops. If we adopt any other course we should have to provide for a new trial and not a mere appeal.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree in the substance of the amendment, because I think it is manifestly out of keeping that an appeal should be allowed when two judges decide in one's favour, and that an appeal should not be allowed and the cause be successful when they differ. That is an inconsistency we should prevent if possible. The Minister of Justice pointed out with a great deal of force that the court of appeal have not the same opportunity of judging the evidence of witnesses as the judges who saw and heard them giving their evidence. That is a difficulty no doubt, and one which cannot be avoided in the case of a disagreement. In practice, however, I do not think there has been any very evil results, because there is a clause in the Ontario Controverted Elections Act which permits an appeal in case of disagreement.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On questions of law?

Mr. McCARTHY. On questions of law and fact. It would be well if the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment would copy this clause, because it has been carefully considered and seems to me to cover the point.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. CASEY. Whatever clause may be adopted in arranging the matter, there can be no two opinions as to the advisability of giving the right to appeal in case of a disagreement. If there is to be an appeal from the decision of two judges clearing a man, there should also be an appeal in the case of a disagreement. The diversity of human nature is such that the chances probably are rather against than for the agreement of two judges, and the law would simply stop all proceedings in cases where the natural tendency of human nature evinced itself. The practical results would be that the greater number of petitions before the court would fall to the ground through disagreement of the judges. That certainly should not be the intention of the House in passing an Act to try controverted elections. As to the question of how the appeal should be taken, whatever may be the present practice in the courts we are quite capable of devising a certain practice which will be applicable in these cases. That is only a question of detail. I hope the Minister of Justice will drop opposition to the principle of the amendment and aid in devising a means to carry it out.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It seems on its face very reasonable that you should have an appeal where the judges differ, but when you come to examine the matter closely you are not very sure whether the Bill is not better without the amendment. In the first place, a man who is tried on an election petition is not tried for any offence he commits himself, in nine cases out of ten, but for an offence alleged to have been committed by another party who, by rigid construction of law, is held to be an agent. If there are sufficient doubts to justify two judges in differing, if one judge says he does not think the agency is proved or that the act constitutes a breach of the law, I think the matter should rest there and the member be allowed to hold his seat. If both judges agree, give an appeal; but if there is so much doubt that the one says he does not think there is sufficient evidence to convict and the other says there is, a case is not made out and the petition should be dropped. You ought to have the union of two minds before giving the right to appeal.

Mr. McCARTHY. If they both agree that the petition should be dismissed?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In case of unanimous decision there should be the right to appeal.

Mr. CASEY. Suppose the two agree to clear him, why should there be an appeal?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You cannot bring this thing down so fine that everything will be exactly logical. Where one of the judges says the evidence is not sufficient, you have not made out a *primâ facie* case.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman's arguments have a great deal of force, but they are in the direction of having no appeal at all. If they have any weight at all, it is in favour of having no appeal. He says that, if one judge is induced to refrain from signing a decision against the respondent there should be no appeal, and how much more should an appeal lie if the two judges decide that there is no case against the respondent? I am willing to vote that there should be no appeal from the decision of the two judges, but as long as one judge thinks the man is guilty and the other judge does not, then there is a ground for an appeal. If the judges agree to dismiss the case there is no ground for going further, but if one judge thinks the person is guilty there is ground for going further. But the law as proposed by the Minister of Justice would permit an appeal where both judges agreed to dismiss it, but no appeal where one judge thought the respondent was guilty, though the other judge took another view.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I regret to hear that the Minister of Justice does not desire to support the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. At present the Court of Review have to decide the case on a legal point, but if it is a question of fact they have not the advantage of hearing the witnesses and observing their demeanour, which is a very important fact in forming an opinion as to their credibility. The appeal here is allowed when the judges are unanimous, but there is no appeal when the judges did not agree. The six months which are allowed may have expired before the time comes for an appeal, and the respondent will still hold his seat, however unjustly, unless there is an appeal allowed to the Court of Review. I regret that there is to be no appeal. We know that even judges make mistakes. Some of the most eminent judges in the Province of Ontario have decided against the respondent, and their decision has been reversed on appeal. Every fair argument points to an appeal where the judges do not agree; the reasons for it are stronger than where the judges do agree.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I prefer the English rule to the Ontario rule, and I think the argument in favour of an appeal where the judges do not agree as compared with an appeal where the judges do agree is most fallacious.

Mr. CASEY. The English rule is no appeal at all.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When two judges decide questions of fact the court above, as a rule, will not disturb that decision, unless they have decided on a wrong principle.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to hear the Minister say that he prefers the English rule that there should be no appeal on questions of fact in any case. I would like to see a provision that there should be no appeal where the respondent was cleared by the action of the lower court, but that there should be an appeal, at all events on points of law, where the respondent is made liable to penalties by the action of the lower court. I think the country generally would be content to have no appeal in any case; but, if we are to continue this rule of an appeal from two judges, we must, as a matter of justice, as well as of logic, provide for a second hearing of the case, whether you call it an appeal or a re-trial in case of disagreement. The lawyers in the House seem not to look upon it as a proper subject for appeal, but whatever you may call it, you should have a new trial of the matter if necessary, and it

is the right of the public to have a final decision given on the points by the superior tribunal.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think you will find that there is no difficulty in this matter. We have found none in Ontario in allowing appeals of this kind. The only appeals I can think of were on very important questions of law. One appeal was in reference to one of the Northumberlands, where the Chancellor took one view and the late Chief Justice Cameron took another view, as to whether there was any breach of the law in accepting passes on a railway. Both judges might agree as to the credibility of witnesses, but they might differ on the legal construction, and generally the difference between the judges has been on questions of law and not on questions of fact. Consequently, to avoid a second trial, the Supreme Court ought to be allowed to decide on the question of law. As to the question of fact, there is no difficulty. If there is a witness that one judge has chosen to believe and the other judge has chosen to disbelieve, the result is that the Supreme Court will not believe that witness, and the case would be tried on other grounds. We are now allowing appeals on questions of fact from two judges. Two judges have said upon questions of fact: We have arrived at certain conclusions. The Supreme Court will not differ from their finding as to the credibility of the witness, but they will, and frequently do, draw different conclusions from the admitted facts. Now, that is what happens when two judges decide. Supposing the judges differ on a question of fact. The Supreme Court would be exactly in the same position; they will not accept the evidence of a man that one judge has discredited, but because one judge has discredited him that would be sufficient, I think, for the appellate court to say: We must take the views of that judge. That being so, the conclusion the judges have arrived at from the facts on which they agree may be, and possible will be, the cause of the differences. Why, therefore, should there not be an appeal? Don't call it an appeal; if you like, call it anything you please; but why, in that case, should there not be an opportunity of finishing the litigation in a legitimate manner, instead of terminating it in a futile way of having the court disagree and nothing being done? The effect is, that if two judges agree the petition is dismissed; if the judges differ the petition is dismissed; there is a finality; but according to this section, if the judges agree there is an appeal; if the judges differ, it rests there, unless the judges find a way of giving relief to the parties. As I understand the section, the case is neither dismissed nor is it allowed; it remains there. I think we ought to allow an appeal, taking such provisions as may be necessary that the Court of Appeal should not accept the testimony of any witness whom one of the judges has discredited.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman advocate an appeal in every case where the judges differ on fact as well as law?

Mr. McCARTHY. Now that we have settled that there is to be an appeal in every case, I think we ought to allow an appeal *a fortiori* in a case where the judges differ, if we are going to allow an appeal where judges agree.

Mr. LAURIER. If the sense of the Committee is to accept this amendment, I would beg to move the Ontario amendment, which is copied *verbatim* from the Ontario statute.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Do you wish to divide?

Mr. LAURIER. Not unless you do.

Committee divided on the amendment of Mr. Laurier: Yeas, 32; nays, 33.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I would draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to a point which occurred in Toronto the other day. I am told that a judge of the Court of Appeal has decided that where the respondent to a petition dies there is no mode by which the petitioner can get the deposit out of court. If that is so, the hon. gentleman ought to provide for it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will have something prepared to meet that difficulty.

Mr. CASEY. I move that the following subsection be added to section 15, as amended by section 6:—

The Government shall name and appoint an officer whose duty it shall be to prosecute all persons found guilty of corrupt practices during the trial of election petitions, except such as have received certificates from the judges for the enforcement of the penalties to which they are liable under this Act.

As a matter of fact, although the agents of candidates are placed under penalties for corrupt practices charged during elections, they are practically never prosecuted, and consequently they escape punishment as a rule. The party which succeeds at a trial is satisfied, and does not care to raise animosity by instituting prosecutions. The party which has been beaten is friendly to the man who has committed the corrupt act. Unless it is made the duty of some particular person to enforce the law, it will not be, and has not been enforced. I use the words "name and appoint" so that the Government might name some existing officers, such as the county attorney or some officer in the Department of Justice, or might appoint a new officer for the purpose of conducting these prosecutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman will examine the clause relating to this subject he will find that power is given to the Governor in Council to prosecute in all cases of corrupt practice. I have acted on this power several times.

Mr. CASEY. It is left optional.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; it is not optional.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As this question which has been raised may involve questions of very considerable importance, it is desirable it should be discussed after recess.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CASEY. After further inspecting the law as it now stands, I find what seems to be sufficient provision for carrying out what I intended to effect by my amendment, and I will, therefore, withdraw it.

Amendment withdrawn.

Committee rose and reported progress.

FRAUDS ON THE GOVERNMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 172) respecting frauds on the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the Minister state what he hopes to accomplish by this Bill that he cannot accomplish with the law as it now stands?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Bill proposes to go further than the existing statute, principally in this particular: The present statute makes it an offence for a public officer to receive a gift for the purpose of inducing him to neglect any duty which he owes to the Government, or for the commission of any fraud on the Government. The statute, likewise, makes it an offence for any person to give, or offer a gift or gratuity for that purpose. The object of the present Bill is to make it an offence, likewise, for a public officer, under any circumstances, to receive a gift from a person dealing with the Government. Circumstances have occurred in which it would be impossible to prove that in the discharge of his duty the officer in any way was influenced by the gratuity. It has been so alleged, and in all probability would have been proved in the trial of any such case, that the duty had been faithfully discharged for the Government, that the contractor or person who offered the gift had not obtained an enhanced price in view of such consideration, and the Government had sustained no injury. Nevertheless, it is most desirable that such an evil should be stopped at its source, and that it should not be necessary, in order to make such an offence punishable, that we should have to prove injury and actual fraud committed, or even fraudulent intent. It is necessary that officers of the Government should be free from suspicion in regard to any such matters, and therefore the reception of gifts under such circumstances by such officers is made an offence by this Bill. This is the main distinction between this and the existing statute. If the House is prepared for it we can go on in Committee; if not, we can simply take the second reading and go into Committee on Monday.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. gentleman had better let the Committee stage stand until Monday, when we will have an opportunity of comparing the Bill with the existing statute.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will say Monday next.

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY TO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 111) to authorize the transfer of certain public property to the Provincial Governments.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When this Bill was read the second time I expressed my views upon it, and I expressed my regret that the Bill extended to the foreshores of the provinces when in the open sea or in the bays. It did seem to me, and I have not seen any reason to change my opinions, that these territorial foreshores are at present vested in the Local Government, and I do not see any reason for taking power to transfer them, as this Act does, under certain conditions and limitations set out in the schedule. It seemed to me that the rights in these foreshores are vested in the Local Governments, without any limitations except the limitations attached to all provincial lands. The Bill to that extent, I think, goes too far and deals with a subject, we have no power to deal with. Having made my protest in the matter, I do not propose to take up any further time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may say that the question remains undecided as to the ownership of the coasts and open foreshores. The Bill, when it comes into operation by any transfer being made under it, will, in point of fact, be a treaty between the two Governments—the Government making the grant and the Government receiving it. The Government making the grant will certainly have property to transfer, because the Bill proposes to include property which is decided to be ours, and as regards that which may be in doubt, and to which the hon. gentleman particularly refers—the sea coasts—not only is the question of title undecided, but the boundary is always open to doubt and uncertainty, in view of the decision that the harbours belong to us. In that view, in dealing with the Provincial Government, we are in the position of a neighbour whose boundary line is in dispute, and we settle once for all, by conveyance to one of the parties, all questions of boundaries, and we receive from the other party concessions which are of advantage to us, as regards any different interest we may have in relation to the property.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I may just say, in passing, that I have always entertained the opinion, although the Supreme Court decided differently, that the foreshores in the harbours belonged to the Local Governments, and although we are bound to to accept the decision of the court, it did seem to me that the intention of the British North America Act would have been better carried out if we had passed a statute expressly declaring that the foreshores in the harbours did belong to the Provincial Governments. That would set the matter at rest. The decision of the Supreme Court went counter to the opinion entertained by the majority of the provinces and by the majority of lawyers in the provinces, and was contrary to the spirit of the British North America Act, although they held it to be within the letter. I foresee that great difficulty may arise out of this statute, because the Provincial Governments, instead of taking this property and holding it as ordinary public land, will hold it on the terms set out in the schedule.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know whether the Minister of Justice or the Committee have considered sufficiently the result as to rivers and harbours that may follow from this transfer of property. If the property belongs to the Dominion, as has been so far decided, whether rightly or wrongly, of course the provinces cannot dispose of it in any way. By this Act it is intended now to confer upon the provinces the property, leaving with this Parliament the legislative control and jurisdiction over harbours, which, of course, we are not at liberty to delegate or part with. Has the Minister of Justice considered what the effect may be on a harbour of the sale and disposition of a

portion of it by a Provincial Parliament? For instance, now, in the city of Toronto, by an arrangement, which I am not saying is at all objectionable, the harbour is interfered with by the land being extended out 200 or 300 feet beyond what is called the old windmill line. In that particular harbour that does not work any mischief, but if you part with the control of the soil there will be nothing to prevent a Provincial Government from disposing, for valuable consideration or otherwise, of such property, and constructions may be put upon it which will interfere with the harbours.

Mr. SPEAKER. It seems to me there is a very strong objection to the transfer proposed in this Bill. There are in many places wharves and other accommodations to navigation, and the soil upon which they are erected has not been acquired by patent or otherwise by municipal or private corporations who may have put up those constructions; and if this Bill passes, unless there are some very strict reservations in it, the Provincial Governments to whom the lands are conveyed may sell them to private individuals, who may then require the removal of those constructions which are necessary and useful adjuncts to the navigation of navigable rivers and streams over which this Parliament has control. The hon. Minister ought to consider very carefully the question of reserving any rights of that kind, some of which may have been acquired, not by statute, but by the consent of the Government, which was presumed heretofore to have control of these structures.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The matter has been fully considered, and if the view I take is right, there can be no inconvenience resulting from this measure. We are dealing, as the hon. member for North Simcoe said, merely with our right of property, and transferring that alone. Our right of property in these harbours, taking the case of harbours alone, is the ownership of the bed of the harbour and its foreshores. While that property remains in use we can sell it or transfer it by lease or otherwise; but we cannot, by virtue of our mere ownership, authorize the erection of any structure, we cannot authorize any harbour to be filled in in the manner in which Toronto harbour is being filled in, or authorize a private citizen to erect a wharf, no matter how small, upon it. The ownership is subject to all the rights of the public as regards navigation, and, therefore, anything that disturbs navigation, as, for instance, the filling in of the foreshore in front of Toronto city, or the erection of a wharf, may be an interference with navigation, and cannot be authorized by us by the mere transfer of the property. If I, as a private individual, were to receive a patent from the Crown of a portion of the foreshore of Toronto harbour, that would not of itself give me the right to drive a post in it, or fill it in, or do any act which would in the least degree interfere with the navigation of any person who likes to use the water which flows upon it. All that species of property, all that kind of right, is controlled by the legislation of this Parliament which enables the Minister of Public Works to sanction the erection of bridges and wharves and such works as are going on in Toronto harbour; but without that sanction, that control cannot be exercised by a patentee of the Crown. It is true that in all the harbours wharves are erected. They are erected, generally speaking, by persons who have received patents from the Crown, but their patents did not authorize the erection of those structures. They exist by the permission of the public, and by virtue only of their being a convenience to navigation, and not an obstruction, except where there has been an arbitrary enactment of this Parliament, which gives the Minister of Public Works power to erect these structures. Independently of that permission, the right to build a structure does not follow from the right of ownership in the soil of a harbour. That must depend on its being susceptible of proof that the structure is not a nuisance but a public convenience. Therefore, the Provincial Governments will take the transfer we propose to make in this Bill with the same limitations. They will have the same property as we had. They will have the same rights to give patents to private individuals that we had; but under this Act Provincial Governments will not have, any more than ourselves, the right to fill in or obstruct or build wharves on these properties. All that will remain under our control as affecting navigation, and as regulated by our statutes.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the statement of the Minister of Justice is correct, and I have no doubt it is, this result will follow: Suppose that land conveyed to a province is then transferred by the province to a private individual, that individual cannot, according to the statement of the Minister of Justice, make any erection upon land covered by water without getting the consent of the Department of Public Works or the Governor in Council. But suppose that the person owning the land chooses to prevent any person else from erecting a structure on it which may be necessary, and supposing he wishes to prevent a municipal corporation from putting up a structure necessary for the purposes of navigation, I take it the Minister of Public Works would have no power under this Bill to compel him to do so, for I do not think it provides for expropriation, if private individuals to whom the land may belong, or a Provincial Government, may choose to prevent the erection of structures that may be considered a great public convenience, and this Government will be powerless.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With regard to the class of cases mentioned by Mr. Speaker, and to which I forgot to refer, of persons having built structures for public convenience without having received a patent from the Crown, those cases can easily be protected. We may think it well to protect them by some further provision of the Bill before leaving Committee, or by a further condition attached to the transfer, because we have taken power in the first section to attach any condition we please to any transfer, or it may be those matters will be dealt with fairly enough by the Provincial Governments. I admit that the rights are not reserved of persons who have built structures already without having received a title from the Crown or permission from the Minister of Public Works, and it will remain to be considered, before we close the Bill, whether it may or may not be well to protect them. As regards the other class of cases, Mr. Speaker assumes this state of facts: that I should be the owner of property upon the bank of a river, lake, or harbour, and that a Provincial Government will patent to some other individual the

water bed, and thereby prevent me putting up a structure which might be a public convenience and would be a convenience to me particularly. I do not think I can conceive a Provincial Government permitting an injury like that. Provincial Governments have dealt with the foreshores all along under the assumption that they owned them—at any rate, until the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Holman and Green. They had dealt with other portions of the foreshore since, and I think the occasions are very rare indeed in which grievances have arisen. If a Provincial Government has granted to another the water in front of any lands owned by private individuals, it would require that state of facts before the inconvenience Mr. Speaker refers to would arise, and I see no reason to apprehend that a Provincial Government would deal less fairly with the disposition of the land than we would ourselves. I think they have not done so in the past. I have had some knowledge of the administration of matters of this kind in one of the provinces, and I know that the cardinal principle which has guided the administration of the foreshores was that the water in front of private property was never to be granted, except to the owner of the property. It was offered to him or was retained by the Crown.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope that may be the result; but I have in my mind a case which occurred in my own town. The eastern boundary of the town runs in a north-westerly direction to the Ottawa River, whilst the western boundary runs north-easterly. There was a farm on the western boundary of the town, and the Ontario Government have, without consulting the town authorities, granted to the owner of that land the land covered by water in front of his farm overlapping the front of the town. If that can be done in regard to land in the west of the town, it might equally be done in regard to land in the east of the town, so that the private owners might own the soil in front of the town, and if the wharves were required to be extended the owners of private property might have it in their power to prevent the extension.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the legislation proposed by the Minister of Justice is founded upon the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Holman *vs.* Green, and it has been assumed that the foreshore is the property of the provinces, and does not differ from other public property under their control. Upon that decision this legislation is proposed, in order to bring about the state of things which it is supposed existed before the decision was given. I do not suppose that that decision goes as far as this Bill. I understand that it refers only to property in harbours in the sense described in the British North America Act, which is a small bay or basin on which an amount of money has been expended, so as to make it a property having a certain value. The harbours of this description are included in one of the schedules of the British North America Act, and it is provided that these shall be the property of the Dominion. Whatever may be the nature of the property in the harbour, it seems to me, if there were any such comprehensive rule of property as is assumed to exist by this Bill, there was no necessity to declare that these harbours were the property of the Dominion, because the transfer of these properties to the province would certainly imply that all property of that description belonged to the Dominion until it was transferred to the province. I do not think that question is interfered with by the decision in the case of Holman *vs.* Green. In the decisions of the English courts it is recognized that the King had no power to grant property in harbours or the right of fishing by letters patent, or vesting that right in particular persons. It was declared that, though the property was vested in the Crown, the right of transfer did not exist, and could only be exercised by the supreme authority, that is, by Parliament itself. It seems to me we go a long way by this Bill in transferring property, which it may be argued does not belong to us, but it may be stated that it belongs to a province. I do not think the case of Holman and Green is a justification for such legislation as this. It may be said that we cannot convey more interest than we possess, and if the right to the foreshore is already in the province our claim to exercise a right of transfer to the province may not do any mischief; but we may attach conditions to the transfer which might be an interference or a limitation of the provincial right, if they accepted or acquiesced in our action. Then it would be difficult to go behind the Act and into the motives of the transfer. Any province which refused to accept this transfer and contested it would, under this Bill, have a different position.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The argument of the hon. gentleman amounts to this: that the Federal Government, under the word "harbours," has only jurisdiction over harbours which have been made by public expenditure, but that is not the view which has been taken by the Supreme Court of Canada. The decision in the case of Holman and Green related to a portion of the harbour of Summerside, which is a natural harbour, and that was followed by a decision in regard to the harbour of Halifax, which is also a natural harbour, upon which no expenditure has been made nor improvements constructed. Now, that being the case, the hon. gentleman will see that the decisions have gone far beyond his interpretation of the British North America Act. I do not say that they are correct; it would be presumptious in me to say that they are open to the suspicion of being incorrect. But I am availing myself of this decision to obtain a settlement of all questions, and I admit that I am acting on the strongest assumption as to what our rights of property are. I admit I am assuming that the foreshores and beds of all the natural harbours belong to us, and the sea coasts and lake shores as well. I find, on the other hand, that the Provincial Governments are anxious to get a settlement of these questions without litigation. It may be that if we resort to litigation to settle them one party or the other may lose rights which it is important they should retain, and which it is not important the other party should acquire. For example, the decision in Holman and Green was practically of no benefit to us. It charges us with the administration of the foreshores and beds of all the public harbours, and that administration is of no profit whatever to the Dominion Government, and can perhaps be better carried on by the staff of officers which are available for the Provincial Governments. Acting on the strongest assumption that I can entertain as regards our right of property, I put for-

ward a scheme for a settlement with the provincial authorities, and I say to them: "Will you settle this question now on terms which will adjust the rights of both parties completely, and which will give both parties what it is desirable, in the interest of the public, they should have?" If any one province does not acquiesce in that view, and prefers to settle by litigation—reaching, as it must, the Privy Council eventually—what its actual legal rights are, we shall both stand on our rights to get them adjusted; but my belief is that nearly all the provinces are willing to avail themselves of this scheme of settlement, and that the result will be beneficial to both Governments.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The decision in Holman and Green was as large and comprehensive as the Minister of Justice states. I argued that case myself, and I contended for the legal construction of the words "public harbour," under the British North America Act, that the hon. member for Bothwell advocates. I contended that the public harbours were artificial harbours that had been constructed at the expense of the Provincial Government. That was the conclusion to be drawn from the collocation of the words where "public harbours" appeared. But the court did not hold that. They held that it extended to all harbours, natural as well as artificial. Therefore, so far as the Bill extends and embraces public harbours, I would have no criticism to offer, because I think the House would be justified in assuming that the decision of the Supreme Court is the law of the land. But the point of exception I take is this: That the decision in the Supreme Court should not be extended further than that. The sea coast and arms of the sea are not and cannot be, in my opinion, by any intendment, brought within the words of the British North America Act. Public harbours mean just what the phrase expresses, and nothing more. The shores of the sea and the shores of bays and harbours were not conveyed, and were not intended to be conveyed by the British North America Act, from the Local Governments to the Dominion Government. Passing from that point, I will take very strong exception to the introduction in this Bill of any more exceptions, such as Mr. Speaker suggests. I entirely object to any attempt being made by this Parliament to adjust complex questions which may arise between the different riparian owners. These questions must be adjusted in each case as they come up by law; we cannot do it here. He talks about lines converging in such a way in front of some town or village that the riparian owners in the town itself are cut off. It is impossible for anybody to give an opinion without knowing the exact facts. But it was long ago decided in the celebrated case of the Fishmongers, that went up to the House of Lords, that the rights of the riparian owner, whether on the sea shore or river, cannot be taken from the owner by anybody else; that is, that subject to the right of navigation, which is paramount the right of all riparian owners, to free access to and from the shore of the sea or river, is indisputable, and there must be no attempt made on the part of this Parliament to interfere with that right. Mr. Speaker suggests that possibly if we transfer this right, that we claim to be vested in Canada, to the Provincial Governments, the transfer might have the effect of depriving some riparian owner of his rights. I cannot see that it would do anything of the kind. In the province from which I come I never knew a grant of the foreshore given to anybody except the riparian owner; in fact, it would not be legal in our province, because the local statute expressly declares that if the Crown grants the foreshore it can only be given to the riparian owner or to somebody to whom the riparian owner has given a written consent that he may become the grantee. But we must be very careful in dealing with this very important and complicated subject of riparian ownership, and we must avoid using any language which would in any way prejudice the right of the province or of the individual owners. Let them decide that for themselves. We are engaged here, not merely in transferring from the Dominion to the province rights which we claim to possess, but rights which I for one claim we do not possess, and in doing so we should see that there are no improper conditions annexed to the transfers. But to the introduction in the Bill of anything such as Mr. Speaker suggests I would take strong exception, and I assume the Government will not yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think this is a measure that requires a good deal of consideration before we accept it, because if we are mixing up our right of property we are in danger of sacrificing our right of property to our right of legislation. Now, it does not appear to me that the Crown, as represented by the Dominion, can claim at all to have a right of property in the soil of the harbour. The transfer evidently is intended to be a transfer of the constructions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is not the decision.

Mr. McCARTHY. It may not be. We ought, perhaps, to consider what really is the effect of the Act. Then it is quite clear we have got legislative control over the harbours, and that we should be very careful not to do anything that by any means might interfere with the proper legislative control and jurisdiction which we have over the public harbours of the country. What I had in my mind when I rose first—I have sent for the statutes since—was this: that some years before Confederation, in the old provinces of Canada, power was given to convey the soil in navigable waters and in harbours.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was not that restrictive of the riparian owner?

Mr. McCARTHY. No. I suppose that does not apply beyond the two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. But what I thought of was that if we have the power—we have the practice in the first place—and if we have the power in the second place, to transfer that property to any other body, then it becomes subject, unless we make some controlling exceptions, to their control, to their right of conveyance; and their right of conveyance, although more limited than I first thought it was, still leaves discretion with them. The words of the section are:

"It has been heretofore, and it shall be hereafter lawful for the Lieutenant Governor in Council to authorize sales or appropriations of land covered with water in the harbours, rivers, and other navigable waters in Quebec, under such conditions as it has been, or it may be deemed requisite to impose, but not so as to interfere with the use of any harbours or harbour, or the navigation of any harbour, river or other navigable water."

That leaves it, of course, to be settled as a question of law, whether the erection which the private purchaser might make would or would not interfere with the harbours or harbour, or with the navigation of the rivers or river. What I desire to draw the attention of the Committee to is this: If we go back to the old common law, which has been correctly explained by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and that is, that the right in the soil rests in the Crown merely as trustees for the public, we cannot in any sense take it unless we give ourselves authority by legislation to do so as a matter of property. It is a trust we hold for the public, subject to public rights and public easement. We are proposing to convey all that property to another Government, to be by that Government dealt with under such restrictions as are determined by Order in Council, but not under such restrictions as are settled by Parliament, not reserving to Parliament from time to time the power to make restrictions; and, consequently, we may at once find ourselves at conflict with the Provincial Governments in regard to a question the jurisdiction of which is exclusively vested here. Dealing with harbours and rivers, why should we hamper ourselves, if they are not valuable as a property—I do not see how they can be valuable as an asset, and I do not understand we have found them so—by transferring them; why not hold them in trust for the public, subject to the control of Parliament? I submit, before we adopt this measure, we ought carefully to consider whether we will not be involving ourselves in conflict, or involving ourselves in possibility of a conflict, not by any means desirable in a federal constitution, such as ours, between the local authority and this authority; whether we had not better keep such right as we have in harbours and rivers, where it is given to us by the British North America Act, because we have the legal control.

Mr. SKINNER. I should like to say a few words as to our position in the Maritime Provinces. The term "foreshore," taken in a strictly legal sense, is that portion of the shore between high and low water mark. The land or portion of the country between high or low water mark on the shores of the Bay of Fundy is very large. I know one portion of the bay where the foreshore extends between high and low water mark a distance of at least two miles. Taking the Province of New Brunswick, from the State of Maine to the head of the Bay of Fundy, a distance of 150 miles, there is a sequence of small rivers pouring into the bay, which not only drain a large portion of country, but have valuable timber lands on their upper waters, and there are mill privileges at the mouth of every one of those rivers. These mill privileges cannot be enjoyed, the lumber cannot be brought down and preserved, unless the foreshore is infringed upon, that is to say, booms erected upon the foreshore and also wharves built for the bringing of the merchandise out and shipping of the lumber after it has been manufactured. Thus we are now in this position: That to put any of these booms at the mouth of these rivers, or to erect any of the wharves on those foreshores, is to infringe on the right of navigation; and in order to obtain the right to do so, that is to infringe on the privilege of navigation, the parties have to come to the Dominion Parliament, because all questions of navigation are centralized here. Therefore, if this Bill is passed we will be brought into conflicting circumstances, for the right to handle the foreshore will rest in the Local Legislature, but the right to regulate navigation over those shores rests in the Dominion Parliament. I do not see how they can be managed in that way with this conflict of authority. With some experience, arising from cases with which I have been connected, it occurs to me that it would be better in the interest of trade and commerce, at all events in the Bay of Fundy, if, instead of the foreshores being vested in the Local Legislature, they should be vested in the Dominion: because, the Dominion having the right of legislating regarding the question of navigation, it would be much better if it also had the right to regulate the property where the navigation is. Before this Bill is passed, and I am not making these remarks as opposing the Bill, but to throw light on the question, it should be very well considered whether it would be in the interest of the business of that portion of the country to have it settled that the right to legislate with respect to this matter must be vested in the Dominion Parliament, while the bare right of property remains in the Local Legislature, and therefore there must be a conflict of authority. It would be much better that the power that had the right to legislate with regard to navigation should also have the right of ownership of the property, so that the two might be united together, and those rights and privileges and property be regulated by one power instead of two powers.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I admit all that has been said about the common law rule as to the ownership of the Crown in public harbours and property of that kind. It is, I think, not useful for us in considering how we should legislate in view of that principle, because that principle has been abrogated by statute everywhere long ago. Every province passed statutes enabling the Crown to alienate the foreshores, beds of harbours, and so forth. The Dominion Parliament has done the same. At the present time we have a statute which enables grants and patents to be made, as of public property of the soil, and beds of harbours and streams, and other properties which may be considered to be vested in us, so far as title goes. There is a good deal of plausibility in the view which strikes the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner), that it would be most convenient that the right of property should remain in the authority that has the power of legislation. But my hon. friend will observe, in the first place, that by the last provision in the Bill it is distinctly provided that our rights of legislation with respect to navigation, shipping, fishing, and everything of that kind, shall not be in the least impaired by this statute. The question, then, narrows itself down to this: By what Government can these properties be most conveniently administered? Let us take the case of property in St. John or in Halifax. It is of great importance that authority to regulate trade and commerce, navigation and shipping, should remains with us; but if it were a mere question respecting the erection of a wharf in a particular locality, it is more convenient for the people of the province that their own Provincial Governments should deal with that matter, as with public lands. They have officers on

the spot, surveyors, who can go to the locality from which an application is made. They report on it, prepare a plan and furnish any observations they can offer in the way of information. The plans, which are accessible to every one, in the Crown lands office or public lands office, show every grant that has been made, every structure that has been authorized and there is every application on fyle. We have here to consider the mode of administering such property all over the Dominion, without any local system of registration, of plans or otherwise, without any staff of local officers who can give their attention to the matter, and the whole thing would be lacking in system, inconvenience and in expedition, unless we go to the expense of organizing a kind of public land system in each province, for the administration of property of this kind, which is of no value to us whatever, out of which we cannot get the income that is necessary to pay the expenses, and which, it seems to me, can conveniently fit into the management of the public lands of the provinces. These are theories on which, it seems to me, this kind of property can be best administered locally, and I do not think there is likely to be any confusion between legislative powers and the right of property, considering that everywhere these properties have been dealt with by virtue of statutes, as belonging to the Crown, to be alienated.

Mr. SKINNER. I know of one case in New Brunswick where the Local Legislature granted the power to a company to erect booms for the purpose of protecting lumber, which erection went over the foreshore, and the riparian owners objected to it. The case was that of Davidson against the Petit River Boom Company. The case came to the Supreme Court of Canada on appeal, and it was decided that the Local Legislature of New Brunswick had not the power to act as they did. Can we not avoid this; that is to say, will the Local Government have the power to give to every authority the Minister refers to the power to erect these wharves, if it interferes with navigation? The point I fear is this: that although it may be said under the law that the Local Government can do this, yet if it interferes with navigation it cannot give them the power to do it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It would not matter in what Government you vested that power, for in no case would they have power to make that grant. That grant was held by the Supreme Court not to be valid because it interfered with the riparian owner's rights. The riparian owner has the right to free and uninterrupted access to the sea. The Local Government gave power to a boom company to interfere with private rights, and neither the Dominion Government nor the Local Governments have power to do that. I agree with the Minister of Justice that it is better these lands should be vested in the Local Governments. My opinion is, that it at present is vested in the Provincial Governments, except so far as public harbours are concerned, and that is the reason I took exception to the Bill in the first instance.

On section 2,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would venture to ask whether this is a fair provision. If my contention is correct that these lands are at present vested in the Local Government, as it was the intention of the British North America to invest them, it is hardly fair that we should take to ourselves under this section a right which we do not at present possess. Assuming my argument to be correct that the foreshores are vested in the Provincial Governments, then we have no right to expropriate any part of it for Dominion work, and the hon. gentleman is making it now to contain in the transfer from the Dominion to the Provincial Governments of rights which I say do not exist or are at least in doubt: that we may have the right for all time to expropriate these lands for public works, provided they are not sold or improvements made upon them. It seems to me after all said and done, that looking at the doubts which exist, it would be better to transfer to them, and if we want to expropriate afterwards take it in the ordinary way.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see that we are not doing this without the consent of the Provincial Governments. With a view to a settlement of the whole question, we are asking of them terms which the hon. gentleman thinks are a little unreasonable, but when that view was put to me by a gentleman on behalf of one of the provinces, I answered him by asking, whether, under the circumstances indicated here, the Government of Canada, desiring to erect a public building on part of the foreshore belonging to the province, the province would not at any time give the transfer for that purpose? We are in the habit of giving them our property, and they give us theirs for such purposes.

On section 3,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will that extend to reserves 200 feet at the side of a public pier, as well as in front of it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And the Provincial Governments have assented to that?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Those with whom I have conferred about it. The original Act claimed 1,000 feet and we have settled on 200 feet.

Committee rose and reported progress.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 165) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I explained it when I introduced it. The provisions are not very important. One refers to school lands, which we propose to give to railway companies in granting alternate townships in lieu of alternate sections. Then there is an amendment to the provision requiring an application for a patent to be made after an occupation of three months. In some cases the application has not been made until a later date, and it has been held that the patent could not be issued unless the application was made immediately on the completion of the three months' residence. Another clause amends the provision requiring five years' residence, a certain cultivation in the first two years, and six months' occupation in each of the three following years, the Bill providing that the patent may be given though the cultivation pre-

scribed for the first two years has not been carried out. Then there is a clause which compels a party to apply for his license five years after the entry. In some cases parties who have carried out the provisions have left the country and their whereabouts cannot be discovered, and this is to enable us to cancel the homestead entry if the patent has not been applied for within the five years. A good many complaints have been made in reference to lands not having been applied for after the patent has been earned, the result being that municipalities have not been able to collect any taxes upon such lands. Then there are two or three clauses enlarging the provisions of the Dominion Lands Act in regard to liens. This is the substance of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there is very great objection to the first amendment to this Bill, which allows the Government to treat as a portion of a subsidy the lands set apart by the Parliament of Canada for school purposes. These lands have in many cases become valuable on account of the improvement of the surrounding district ; and it is because they have become valuable that their sale will in time serve to constitute a school fund of a considerable amount, which in itself will afford a corresponding relief to the population who settle in the country, in connection with the maintenance of public schools. What the hon. gentleman proposes by this Bill is to take power to the Government to take these school lands and apply them as a portion of a railway subsidy or for some other purpose, altogether foreign to the purpose for which they have been reserved.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We substitute others.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman may substitute lands on the shores of the Arctic. It is important that these lands, which have been specifically named from the very first survey of the country as school lands, should be applied to no other purpose whatever. If we consent to break in upon that reservation which has been made for educational purposes, the lands that will be substituted for them will always be in the newer districts, where lands are less desirable and less valuable, and where they may acquire no increase of value for many years to come, so that the population may receive no relief from their school burdens within any reasonable time by bringing the school lands into the market. This provision simply means that the railway corporations are becoming very powerful in that country, and that they are exercising undue influence over the hon. gentleman and those of his colleagues who have assented to this change—a change which in my opinion will be of very serious detriment to the well-being of the country. It reveals simply a desire for Naboth's vineyard. The hon. gentleman proposes to give lands elsewhere that will have little or no value. Well, if lands elsewhere can be had that are about as valuable as these, let the corporation obtain them, but do not divert the school lands from the purposes for which they were set apart. Allow them to remain as such, and when they have acquired proper value, put them upon the proper market and let the proceeds be devoted to the wants of education, but do not hand them over to railway companies to be held for speculative purposes, and to be, as experience has shown, impediments in the way of settlement instead of instruments for the rapid settlement of the country. Let the school lands originally set apart remain school lands and take care they are not appropriated for any other purposes. The hon. gentleman proposes that lands elsewhere may be substituted for them. If such lands are susceptible of being substituted for the original school lands, they ought to be acceptable to the railway company. I trust the hon. gentleman will not proceed in the direction of this clause. Let it be struck out, and let the public who are invited to come into the country feel that the lands set apart for the purposes of education will be used for those purposes alone.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman as to the way in which we should deal with the school lands. They are a solemn trust which should be very carefully administered, but the proposition I submit to the House is one which was made in accordance with the policy advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite, that of giving alternate townships to railway companies in preference to alternate sections. The land given to railway companies there are not as a rule agricultural land and it is not expected they will be thickly settled, and it was in order to give them these alternate townships so that railway corporations might be able to dispose of a portion of the range of country in a solid block. By Act 49 Victoria, chapter 12, passed the 2nd of June, 1886, we gave the Government the power of not only dealing in that way with the school lands but also with the Hudson's Bay lands :

"Notwithstanding anything contained in sections eighteen and nineteen of the 'Dominion Lands Act, 1883,' the Governor in Council is hereby empowered to grant the subsidies in land authorized by the Act cited in the preamble to this Act, wholly or in part, in tracts each comprising a township or a fractional part of a township, as he deems expedient : but no such grant shall be made until an extent of land equivalent to that reserved for the Hudson's Bay Company in the township, or fractional part of a township to be so granted, has been set apart for the company out of other ungranted available public lands, and such change has been assented to by the said Hudson's Bay Company."

This was the arrangement come to by Mr. Brydges, commissioner of the Hudson's Bay Company, and the Land Commissioner at Winnipeg, with the Government. The land was inspected by the land inspector and he recommended that this should be done. Sir Donald Smith, Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company, objected to it, and we were unable to deal with the school lands without the consent of the Hudson's Bay Company. We cannot deal with the Hudson's Bay lands as they will not consent, and this is for the purpose of giving us power to deal with the school lands of that country. It is a question of course of policy, which I do not feel very strongly about, and I agree with what the hon. gentleman says with reference to the manner in which the school lands should be dealt with.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Better drop it.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not feel that any very great injury would be done to the interests of education by the passage of this clause, although at the same time I do not see any very great necessity for passing it. The Minister of the Interior seems equally indifferent which course is taken. If there would be any advantage to the school interests by allowing these lands to remain as the Hudson's Bay sections are, I think they should not be disturbed. I confess if

equivalent lands are given, I cannot see what injury would be done. The clause reads:

"Provided that lands equivalent in extent, and as nearly as may be in value to that so set apart as aforesaid as school lands in such townships, are first set apart in lieu thereof out of other ungranted available public lands."

I want to point out one inconvenience that may arise from the passing of this clause. If you take the school lands out of the township that you are about to give to the railway, and you set apart other school lands equivalent, you must take the school lands equivalent from townships where settlement is going in. In that way you will diminish the number of sections open to settlement and, therefore, liable to contribution for school as well as other purposes. For instance, if you take out of a township a number of school sections and you seek their equivalent elsewhere, you will have to find them where settlement will ultimately go in or is going in, and in that way you will have double the number of school sections in one township that you would otherwise have, and I think some harm might in that way be done. However, I am not sure that this is a very serious matter. I hope the hon. Minister and the Government have considered the suggestion I ventured to make on the first reading of this Bill. I had a Bill on the Paper and a resolution with regard to one of the clauses, and the House will remember that there was a very strong feeling in favour of a resolution embodying the principle of one of the clauses, and that feeling was expressed by a vote in this House, and there were other means taken to express the same sentiment. I withdrew that resolution and I also refrained from moving the second reading of the Bill, because I was told by the Government that my Bill would be placed on the Government orders. The reason it was not placed on the Government orders was that the Minister of the Interior brought down a Bill, and there would have been two Bills dealing with Dominion lands on the Government orders. The Minister of Justice is not here, but he told me that he would make a statement to the House at any convenient time, declaring that that was the position of the Government. Therefore, I assume that the principle of these clauses in Bill No. 108 is agreed to by the Government. One of the clauses deals with the prevention of the pollution of the waters, another deals with the sale of homesteads for taxes, and another deals with second homesteads. I assume that the principle of these clauses has been acceded to by the Government, and whether during the interval the Government has decided to put them into their Bill when we go into committee or not, I do not know. I also spoke of the necessity of setting aside lands for a university. It does not follow that we should establish the university at once, but it is clear that you cannot too soon set aside lands for the purpose of a university. The census shows that we have 67,000 inhabitants. When Manitoba had only 62,000 inhabitants, 150 acres were set aside for a university, and, if the House and the Government will turn to the legislation of 1882 and 1885, they will see how liberally Manitoba was dealt with in that matter, though its population in 1882 was less than the population of the North-West Territories to-day. Before I left the territories, a meeting of gentlemen interested in education was held and certain resolutions were passed in reference to the establishment of a university in the territories, and I think these resolutions were sent on to the Minister. I find that, on the Thursday in the first week of the present month, another meeting was held in Regina, which was presided over by the Bishop of Saskatchewan and Calgary, and among those present were the Rev. Dr. McLean, of Moose Jaw; Rev. Father LeDuc, of Calgary; Rev. Messrs. Carmichael, Harrison, Dawson and Caron, of Regina; Rev. Mr. Green, Principal of St. John's College, Qu'Appelle; Mr. Justice Rouleau, of Calgary; Rev. D. G. McQueen, of Edmonton; Inspector Rothwell, of Regina; Captain Craig, of Prince Albert; Mr. Chisholm, Principal of the Regina High School; Mr. Calder, Principal of the Moose Jaw High School; Mr. Thornburn, of Broadview; Mr. Secord and Mr. Forget, Dr. Willoughby, Mr. J. J. Young and others. They passed resolutions such as were passed at the meeting I attended about a year ago, and the point they make is that we cannot too soon set aside lands for a university. The Bishop of Saskatchewan and Father Leduc and Dr. McLean, the leading men in the Methodist Church, in the Roman Catholic Church and in the Church of England, contended that we cannot too soon establish a university. They do not propose to have a building erected right away, but to have, so to speak, a university on paper, qualified to have professors and examiners who shall lay down a curriculum and shall have the power of granting degrees, but the chief thing they contend for is that the land should be set aside as soon as possible. I have hoped, as I have previously expressed in this House, that, if action is taken at once, we might lay the foundation of higher education in the territories on a sounder basis than it is laid in any province in the Dominion of Canada. As everyone who knows anything about university education is aware, our defect is that we have so many universities that the universities are competing for the students, instead of the students competing for the degrees of the universities. The result is that the universities make the gate easy for the students to pass through. It is made known that it is easy to get a degree in this or that university, and we know that a young lad entering on manhood is not always wise as to the best means of strengthening himself for the battle of life. And, if it is easier to go to one university than to another, he will go to that university, with the result that the standard is lowered. One of the first men in the University of Toronto to-day, gave me amusing instances, on one occasion when Mr. Goldwin Smith and he and I were chatting about this matter, of the blunders made by men who had taken honours at our first university. I hope the Government will consider this question. I hope the Minister has considered another matter which I brought forward and which he very properly stated could be dealt with by Order in Council, to enable those who want to use the two-mile radius provision in regard to cancelled lands to do so. As you are now about to abolish the two-mile radius provision, I hope, while it remains in operation, an Order in Council will be passed enabling men who are there with their boys to settle on lands within two miles, though they may settle on cancelled lands. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Davis) is very anxious in regard to another matter, and I find there are people in

my own constituency who are very anxious to have an amendment made to the Bill providing that, in cases where land is better adapted for grazing than for cultivation, the cultivation should not be insisted on, but that, in lieu thereof, continuous residence and improvements to the value of $500 within three years from the time of perfecting the entry should enable a man to get his patent for his quarter section. That concerns the people of southern Alberta more than it does the people of Assiniboia, but I do not see why it would not work well. The two provisions I am most interested in are these, and in Committee I shall move these clauses:

Whenever, under this Act, lands are entered for either as a homestead or pre-emption, or sold or otherwise disposed of, and such lands contain or border upon a coulée or ravine, which has been utilized for the purpose of forming a reservoir for the storage of water, or which, in the opinion of the Minister, or of the agent or other officer by whom such entry is issued or such sale or disposal is made, is capable of being so utilized to advantage, such entry may be issued or such sale or disposal made subject to the condition that no building shall be erected within a specified distance from the border of such coulée or ravine, and to such other conditions as, under the circumstances of the case, seem desirable with a view to the prevention of the pollution of the water stored in such reservoir; and in every such case any patent issued for such land shall be expressed to be subject to the conditions so imposed.

We have, Sir, coulées in the North-West in places where you have no running streams, and if you dam them up you find you get a lake. Sometimes it is made by the melting of snow, and where water is not plentiful, it is of great advantage to the people. But I am speaking about the case of a man who has, it may be, built his stable or house near it, and the undesirable fluids from his house and stables may pass into that little artificial lake and destroy its value for cattle and for man. Now, the Minister of the Interior must have had representations from Moose Jaw on this subject, where they take great interest in it, and I hope that he has provided for it, and if he has not, when we go into Committee, I shall move in that matter. I may say, as the Minister of Justice is in his place, that he will remember that I withdrew my resolution, and I did not move the second reading of this Bill because I was given to understand that the Government would place it amongst the Government orders. Another clause is this:

Where land has been homesteaded, and five years have elapsed without the homesteader taking out his patent, the interest of the homesteader who has thus failed to take out his patent for such land may be sold by a municipality or school board for taxes levied within the municipality or school section wherein the lands are situated.

I may add that there is a clause in the Bill that I think satisfactorily provides for that. Now, there is another clause which it is also problematical if I move, because I am not quite satisfied about it myself, although some of my constituents are anxious to have it:

From and after the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, no patent for land shall be issued to a homsteader without its containing a provision that should the land be suffered to remain two consecutive years without the cropping of at least fifteen acres the homestead shall revert to the Government.

I see myself great difficulty about that, and I bring it before the attention of the Government more with the view of ventilating the idea, so that the object of it may, at some future time, be reached. The clause in regard to the second homesteading is exactly the same as in the statutes, with the change that instead of 1886 you have 1889, or from 1887, as in the amending Act, to 1889. When I brought forward this subject before, in the early part of the session, hon. gentlemen connected with the party in which I serve, took a sympathetic view of this matter, I do not see them in their places now, with one exception. My hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) told me that he agreed with me, and he came to me and asked me not to press my resolution. He mentioned to me the names of at least a dozen members of the House, of prominent Conservatives, some of them from British Columbia, and some from the North-West, some from Manitoba and some from Ontario, who sympathized with the view I took. One hon. gentleman said he had analogous cases in his own constituency in consequence of legislation by the Ontario Government, and he was fully alive to the justice of the demand of these second homesteaders. I certainly have the strongest grounds for believing that the Government in their conscience approve of this. I have been informed on very high authority, that the Prime Minister admits that my contention, in regard to this second homestead question, is a just contention. Of course I have not had that from Mr. Abbott. I have not conversed with him save once on the subject, but I was told on high authority that Mr. Abbott was of that opinion. Now, I should not be surprised if it were so. When I did converse with Mr. Abbott I found him on this, as on other subjects upon which I have conversed with him, prompt in grasping the question, sympathetic and ready to consider your views, so that I think there ought to be no difficulty now in passing this clause. The arguments that I have chiefly used against it are arguments that emerge from the bureaucracy. I have studied the history of the management of our Dominion lands for the last nine years. All through those years, from month to month, from week to week, from day to day, my attention has been directed to the management of those lands, to the way they have been dealt with by the Department of the Interior. I have been in constant communication with the Department of the Interior, in constant communication with Mr. H. H. Smith, and I will say this that I do not think the management has been such that we should have an extraordinary reverence for any dicta that may come from the bosom of that department. Now, the great argument is that the public domain cannot be spared; that is, that a few sections of land cannot be spared. We must have railways. The more railways we have the better. I do not at all agree with arguments, such as I sometimes hear from those benches, against subsidizing railways with lands, because as Mr. Cochrane, of San Francisco, stated in his evidence: "Land is of no use until you have railways. The way to colonize is, first build a railway and then settlement goes in." That is the way to settle a country. But I say this, that without compulsion, without a sigh, without one regretful glance, we will vote away any number of townships, we will vote 6,400 acres of land per mile for a railway. Our conscience in regard to the disposal of public lands grows sensitive, however, the moment the question comes up of giving to a man a second homestead to whom you are as much bound in honour as you are to pay for the bacon you

buy for your breakfast to-morrow morning; our consciences in regard to these lands become sensitive and then there is a cry raised respecting the public domain. The amount of the public domain, I may say here, will be very small. But I am told that a man very highly placed in Canada at this moment, when that argument was used to him, declared that the question is not in regard to the public domain, if justice demands that these people should get second homesteads. If he said so, it was greatly to his credit; if he said so, it reflected honour on his sense of justice, and I will go further, and say it would reflect honour on his statesmanship; because it can never be wise statesmanship to do injustice to any class, especially to a class that is representative, and I may say, coming down to a lower point it is bad politics. If I may separate politics from statesmanship—and I believe there is sometimes a divorce between them—if I may separate the politics that looks to the success of a party from statesmanship, I say it is bad politics to act unjustly towards a large class, towards a representative class, towards settlers who diffuse their grievances amongst their brethren who have no interest whatever in second homesteads, and who thereby get an idea like this: "Oh, we are poor settlers, and so disregarded; but if we were rich and powerful, our claims would be acknowledged." I do hope that when I come to move that clause in Committee, I shall have, if they are here, the support of those hon. gentlemen who have so generously told me they agree with me; but what I would prefer would be to see the clause placed in the Bill by the Government itself, because it is my desire that all the credit of such action may go to the Government, and that as for myself I shall be effaced before them. There is another suggestion that has been made, and that is, that a clause should be placed in the Bill, that where pre-emptions adjoin homesteads the homesteader should not be required to live on his pre-emption, but he should be bound to cultivate 10 acres the first year, 15 acres the second year, and break 15 acres and have it ready for crop the third. My anxiety respecting the ranching clause is emphasized by the fact that my hon. friend, who is very anxious about it, is not here. I throw that out for the consideration of the Minister, so that he may, if he approves of it, give this clause that would enable a rancher, by fulfilling certain conditions, without cultivation, to obtain a quarter section. I did not think any of my constituents took interest in it, but I find they do. I do not set any store by it myself; but my hon. friend does, and others do. I have now explained the points of importance. I want to say, with the permission of the House, that I think the Government cannot deal too generously with the North-West. There is a general impression that we are dealt with very generously. But if hon. gentlemen will take the Manitoba Act of 1870, and examine the clauses respecting the Government of that province, they will find that Manitoba, which at that time had an estimated population of 17,000, received $30,000 for government; 80 cents per head was given on an estimated population of 17,000, and there are other clauses that would show hon. gentlemen that at the present time, with our 67,000, as the Minister knows, we are entitled to a very much larger sum than we have received. I make that statement with the permission of the House, for I do not think this Bill could properly deal with it. I think there are some clauses of the Bill that will prove very useful, and it will be made very much more valuable if the clauses that I have described are added to it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is due to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that I should say a word as to the fate of the clauses which are comprised in his own Bill, because it is true that when the hon. gentleman proposed to bring forward again his resolution with respect to second homesteads, he acquiesced in my proposal not to press it then, because it required a good deal of consideration on the part of the Government, and I told him that his Bill on the subject of Dominion lands would be moved to Government Orders, if the House would acquiesce in our proposal to do so, in order that the delay for which I asked him should not prejudice his opportunity of bringing his Bill to the attention of the House. The opportunity was provided the other day. I did not move to transfer the hon. gentleman's Bill, because the Minister of the Interior was about to introduce a Bill on the same subject, and the discussion of that Bill would enable the hon. gentleman to bring forward the clauses contained in his Bill. The progress made with this Bill to-night will not be very great, I suppose, and I will have an opportunity in the early part of the week, when in Committee on the Bill, of informing the hon. gentleman what policy the Government will adopt on this subject.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DEWDNEY. Sub-section 3 of section 4 of the Dominion Lands Act authorizes the Minister of the Interior or the Dominion Land Board to authorize any person named therein to make a homestead entry. I wish to make it read that the Minister of the Interior, or any member of the Dominion Land Board, shall be able to make the entry, because it is seldom that the Board are all together, and the present provision is found inconvenient where the agents are at such long distances.

Mr. LAURIER. The only change is to give to a member of the Board the power to make an entry or to receive.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

On section 4,

Mr. DAVIN. I think this clause is a great improvement and will meet with approval in the North West.

On section 5,

Mr. DEWDNEY. If we agree to adopt this clause I would extend the provisions to 1893 or 1894. I explained before that I think we have too many different regulations with regard to taking up land, and I think the simpler they are the better. Therefore, if the Committee could agree on a date I would very much like to see this adopted.

Mr. DAVIN. It think this is a step in the right direction. It think the simpler our conditions of entry are the better. It was undoubtedly a mistake to have so many fancy franchises for entries. I would suggest that this clause be allowed to stand, and we will discuss the date before we go into Committee again.

On section 11,

Mr. WATSON. Does this apply to charges for seed grain?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; it applies only to the lien clauses, and it is for this purpose. In the case of a homestead on which money has been advanced, but on which the settler finds that he is not able to live, it is provided that if he changes his homestead the lien may be transferred to the new homestead.

Mr. WATSON. I had a communication to-day from a person who wishes to obtain a homestead in the Gladstone district. He wishes to take up a homestead which has been abandoned, but against which there is a mortgage for seed grain advanced to the person who previously occupied it, and the man who now wishes to take it up is informed by the agent that by paying the claim on the land for the grain he can get it. It seems to me that is unfair. I think the Minister should transfer the mortgage for the seed grain to the homestead occupied by the person who got the seed grain.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Of course the Government must have some security for the payment for the seed grain; but as long as it has the security, I do not think it matters where it lies. The question raised by the hon. member has not yet been brought to my notice, and I think it is worthy of consideration.

Mr. WATSON. The person who has obtained a homestead ought to be liable on the land he occupies. If he abandons the homestead, the Government have no security, because they own the land, and it appears to me that if a person comes along and wishes to take up the abandoned quarter section, he should not be liable for the seed grain advanced to the other man.

Mr. DAVIN. I could not agree very well with what my hon. friend from Marquette says, because there might come a year when some of our settlers, especially new settlers, would want seed grain; and if that contention of my hon. friend prevailed, the Government would meet us with the response: You cannot give any security; and we have contended that the Government might very properly take the security which in the case referred to by my hon. friend was taken. I think with the hon. Minister that the suggestion of my hon. friend from Marquette that where a settler against whose homestead there is a lien for seed grain is allowed to enter for another homestead, the liability should be transferred to his new homestead is a good one. But my hon. friend went further. If a settler borrowed seed grain from the Government and abandoned his homestead altogether, and took up no other homestead, he still seems to contend——

Mr. WATSON. I did not.

Mr. DAVIN. Then there is no difference between us. I understood he contended that in that case the incoming settler who wanted the abandoned homestead should not be asked to pay the obligation for seed grain. As the Minister properly says, the Government must have some security, and there ought to be no difficulty about the new settler paying the lien because there will be improvements on the abandoned homestead, and the settler who wants an improved homestead ought not to object to paying the small amount due for seed grain. Oddly enough, in abandoned sections, there is, generally speaking, something desirable and often competition as to who should get it. It would be not at all desirable that we in the North-West should place ourselves in this position, that the Government would be justified in saying, in case another year should occur, and it is to be hoped it never will, when some of our settlers would need seed grain: "Why, you cannot give us any security." However, that has nothing to do with this clause. This clause will meet a difficulty we have felt in the North-West. For instance, a man who has a homestead entirely suited for agriculture desires to get one which he can convert into a mixed farm. He is restless where he is and wants to get another entry. The department will have no objection to that, but if there is a lien against this quarter section—and we have had in my constituency south of Dunmore some Germans and one or two others who came in by the aid of certain parties and whose sections were subject to a lien—there is a difficulty about getting that entry, although it is desirable on several grounds that they should remove. This clause will enable them to make a transfer to another homestead.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for West Assiniboia entirely misunderstood me. My contention would give the Government ample security. I want them to follow the settler for security.

Mr. DAVIN. Suppose the settler goes out of the country altogether?

Mr. WATSON. You have simply to hold the land. But the case I refer to is where a settler has abandoned land and taken up a more desirable homestead. The seed grain he has received from the Government should be a charge against the homestead he has taken up.

Mr. DAVIN. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. At present that mortgage is not transferred and certainly the abandoned homestead is no security as there is no one living in it. A person might secure seed grain on a worthless piece of land and then abandoned it to take up a good section which would be ample security. The lien for the seed grain should be transferred to the land he takes up. I cannot understand that any persons would act as the hon. member for Assiniboia says they would, and consider a piece of land abandoned as desirable for settlement. As a rule, settlers do not leave desirable pieces of land. If land is abandoned by one settler and taken up by another, the latter should get it for the simple homestead entry and not be charged any mortgage standing against it. There are some vacant sections which were abandoned on account of the wet, around Lake Manitoba, seven or eight years ago, which some people now want to take up. But they would have to assume a lien for seed grain furnished the former settlers, and they will not take up the land subject to such lien. I have a letter from a person who applied for a quarter section, which he says he would take up if he had not to assume the mortgage for seed grain. The man who received the seed grain should pay for it, and it should not be a charge on the land.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not lay down the broad proposition that every abandoned quarter section is a desirable one, but it is well known that it frequently happens no more desirable quarter section can be had than one which has been abandoned,

and my hon. friend illustrates this by pointing to quarter sections around Lake Manitoba which were abandoned some years ago and now turn out to be very desirable sections. The point my hon. friend contends for is one of importance for the future, namely, that where a man abandons a quarter section against which there is a lien for seed grain and takes up another, that lien should be transferred to the other. The Minister agrees with him in that view, and so do I. But in the case of a section abandoned on which there is a claim for seed grain and when no other section has been taken up, the only security the Government can have is the homestead, and it is in the interest of the incoming settler himself that he should be asked to pay that claim. It generally is a very small claim, and by paying it he keeps up the credit of the settlers with the Government. I might point to an analogous case. When imprisonment for debt was abolished, it had the effect of destroying the credit of the poor people in whose interest it was abolished, and the learned judge who was mainly instrumental in carrying out that law devised the judgment summons as a means of restoring the credit of the poor. I asked him how that came into existence, and he told me that he himself contrived it with the view of restoring the credit his own act had destroyed. So, if you take away the lien from the homestead of the settler who has abandoned it and left the country, you would place the incoming settler in this position, should he ever require to borrow seed grain from the Government, that the Government could reply: You have no security to offer for repayment. I have no doubt that when we go into Committee again, the Minister of the Interior will provide for the transfer of the mortgage, but I would not advocate abandoning the claim of the Government on the homestead.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). Because a man has abandoned his homestead does not necessarily reduce its value, and I think you should follow him on the mortgage for the seed grain. I have two cases in my county where homesteaders took up abandoned homesteads and performed the duties, and when they applied for their patents, they were told that seed grain mortgages were on those homesteads. It would not be fair to make them pay on these mortgages without having received any notice or any value. If these homesteads were of more value after they were abandoned, it might be another thing, but when homesteads are abandoned they are of no more value, because, where the ploughing has been done, the weeds have grown, and the land is not worth as much as it was before. The difficulty is where the party leaves the country, but even then I would not charge the new homesteader with the mortgage.

Mr. TROW. Such cases as have been described by the hon. gentleman must be very rare, because a man would not abandon his homestead if it was a good one, and he should receive no seed grain unless he had considerable improvements. There may be some cases of this kind, but I do not see any possiblity of following the man on his personal bond, because unfortunately in those cases they go across the line. I do not see how they can get other homesteads under the present law, but, if they do, it would be right to hold your claim on the first homestead, so as to have two strings to your bow, and thus secure the claim of the Government.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not lay down the absurd proposition that a homestead was more valuable because it was abandoned, but, reasoning *a priori* on this subject, we might agree that an abandoned homestead was not a desirable homestead. As a fact, however, some of the most desirable homesteads in the North-West are homesteads which have been abandoned, especially in the neighbourhood of Lake Manitoba.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). They were abandoned during the wet years.

Mr. DAVIN. They were abandoned for some reason, and I do not suppose the homesteader was struck suddenly with a desire to fly off without any reason, but there is no doubt that some homesteads that were desirable have been abandoned. Nobody disputes the proposition that, if a man leaves one homestead, and, by permission of the department, goes to another, the lien should follow him. The point we are discussing now is, whether the Government should abandon its claim for seed grain in regard to a homesteader who has gone no one knows where. It is not in the interest of the settler that the Government should abandon that claim, because it is only in that way that you can keep up the credit of the settlers with the Government. The settler who goes in does not know whether he may not want to borrow seed grain from the Government. What my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Ross) says is true, that at times a homestead which has been abandoned is not as valuable as another. I know there are cases of that kind. There are cases where, actually, the ploughing, instead of being an advantage, is a disadvantage. I understand all that; but I say that there are cases, and not a few, where homesteads have been occupied, and where, by reason of their occupation, they have been made more valuable. What I say is, that it sometimes happens that a very desirable homestead has been abandoned by a homesteader, and persons will sometimes seek for it, and the amount that stands against it for seed grain they will be ready to pay.

Mr. WATSON. The lands referred to by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) are probably similarly situated to the lands mentioned in this letter. The hon. gentleman knows that from 1879 to 1885 these lands were wet. The lands that I have referred to in township 14, range 12, west of the first meridian, were homesteaded in 1874, and during grasshopper time seed grain was given, and that stands as a mortgage chargeable against those lands. In 1879 and 1880, settlers in township 12, range 14, were allowed second homesteads by the Government, on account of their lands being so wet they could not cultivate them, and they had to leave them. These lands are subject to wet again, and any person taking them up has got to take those chances, unless the Government, either Provincial or Dominion, who are interested in those lands, take means to prevent it. That overflow will occur again, unless means are adopted for the purpose of widening the outlet of Fairford River out of Lake Manitoba. That lake forms the basin for the drainage for a very large tract of country, a large number of streams run into that lake, of which the only out-

let is the Fairford River. That outlet is not sufficient to carry off the water that runs into the lake. I have known, in wet seasons, the lake to rise as high as six feet above its lowest level, and the result was that a large tract of country was rendered useless. But the last few years the lands have become dryer, and people are now willing to take them up as homesteads and go on and cultivate them. I say that it is in the interest of that country, and in the interest of the municipalities, that these lands should be settled immediately, that homesteaders should go on and reside there and cultivate them. But if the mortgages for seed grain given in 1874 are allowed still to stand against those lands, with the interest on that seed grain from that day to the present time, they will not be occupied. I think it is in the interest of the department and of the Government to have those lands occupied and settled upon. I would say that so far as I am concerned —and I hope the department will take the same view—it is simply a matter of profit and of loss, and I would be willing that the Government should relinquish its claims on these small amounts of grain given from 1874 that have prevented the settlement. Still it may not be necessary, it is not necessary where a large number of settlers transfer their homesteads in that particular section to a more desirable place: in that case the Government ought to place the persons who got the seed grain in the same position as they were before. I hope the Minister will provide for such an emergency. There is only a limited number of such cases. We hope that seed grain will never again be required either in Manitoba or the North-West, but it is in the interest of that country that these lands should be settled. Applications are being made for these lands, but people object to take hold of them simply because a mortgage is standing against them.

Mr. TROW. I can corroborate the statements of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). Lake Manitoba more than any other lake is subject to rise and fall in wet seasons. I know that the lake he has described in wet seasons spreads over a very large area of country, rendering thousands of acres unfit for settlement, and this overflow may sometimes occur during four or five successive seasons. I think it would be in the interest of the Government to abandon their small claims upon the land for seed grain given in 1874-75. I know that several of my friends took up land, in that region and two or three years afterwards, when they obtained their title, they found they could not get near the lands unless they had a boat.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have made up my mind, after considering this matter, to drop clause 1. The last clause we will not consider now.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Mr. WATSON.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 21st September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LANGEVIN BLOCK.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) asked, 1. How much has been paid on the Langevin Block up to 1st September, A.D. 1891? How much under each contract and outside of the contracts? 2. How much has been paid to Charlebois and each of the other contractors under their contracts and outside thereof? 3. How much has been paid for the land, and for legal expenses and commission, giving each separately and to whom paid? 4. Have all the appropriations made by Parliament for the construction of said block, and the purchase of said land, &c., been expended? If not, how much remains over, and how has it been disposed of?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The expenditure up to 31st of August, 1891, was $782,491.18. Of that amount, $575,134.78 was under contract, and other payments, including the cost of land, amounted to $207,356.40. The amount paid to A. Charlebois was $490,060. Paid Carrière, Laine & Co., $15,241.54; paid John Fensom for elevators, $45,099.94; Garth & Co., heating apparatus, $24,733.40; total, $575,134.78. As for the land it was acquired from eleven proprietors. The cost of the site was $88,130; interest, $3,243.15; compensations, $300; commissions and legal expenses, $2,325.42; damages, $750; part premiums of insurance, $27.50; total, $96,776.07. As to the question whether the whole vote has been expended, the answer is, that the amounts voted were $1,273,350.04, and the amount expended $782,491.18, leaving a balance lapsed of $490,858.86.

AMERICAN CATTLE FOR SLAUGHTER.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. CHOQUETTE) asked, Whether an Order in Council was adopted, since the first day of January last, authorizing the admission, duty free, of American cattle for slaughter at Three Rivers? If so, was the said Order in Council submitted to the Imperial Government, and did the latter signify its approval, or otherwise? Was the said Order in Council repealed, and if so, when and for what reason? If not, do the Government intend to give effect thereto?

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. gentleman I would state that no Order in Council has been adopted since the 1st of January last authorizing the admission, duty free, of American cattle for slaughter at Three Rivers.

PIER AT THREE RIVERS.

Mr. AMYOT asked, 1. Did the Government get a pier constructed at Three Rivers, in 1890? Who was the lowest tenderer for that work? How many tenders were received? What tender was accepted, and what was the amount thereof? How much money was paid by the Government, for the construction of the said work, to the party whose tender was accepted? How much money in all have the Government paid for the said pier, to whom were the payments made, and how much to each person,

that is to say, to the said tenderer and to any other person, and what are the names of such persons? 2. Do the Government intend to construct another pier at Three Rivers? Are tenders to be called for for that work, and when? 3. Is Mr. Thomas Berlinguet, of Three Rivers, in the employment of the Government? In what capacity is he so employed? What is his salary? How much has he received: (1) By way of salary; (2) as travelling expenses up to this date, and how much for the year ending 30th June, 1891? 4. What was the revenue yielded by the slides and booms on the River St. Maurice for the year ending 30th June, 1891? What is the amount expended for maintenance during that period, for the said slides and booms? What is the amount paid to keepers and for other expenses of management of the said works, for that period? What are the names of the keeper of the said slides and booms and of any other person to whom money has been paid in respect of the said works, and how much has been paid to each such person?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The contract for the construction of a wharf at Three Rivers was signed on the 13th of November, 1889. Mr. T. E. Normand was the lowest tenderer. Nine tenders were received. The lowest was accepted, that of Mr. Normand for $8,525. $10,894.50 was paid him for the construction of the work. The difference between the amount paid and that of the contract was authorized by Order in Council of the 8th of November, 1890, to raise the level of the wharf 4 feet 6 inches. $12,307.79 was paid by the Government for the wharf in question, as follows:—T. E. Normand, $10,894.50; George Leprohon, inspector, $327; J. M. Desilets, professional services, expropriating land, $159.30; advertising and printing, $146.46; F. M. Hamel, travelling expenses, $36.05; treasurer, Province of Quebec, claim of lot bought from A. Baptist, $744.48. Total, $12,307.79. There is a sum of $10,000 in the Estimates of 1891-92 for the construction of an addition to the wharf. Tenders will be called for the work as soon as the plans and specifications are prepared. Yes, Mr. Berlinguet is in the employ of the Government as resident engineer at Three Rivers, for the Department of Public Works. His salary is $4 per day. During the year ending 30th June, 1891, he was paid $1,803.32, as follows:- Salary, $1,440; sustenance allowance and travelling expenses, $1,363.32. This may be taken as an average of the yearly payments made to Mr. Berlinguet. The revenue yielded by the slides and booms on the River St. Maurice for the year ending 30th June, 1891, has been $3,953.87. The amount expended for maintenance during that period, $17,111.81. The amount paid to staff people and labourers during the year ending 30th June, 1891, $13,896.79. It will be impossible for me to answer the last question in a shape sufficiently concise, and the hon. gentleman had better move for a return. It is the intention after the session to take steps to reduce the expenditure for staff and maintenance considerably for next year, there being a reduction of $3,000 in the vote asked for that purpose this year.

ADMIRALTY COURTS.

Mr. FRÉMONT asked, When is it intended to insert in the *Canada Gazette* a proclamation declaring in force the Act passed during the present session and sanctioned on the 31st July last, intituled: An Act to provide for the exercise of Admiralty Jurisdiction within Canada, in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As soon as the assent of Her Majesty's Government is signified to the Canadian Government.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS.

Mr. GIROUARD. After an enquiry which has lasted nearly four months, the first sitting of the Committee on Privileges and Elections having taken place on the 15th May last, after having presided at 100 sittings of that Committee, including 29 sittings of the sub-Committee, I feel very little disposed to make a speech, and especially to make a long one. If I was to consult only my own disposition, I would ask the members of this House to do what the members of the Committee did the other day, pass a vote without any debate or discussion. The consideration of this division which took place in the general Committee without any debate leads me at the very beginning to consider whether this Committee on Privileges and Elections is really the best one that can exist for the protection of members of Parliament against whom serious charges are made like the present one, and at the same time to protect the dignity of the House of Commons. A division adopting the report of the majority took place in Committee without any debate, on a strict party vote. I am not surprised at that result. It has been the history of the Committee on Privileges and Elections in almost every instance since I have presided over that Committee from 1882 to the present time. I recollect, when we discussed the validity of the election in Queen's County, P.E.I., we had a majority and a minority report. The majority wished to give the seat to a gentleman who was not elected. The minority wished to give the seat to the one who had been returned although ineligible. I did not agree with either the one or the other. My opinion was that a new election should take place, but on that occasion, as usual, there was simply a party vote. Take the "Blind Shares" Colonization Company case. There was a majority report and a minority report. I agreed with a great portion of the majority report, but I had to agree with a portion of the minority report. Last year we had another case, but there the evidence was so clear and complete, the member charged had written so many letters and communications that the Committee had to come to a unanimous report. This year, in reference to this very complicated case—not only case but cases—the Committee has come to the conclusion that the charges made by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) were substantially—in fact amply—proved as far as the Hon. Thomas McGreevy is concerned, but as far as Sir Hector Langevin is concerned the members of the Committee came to a division. The minority report concluded that Sir Hector Langevin knew of the conspiracy of McGreevy with Larkin, Connolly & Co., but the majority could not arrive at that conclusion. I ask whether the Committee, having a history of this kind, in which almost every serious charge that comes before it seems to be decided by a party vote—honestly it is true, I do not pretend to accuse the other side of acting dishonestly more than I do this side—we

all have our predilections—but it is time to consider, when the honour of a member of the House and the honour of his family are concerned, whether we should not adopt a tribunal which would give a guarantee of greater justice to the party concerned. I heard an objection made by an hon. member of the sub-Committee that it would be unfair for us to divest ourselves of jurisdiction in a case of this kind. We have already divested ourselves of our jurisdiction in regard to the very existence of this House. At one time election petitions were always tried before a Committee on Privileges and Elections, but it was thought the ends of justice would be better attained if these cases were brought before the courts of justice, and I say that justice would be better rendered if such grave charges as these were brought before a court of justice. I think the constitution ought to be amended in that respect, not to destroy the Committee on Privileges and Elections, but to give this House power to refer any such charge to the Exchequer Court with an appeal to the Supreme Court. If we are going to continue to refer these grave matters to the Committee on Privileges and Elections I would recommend a change in the constitution of the Committee, and that, instead of 42 members, we should have 9, with a quorum of 7, or even a Committee of 7, with a quorum of 5. What have been the facts of this case? In the beginning we were not able to proceed with a quorum of 22 members, and we had to ask this House to reduce that quorum to 11. Hon. gentlemen, no doubt, have noticed the voluminous evidence which has been adduced before our Committee, covering about 1,500 pages. A great deal of that evidence is perfectly needless; it is a repetition of previous evidence. Hon. members sometimes came to the Privileges and Elections Committee and put questions to members on points which had already been disposed of in their absence. I would, therefore, suggest that if the usefulness of the Committee on Privileges and Elections is to be continued in trying cases of this kind, the quorum should be greatly reduced, and every member of the Committee should make it his duty to attend the sittings from beginning to end. Now, it may not be out of place to give a little history of this case from the day it was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. We had, as I have said, 100 sittings of the Committee, and during the four months during which the Committee sat, many unforeseen occurrences took place. First, perhaps, the most important witness had left the country, that is, Martin P. Connolly, book-keeper of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. In the next place, Michael Connolly, one of the members of the firm, refused to produce his books, and we had to report him to this House, and it was only when he had been brought before the Bar of the House, that he consented to produce the books. A sub-Committee was appointed to examine those books, and in the first examination it was found that some of the books belonging to Larkin, Connolly & Co., implicating other parties, had been mutilated. The Committee then decided that it was necessary to call in the assistance of accountants. Accountants were summoned who took possession of the books, and they presented to the Committee a report which forms a portion of the evidence which has been presented to this House. It was also found that no reliance could be placed upon the calculations made by Mr. Boyd and Mr. Perley in extending the quantities, when the tenders were opened. The Committee procured the assistance of skilful engineers to go over the figures of Mr. Perley and Mr. Boyd, and their report also forms a portion of the evidence submitted to the House. Another difficulty which met the Committee was the fact that Thomas McGreevy was asked what he had done with a portion of the moneys he had received, or that were supposed to have come from Larkin, Connolly & Co., through his brother Robert H. McGreevy. He refused to answer and was reported to the House, and then sent in his resignation. A difficulty in parliamentary procedure arose in consequence of that resignation. It was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, who referred it to a special committee, and a report upon that incident of the case has also been presented to the House. Another incident in connection with the case was the resignation of Sir Hector Langevin. It was considered at the beginning, and, in fact, I believe it was expressly stated that Sir Hector Langevin, being charged as he was with an offence, was bound to tender his resignation as Minister of Public Works. He did not do so at first, but he did so about the time that he made his statement before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. His resignation was not accepted at once; it was only in the course of last week that the Government announced that his resignation had been accepted. Some criticism has been made of the course followed by Sir Hector Langevin. I have looked up some cases of parliamentary practice in similar circumstances occurring not only in England, but in this country. I do not intend to review all the precedents on that branch of the case, but I would refer, so far as our own practice is concerned, to the Blind Share case of the Prince Albert Colonization Company, which was referred to a committee six or seven years ago. An hon. member of the Government, Mr. Bowell, and Mr. White, a member, were accused, and the case was referred to that Committee. On that occasion no one suggested that Mr. Bowell, the accused Minister, should resign his position in the Cabinet. The investigation went on, no objection was raised, and the report of the Committee completely exonerated Mr. Bowell, and also Mr. John White. In regard to English precedents, I have no doubt my hon. friend will refer to the case of Lord Lennox, which came before the English Parliament in 1876. Certain revelations had been made against him in a trial before a court of justice in relation to the Lisbon Tramway. Lord Lennox immediately resigned, but contrary to another precedent the same year. In the same session a charge was made against the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. He did not resign; he made a statement in the House, there was a discussion, and he was exonerated immediately. He did not resign before a vote was taken, nor afterwards. Take another case which is, perhaps, more striking still, the case of Mr. Stanfield, in 1864. I do not intend to go beyond that date. A charge was made against Mr. Stanfield, a Civil Lord of the Admiralty, upon which an enquiry took place. Mr. Stanfield took part in the debate, but he did not resign—or rather he had sent in his resignation, but it was not made known to the House. Mr. Stanfield not

only did not resign, apparently, but he voted on the motion which was made implicating himself. The motion was carried by a majority of ten only. It was very evident that Mr. Stanfield had a weak case, and after he had voted, the attention of the Government was called to the fact that Mr. Stanfield was still in the Government, and he then stated that, considering that he was a source of weakness to the Government, and a cause of embarrassment to his friends, he had tendered his resignation. So much for the precedents with reference to the resignation of Sir Hector Langevin. I think the members of the Committee will bear me out in saying that the greatest latitude has been given to the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) in proving his charges; the greatest latitude has been given him, not only by the Committee, but also by the Government. We had the assistance of two counsel engaged by the Government to defend the department, of two engaged by Mr. McGreevy, and of one engaged by Mr. Tarte. I may say here that I am glad to recognize that the onerous duties of the members of the Committee have been greatly relieved by the assistance that we received from all those learned gentlemen. I do not think I am transgressing the rules of the House when I say that there was a verbal expression of opinion in the Committee that Mr. Geoffrion, counsel of Mr. Tarte, should be paid by the Government, together with Mr. Osler and Mr. Henry. The greatest latitude was given for the production of evidence. There were no divisions in any of the 100 sittings except on one day. I did not happen to be present, but I am aware that it was on a question on which the majority ruled that the investigation should go on—it was whether Mr. Thomas McGreevy should be reported to the House to answer or not, and it was carried in the Committee by 2 to 1, by 12 against 6 votes. All papers were produced. The papers of the firm were produced; not only the papers of the firm, but also the private diaries of all the parties, the private diaries of Thomas McGreevy and Robert McGreevy; and Sir Hector Langevin was asked to produce his diary, if he had one. There was no paper so private as to be excluded from the examination, the careful examination, of the sub-Committee. I state the sub-Committee, for, in order to do as little injustice as possible and disclose as little of the private business of these parties, a sub-Committee was appointed to examine the private books and papers before they were delivered to the full Committee. All possible information was obtained, and we have come down with the report the adoption of which I move. Before I consider the two reports presented, permit me, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of the House and the country to a fact which is undisputed: that the works done by Larkin, Connolly & Co. were carried out in a substantial manner, and that the country received the value it paid to those gentlemen. This is admitted all round. The total number of contracts, there being several in connection with the Quebec harbour, and one in British Columbia, was six or seven. The total amount of the contracts was $3,138,234. These contracts extended from 1878 to 1891, 11 years. The profits received on these contracts by the contractors was $735,061, or less than 25 per cent. It is generally conceded that contractors are entitled to receive a profit of 20 per cent. on all contracts. I must say that, in addition to those clear profits, the expenditure in connection therewith comprised also $48,466 for salaries paid different members of the firm. The sum of $170,407 was also paid by them, in addition to said salaries and said profits for donations and other extraordinary expenses for political and other purposes, subscriptions to churches, subscriptions to charity, and subscriptions for party purposes: the total amount of the expenditure, comprising clear profits as well as this extraordinary expenditure, was $953,975. These facts, I believe, are indisputable. Now, let us come to the two reports which were made by the sub-Committee. Before reading the conclusions of these reports, I will remind the House that these charges were directed against three parties: First, the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, member for Quebec West; second, the Department of Public Works; and third, Sir Hector Langevin, the Minister himself. At page 39 of the report of the majority of the Committee, the charges against Thomas McGreevy and the department are disposed of in the following words:—

"Having regard to various features which appear in the contracts which were the subject of this investigation, we feel bound to report that the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. conspired to defraud the Government and the Harbour Commissioners, and were materially aided in their designs by the interference of Thomas McGreevy, as has been shown in earlier parts of this report. This conspiracy has been all the more powerful and effective by reason of the confidence which the late Minister of Public Works had in the integrity and efficiency of his officers and by reason of the confidence which the late Minister entertained with regard to Thomas McGreevy, and has accomplished results which are to be deeply regretted as regards the administration of the department, and greatly to be condemned as regards those who lent themselves knowingly to the purposes of the conspirators."

Finally the Committee recommended:

"That in addition to such action as may seem to be called for under the findings hereinbefore expressed, such legal proceedings as may be available be taken against those who are concerned in this conspiracy, and that for that purpose the books and papers which were before your Committee be retained (or so many of them as may be necessary) in order that they may be available for such proceedings."

The way I read the conclusions of the minority report is that so far as Thomas McGreevy and the department are concerned, the two reports are not very far apart, if there is any distance at all between them. The minority report reads as follows:—

"In concluding their report your Committee would observe that the manner in which the several contracts were obtained by Larkin, Connolly & Co. from the Public Works Department and the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, the modifications subsequently made in these contracts in the interests of the firm, the enormous sums of money paid and allowed to them out of the public funds for extras and for damages, indicate without any reasonable doubt that this firm had gained a controlling influence over the Minister and Department of Public Works,

"That influence we believe to have been largely exercised through Mr. Thomas McGreevy."

I do not intend to dwell any longer on the case of Thomas McGreevy. It is almost a unanimous report so far as he is concerned, in fact I may say it is so. That hon. gentleman, I understand, has placed his resignation in your hands, Mr. Speaker, and has thus confessed that he committed the wrong that has been charged against him; and so, I think, it is not necessary on my part to offer any more remarks on this branch of the case nor with regard to the department. I come now to Sir Hector

Langevin, where the division of opinion seems to begin and to end. At page 39 in the majority report it is stated:

"The charges against Sir Hector Langevin, as already intimated, having been as above set forth, the Committee would observe that in course of the investigation an effort was made to connect him with the wrong-doing of others who have been reported against as directly connected with fraudulent conduct.

"Your Committee, therefore, report that the evidence does not justify them in concluding that the Minister knew of the conspiracy before mentioned, or that he willingly lent himself to its objects."

The minority report upon the same branch of the case says:

"It was suggested that the frauds might have been perpetrated upon the department through improper influences used upon Perley and Boyd, the engineers, but the closest examination of the books and the witnesses failed to disclose evidence of any improper payments having been made to Boyd, while the only one made to Perley was that in 1887 of the jewellery and diamonds—a time long after many of the contracts had been improperly awarded and moneys improperly paid.

"Except the desire to please and obey the Minister at the head of the department, we cannot discover any motives which would induce these engineers to assist in defrauding the public in order to put money in the pockets of Larkin, Connolly & Co.

"It is true we find that Boyd is a party to the fraud connected with the awarding of the cross-wall contract, and that Perley was a party to this and other frauds in the letting of the contracts and the payment of the moneys to Larkin, Connolly & Co., but the fruits of these frauds did not go into their pockets, but into the pockets of Thomas McGreevy, towards the support of the newspaper *Le Monde*, to which Sir Hector swore he himself financially contributed, so that he might have a controlling influence over it if and when required, and to the fund managed by Thomas McGreevy on behalf of the party in the district of Quebec in the political interest of Sir Hector Langevin."

You have, Mr. Speaker, the two reports word for word. Now, it seems to me that you would be struck with the finding of the minority report when they can see no motives for Mr. Boyd and Mr. Perley to act as they did, except the desire to please and obey the Minister of the department. Where is the proof to justify such a statement? There is none. Suppose they were not able to find the motive why Mr. Boyd and Mr. Perley acted as they did, would it be reasonable to infer and to conclude that it was to please and obey the Minister of Public Works, especially in the face of the following sentence which is to be found in that very report of the minority:—

"It is true we find that Boyd is a party to the fraud connected with the awarding of the cross-wall contract and that Perley was a party to this and their frauds in the letting of the contracts and the payment of the moneys to Larkin, Connolly & Co."

We find that the minority report says that Boyd and Perley from the very beginning had been guilty of fraud, and are we going to suppose for one moment that they did so to please, and upon the order of the Minister of Public Works, when there is no proof whatever to that effect? Now, Mr. Speaker, let me first dismiss the charge that was made against Sir Hector Langevin, the only charge in fact made in the reference which was sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. At page 44 of the minority report you find this charge reproduced from the reference:

"That certain members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. paid and caused to be paid large sums of money to the hon. Minister of Public Works out of the proceeds of the said contracts, and that entries of the said sums were made in the books of that firm."

The minority report concludes as follows upon that charge:—

"We find that the $10,000 was drawn by Murphy from the bank on the respective dates of the cheques, 2nd November and 21st November, 1887, and that each of the cheques was endorsed in the handwriting of Nicholas K. Connolly, but in view of the statement on oath made by Sir Hector that Murphy 'did not offer, loan, or pay him any sum of money,' which we assume he intended as a denial of his having received any moneys whether as gift, loan or payment, we are unable after much doubt to come to the conclusion that we would be justified in finding this charge proven."

In reference to this charge, I may mention, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) himself was very careful not to charge Sir Hector Langevin with any corrupt act and with any corrupt motives in his reference. Not only was he very careful in his doing so in his charge, but he also made a declaration which will be found at page 1141 of the evidence (old series). We here find a declaration of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) to the effect that he never intended to charge Sir Hector with corruption or any corrupt motives. Now, let us see the statement of Sir Hector Langevin himself. At page 1055 of the evidence you find this general statement made by Sir Hector Langevin which covers all the charges made either against himself or against the Hon. Thomas McGreevy or the Department of Public Works, so far as he himself is concerned:

"I begin by declaring that, in all departmental works mentioned before the Committee, I have fulfilled my duty most conscientiously, to the best of my knowledge of matters and of my ability, without ever having allowed anyone to influence me by promises or gifts of any kind whatever, and that my acts have always had public interest as their object; that I never received gifts, loans or values whatever, directly or indirectly, from the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., or from any of its members; that, in truth, Mr. Thomas McGreevy and I have been, for a long time, on friendly terms, and that he has been my guest at Ottawa in the period from 1878 to 1890, whilst I resided here as a Minister, and during which I did not receive from him, and he never offered me, any sum of money, gift or loan; that Mr. Thomas McGreevy has never tried directly, or, to my knowledge, indirectly, to influence me unduly in the execution of my duty, nor to obtain directly, or, to my knowledge, indirectly verbal information or documents that my duty would have required me to hold as private; that I never authorized any one to communicate to him any such information, and he has received none to my knowledge: that I did not know, before Mr. Tarte adduced evidence on the subject, that Mr. Robert H. McGreevy was a partner with Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co. or interested in their contract, and that Mr. Thomas McGreevy never gave me reason for suspecting that he was personally interested, directly or indirectly, in their works; that I always had full confidence in the integrity and capacity of the Chief Engineer of Public Works (Mr. Perley), and of the other officers of my department who had anything to do with the works which have been enquired into; that, up to the time Mr. Perley admitted it, I did not know that he had received any gift from the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., or from any of its members; that, therefore, not being myself an engineer, I considered I was justified in accepting and treating as correct the statements of the chief engineer and to adopt his advice about works of which, on account of their special nature, I was not competent personally to form an accurate idea."

Then at page 1066 you find another fact which throws more light upon the doings of the Minister of Public Works:

"In so important an administration as that of the Public Works, where the correspondence alone in this last year represents nearly thirty thousand official letters, besides 8,946 cheques, it is impossible for the Minister to see and know everything. He must necessarily leave to his chief officers that part of the work of the department which does not require a decision on his part. He must also have confidence enough in them, so long as they have not shown themselves unworthy of it, to rely on their fidelity and depend on their submitting to him all questions which require his interference."

That is the statement of Sir Hector Langevin; could a statement be more direct or positive? Why was his statement not accepted in the whole case? The minority report accepts Sir Hector Langevin's statement with regard to the alleged payment of $10,000 to him. If you are willing to accept his statement in that branch of the case, why not believe him with regard to every portion of the case in which he is interested? Allow me to call the attention of the House to certain rules of evidence, although rules of evidence do not always prevail even in the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It has often been impossible to adhere to the strict rules of evidence. For instance, a letter from one witness to another witness is produced, containing disparaging statements concerning one of the parties accused. That letter could not be admitted as evidence; but on the following morning it was published in the press, and, therefore, as chairman of the Committee, I thought it was better to admit illegal evidence with the possibility of explanations, than to have such letters published in the press without any explanations whatever. No doubt during the investigation a good deal of illegal evidence has been allowed; but when we come to give a decision on the merits, it appears to me that we ought to adhere most strictly to the rules of evidence. What Starkie says is an old rule of law:

"Positive testimony ought not to be rejected on the ground of inconsistency with circumstances, unless the incongruity be of a conclusive and decisive nature."

Where is the inconsistency in this case? Have we not the fact, which has been found by the minority report, that Perley and Boyd acted fraudulently from the beginning? Have we not there an explanation, and a natural one, of how the great frauds have been perpetrated by the department, aided by the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, in favour of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co.? Is not that sufficient to explain the success which all these parties achieved? Well, what was the good of having Sir Hector Langevin in the plot? The engineers were in the plot; the inspectors were in it; the contractors were in it. But the engineers, the inspectors, Mr. Thomas McGreevy and the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., did not need the intervention of the Minister of Public Works. The minority report contains charges in the body of the report which are, I believe, still more serious and more grave than the findings contained in the conclusion. For instance, at page 16, in regard to the dredging of the wet dock, it says:

"That the facts connected with the letting of the contract and its subsequent execution were known to Sir Hector Langevin, the Minister of Public Works, and that the frauds were perpetrated at least with his passive connivance."

Then, at page 22, with reference to the Lévis graving dock, the same report says:

"We find that the supplementary contract for $74,000, except that part which related to the building of the caisson for $10,000, was entered into without any justification, and that the contractors received this money without giving any consideration therefor, being bound by their original contract to do the work. And we find that all the facts were known to Sir Hector Langevin and his engineer, Perley, and that their conduct in assenting to the giving of this contract was highly censurable and a violation of public trust."

In relation to the cross-wall contract, at page 27, the minority report says:

"We find there must have been a conspiracy between McGreevy and some one or more of the engineers of the Department of Public Works to procure the contract for Larkin, Connolly & Co., and we find it difficult to absolve the Minister from a knowledge of the existence of that conspiracy."

There is not a particle of evidence in the whole of that report to show that Sir Hector Langevin knew that large sums of money had been paid either on account of the Lévis graving dock or any other contract, or that he knew of any conspiracy or any illegal payment. It is in evidence that in everything Sir Hector Langevin was supported by a report from his chief engineer. Mr. Speaker, I would blame the Minister of Public Works if he had undertaken to play the role of chief engineer, or if he had undertaken to pay the money to these contractors without having the report of his engineer; but once the engineer has taken the responsibility of his position, it is not for Sir Hector Langevin to interpose his own authority unless he sees clearly that the chief engineer is wrong. Why should not Sir Hector Langevin take the advice of his chief engineer? Was he not reputed to be an able man? Was he not also reputed to be an honest man? When he appeared first as a witness before the Committee on Privileges and Election, there was not a member of that Committee who was not satisfied that he was a perfectly honest man. It was only when the story of the diamonds and the jewellery came before us that we had to change our opinion. It is all very well for us to blame a Minister for having followed the advice of his chief engineer, after we have spent three or four months in an enquiry, after having the report of the engineers and the accountants who examined the accounts in the very minutest manner, and after having examined under oath 70 or 75 witnesses. We know more about the case than Sir Hector Langevin. If Sir Hector Langevin had had time to make such an enquiry into every contract and every payment, no doubt he might have found something that he would not have sanctioned, even in a passive manner. But let us place ourselves in the position of a Minister who receives 30,000 official letters every year; that is 2,500 letters a month, over 100 letters every day. You may say that he does not read every one of them, that a great portion of them are read by his subordinates. That is no doubt true, because he would not be able to read them all; but it must be supposed that a large proportion of that vast correspondence requires the attention of the Minister. Then, besides this official correspondence, you must remember that Sir Hector Langevin was one of the leaders of his party, and consequently he had to devote a good deal of his time to political interviews, besides almost daily Council meetings. Taking into consideration the position of the Minister of Public Works, the important and onerous duties he had to perform, will we not admit that Sir Hector Langevin took the correct view in his statement, when he said: I was bound to accept the advice of my chief engineer whose integrity and ability I had no occasion to doubt? If a Minister in dealing with technical or scientific matters is not to be protected by the advice of the scientific men he has to consult, I would like to know what Minister could consider himself safe. You see presidents and directors of banks deceived, and deceived for years, in matters with which they are familiar. You may also conceive of a Governor or a Lieutenant Governor being deceived by his advisers. His Ministers may be squandering away

public property, it may be said that their acts are publicly known, everyone may be talking about them, but still will you say that the Governor may be impeached without actual proof that he knew of the designs and doings of these thieves? It is the same thing in the case of a Minister. Unless we have actual positive proof that he knew of the wrong-doing of his chief officers, his denial, his positive denial, ought to be believed. The doctrine I am advancing is not new. It has been the rule of conduct of all Cabinet Ministers in this country. In matters of that kind the Minister has always been guided by the advice of his chief officers. Extras and changes have been allowed to contractors clearly against the terms of their contracts, claims have been made and allowed, not only by Governments, but by Parliaments—and this I will show, supported by a court of justice—clearly against the law and against the terms of the contract. Why were these claims allowed? Because strong equitable grounds were urged in their favour. I could find many such instances in the Department of Railways and Canals. I find a good many claims made against the very terms of the contract and against the law, in the case of the Intercolonial Railway contracts. These cases are of recent date, and I will content myself with referring to a few of them. Take the Sessional Papers of 1873, 1878, 1879, 1880 and 1881, and you will find therein a whole list of them. Many members of of this House know that under the terms of the Intercolonial Railway contracts and of the Intercolonial Railway Act of 1867, no extras were to be allowed except when caused by change in the grade or the location; but still, under one pretense or another, payments of large sums were made under the authority of this Parliament to contractors, contrary to the statute and agreements. Sumner & Somer, contractors, section 12 of the Intercolonial, received $702,866, although their final estimate was $548,844, making an amount over-paid, "by cost of work," of $154,022. Alexander Macdonald, section 5 of the Intercolonial Railway, whose contract price was $533,000 and final estimate $460,773, was paid $526,000; or $65,225 over-paid. Sutherland & Grant were over-paid $103,632. And King & Gough, $40,000. Here is a claim that was admitted by my hon. friends opposite when in power: the claim of G. and T. Worthington, sections 1 and 2 of the Intercolonial Railway contract. Their contract, like the others, excluded all claims for extras except when caused by change in grade or location, and they received $60,000 for extras. The following is the entry:—

"Partly on account of the difficulty met in the clay at Trois Pistoles."

Does anyone pretend to say that the Minister of Public Works in those days did not act properly, when he took the advice of his chief engineer in favour of those claims? Well, I hold that if that doctrine were good in the case of the late Minister of Public Works, it ought to hold good in the case of Sir Hector Langevin. But we have another case, in which several contractors on the same railway were paid large sums of money against the terms of the contract. A commission was appointed by the present Government to investigate the balance of the claims not yet settled. The commission was composed of Judge Clark and Messrs. Bolton and Broughton. In 1884 they brought down to this House a report granting to four different contractors a sum of no less than $253,996, contrary to the terms of the contract. I have read the report, and anyone who will read it will find that this amount was awarded in consequence of the Government instructing the commission not to charge the decreases to the contractors, notwithstanding that, under the contract, the contractors were to be charged with the decreases just as they were to be allowed the increases. This was done against the terms of the agreement and against the law, but it was sanctioned by Parliament in 1884, because it was supported by the advice of the chief engineer and upon equitable grounds. But we have also on this point the opinion to some extent of a court of justice. Some hon. gentlemen will recollect the case of the Queen and Murray, arising out of the Intercolonial Railway contracts, which came before Justice Fournier. There were a great many items in the claim which were clearly against the terms of the contract. Mr. Justice Fournier ordered the matter to be referred to experts. The Government appointed Mr. Samuel Keefer to examine into the claims. I leave out a great many items exacted by the terms of the contract, but I find, for instance, that there was 30,998 cubic yards of earth excavation, 23,881 of bush excavation, 6,878 yards of rip-rap, 6,207 yards of crib-wharfing, and even $1,000 allowed for damages caused by detention. This money was paid in consequence of a vote of Parliament, and the deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Lash, and Mr. McIntyre, counsel for the Government, reported that these moneys were fairly due. If it was right to pay those moneys in those days, because of the report of the chief engineer, why was it not right for Sir Hector Langevin to order the payment of money on the report of his chief engineer? I could quote many other cases where Ministers, unless some explanations could be given, acted apparently against the law. We have a law which declares that the contract must be awarded to the lowest tenderer. How often is that done? Are Ministers to be impeached for not doing so? Take during Mr. Mackenzie's Administration the River St. Charles improvements, which are a portion of the work done by Peters, Moore & Wright; the lowest tenderers were Denis O'Brien and Denis Gaherty by $25,000. Section 2 of the Welland Canal was let to an American company, though Macdonald & Tabb, and A. P. Macdonald & Co. were lower tenderers. Then take section 7 of the Welland Canal, which was awarded to Higgins & Sutherland, though there were three others lower; and section 13 of the same canal which wes awarded to Ginty & Dickey, though there were two lower tenderers. Take the dredging of the Goderich Harbour, which was awarded to David Moore who was $29,525 above the lowest tenderer. The contract for the Montreal examining warehouse, which was let to Bourgouin & Lamontagne, though Martin was lower. Look at the celebrated steel rails, for which the contract at $54.26 was given to Cooper, Fairman & Co., while the tender from Cox & Green for $48.67 was rejected; take the Lévis graving dock, which was awarded to Patrick Larkin, though Denis O'Brien and F. B. McNamee were both lower. The awarding of that contract to Patrick Larkin was the beginning of the now celebrated firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. Then there was the Quebec Dufferin Improvements, which were let to L. Z. Mallette, though there

were two lower tenderers. Then take the question of Section B of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was awarded to Fraser, Manning & Co. at an amount of $4,130,707, though Morse, Nichols & Co. tendered for $3,364,274, involving a loss to the country of $776,433. I do not intend to accuse the Ministers who awarded these contracts to men who were not the lowest tenderers of breach of trust against the terms of the statute, but I ask that the same rule should be applied to Sir Hector Langevin, and no more. We have, therefore, no reason to be scandalized because the terms of the contract have been exceeded or have been carried out against the law. We have no reason to be scandalized because Sir Hector Langevin, in acting as he did, followed the well-settled practice of the departments of the country. We have no reason that can be advanced to put aside the statement of Sir Hector Langevin and accept mere suspicions. Hon. members may have suspicions. There may be some circumstances which may throw some suspicion, but are we going to decide this case upon suspicion? No: we can decide it only upon the most positive evidence of the guilt of the Minister of Public Works. The way in which I view this case is this: Sir Hector Langevin has been the victim of his long intimacy with the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, an intimacy which began long before he became a Minister of the Crown, an intimacy which he did not see any reason for destroying when he became a Minister of the Crown. That has been his misfortune, and to-day he is the victim of that misfortune. Were it not for that, Sir Hector Langevin's name would not have been mentioned in relation to the charges of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte). The best, or at all events one of the circumstances which tend to corroborate this impression, that Sir Hector Langevin was not a party to the plot or conspiracy, is the fact that he did not see and did not take any means to pay these accommodation notes which Thomas McGreevy endorsed for him in regard to the confiscation of the Charlebois election, before the electors and before the Supreme Court. If Sir Hector Langevin was in the plot, he knew that McGreevy could obtain any money he pleased, and these notes would have been withdrawn from the public and from the banks, but those notes have been renewed within the last two or three months. Another suspicion is said to arise from the Langevin testimonial fund. The list of subscribers has not been reported, but I have read every name, and I say that that testimonial fund shows that, out of 150 names of subscribers, there is only one subscription of $1,000, that of Larkin, Connolly & Co. True, Mr. McGreevy brought $1,800 to that fund, but he stated that he obtained that from the City of Quebec, and we do not know who the contributors are. Most of the contributions are small, from $25 to $150, and made by personal admirers of Sir Hector and not by public contractors. Sir Hector Langevin has stated that he did not know who the subscribers were until this investigation commenced. This House has already passed an opinion in regard to the receiving of testimonials, and I accept that as sound. One more remark, and I conclude. A good deal has been said as to subscriptions for election purposes. I am sorry to say that the evil of these subscriptions lies on the people themselves. As long as the electorate will not cast their votes without their expenses being paid—call them legitimate expenses if you like—as long as committee rooms are required from candidates more than are actually necessary; as long as paid canvassers must travel through the country during the whole of the election time, the people must not expect that the money necessary to pay these expenses will come in every case out of the pockets of the candidates. There are some rich constituencies where the friends of the parties are wealthy enough to subscribe the necessary funds to defray those legitimate expenses; there are also counties where the candidates are rich enough to provide for such expenses; but, Mr. Speaker, there are constituencies where the funds must come from a distance. As long as the people of the country will not learn that they must cast their vote—I do not mean without bribery, but without involving a large expenditure to the candidate, I am very much afraid that the practice of subscribing for election purposes will continue, and that a portion of those subscriptions will come indirectly from the public purse. But, Mr. Speaker, whether election expenses must be continued or not, the moral lesson of this case is that members of Parliament must be careful not to handle any of that money. In England the subscriptions are handled by agents, and the same practice should be followed here. Members of Parliament should be very careful to keep their hands perfectly clean. It must be gratifying, however, notwithstanding the bad features of this case, that only one member of Parliament has been found guilty. If you look to the charge that has been made there is a reference to other members of Parliament. It is stated in the reference that Thomas McGreevy conspired with contractors to induce certain members of Parliament to assist them in obtaining certain public works, and that members of Parliament were paid by members of the firm. I am very glad to have to announce that at page 39 of the minority report, the minority state that this charge has not been proved. Upon the whole, I think that this enquiry will be productive of a great deal of good. I think that first-class engineers should be obtained to conduct the public works of this country; and if it is necessary to increase their salary, let their salary be increased, instead of exposing the public treasury to be plundered. I believe that not only the chief engineers of the Department of Public Works and of Railways and Canals should be able men, and men of character, but the deputies of those departments should also be engineers of high standing. The proceedings which the Committee recommends to the Government to take against the contractors and all who are parties to the frauds, will, I believe, have a good effect. They will teach contractors that if they subscribe funds for election purposes, they must keep within the limits of the law. Canadian contractors are so little accustomed to the new methods which have been introduced by Mr. Murphy into this country, in dealing with public contracts, that Mr. Murphy was very careful to keep some of them, so far as possible, in absolute ignorance of his doings. At the time their books were audited he represented to them, in answer to the charge that he was expending their money lavishly, that "It will be all right in the end." If we are to believe Michael Connolly, Nicholas Connolly and

Patrick Larkin, he kept them in ignorance of his doings: and if we are to believe Robert McGreevy, the moment he heard that the inspectors were paid, he sent a protest to the firm saying that he would not for one moment consent to such bribery. A big steal has undoubtedly been perpetrated on the public treasury: but I am confident that the revelations made before the Committee, and the proceedings that are to be taken, will check the evil. I move that the Seventh Report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections be adopted.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the first duty which I have to fulfil in taking the floor at this moment, is one of the pleasantest, that of congratulating the hon. member who just resumed his seat, upon the dignity and the tact with which he presided over the long sittings, the outcome of which we are now to examine. The hon. member proposed another mode of judging such cases as we now have to deal with. Were we always sure of a chairman as impartial, as distinguished and as enlightened as the one who presided over the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I would unhesitatingly say that we would have no ground for desiring the reforms which he suggests.

Mr. Speaker, on the 11th of May last, in answer to a charge that I made before the House, Mr. Thomas McGreevy spoke as follows:—

"I am very glad this charge has been made, and I hope a speedy investigation will take place. I am prepared to defend myself, and the result will be that the whole thing will be proved a conspiracy and false from beginning to end. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte), who takes up the case for those two parties whom I might call his associates, because the hon. gentleman has associated himself with them, has made statements and taken a position out of which I think he will have some difficulty in getting. I am prepared for a speedy and thorough investigation."

The first general observation of the report moved by my hon. friend reads as follows:—

"Having regard to the various features which appear in the contracts which were the subject of this investigation, we feel bound to report that the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. conspired to defraud the Government and the Harbour Commissioners, and were materially aided in their designs by the interference of Thomas McGreevy."

Without reading further from the conclusion of the Committee, I stand ready to admit, we all stand ready to admit, and I will say more, we all stand obliged to admit that a conspiracy has taken place. As to the extent of that conspiracy, I think we must be as prudent as true. In order to understand the matter truly, I think some reference should be made to the past. After the funeral of Sir G. E. Cartier, the distinguished statesman that in my early days I learned to love and admire, Sir Hector Langevin was elected our leader in the Province of Quebec. A great political crisis came upon us in 1873. The Government we sustained at the time was defeated. General elections followed in 1874. Sir Hector Langevin did not think proper to offer himself for election. His popularity had been destroyed to a very large extent by the accusations brought against him, accusations, which I say frankly, I did not believe at the time, and do not believe now. Time went on. My political friends then on your left, Mr. Speaker, made the gallant fight we all remember. In 1876 the Conservative reaction had commenced. I had, although a very young man, made up my mind to be a member of Parliament. An election was then contested, the election of Charlevoix. My political campaign had begun, when some friends, leaders of mine, came to me and told me: Sir Hector is a fallen man—he has been beaten; in the Conservative party we never go back on our leaders: you had better give up the chance you have and try to have him elected. I accepted the proposition at the time, and, after one of the most important fights that ever occurred in the Province of Quebec, he was elected. He was unseated for undue influence. In 1877 he was elected again, but by a reduced majority. The general elections of 1878 came. Sir Hector Langevin at the time thought proper to abandon Charlevoix and run his chance in Rimouski, where he possessed large family influence. In spite of it all, he was defeated. Sir John A. Macdonald came out victorious at the polls. We all remember the day he came down to Quebec to form his Administration so far as the Province of Quebec was concerned. I speak in the presence of friends who were there with me, and I call their attention to the circumstance, that, in spite of the fact that Sir Hector Langevin had been defeated, in spite of the fact that at the time Sir John A. Macdonald did not feel inclined to take with him Sir Hector Langevin, we rallied around him like true friends. The hon. gentleman I see before me, the Secretary of State, was with us at the time, and we asked the old chieftain, whom we are all sorry not to see again, we begged him to take again in his Government the man in whom we had confidence. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence had rendered great service: he was one of us, a young man; but we went back on him—he was not pleased at the time—and Sir Hector was taken in the Administration. He was appointed Minister of Public Works. In past days, during the fights of 1876-77, Thomas McGreevy had helped Sir Hector Langevin to a very great extent. As soon as Sir Hector Langevin was elected a Minister, Thomas McGreevy began to live with him in Ottawa. Sir Hector Langevin is not in his seat to-day, and no one is more sorry than I am: but he will remember that at the time a great many of us young men went to him and made representations to him. We felt they were not men of the same training: one having been a Minister, besides being, as every one knows, an educated man; the other man being scarcely able to write a letter correctly in his own language. We did not understand why such influence—and we felt it a very few months after Sir Hector Langevin was taken as a Minister—was made to interfere between the man in whom we had confidence and ourselves. At all events, such was the case. In 1879 Thomas McGreevy was elected a member of the Harbour Commission in Quebec, and Mr. Valin was elected chairman of the same board. Mr. Valin was at that time also a member of the House of Commons. Mr. Valin has been before the Committee. He has given testimony under oath, and I did not hear anyone state that Mr. Valin was not an upright and honourable man. Mr. Valin swore that finding that Thomas McGreevy had an idea of doing everything, that he was trying to run the Harbour Commission, that he was using Sir Hector Langevin's name, he, Valin, enquired what it meant. He received as his reply from Thomas McGreevy this statement: "I must tell you that I

am Sir Hector Langevin's confidential man. He requires a confidential man, and it might as well be me as another." Mr. Valin then went to Sir Hector Langevin and told him that McGreevy was taking this attitude, and the Minister advised him to follow Thomas McGreevy. He said: You know we frequently meet and consult together; by following him you could not make any mistake, he is a trusty man. On one occasion Mr. Valin said: The Minister told me that if the commision did not do well, he would dissolve it; and Thomas McGreevy repeated the same statement as coming from Sir Hector Langevin. Half the money that was spent by the Harbour Commissioners was money voted by this Parliament. Mr. Valin says in his evidence:

"I stood by the Minister's advice, and I followed Mr. Thomas McGreevy, and when I had a doubt I consulted the Minister himself."

Well, Sir, with a chairman instructed as Mr. Valin was, Mr. Thomas McGreevy in a short time, as a matter of course, became the chief factor and *Deus ex machina* of the Harbour Commission. We have had before the Committee several members of the Quebec Harbour Commission, and they have all established the very material and important fact that they have followed their engineer blindly—from the very moment that their engineer was Mr. Perley; so long as the engineers were Kinipple & Morris, it was quite a different thing. There are nine members of the Quebec Harbour Commission, and out of these nine five are appointed by the Government. It was very reasonable indeed that the five commissioners appointed by the Government should look for advice to their chairman, and also to the trusty man who was so near to the Minister; the Minister to whose department their principal officers belonged, the Minister from whom they were receiving the large sums of money they were spending, the Minister who took such an interest in the work that Mr. Dobell, one of the most intelligent men of Quebec, and a member of the Harbour Commission, stated in his evidence:

Q. From your acquaintance with Sir Hector Langevin during all this time you have been on the Harbour Commission, do you consider that he was very careful about details, and looking after all matters himself, giving personal attention to them?—A. I never knew a man that seemed to be able to take in every detail as completely as Sir Hector Langevin has been in this work, and he did not seem to neglect it. He seemed to be familiar with them all.

Q. He was perfectly *au fait* with all details of the contract?—A. With everything.

Then, Sir, with the chairman under his control, by the Minister's direction, if we are to believe Valin's evidence, thanks to his position as an intimate friend of the Minister, Mr. McGreevy was the head of the board which looked upon him, as Mr. Dobell says again:

"As the natural medium by which they would learn what the Minister of Public Works' views were."

Mr. Valin was a member of this House just as well as Mr. McGreevy. From 1878 to 1887 he represented the same county that I represent now. He was chairman of the Board of Harbour Commissioners, and still, strange to say, Mr. Valin was not looked upon as the natural medium of communication between the Minister and the board. Mr. Dobell says that he voted against Mr. Valin from the very beginning, and that he maintained all through a steady fight against him, because:

"I believe him incapable of performing the duties properly."

Mr. Giroux, the present chairman of the board, expressed the same opinion. Still, Mr. Valin was maintained in the position, in spite of us all, as I may frankly say. He was maintained in that responsible position until the last general elections, when he had, as I had myself, to incur the displeasure of the late Minister of Public Works. He was the right man in the right place. Was it because he had chosen to follow blindly and implicitly the "trusty man" who was very imprudently indicated to him by the late Minister of Public Works? Will you permit me to say, Mr. Speaker, that this very fact that Mr. Valin—an honourable man, but I admit at once, a man who might have been replaced as chairman of the Harbour Commission—is a fair sample of the direction given to the Conservative party in the Province of Quebec during the past ten or twelve years.

When the Harbour Commission was reorganized in 1879 with Mr. Valin as chairman and Mr. McGreevy as the Minister's confidential man, Larkin, Connolly & Co. were building the Lévis graving dock. The firm was then composed of Mr. Larkin, Mr. Nicholas Connolly and Mr. Nihan. One year after, in 1880, O. E. Murphy joined them on Nihan going out of the firm. Michael Connolly was evidently connected in some way or other with the firm, because in 1880 we find that Mr. Larkin writes to him as follows:—

"I am afraid that parliamentary duties absorb all of Langevin's time and that he is neglecting it. Urge your friends to immediate action."

Mr. Thomas McGreevy admits in his evidence that he knew Michael Connolly in 1878 or 1879, before even making the acquaintance of Murphy, and their relations seem to have been very intimate, if we are to judge of their nature by Mr. Michael Connolly's letters from Texas; in one of them he says:

"You do right in keeping in with Hon. Thomas, as just at present he has the whole thing in the hollow of his hand."

Strong as Mr. McGreevy was, it appears that some difficulties were in his way and in the way of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. That firm did not pull well and Mr. McGreevy, I suppose, did not pull better with the engineers, Kinipple & Morris, and Mr. Pilkington, their resident engineer, and they resolved that those engineers should be done away with. Murphy in his evidence says that those engineers were very severe upon them, that they obliged them to execute their work to the very letter. But he intimates clearly—and in that he is corroborated by other evidence—that their first reason in seeking to have these engineers dismissed was the fact that other works were at the time contemplated, especially the cross-wall. Murphy put himself in communication with Thomas McGreevy; they discussed the question together, and the question was pretty quickly resolved. The changes that they wanted specially at the time, and that they could not obtain, were changes in the stone backing. If hon. gentlemen will look at the evidence on page 1171, they will find that the very change to which Kinipple & Morris would not consent was made as soon as Perley was appointed; and the bill of fare of Larkin, Connolly & Co. for the change was $32,318. Well, Mr. Valin

swears—and I believe him, not only when he speaks of Mr. Thomas McGreevy, but all through his evidence, because I know him—that Mr. Thomas McGreevy told him that Kinipple & Morris were bound to go. I am prepared to give Sir Hector Langevin all the benefit of the doubt. Mr. Valin says: "I do not remember whether I spoke at the time to Sir Hector Langevin." At any rate, Kinipple & Morris were dismissed in June, 1883. The pretext of their dismissal was that they were absent, that they were not living in Canada, and that in consequence mistakes had been made. Sir, that pretext does not stand very well to-day in face of the facts we have before us. It is true, they may have made mistakes. Engineers, like all men, and it may be more than other men, may make mistakes, but still, if we compare the mistakes they made with the results that followed their dismissal, I believe that our judgment must not go too strongly against them. I wish to call your attention immediately to a fact, which is a striking feature in this case. For every fraudulent act that has been committed during all that long series of robberies, we find an official pretext or an official report. Kinipple & Morris were dismissed on an official pretext after an official correspondence. If you look at their reply you will find that their dismissal was not justified by the facts, but was the first move in the conspiracy as to which we all agree in this Parliament. It will be borne in mind, Sir, that Kinipple & Morris were at the time in charge, not only of the Quebec harbour works and the Lévis dock, but had been in charge of the Esquimalt dock also.

They were succeeded by Mr. Perley as chief engineer. Mr. Perley was as the time engineer in chief of the Department of Public Works. With Mr. Perley having his headquarters at Ottawa, and Mr. Thomas McGreevy and Mr. Valin working together in full harmony by the Minister's direction, both of them being members of the House of Commons, Thomas McGreevy living in close intimacy with the late Minister, and using his name freely, in spite of the denial of this fact in the report, with a firm of shrewd business men, bound together by a common interest in the hundreds of thousands of dollars which they saw they were going to make—I say, Sir, that was a strong combination of men and circumstances. And, had it not been for the fortunate quarrel which took place between them, they would have taken possession of nearly all the important public works of Canada, and they would have acquired an even stronger influence in our political world. I have in my hands plans of works that they were preparing to make, that they were sure to have; because it seems to me to-day as clear as sunshine that they were masters in the Department of Public Works. We agree, Sir, that there was a conspiracy; but it may be just as well now for me to say that this conspiracy was of a double nature. There was a political conspiracy and a financial conspiracy, the political conspiracy being aided, sustained and substantiated by the financial conspiracy. I am speaking to-day in the presence of the Province of Quebec, in the presence of my old political friends of the Province of Quebec, and I think, Sir, that the day of my vindication has come. That conspiracy which we Conservatives have seen at work for the last ten years was a very powerful one; it could crush nearly everyone. When I look around me, in the field of my political action for the last ten years, I see many men gone into private life who would have been to-day ornaments of this Parliament but for that conspiracy. I see other men before me who have fought arm-in-arm with me that conspiracy. The conspirators had money, they had public money, as we see to-day. Nay, more than that, any one of us who made up his mind to have an idea of his own, to stand by himself, was sure to incur the displeasure of those men, and if more of us are not politically dead, it is not their fault. Ask my hon. friend, the Minister of Militia and Defence, by whom he has been fought and nearly politically ruined in his own district. He will say, like a man, that he has been wrecked, as have been other Conservatives of the district of Quebec, by those men. Ask all the members of the Conservative party in the Legislature of Quebec by whom they have been ruined and thrown into Opposition and kept in Opposition, and they will say as I do—because I have the written evidence in my hand—that they have been ruined and betrayed, nay, more than that, the day came when they were very nearly being sold for money by those very peculators. If the old chieftain, whose seat is empty forever, were to-day in his place, he would be at liberty to produce before you the solemn protest that all the members of the Conservative party in the Legislature of Quebec signed in 1889. I was the one who, with another friend, brought the protest here to him. That protest declared that the Conservative party in the Province of Quebec was ruined and disgraced by Mr. Thomas McGreevy. Ask Mr. Taillon, the personification of honour, one of the most honourable men I have met, why he is no more in public life. He has been fought, as other men have been, from the very moment he would not comply with Mr. McGreevy's order to grant a bogus claim for $400,000 which Mr. McGreevy had fyled against the Quebec Government. In vain did we protest. The provincial elections of 1890 were at hand. Many of those papers which are brought to light before this Committee were in my hand. We had organized for the fight. Our Ottawa friends will remember the numerous interviews I had with them at the time. We found good-will, but there was a power behind the "throne" which was stronger than any one of them, as far as the province was concerned. All our efforts were in vain. We felt we were betrayed; and having had recently in my hands the papers, I made up my mind to publish what I did publish. I am fully prepared to admit to-day that I have been nearer going to gaol than coming to Parliament. Mr. Thomas McGreevy boasted in the streets of Quebec, even in this chamber, that he was quite able to ruin me, that he was controlling criminal justice, and that my days were numbered. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition who stood by me as true as steel in those fights knows what difficulties we had to face together; he knows in what way they came upon us; we saw there was an intrigue on both sides of politics to crush me, to send me to gaol, and that intrigue would have succeeded if justice were not stronger than wrong-doing. I make statements that may be very strong, but are very true. Criminal justice, to a certain extent, was at one time in the hands of Mr. Thomas McGreevy. He had also, with his other

influences, the strong political influence of money. He was a powerful man in the banks of Quebec. In the Union Bank he was, and I believe he is still, vice-president. That bank had a peculiar way of doing business when he was concerned. We have discovered in our Committee that the bank carried Sir Hector Langevin's notes endorsed by him, for the last ten years. I do not know any other bank which does such a kind of business. We have also discovered that Mr. Robert McGreevy's notes were carried for a long period, I think, eighteen years. I would like to know, and the Government itself may have reason to know, if the Union Bank is carrying a great many other notes like these. I speak on my responsibility, without any desire of injuring the bank, when I say that it is time the credit of Canada should no more be lent to men who do business as the Union Bank has done it, not only in this but in some other cases we know of. I have been very much accused for the course I have pursued. I must admit that I have been obliged to make a good deal of fencing: and if I had not made up my mind to look to the end, *de regarder le clocher*, as we say in French, I would not be here to-day. I did not make any dishonest bargain, however, thank God, but I repeat, I have been obliged to pass through many ways and roads. I think, however, that after all I find myself to-day in the right track. If my own political friends of twenty years' standing had chosen to have a little more belief—I do not say in myself alone, but in the written documents I offered them—I would not be to-day on this side of Parliament. My colleagues on both sides know full well that I have not been able to agree to a very great extent with the fiscal policy of my hon. friends on this side, and have been obliged to absent myself from divisions. That is a painful position for me to be in; but my political friends on the other side did not stand by me. I will say more than that—without a word of reproach, without any personal allusions and if only the friends I never deserted had had the courage to stand by me to the end, they would have achieved greater results.

At the time Larkin, Connolly & Co. contemplated the dismissal of Kinipple & Morris, they had made up their minds to arrange that Robert McGreevy, brother of the Hon. Thos. McGreevy and his confidant in politics and finance, should enter their firm. Both reports admit, and it cannot be doubted as a matter of fact, that Thomas McGreevy was a party to that partnership in this way, that his brother and himself consulted and agreed upon it. It may be true, and I believe it to be true, that Thomas McGreevy did not inform the other members of the firm that he knew that Robert McGreevy was a partner with them. Because it seems to me very clear, first, that he wanted to protect himself from indiscretion, which came later on upon him, and secondly, that he contemplated to have his share of the gain which his brother would get from the firm, and also he wanted to draw money directly from the firm, as it is proved he has done. In 1884 or 1885, eighteen months or two years after the cross-wall contract was awarded, Mr. Dobell, one of the Harbour Commissioners, warned the members of that body, and Mr. McGreevy was there at that time, that Robert had become a partner in the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. Mr. McGreevy denied this, and he denied it with some anger, at least so Mr. Dobell says. Having been warned in this way, why did he continue to furnish his brother with the information in the years 1885, 1886, 1887 and 1888? When pressed with questions, he refers to his brother as the broker of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. I think the real broker was Thomas McGreevy himself. The final correspondence between the two brothers is sufficient to establish the perfect knowledge that Thomas McGreevy had of that partnership. On the 14th January, 1889, Robert furnished Thomas with a statement of account since 1883—it reads as follows:—

"I received from Larkin, Connolly & Co. about $135,000, something under that I believe; you received from me out of this $135,000, or thereabouts, $58,000, besides some $117,000 paid direct to you by Larkin, Connolly & Co., and still you are not satisfied."

On the 24th, Thomas McGreevy answers:

"DEAR ROBERT,—Your letter dated the 14th January, 1889, with enclosed statement and charges against me from 20th February, 1883, to date, with also an interest account for same, and also statement of moneys collected on my account, has been duly received by me. I have handed your statement to Mr. Chaloner, who has given you credit for the full amount with interest. I would be obliged if you would see Mr. Chaloner and arrange with him our respective proportion of the National Bank account. Would you also send me statement of other properties or securities which you hold belonging to me. And in future you will make no further transactions in my name or on my account. I shall attend to it myself.

"I remain, yours truly,

"THOMAS McGREEVY."

It has been said, and it is said in the report of my hon. friends opposite, and in the report of the minority also, that we cannot exactly come to the amount that was paid to Thomas McGreevy. This answer of his of the 24th January, 1889, is by itself a very strong document. If Thomas McGreevy had not received from Larkin, Connolly & Co. the $117,000 his brother said he had, would he not have denied it at once? He said nothing of the kind. He said not one word of protest, and it seems to me that silence in that case is the same thing as admission. In 1884, when he wanted money for *Le Monde*, it was to Robert McGreevy that he applied. It was the same thing in 1887. He says: "What is the firm going to subscribe?" In June, 1885, he reminded his brother of the calculation they had made together. He says:

"According to your estimate and mine made here (Ottawa) the other day, only $190,000 would be required for the summer, and the $23,000 included in that."

In short, Mr. Thomas McGreevy's interference in the commission and the Public Works Department is felt in every contract we have gone through in connection with the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and that interference has taken place through the medium of Robert H. McGreevy, his brother. It was through him that he kept himself posted as to the doings of that now celebrated firm. The close intimacy of Robert McGreevy with Murphy is also to be attributed to that fact. Murphy was the confidential friend of Robert McGreevy. He was at the same time the confidential and financial agent of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. I do not agree with my hon. friend who has moved the report, when he says—and I know that he means what he says—that the other members of the firm did not know of all the doings of Murphy. I fully admit that, during the first years of the existence of the firm, Murphy was the head man of the firm.

He may be called the bad angel of the firm, if there were any good angels in the firm, but he is not the worst. Knowing all the facts of the case as I do —I do not suppose I am bound to defend any members of that firm—I say that he is not the worst of the lot. The close intimacy of Robert McGreevy with him is to be attributed to this fact. It is to Murphy that Nicholas Connolly, Michael Connolly and Larkin applied to see "their friends" and arrange with them. There are numerous letters and a quantity of verbal evidence to prove that. I hold that every one of them, from Thomas McGreevy to the last member of the firm, knew Mr. Murphy's antecedents. Murphy came into Canada in 1877. He has narrated under what circumstances he came. He went directly to his cousin and friend, Nicholas Connolly. He was a defaulter on the other side of the line in the way he has explained, but having some money still at his credit there, he gives to Nicholas Connolly, the ideal witness, a cheque to his own order, that Nicholas Connolly endorses himself, on those funds. If the cheque was not honoured, it is not the fault, at any rate, of Nicholas Connolly. Nicholas admitted that he knew the past career of Murphy; Michael Connolly knew it also. Michael Connolly has gone nearly all round the world with Murphy. Thomas McGreevy admitted under oath that he heard about Murphy's antecedents very shortly after he came down to Quebec.—

Q. Will you kindly tell us when you made the acquaintance of Murphy for the first time?—A. I do not remember much about it.
Q. Try to?—A. It must have been some time before I came on Harbour Commission.

He came there in 1879.—

—I do not think I knew him before that.
Q. Is it a fact that he came there in 1880?—A. I do not know what time he came there.
Q. In 1882 did you know Murphy?—A. I knew him to meet him, he was around the office.
Q. When did you learn for the first time that Murphy was a fugitive from justice?—A. I learned it sometime—I do not remember well.
Q. Can you recollect when you learned for the first time that Murphy was a fugitive from justice?—A. It was talked of in the streets from the time he came there.

Murphy, known as he was by Mr. Thomas McGreevy, a fugitive from justice, as they call him to-day, signed nearly all the contracts of the firm with the Department of Public Works and with the Harbour Commission of which McGreevy was one of the members. I do not see, then, what right they have to throw discredit upon the man they have chosen as their own associate. I do not see why, after he has signed with them nearly all the contracts that we have been called upon to investigate, they have devoted so much time and so many words to throw discredit upon him. They have chosen their own company. Before the Committee, Murphy was not treated as an ordinary witness, he was not treated as a man from whom it was sought to elicit the truth. I admit that he had a doubtful career; but at the same time it should not be forgotten that that career was known from the very men who allowed him to become a public contractor. The representatives of the Minister of Justice on this occasion, I submit, committed a mistake that is to be regretted; because I claim, and I do not make any boast, that Murphy has not told everything he knows. But, Sir, I must immediately say this much to the credit of the Minister of Justice. On this question, which is of so grave a character, I feel that I am not speaking as a partisan. From the very moment that the Minister of Justice perceived that I had a case, that he had been deceived by these men who had deceived the country—from the very moment he perceived that—and I am at liberty to say it because I have his permission to say it—he sent to me the two counsels for his Administration, Messrs. Henry and Osler; it on was the day that Mr. Perley was found to have received a bribe. They came to me and to my lawyer, and they said: It is better not to say publicly that we will work together as much as we can, but we have been authorized to come to you." I asked them, "By whom are you authorized?" They told me they had been authorized by Sir John Thompson. I asked them: "Are you going to take your orders from the Minister of Justice, or from Sir Hector Langevin?" Mr. Osler and Mr. Henry replied to me: "We are taking our orders from the Minister of Justice, and we are prepared to work with you to find out the truth as much as we can." I say that they have helped me, and Mr. Geoffrion, my lawyer, will tell you the same thing; they have helped us as much as their delicate position, and the delicate position of the Minister of Justice, allowed them to do so. I think, Sir, it is well that we should know, and that the world should know, that when a grave and momentous question like this is thrown upon Parliament, the representative of justice is prepared to stand by his duty, however delicate and difficult may be the position in which he is placed. Murphy, Sir, I must say, has not been an informer. We must draw the line somewhere. He did not volunteer to me much information. It is my fault if he is in the painful position in which he finds himself now. When he came to me with Robert McGreevy and gave me the first information, I solemnly declare that it was only to be shown to Sir John A. Macdonald—I swore that in another place. I am not in the habit of giving up a fight, when I think I can win it. I began to look after evidence; it came to me piece by piece; and, Sir, Murphy accused himself before a criminal court, was obliged to reveal what he has given to me. I am fully prepared to admit that there have been a great many perjuries committed in this case; it is just as well to admit there have been perjuries committed that are a scandal to Canada. We can trace them. I will not insist on the perjuries that I have heard, and of which I have been a witness; I will not name the parties who have perjured themselves to my knowledge. Sir, it is to be regretted that perjury can be tolerated in such a country as ours. I call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the necessity of reforming the law.

I said a moment ago that the first trace of the conspiracy can be found in the dismissal of Kinipple & Morris. At the same time it is apparent also in the dredging contract of 1882. I think my hon. friend who has moved the adoption of the majority report has not paid sufficient attention to this part of the case. One of the findings of the report is as follows:

"This is denied by Thomas McGreevy. The Committee have come to the conclusion that Thomas McGreevy knew of his brother's interest at the time that interest was acquired.

"There is no evidence of any express agreement on the part of Thomas McGreevy to give his help or influence to Larkin, Connolly & Co. in connection with these tenders

or their contract, but it seems to have been understood by the parties interested that such help and influence would be given."

I beg to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the facts of the case. It is admitted that Thomas McGreevy knew of his brother's interest; he also knew that Robert McGreevy was using Beaucage's name. In his evidence Thomas McGreevy says:

Q. You told us that Mr. Beaucage used to tender for Mr. Robert McGreevy?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you know that in 1882?—A. Oh, he had been doing it for a long time. He was under me as a sub-contractor on the North Shore Railway and he supplied me with quarries. I knew the men very well.

Again, let hon. members notice that Thomas McGreevy knew those two things. Tenders were called for in the spring of 1882. The members of the firm made their arrangements together. Owen Murphy's evidence on this point is as follows:—

Q. Will you tell us, if he was taken into the firm with the consent and knowledge of the Hon. Thomas McGreevy?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you discuss the matter yourself with the Hon. Thomas McGreevy?

Q. Did you discuss the position that Mr. Robert McGreevy was going to have in your firm, with anybody?—A. I discussed it with members of the firm—Mr. Larkin and with Mr. Thomas McGreevy.

Q. Then Mr. Thomas McGreevy knew full well that you were to take with you Mr. Robert McGreevy?—A. Yes.

Robert McGreevy examined, answered:

Q. Do you know, or are you able to state, whether your brother, Thomas McGreevy, had any knowledge about your interest in the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co.?—A. I do state so—yes.

Q. Will you explain to the Committee whether he had any knowledge, and to what extent his knowledge was?—A. He knew I was going into that contract, because he said before closing he would see Sir Hector to get permission from him whether I would go in or not.

Thomas McGreevy has denied the fact, and Sir Hector Langevin denied having been asked the question. Thus, on this point, as far as Sir Hector is concerned, I am prepared to admit there is no evidence. Let us now look at Larkin's testimony, as follows:—

Q. You stated yesterday that you thought it advisable to take a partner in Quebec, on account of your being strangers, from the place. Will you explain why you took Mr. Robert McGreevy?—A. I think I stated yesterday.

Q. Repeat it, please?—A. It was to have some person, as we were not treated fairly by the engineers, and, I thought, by the Harbour Board, to state our case to the Harbour Board, who had some influence with them. That is in relation to the dock. That was *my* reason.

Q. Were you aware that Robert McGreevy had some influence with the Board?—A. Certainly: his brother was a commissioner.

Q. You had in view his brother in taking him as a partner?—A. Yes, certainly I had. His brother would listen to him sooner than to us.

Q. Had you any conversation with Mr. Thomas McGreevy about that when you took his brother in?—A. None whatever.

Q. Was Robert McGreevy to be interested in the dock or future contracts?—A. He had no interest in the dock.

Q. But in any future contract that you might get in connection with the Quebec Harbour?—A. Yes.

I call attention to this answer because it corroborates entirely the answer given by Mr. Murphy, in which he said that when Robert McGreevy was taken into partnership with them, it was not only for the dredging contract of 1882 but for all future works in Quebec. The dredging contract was signed in September, 1882, and was continued until the end of the season of 1883. When Robert McGreevy was taken in as a partner with them the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. knew full well the extent of Mr. McGreevy's influence. Michael Connolly, writing from Texas on 12th October, said:

"SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, 12th October, 1882.

"FRIEND OWEN,—Yours of the 2nd inst. was here in San Antonio before I arrived. I am glad to hear that you have got along so well with the work the past season. You do right in keeping in with Hon. Thomas, as just at present he has the whole thing in the hollow of his hand. You tell me you have the contract signed for the harbour work, but I think you have given Bob more than he is entitled to, especially as he is not furnishing any capital. But of course you, who are on the ground, ought to know best, and it would be better to make a hundred thousand dollars with him in, than fifty thousand dollars with him out."

That has been the policy that Larkin, Connolly & Co. have pursued all through these transactions. They found it better to make thousands of dollars with their "friends" with them than a few hundred dollars with their friends out. Owen Murphy explains very well the whole case, and he is corroborated all through in the following words:—

Q. Have you any recollection that tenders were asked twice?—A. Yes; this (referring to a paper in his hand) is the first dredging contract.

Q. Did you put in a tender the first time?—A. No.

Q. Why?—A. I had it made out and was going to the Harbour Commissioners to put it in when I met Mr. Thomas McGreevy, who told me not to put it in; that they would not be opened: that the commissioners intended that the contract would be re-advertised. The consequence was that I did not put it in.

Q. Did he give you any reason why you should not put in a tender?—A. There were considerable reasons, but I have no remembrance of any other one than that he said they would re-advertise to show Moore & Wright that we were not going to tender and that we would have an advantage in the next tender put in.

As a matter of fact, the first tenders were not opened, in conformity with a motion moved by Thomas McGreevy. In the minute book of the Harbour Commissioners, page 350, we find the following:—

"Moved by Hon. Thomas McGreevy, seconded by William Rae, Esq., and *Resolved*, That inasmuch as it appears on the recommendation of the Harbour Master to be advisable that a depth of water in basin and docks, new harbour works, be increased from 24 feet at low water to 26 feet, it be decided upon not to open the tenders for excavation, &c., on the 24-foot basis, but to advertise for tenders on the 26-feet line, and they be required to be sent in by noon on Tuesday, 4th July prox."

Mr. Speaker, here is another instance of official pretext. Look at the facts. A depth of 26 feet was never reached. It was given as a pretext for new tenders that they should reach 26 feet, and Mr. Thomas McGreevy, the *Deus ex machina* of the Harbour Commission himself moved that the depth should be 26 feet, but it never was reached. He has remained since that time a member of the Harbour Commission, and what do we find? Listen to Mr. Boswell's testimony:

"*Examined by Mr. Tarte:*

Q. Will you point out to us and count the spots on which there are not twenty-three feet of water (referring to the chart)?—A. That is the only spot.

Q. Only one spot?—A. Only one spot.

Q. I speak of the whole basin?—A. There are places in here (pointing to the lower left hand corner) where there is only one foot or two feet of water. That is in the corner where there never has been any dredging. The ground is as it was originally.

Q. Will you count the spots on which there is less than twenty-five feet?—A. As I told you yesterday, these marks indicate the places that are less.

Q. Count them?—A. About forty-nine, somewhere about there. That is not absolutely correct.

Q. There are forty-nine spots on which there is not twenty-five feet of water?—A. Yes.

Q. What is the depth of these spots?—A. Between twenty-three and twenty-four and a-half feet.

You will see that this was not a very willing witness. The official pretext this time is very clear, and

the results are very clear too. New tenders were then called for, and what happened? Eight tenders were received and the lowest of all was that of Messrs. Fradette & Miller: the next lowest was the tender of Beaucage, and, as I have said, Beaucage was known as the tenderer of Robert McGreevy. This fact was known by Thomas McGreevy. The duty of the latter then, as a member of the Harbour Commission, was to insist that the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. should take the contract of Beaucage, but what do we find? We find here again another official pretext. We find on the 10th of July a letter from Mr. Verret, the secretary of the Harbour Commission, which reads as follows:—

"10th July, 1882.

"Messrs. Fradette & Miller,
"Contractors, Quebec.

"Gentlemen,—I am directed to inform you that the Commissioners are prepared to accept your tender for dredging provided you make a deposit of ten thousand dollars ($10,000) in cash on or before three o'clock, p.m., on Wednesday next, 12th instant, for the due performance of the work you have tendered for, and provided also that if the contract is awarded to you, you will undertake to commence the work on or before the 1st August next and that you will deliver the whole on the 1st November, 1883, it being, however, understood that the award of the contract must be ratified by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works.

"I am, Gentlemen,
"Your most obedient servant
(Sgd.) "A. H. VERRET,
"*Secretary-Treasurer.*"

There is a condition very clearly stated here, namely, that the works were to begin on the 1st August, 1882, a very few days afterwards, and a deposit of $10,000 was to be made. Fradette & Miller could not comply with that new condition, and although they had already done important works for the Harbour Commissioners, yet being given only 24 hours to provide for a deposit of $10,000, they found it impossible for them to do so. We find another tenderer, Mr. Askwith, of Ottawa, sending immediately his cheque for $10,000, and at the same time a letter to the Harbour Commissioners which contained the following:—"Gentlemen will you give me two weeks to bring my plant on the ground. I have dredges for the works on the lakes. I am not quite sure that they will suit for the tidal work in Quebec; give me two weeks only and one week more to bind myself and I will see what I can do." What is the answer of the Harbour Commissioners? The answer is: "If in 24 hours you do not give us your answer 'yes' or 'no' we will send you back your cheque." He was not able to comply with that condition, and what do we see next? Beaucage, the bogus tenderer of the firm of Robert McGreevy, to the knowledge of Thomas McGreevy, asks from the Harbour Commissioners permission to withdraw his tender and that permission is granted him immediately.

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

After Recess.

Mr. TARTE. I was calling your attention, Sir, to the Askwith tender. I think, for the understanding of the case, it is better that I should read Mr. Verret's answer. On the 28th July, 1882, he writes as follows:—

"Sir,—I am directed by the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 18th instant, enclosing a cheque for $10,000 as security for the due performance of the contract for dredging, which you have tendered for, and which has been conditionally offered to you. I am further requested to inform you that the commissioners cannot allow you any further time to consider your acceptance or refusal of the contract, but insist on an answer within twenty-four hours from now, this day, as to whether you accept or refuse. Your cheque will be returned if the commissioners do not hear from you within the time above directed, and the contract will be offered to other tenderers.

"I am, Sir,
"Yours,
"A. H. VERRET."

Askwith being given so short a notice, was obliged to withdraw his tender. But what do we find? The Harbour Commissioners who were in so great a hurry when Askwith was asking for some delay, signed the contract with Larkin, Connolly & Co. only on the 25th of September, that is to say, two months after the day fixed for all the other tenderers. They told him he would be obliged to begin the work on the 1st of August; but they signed the contract with Larkin, Connolly & Co. on the 25th of September. I refer my hon. friends to page 3 of the blue-book. But what is worse even than that is that Larkin, Connolly & Co. had no plant at all on the ground. They began the works only in the following spring, and their first estimate was not paid until the month of June, 1883. Robert McGreevy, examined on this point, speaks as follows:—

Q. Do you remember when the works in execution of that contract were begun by Larkin, Connolly & Co.?—A. In the spring of 1883—the next year after the contract was entered into.

Q. No work was done in the fall of 1882?—A. No: they had no plant. They had to build their dredges and scows during the winter, and they did not begin until 1883—May, 1883.

Now, this contract was approved by the late Minister of Public Works. I do not accuse him of a wilful fraudulent act in this matter. In such a case the benefit of the doubt must always be given to the man who is accused, especially when that man is not only a member of the House but a Minister. But the late Minister cannot be exonerated from all blame in such a case. He had before him all the facts. He knew that the date fixed for the beginning of the work was the 1st of August, 1882; he knew at the same time that the work did not begin till 1883. These are not arguments; these are facts. That contract, which had been given for a certain amount of work, to be finished in 1884, was continued until the end of the season of 1886. If you refer to the quantities given in the tenders, you will find that they amount to 433,000 yards in round figures; and if you refer to the quantities paid for, you will find that the contractors have been paid for nearly 2,000,000 yards. When the tenders were asked for, a certain quantity of work was specified; but that quantity of work has not been adhered to. No conditions that were imposed on the tenderers have been complied with. If I insist on this point, it is because my hon. friends who have drafted the report have thought proper to find that Mr. Thomas McGreevy did not use his influence on behalf of Larkin, Connolly & Co. I believe that that part of their report cannot be sustained by the facts. When the moneys voted for the first contract were exhausted, Mr. Thomas McGreevy—not the Harbour Commissioners—went to the ex-Minister of Public Works and arranged with him for a new subsidy. In 1885, you find in

a letter, page 974, which Mr. Gobeil wrote to the Harbour Commissioners, that an agreement took place between Sir Hector Langevin and Mr. Thomas McGreevy to the effect that $50,000 more would be spent on dredging. It seems to me that when we are face to face with those facts, especially with this last fact, that a second arrangegement was made by Mr. Thomas McGreevy with the ex-Minister of Public Works, it is not possible to say that Mr. Thomas McGreevy did not interfere to help the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. through. I hold that Mr. Thomas McGreevy helped them in getting the first contract for dredging in 1882; I maintain that he helped them in that second transaction of $50,000: and it seems to me that these facts prove that the organization, whose working we will be obliged to follow through all those fraudulent transactions, was then beginning to work too well for this country. Before leaving this subject, I beg to call your attention to a letter of the late Minister of Public Works, dated 31st July, 1882, in which he enquires from the Harbour Commissioners if there has not been any collusion among the parties who tendered for the dredging. This letter was answered by the Harbour Commissioners, who said that it was useless for them to defend themselves against such an accusation. Mr. Thomas McGreevy, knowing everything that we know now, was guilty of a breach of trust because he allowed the Harbour Commissioners to reply that they were sure that there was no collusion whatever. In this instance, taking the most lenient view of the case, namely, that Sir Hector had been deceived by Thomas McGreevy, he was deceived in a way in which no man who took greater care in the administration of public affairs, could have been deceived. The letter was more than this. It is much to be regretted that the late Minister of Public Works did not follow in other cases the precedent he adopted in that dredging contract. For instance, why did he not write in the cross-wall matter? Why did he not enquire if the parties tendering for that contract were not guilty of collusion, as he enquired in the matter of the dredging contract of 1882? Is it not a striking fact that in this case Beaucage's name appears for the first time, in 1882? And is it not a striking fact also that in the cross-wall contract, two months afterwards, in 1883, we find the very same name and the very same results? In the tender of 1882 Beaucage was allowed to withdraw the lowest tender of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and in 1883 the same permission was again given.

Coming to the cross-wall contract, tenders were asked in April, 1883. They were opened by the Quebec Harbour Commissioners and then sent to Ottawa to be moneyed out. There were five tenderers: John Gallagher; George Beaucage; Larkin, Connolly & Co.; Peters, Moore & Wright; Samson & Co. The three tenderers, Larkin, Connolly & Co., Beaucage and Gallagher, belonged to the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and their tenders were prepared in the interests of that firm. Mr. Thomas McGreevy was aware of all those facts, as he was aware of his brother's interest in the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. On the 5th of May, 1883, he writes as follows from Ottawa:—

"My Dear Robert,—The tenders for the cross-wall only arrived here yesterday and are locked until Monday when he will commence his calculation. I will write you Tuesday and let you know the result. Larkin was here yesterday. I told him it would be useless to get Peters out of the way, as it would be tantamount to giving the contract to the highest tenderer, that you would have to stick to the Beaucage tender as it was fair.

"Yours truly,

(Sgd.) "THOMAS McGREEVY."

This letter proves most conclusively, first, that Mr. Thomas McGreevy knew that the Gallagher tender was the lowest; second, that Mr. Beaucage's tender was the second lowest; third, that Peters, Moore & Co. came after those two; and the highest tender was the one of Larkin, Connolly & Co. I ask members of this House if a man occupying a seat in Parliament and who was at the same time a member of the Harbour Commission at Quebec, was not bound by his oath of office, was not bound by honour, to stand by the lowest tender? In his own evidence he admits that when the tenders were opened in Quebec he knew that Gallagher's was the lowest. Well, what do you find? In the very first letter of the 5th of May, he writes to his brother: "You will have to stick by Beaucage's tender;" that is to say, the tender higher than Gallagher's. One unfortunate feature of the case is this, that the ruling of Mr. Thomas McGreevy on the 5th of May was followed by the Minister of Public Works. It seems to me that, as soon as these tenders came before him, as soon as he saw clearly that Gallagher's tender was the lowest, his duty was to stand by that lowest tender. But let us not anticipate. Thomas McGreevy admits in this letter that he had seen Larkin that day and told him that it would be useless to get Peters out of the way—meaning to buy him out—because it would be tantamount to giving the contract to the highest tenderer. At that time he found it would be impossible to reach Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s tender because it was too high. But he says, I will give you information. Under the 7th May he writes again to his brother:

"I hope to let you know to-morrow about the result of cross-wall tenders. Have your arrangements right with Beaucage before result is known. I will give you timely notice."

Thomas McGreevy admits by this he knew that arrangements had been made between the firm and Beaucage. The fraud which began on the 5th May was going on. On the 7th May, Thomas McGreevy still believed it was impossible to reach Larkin & Connolly's tender. On the 8th May he writes that Boyd has finished his calculations. He admits in his own evidence that he sent to Robert McGreevy, his brother, the schedule of rates as moneyed out by Boyd. On the 13th May Robert and Thomas McGreevy meet together in Montreal. There Thomas McGreevy gives his brother all the figures he has, and I call your special attention to this important fact, that Robert McGreevy swears, that they then had the original figures as made out in the Department of Public Works. This has not been denied either by the Minister of Public Works or by Mr. Thomas McGreevy. This fact is a most important point in the case. After having in this way met Mr. Robert McGreevy, Mr. Thomas McGreevy meets Murphy in Quebec, and there Murphy tells us he offers Thomas McGreevy $25,000 if he can manage in such a way as to reach Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s tender. I know that Murphy's evidence will be assailed, but facts are facts. Nothing is stronger than facts. What has happened? From the very moment that this offer

is made, what do we see? Thomas McGreevy changes his mind immediately. He does not stand any more by Beaucage's tender. I suppose it would have only paid him $5,000. the price mentioned in Beaucage's transfer to Larkin, Connolly & Co., but there begins the intrigue which does not seem to have attracted the attention of my hon. friends on the other side of the House. On the 17th May the Department of Public Works writes a letter to Larkin, Connolly & Co., another to Beaucage and another to Gallagher, calling the attention of each of them to pretended errors in their tenders, and on the very same day Thomas McGreevy writes to Robert McGreevy in this way:

"As I told you yesterday to try and get a good plan and as quick as possible in answer to letters that Gallagher and Beaucage will receive about their tenders."

Thomas McGreevy here is clearly guilty of a conspiracy, and I say that the Department of Public Works is itself clearly guilty of the same conspiracy, because from whom could Thomas McGreevy ascertain that these letters would be written on the 17th. I would like my hon. friends who have drafted the report to answer me clearly on this point. They have said that Mr. Boyd is guilty. I am not prepared to go so far. He is a dead man, and is not prepared to defend himself, and it may be that the guilty parties may shield themselves behind him. The schedule of rates was out of Boyd's hand on the 17th. On the 16th it was in the hands of Perley and of the Minister, and I say without any hesitation that one of them is guilty of giving Thomas McGreevy the information which he used as the keystone of this conspiracy. There is no other alternative. One of the two is guilty. Who is the guilty man? We will wait for the evidence by-and-bye. It may be better to read the whole letter of the 17th May:

"As I told you yesterday to try and get a good plan and as quick as possible in answer to letters that Gallagher and Beaucage will receive about their tenders to bring them over L. & C. so as their tender will be the lowest."

As soon as this letter is received, the fraudulent work begins, and here to my mind begins also the responsibility of the Public Works Department. Boyd completed his work of moneying out the divers tenders on the 8th May, if we are to believe McGreevy's letter of that date. For several days nothing seems to have been done. When Mr. Perley described to us the way of opening tenders he told us that the tenders, after being opened, were put into the hands of the Minister. If it was done this way on that occasion, the Minister must have had the tenders and the moneying out of the tenders very shortly after 8th May, 1883. As Mr. McGreevy has sworn, Gallagher's tender was clearly the lowest. I am expecting an explanation from my hon. friends who have drafted the report on this point. How is it that the late Minister of Public Works, seeing that Gallagher's tender was the lowest, did not call upon him immediately to sign the contract? This has not been explained. I do not think it can be explained. The Minister and his department cannot plead that they were in ignorance of what was going on. On the 7th May, 1883, Sir Hector Langevin wrote this letter to Mr. Peters:

"MY DEAR MR. PETERS,—Your letter of the 26th reached me some days ago, but it was impossible for me to answer you before to-day. I cannot fix a day to have an interview with you. If you want to see me during the session you must run your chance, inasmuch as I cannot foresee, from day to day, whether I shall be free the following day or not.

"Yours very truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN."

Mr. Peters did not get discouraged. On the 9th of May he answers as follows:—

"MY DEAR SIR HECTOR,—I am this moment in receipt of yours of the 7th instant, will have to do as you say, run my chance.

"I would now ask your favourable consideration of my tender for cross-wall, we are the only parties having all the plant required for immediate carrying out of this work. The experience acquired in constructing the Louise Embankment fits us in a special manner for the successful performance of this contract: besides, Colonel Moore, with whom I am associated, has had much experience in the building of coffer dams which would be of great advantage in the present work.

"Trusting that it will be in your power to award me the above contract, as being a continuation of the work I commenced, including the ballast wharf in 1864.

"Believe me, dear Sir Hector,

"Yours faithfully,

"SIMON PETERS."

Well, Sir, this was a pretty strong warning, but another warning had preceded. On the 5th of May Mr. Peters wrote to Mr. Baillairgé, the Deputy Minister of Public Works:

"DEAR SIR,—Amongst the tenders for cross-wall of Quebec harbour works sent in on Wednesday last, you will find my tender. From information obtained since that day from the other tenderers, we have reason to believe that when the quantities are worked out the tender that bears my signature will be found to be the lowest; although one tender is below us on the lump sum for coffer dam and unwatering, this difference will be more than made up on the crib-work, stone-filling, masonry backed with concrete, and earth-filling, &c. I would ask you for old acquaintance sake to take a personal interest in looking into this matter for me. I have not the pleasure of knowing your Mr. Perley, or I would have written to him. We have all the plant and experience for this work.

"Believe me,

"Yours faithfully,

"SIMON PETERS."

This was on the 5th of May. The Department of Public Works, usually so quick in answering letters, was this time very slow indeed. I find that the answer came only on the 16th of May, as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—I duly received your letter of the 5th inst., on the subject of the tender submitted by you for the construction of the proposed cross-wall in connection with the Quebec harbour works—and have communicated it to the Chief Engineer of the department, Mr. Perley.

"The schedule of tenders has been handed to the Honourable the Minister.

"I am, dear Sir, yours very truly,

"G. F. BAILLAIRGÉ."

On the 16th of May, as Mr. Baillairgé says, the schedule, as prepared by the engineer, was in the hands of the Minister. From the 8th of May till the 16th no step was taken by the department to call on Gallagher to sign the contract. Mr. Peters could not find his way in the department, he could not be seen; but Thomas McGreevy had been given ample time to work out his "good plans," and on that day the plans were ready, as we find by Gallagher's letter:

"To the Secretary,

"Department Public Works,

"Ottawa.

"MONTREAL, 16th May, 1883.

"SIR,—Since my proposal for the 'cross-wall,' Quebec, which I learn from the secretary of the harbour works has been sent to your department, I find, owing to the length of time that has passed since my tender went in and the time it may take to decide, and from the fact of fearing further delay, I have taken another contract and I

wish to withdraw my tender for the said work on condition of my deposit cheque being returned to me.

"Very respectfully, &c.,

"JOHN GALLAGHER."

That is to say "very respectfully, Michael Connolly," because the letter is in Michael Connolly's handwriting. It is printed at page 88. Well, Sir, it is a peculiar fact that no answer is to be found to this letter. The ruling given in Thomas McGreevy's letter of the 5th of May is adopted by the Department of Public Works. Gallagher's tender, it is a foregone conclusion, will not be entertained at all; they are bound to have the highest tender by any means. The only reference in the public records that we find about that letter, is in Mr. Perley's report to the House last year, as follows:—

"The reply to my letter to Mr. Gallagher was to the effect that he has withdrawn the tender, and on enquiry I find that on the 16th May, 1883, he had written to the department asking to withdraw his tender, and that his cheque should be returned."

I say again that no permission was given to Gallagher to withdraw his tender, but effect was given to Mr. Thomas McGreevy's letter of the 17th, and of Perley's letter of the same date. You will remember that this letter was to the effect that in answer to Perley's letter to Gallagher and Beaucage, the answer should be made in such a way that his tender should be put higher than Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s. Beaucage, so invited to amend, does so. It seems to me that it will appear clear to every reasonable man that his so-called amendment was a fraud of the worst kind, worse than the so-called errors in the three tenders of Larkin, Connolly & Co., Beaucage and Gallagher. In those tenders they had put for sheet-piling 19, 17 and 15 cents per lineal foot, which was a ridiculous price. What does Beaucage do? In order that his tender may become higher than that of Larkin, Connolly & Co. he replaces 19 cents with $19, 17 cents with $17, and 15 cents with $15. A reasonable price was $8 or $10. By this "good plan," as Thomas McGreevy calls it, Larkin, Connolly & Co. became the lowest tenderers. Gallagher was permitted to withdraw; Beaucage's tender was amended in the shameful way I have indicated. There was not an hour lost. On 23rd May Mr. Perley made a report, in which he advised that Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s tender be accepted, and the Minister immediately concurred in his engineer's opinion. I do not wish to incriminate, more than does the evidence, the late Minister of Public Works. We have here the statements from which to judge. I do not say I am not prejudiced; I say frankly, I may be prejudiced, and I may be mistaken. But when we come to the evidence, it is for every member to judge. In Perley's evidence there are the following words:—

"I am aware that those tenders were placed in his hands (Boyd's), that he prepared the schedule, and he discovered the errors in three of the tenders, marking those errors on the margin of the schedule sheet. I believe it is in evidence; he called my attention thereto, and as it was my duty to do so, I laid that schedule sheet before the Minister of Public Works and discussed with him the errors that had been detected and that unless those errors were cleared up in some way it was impossible to make a comparison between the three tenders which were incomplete and the two tenders that were complete.

"At that discussion I have no doubt no direction was required, but as it is the course I have always pursued in cases of tenders, and as I have done in many instances since—I won't say by direction of the Minister, but with the knowledge of the Minister—I wrote the three letters to the parties, that is, Larkin, Connolly & Co., George Beaucage, and John Gallagher. Two of the letters were exactly alike."

Before the letters to Larkin, Connolly & Co., Gallagher and Beaucage were written, the Minister had before him the schedule of rates. If it was not by his directions it was after there had been a discussion with his engineer, and to his knowledge, that the letter of 15th May was written. He knew then the so-called errors; and if we are going to stand by the brief of the lawyers of the Public Works Department, the Minister should be condemned, because they said that those three errors were perceptible errors, and those three tenders bore every evidence of a common origin. But let us not take for granted as criminal facts matters respecting which there may be doubts. Mr. Perley continues his evidence as follows:—

"I received the letters in reply. I then wrote a letter to the department submitting the schedule with the corrections made. I might say that after my letter had been despatched to Gallagher and almost before he could have received it, there had been received in the department a letter from Gallagher asking to withdraw his tender for the reason stated in that letter. Therefore no change was made and he adhered to his prices, I think. That narrowed us down to the four put in. Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co. stated they adhered to the prices they put in."

Mr. Perley swears that all the papers were put in the hands of the Minister. He goes on to say:

"All the columns were added up, because the addition is in my handwriting, but the body of the schedule is in the handwriting of Mr. Boyd. It was then sent forward to the Minister. That is my connection with these schedules."

I want an explanation of this evidence of Mr. Perley. Did Mr. Perley speak the truth? He has been severely discussed, and he deserves to be severely condemned by this Parliament without doubt. But is his evidence true or false? If it is true, the Minister of Public Works must explain his conduct to Parliament, because if he saw the errors before they were corrected, if he consented that the letters of the 17th May should be sent, if after the replies came in he consented, knowing that Gallagher's tender was the lowest, to passover that tender, and if he consented to the amendment of Beaucage's tender—I say there is no alternative for us after all. I hope to obtain some explanation, because it is a case in which the Minister of Public Works has been placed in a position of great difficulty by his own engineer's evidence. In their brief Messrs. Osler and Henry say the three tenders bore marks of common origin. I think the Department of Public Works, or some one in the department, was acting in the interest of those parties; and there is no stronger evidence of the truth of this assertion than the following, which I find in a letter dated 28th May, 1883. It is a letter from Mr. Ennis, Secretary of the Department of Public Works at the time, and the following is an extract:—

"I return herewith the tenders forwarded with your letter of the 2nd inst. and the cheques enclosed with those offers, with the exception of that submitted by Mr. Gallagher, which is retained pending the taking of the necessary steps for its proper disposal."

Well, Sir, how is it that the Department of Public Works was sending all the other cheques, and that they kept that cheque of Gallagher's. We find the explanation of that fact in the evidence of Mr. Larkin. He says that cheque was provided by him, and was a cheque of the Toronto Bank, dated St. Catharines. No clearer evidence than

this letter could be adduced to show that the department knew that Gallagher's tender was a bogus tender; and so they kept the cheque for proper disposal—that is to say, until the Department of Public Works could see some of the tenderers, and ask them if it was safe for them that the cheque be sent to Gallagher. As a matter of fact, that cheque was sent down to the Harbour Commission only on the 9th June (page 89 of the evidence). It is not out of place, Mr. Speaker, to call your attention to a ruling of the chief engineer in this cross-wall case. One of the reasons given by him for allowing Gallagher's tender to be withdrawn, was that it was too low. We all remember the painful scene that occurred in the Privileges and Elections Committee during the examination of Mr. Perley when we asked him: "Had you any data at the time, on which to base your assertion that Gallagher's tender was too low," and he could not answer. When pressed upon that point he told us that he had no data, and then he fainted. It is a pity that Mr. Perley has been so sick, because I have no doubt that had he been able to continue his evidence it would have proved my case stronger even than it is proved to-day. But, few months after that, I find a ruling from Mr. Perley in the Esquimalt graving dock case that I must call your attention to. In April, 1884, Perley made a report to the Minister of Public Works, in which he declared that Starrs & O'Hanly would not be permitted to amend their tender. He says:

"As they have asked to amend their tender which course is not usually pursued."

We find that in the cross-wall case, not only did the Department of Public Works allow the lowest tender to be withdrawn, but they actually suggested themselves by their own letter to Gallagher to withdraw that tender or to amend it, while in this case of the British Columbia dock, they say that Starrs & O'Hanly should not be permitted to amend. Why was that, Sir? It was because Larkin, Connolly & Co. were tenderers for the work. We find ourselves here face to face with the same result; in the first case an amendment is allowed, is suggested, and Larkin, Connolly & Co. get the work: in the second case no amendment is allowed, and Larkin, Connolly & Co. again get the work. In view of the fact that in the space of a few months such a different ruling was given, there can be no clearer evidence that we have to deal to-day with an organized and long-standing conspiracy, the very root of which is in the Department of Public Works. Again, Sir, if you refer to the south wall tender, which my hon. friends who have drafted the majority report do not seem to have studied carefully, you will find that there is a palpable error in the prices of Cameron & McCarron's tender, not only by thousands of dollars but by hundreds of thousands of dollars. Still, the very same man who has ruled in the two cases I have just explained, does not ask any explanation from Cameron & McCarron; and why? Because in this case Larkin, Connolly & Co. are again involved and they get the work again. It might be just as well, Sir, to call your attention now to a part of Mr. Perley's evidence, which to my mind is of very great importance. Gallagher's tender, as I explained, had been withdrawn, and if Mr. Perley is to be believed, he states as follows:—

As a rule, when a tenderer is to be allowed to withdraw his tender you do not act on your own authority, do you? A. Oh, no.

Q. You have to consult the Minister? A. I must state that I have nothing to do with the acceptance or rejection of a tender.

Then, Sir, if this rule of the department, as laid down by Mr. Perley, is the right rule, the Minister is directly responsible for the withdrawal of Gallagher's tender. The figures of the tenders stood as follows, in round numbers:—Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s tender, $634,000; Gallagher's tender, $552,000; a difference of $82,000. It seems to me that the lowest tender should have been accepted. There was a deposit of $7,500 as security. The firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., by Murphy, have sworn here that they were prepared to do the work. As a matter of fact, they were prepared to do the work for that price; and it is a mystery to me, or rather, it would be a mystery to us, that the lowest tender had not been accepted on that occasion, were it not for the fact that Thomas McGreevy had acquired such influence in the Department of Public Works as to be practically the master there. My hon. friend who moved the adoption of the report (Mr. Girouard) has attached more importance than I have to the Langevin testimonial fund. Although there is some importance to be attached to the fact that $1,000 were subscribed to that fund four days after the contracts for the cross-wall were signed and the $1,000 subscribed by the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. was collected in Quebec by Thomas McGreevy on the 4th of June—I do not intend to incriminate more than necessary the late hon. Minister on that account. I am fully prepared to admit that all through the late Minister has made a mistake in accepting such a testimonial from some parties who have subscribed to it. I know that a great many of us in this House—I am one of them—subscribed to that fund; but at the time none of us suspected that a great part of that fund was going to be composed of moneys collected from public contractors. And certainly in this case Thomas McGreevy has been more than imprudent; he had been the engineer of the frauds committed in that cross-wall affair. He had received payments for his corrupt bargain, and it was more than imprudent in him to collect for the Minister that money immediately after such a fraud. But the Minister swears that he did not hear anything about it.

Now, the report of the majority admits that $14,000 were paid to Thomas McGreevy; but they are not very sure whether there has been a corrupt bargain beforehand. Well, Sir, I want to know how it could be that a member of the Harbour Commission, having sworn to be true to his duty, would on such an occasion receive $14,000. Thomas McGreevy, in his evidence, to which I will not allude more than is necessary, because it is a painful subject, and is calculated to create the impression that members of Parliament have very poor memories, denies everything or nearly everything, except the fact, which he could not deny, that a judgment of $15,000 was paid out of those funds. But he said: "I knew only one year after that these moneys were coming from the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co." The majority in their report, after having carefully examined the evidence, have

put aside that part of Thomas McGreevy's evidence, and they are right in doing so. But, Sir, they have made a reflection on Robert McGreevy and Murphy which I believe is not borne out by the evidence. They have said that it appears that Robert McGreevy and Murphy have appropriated for themselves the balance of the money. It would not make a great difference after all if $10,000 had been stolen by them; Thomas McGreevy would be equally guilty if he had received only $15,000. But where is the evidence that he did not get the whole amount? If there was a bargain, and there was clearly a bargain, where do you find the evidence that Thomas McGreevy did not get his whole salary? I know that Mr. McGreevy's lawyers have insisted very much on this point, although I do not see the importance of it. But I insist that the corrupt bargain is clearly proved, there is no escape from that. Thomas McGreevy began by standing for Beaucage's tender, but he changed his mind—why? It is explained in Murphy's evidence and borne out by the facts. Because, after having asked $5,000 for Beaucage's tender which the two McGreevys controlled, he was offered $25,000 by Murphy, who measured his men evidently. Thomas McGreevy accepted the bribe, and immediately changed his mind, and the conspiracy was successfully carried out, through the complicity of some one in the Department of Public Works.

I propose now to come to the Lévis dock contract, and I will pass as quickly as I can over it. Mr. Perley took charge of that work in 1883 after the dismissal of Kinipple & Morris. Those engineers had proved that the total cost of the work would not and could not possibly amount to more than $500,000. But, as I have already indicated, the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. wanted changes, and to get these changes it was felt necessary by them that Kinipple & Morris should be sent home to England. The first important change, if I may call it that way, was the supplementary contract of 1884; and the political reason for that contract, the only reason, was the purchase of that important paper *Le Monde*, which we know in the Province of Quebec very well, indeed. Sir Hector Langevin admits in his evidence, page 1108, that he spoke to Mr. Thomas McGreevy about the purchase of *Le Monde*, and Thomas McGreevy says that he paid in 1884 $35,000 for that paper. Sir Hector Langevin thought that it was only $27,000 or $28,000. Thomas McGreevy admits that he applied to Robert McGreevy for the money necessary to buy it. Well, Sir, it is a curious coincidence. That paper has been known in the Province of Quebec as the personal organ of the late Minister of Public Works. I have no hesitation whatever in saying, before my hon. friends of the Province of Quebec, that the newspaper *Le Monde* has been one of the causes of our divisions. More than that: it has been the cause of the downfall of the Conservative party in that province. Many of those I see around me were Conservatives who have fought the battles of the party with me, and they know as well as I do that it is this newspaper and the policy followed by Sir Hector Langevin which were to a great extent the cause of our defeat. This $35,000 was required to purchase *Le Monde*. By looking into the accounts of *Le Monde* yesterday somewhere, I found that the ex-Minister of Public Works has a claim against that paper for $39,000. It will be a surprise to his colleagues to find that the ex-Minister did not think proper to free himself from that debt of $10,000 which Mr. Thomas McGreevy has been carrying for him for the last twelve years when he was able to advance *Le Monde* $39,000. I repeat, you will find in that purchase of *Le Monde*, you will find in that heavy indebtedness of *Le Monde* to Sir Hector, the cause of the disastrous policy followed in the past in the Province of Quebec. If my hon. friend, the Secretary of State, were in his seat, I would enquire of him what that paper has done in the district of Montreal? I would ask him what nefarious influence it exercised over the Conservative party. The clique of schemers, who substituted themselves for the Conservative party in that district, ran *Le Monde*: the best elements of the Conservative party in the districts of Montreal and Quebec were rendered powerless in spite of their good-will, by those schemers who exercised more influence than the ablest and best men of the party. That Riel crisis which created such a storm in this country, by whom was it first raised? Look at the fyles of newspapers in our library, and you will find that the organ of the late Minister of Public Works was the first to deceive public opinion in the Province of Quebec. At that time the McGreevy fight was already beginning between some of us and the late Minister of Public Works, and we were every day begging that he should disassociate himself from Mr. Thomas McGreevy. But we could not approach him with confidence; we were not allowed to tell him the truth. In that Riel affair *Le Monde* raised the storm which wrecked in a great measure the influence the Province of Quebec held in this House. If I insist on this point, it is to vindicate the character and the position of many of us. We have been, as a matter of fact, I would say as a matter of policy, expelled from the Conservative party. We were not allowed to give sound advice. The Minister of Militia and Defence knows that I am telling the truth; he knows that we were crushed, one after the other. He knows that our best friends in Quebec have come over and over again to Ottawa to the late First Minister, and he knows that Sir John Macdonald said to us: "You may be right, but what can I do? The Province of Quebec has its leader and I cannot do anything else than let things go." I believe it is more than time these facts were known in our own vindication, because we have been accused of all sorts of crimes, for having refused, as free men, to submit to that state of tyranny. I have given the reasons for this charge. If you will look carefully to that supplementary contract, you will find that it was no contract whatever. Larkin, Connolly & Co. had been working at the Lévis dock since 1878. They wanted money, and Mr. Thomas McGreevy wanted money to purchase *Le Monde*, and between them they invented that supplementary contract. And what do we find? We find that Mr. Thomas McGreevy, according to Murphy's evidence, which it is just as well I should read now, wanted that means of raising money. The evidence is as follows:—

Q. Had Mr. Thomas McGreevy anything to do with the negotiations to come to these supplementary contracts?—A. Yes. Q. Had you anything to do with that contract?—A. I had. Q. Personally?—A. Yes. Q. Please explain to the Committee how you came to tender and

under what circumstances?—A. We had a great deal of trouble with the engineers and the harbour commissioners generally, and under a lump sum contract we could make donations to parties, if you please, and for other purposes. Q. Was there any talk of it before the tender was made about the future donations?—A. Yes; Mr. McGreevy made this statement: that Sir Hector's paper was not paying.

That was a slight mistake, for the paper was not then bought.—

Q. Which Mr. McGreevy?—A. Thomas. He said if some lump sum contract could be made, so as some of his friends could be pleased, they could make something out of it. After several conversations, carried on chiefly by myself and Thomas McGreevy, they figured up to us what it would come to, and I finally came to the agreement with McGreevy that all over $50,000 himself and his friends could take, and we submitted plans or estimates in pencil to the principal engineers that amounted to some $43,000: and on the shortening up of the dock—it was to be shortened a certain number of feet—the increase would show $64,000: and then there was to be $10,000 allowed for building the caisson, which made it $74,000, and after we agreed on that and got the contract, there was a slight misunderstanding between Mr. McGreevy and myself about $2,000. It was a trifle data, and that is how the note for $22,000 came to be given instead of $24,000.

Well, the facts of the matter are, that their engineer, Mr. Hume, as it is proved later on, made fictitious figures. The pretext of the contract was that the dock would be completed during the season. The dock was not completed until the end of the season of 1886, so that the pretext is altogether gone. But the money was paid, and on that account the report of the majority agree that there was an understanding between Mr. Thomas McGreevy and Mr. Murphy to the effect that a certain sum of money was agreed between the parties. I call your attention, Sir, to this fact, that in this matter of the Lévis dock, Murphy's evidence is accepted against Thomas McGreevy's, and on Murphy's evidence my hon. friends have based a verdict against Thomas McGreevy. Well, if Murphy is to be believed on such a pint, I do not understand why he should not be believed on some other points. It is true that this man Murphy has made mistakes, and I do not explain or condone his faults. That is not my duty. As I said, he has been here as my witness or rather as the witness of the people of Canada. In this case as in other cases, Robert McGreevy has been the instrument of Thomas McGreevy. On the 13th March, 1884, Robert McGreevy writes to Murphy:

"I will get my brother to interview Perley with Valin before I leave on graving dock."

On the 17th he writes:

"My Dear Sir,—The result of the interview between Mr. Perley and my brother was that he (P.) will write you to ascertain the rate at which you will complete the dock, giving a guarantee of completion within this year or season of navigation. I will be done in a few days and see you. In meantime do not reply until you see me. The question of some diminution in the value of dock, being shorter than contract, came up. Perley says it is 31 feet shorter. I think they can be convinced that only a bulk sum contract will ensure completion this coming season.

"Yours,

"R. H. McGREEVY."

What do you see? Mr. Perley, on the 16th April, writes to Larkin, and an answer is given to him. If you compare the two exhibits you will find that the letter drafted by Robert McGreevy and submitted to Thomas McGreevy is the very letter that we find sent to Mr. Perley. This is a fact of the utmost importance, which tends to show in the clearest possible way that Thomas McGreevy was a conspirator with them, and that a big fraud was perpetrated in that case. But here again the question of money arises. Thomas McGreevy seems to complain that he does not get the money that is put to his account in Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s books. I will not insist very much on that, because, whatever was the amount, the corrupt bargain was made and carried out. But Thomas McGreevy has tried to explain about this Lévis contract, that he did not get the whole $22,000, and that he reimbursed to the political fund $15,000 that was used in 1883 to pay McCarron & Cameron. That evidence has been destroyed. I think that this Lévis dock job is probably the worst of the series of robberies which we have before us to-day, and I am anxious to call the special attention of my hon. friends who have drafted the report to the following facts. I will try to make them as clear as I can. Larkin, Connolly & Co. were bound to finish the work by the supplementary contract, during the season of 1884. The work was not finished until 1886. Then we find this letter:

"Office of the Minister of Public Works,

"Ottawa, 20th September, 1886.

"My Dear Mr. McGreevy,—The contractors for the Lévis graving dock should ask a settlement from the Harbour Commissioners, who then will most likely consult with their engineer. For the Esquimalt dock it is different, because the work there is altogether under my control."

"Yours truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN."

The words "their engineer" are underscored. I do not want to attach more importance to that than it is necessary, but I call the attention of my hon. friends to that letter. On the 24th January, 1887, a few months after the letter, Perley makes a report of the statement of accounts presented by Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co. to the amount of $814,241.98, and gives them an estimate of $77,887 in round figures. Again please mark the dates. The Minister of Public Works suggests to Thomas McGreevy, who had evidently written to him, that they should have a settlement of their account with the Harbour Commissioners. A few weeks afterwards the account is put in, amounting to $814,241.98. They were pledged to complete the dock during the season of 1884, and in 1887 they put in a claim for $110,000 because they had not completed their work in the proper time. It was a pretty queer claim, but still you will find that claim has been paid. Mr. Perley says in his letter that Larkin, Connolly & Co., when he took charge of the work, had made no claim whatever, in fact it had been stipulated that there would be no claim at all, but still they were allowed first $30,900. On the 5th November, Larkin, Connolly & Co. refused to accept that account as a full settlement of their claim and suggested an arbitration. On the 11th February, 1888, the commissioners agreed to that suggestion and named their own arbitrator, and Larkin, Connolly & Co. appointed theirs. A few weeks afterwards Larkin, Connolly & Co. applied to Mr. Perley to be paid the $30,900 pending the settlement by arbitration of their claim. Mr. Perley declines positively unless they give a clear receipt. Then, Sir, comes an important point. On the 8th March, 1888, Thomas McGreevy writes the following letter:—

"HOUSE OF COMMONS. 8th March, 1888.

"MY DEAR ROBERT,—Tell Murphy I have seen Perley, and he will report to arbitrators or to commission of the amount to be submitted to them, which will be on their total plant $814,000; at the last meeting they wanted to make it out that the amount to be submitted was the balance of $110,000 for damages."

On the 19th of March, as appears from the minutes of the Harbour Commissioners, Mr. Perley wrote a letter to the effect that it was desirable that the contractors should furnish the Harbour Commission with a full statement of their claim, as they intended to submit it to the arbitrators. On the 26th of March the contractors answer that their claim is the same as the one lodged by them previous to the issue of the final estimate in January, 1887. Then, again, I am sorry to say that we see the intervention of the Minister of Public Works. You have not failed to observe that he wrote a letter in the last months of 1886, in which he suggests that the claims of Larkin, Connolly & Co. should be submitted to the Harbour Commissioners. After their claims are so submitted they form a "good plan," as Thomas McGreevy would say, to kill that arbitration and go quicker and safer. They ask to change their own arbitrator, and then we see that the hon. the Minister of Public Works is communicated with on that very point. It is difficult to understand how it is that the arbitration that was settled between the Harbour Commissioners and Larkin, Connolly & Co. needed to be submitted to the Minister of Public Works, but it was submitted. That is not our fault; we are not responsible for it; the Minister is responsible for his deeds. Well, the Minister said: I will not allow you to change your arbitrator. Then, the arbitration falls to the ground. But we find that a few days afterwards, on the 1st of May, $35,000 are paid to Larkin, Connolly & Co. in addition to the award of $30,900 already given to them, making over $65,000 for that bogus claim of $110,000. I say that is one of the worst features of the case. Allow me to call your attention, in the light of all these facts, to Larkin's letter of the 16th June, 1881, which has its importance now:

"ST. CATHARINES, 16th June, 1881.

"MY DEAR MIKE,—I have your letter of the 12th inst. As you say, we are very much disappointed. Matters are not turning out at all as we anticipated. I am in hopes, however, that Sir Hector will not recede from what he said about furnishing the funds for work controlled by Kinipple & Morris; in that case all may be right yet, and if not the changes contemplated must be of a considerable advantage if proper prices are obtained, which no doubt you will look sharply after."

My hon. friend who has moved the adoption of the report said that a good deal of illegal evidence has been admitted in this case. It may be so, but I claim that the letters exchanged between members of the firm are not illegal evidence. They are the strongest possible evidence that could be adduced; those letters are written on the spot, so to speak; they were written at the time the fraudulent plans were made. Then, again, coming to the dismissal of Kinipple & Morris, I say that they were dismissed just because all these changes were contemplated. The changes took place, and the original price of that contract for the Lévis dock, which was $330,000 in round numbers, was raised to $726,000, about double the original price, although the dock has been shortened twice since Mr. Perley was named engineer of the Harbour Commission. If the late Minister of Public Works stated to Mr. Valin one day that Mr. Perley would not cost anything, he made a very great mistake indeed.

Now, Sir, I do not know that, being aware of the fact that a great many of my hon. friends are ready to discuss the matter fully, I should go on any further. But I want to touch a little on that dredging contract of 1887, and I will leave the balance of the case to my hon. friends on this side of the House. As I said, the contract of 1882 was made in such a way as called for its completion in 1884; still, it went until 1886. The contract of 1882 was a schedule rate contract for 15 feet below low water. As you may see on page 10, B book, 27 cents were given. By that contract the materials were to be thrown in the embankments. It has been explained in the evidence of Mr. Boswell and others, that throwing materials into the embankment is a great deal more expensive than throwing them into the river. There is a great deal more handling, and so much is that the case that Mr. Boyd, who was supervising the contract of 1882, deducted 5 cents on every yard of material that was thrown into the river at the time. It is true that later on, when Mr. Perley became entirely the tool and instrument of the contractors, that deduction was given back to them. But as a matter of fact those 5 cents were deducted—putting to 22 cents the price of the dredging by the contract of 1882. It is admitted in both reports, that Thomas McGreevy made a bargain in the winter of 1886-87, by which he undertook to raise the price for the dredging to 35 cents per cubic yard. The elections were at hand, and he thought it a proper time to commit a fraud, evidently to secure a victory for public morality. I am bound to say this much, and I say it on my responsibility as a member of Parliament, and as one who took a considerable share in the election of 1887, that Thomas McGreevy appropriated for himself, or unknown purposes, that sum of money, because I know that the Conservative party at the time did not need those funds. I do not say that as a justification of the party to which I have belonged so long, but simply as a matter of fact. It does not change the facts of the case, they remain as they are; but I say from my seat here, that when the elections of 1887 were over Thomas McGreevy had in his hands nearly $30,000. It has been tried to be proved that that man was not an ordinary conspirator but a polical conspirator. He may have been both, I do not know; but I know he never conspired successfully for the true Conservative party. That contract is, in my opinion, one of the most shameful deeds a member of Parliament could have committed. The first proof of the shameful conspiracy is found in a memorandum as follows:—

"If contract is entered into with Harbour Commissioners, and approved of by the Minister of Public Works, for eight hundred thousand yards of dredging at thirty-five cents, to be dumped in river, or if in more difficult place to be paid extra, we give 25,000. All over 200,000 at Lévis dock. Extras British Columbia about 73,000, of which we give 23,000.

"LARKIN, CONNOLLY & CO."

The hon. gentlemen who drafted the report made a mistake. They claimed that the contract was reduced to the amount of $100,000. I had better read the contract:

"Therefore these presents and I the said notary witness that the said parties of the second part did hereby undertake and promise, bind and oblige themselves, jointly and severally, *conjointement et solidairement*, their heirs and assigns, executors and administrators, to execute, perform and complete in a good and workmanlike manner, to the satisfaction of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners and their engineers, all the dredging and removal of materials required to be made in the wet basin of the Quebec harbour works, and that they shall place and level the dredged materials on the Louise Embankment, or on such other locality belonging to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, or that may be hereafter acquired, the balance to be dumped in the river."

At the time it was known that 1,000,000 yards was required to be dredged there. The contract thus was made for all the work to be done. But it was stipulated that for the season of 1887 only $100,000 should be spent. What took place? That condition was immediately put aside. During the first season there was an expenditure of $169,000. When Mr. Dobell was heard before the Committee he swore positively that this additional dredging was forced upon them. They were not prepared to spend more than the sum I have mentioned: but they were not the masters of the situation. Thomas McGreevy was the master. I know in the majority report the hon. gentlemen say the Minister is not responsible for it. How is that? How could it be so? Mr. Valin was sworn, and we can only put aside the evidence of credible witnesses by declaring that they perjured themselves. I cannot believe it, because I know that gentleman. Mr. Valin swore in a most positive manner that before signing the contract he consulted Sir Hector Langevin. Sir Hector told him: "I have seen Thomas McGreevy, and he tells me it is all right." Has the Minister been deceived. Has the Minister by his improvident confidence in this man, who has been found guilty of conspiracy, by his long friendship for him, been deceived? It may be so. I hesitate to be a judge in such a case. At all events, without being authorized in any way, Thomas McGreevy begins to negotiate. On 16th April he wrote to Robert McGreevy:

"HOUSE OF COMMONS, CANADA, 16th April.

"MY DEAR ROBERT,—I have just seen Perley about dredging. I have arranged to meet him on Monday to discuss his dredging report before he sends it to Harbour Commissioners, also other matters about graving dock, &c.

"I have arranged with Fuller to have office in Quebec opened as Public Works office and put Lépine in charge and let Peehey be architect. I want you to get O'Donnell to write a letter to Fuller as inclosed, so as they may get another month's pay. They may not get the balance of their pay until the money is voted. As Curran's motion is coming up on Monday, I thought better to remain here, also to see Perley and arrange matters with him. When I am wanted below you will let me know.

"Yours,

"THOMAS."

On 26th April he wrote again:

"HOUSE OF COMMONS, CANADA, 26th April.

"MY DEAR ROBERT,—I have just seen Perley on dredging. I think he will report on 35 cents, and put some conditions which will amount to nothing. He will report when I will be there."

The last letter of Thomas McGreevy is written on the 26th April; the following day, the 27th April, Perley writes, and on the 28th, Larkin, Connolly & Co. answered, and the contract is signed on the 5th May. Well, Sir, this contract, which as my hon. friends on the other side believe was to be only for $100,000, has lasted until 1889, and I will say that had I not interfered with their shameful operations, they would still be at work there. At any rate, we have found enough of evidence in this "35 cents contract," as we call it, to prove that we have to deal with a dangerous set of men. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) stated to-day in his able speech that the country has got the value of the money paid. How can he entertain such a belief, when in that dredging contract alone half of the money has been stolen? We have paid for half of the work that has not been done, and as it has been proven before the Committee, we have paid in the Lévis contract for half the work that has not been done either. Let us go straight to the point in this matter. It is better for our credit and reputation to admit frankly that we have been robbed to a large extent. It is not our fault. There have been able men in this Parliament. From that press gallery, where I spent so many years, I have witnessed here very able debates and seen very strong men. But, under the eyes of these men, for the last ten years, fraudulent practices and conspiracies have been going on which, until now, we were not able to discover. We have the evidence of this fraud to-day, and it is better, as I have said, to admit the facts plainly, and to punish the guilty parties. I will not insist very much on the so-called difficulties that have been invoked to justify that contract. The case is very clear. As I have shown, in 1886 the same firm carried on dredging for the same price of 27 cents in the same wet basin. The caisson was removed only in 1888 and at that time they had a large passage of nearly 200 feet, and there were no more currents than in 1886. I think, Sir, that my duty, as far as I am concerned myself, will be over when I have called the attention of my hon. friends on the other side of the House to their finding which is to be found on page 23 of their report. Charge No. 10:

"That the name of the Honourable Minister of Public Works was made use of by the said Thomas McGreevy in his dealings with Larkin, Connolly & Co. so as to give the impression that he had control over him; the said Thomas McGreevy undertaking to obtain his co-operation, or declaring he had secured it, and that in the name of the Minister of Public Works large sums of money were corruptly demanded by the said Thomas McGreevy from Larkin, Connolly & Co. That he used the Minister's name before the Harbour Commissioners, and that from 1882 to the present session of Parliament he lived in the same house as the Minister, thereby giving the impression to Larkin, Connolly & Co. that he had absolute control over him and that he was acting as the Minister's representative in his corrupt transactions with them."

The Committee find:

"As to this charge, that the name of the Minister of Public Works was made use of by Thomas McGreevy in his dealings with Larkin, Connolly & Co., and that this was done in such a way as to give the impression that he had influence with the Minister. They do not find that sums of money were corruptly demanded by Thomas McGreevy from Larkin, Connolly & Co., nor do they find that he used the Minister's name improperly before the Harbour Commissioners. It appears that during the time that Thomas McGreevy attended the sessions of Parliament, since the year 1882 to the beginning of the present session, he lived in the same house with the Minister, but the Committee are unable to find any evidence that he thereby gave the impression to Larkin, Connolly & Co. that he had control over the Minister, or that he was the Minister's representative in any of the transactions referred to."

I am prepared to admit, Sir, that the evidence does not show that Thomas McGreevy was in these transactions a direct representative of the late Minister of Public Works, but I would like to know from my hon. friends how they have been able to come to

the conclusion that Thomas McGreevy did not create the impression on Larkin, Connolly & Co. that he had influence over the Minister. I say that this finding cannot be justified by the facts. Look at the results as they are. McGreevy may have deceived them. His role I suppose to a certain extent was to squeeze them as much as he could; but, Sir, here are the facts, and it is with pain and sorrow that I am obliged to refer to the letters that I am now going to read. At page 213 of the evidence I find this letter from Michael Connolly:

"SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, 31st December, 1882.

"* * * * I think if you manage your affairs properly there is no doubt but you will get the cross-wall. By all means keep in with friend Thomas, and be guided by him in everything that you do, and as yourselves and Moore & Wright are the only ones in the Dominion who have proper plant for doing such work, I think there is not a doubt but you will get it; for they cannot give it to Moore & Wright, as they are at loggerheads with the Board. Then you will be the only party who are in harmony with the Harbour Commission, and have the necessary plant to do the work: therefore, you will get it, for friend Thomas can work it in many a way. For instance, he can have the engineers in charge make out a report in your favour, which will justify the Commission or Minister of Public Works in giving you the work, even though you are not the lowest. If you get the work and want me back of course I will come back: but if you do not get it I think there are enough of you there now to attend to what you have in hand.

"Very truly yours,

"M. CONNOLLY."

And on the 27th February, 1883, the same Michael Connolly writes as follows:—

"SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, 27th February, 1883.

"Yours of the 15th and 18th inst. came duly to hand. I am really very glad to hear that you have everything in such good shape. I think, as you say, there will be no difficulty about your getting the cross-wall. Even if the Minister has to strain a point you will find the work will be awarded to you, for he is not overscrupulous when his friends need assistance."

Well, Sir, where did Michael Connolly get the impression that Thomas McGreevy had such influence over the Minister? I say, without fear, that my hon. friends have not drawn the proper conclusion. Thomas McGreevy, all through that long series of fraudulent operations, created the impression in the minds of Larkin, Connolly & Co. that he controlled entirely the late Minister of Public Works. It is a painful duty for us to acknowledge that; but it is the fault of the late Minister himself. He should not have allowed Thomas McGreevy to live with him; he should not have allowed him to go among his employés as he has done; he should not have said to Mr. Valin, of the Quebec Harbour Commission: "You follow McGreevy in spite of all." It has been a great and unfortunate mistake that he has made; but the facts remain. You say there was a conspiracy. There is no doubt there was; but it was not a pleasure to Larkin, Connolly & Co. to bleed as they have done; it was not a pleasure to them to pay the large sums of money they were obliged to pay. It was a conspiracy, but a conspiracy forced upon them on a great many occasions. Again, Thomas McGreevy, in the letter that he wrote on the 2nd of May, 1885, boasts that he has seen the Minister, and that the Minister and Perley have agreed to dismiss Bennett. You will tell me that Bennett was not dismissed. But look at Murphy's evidence. Murphy tells you in so many words: "We tried to find a party as suggested by Thomas McGreevy himself in his letter of the 2nd of May; we tried to get Williams, who was asked by Thomas McGreevy, but he would not go." Then they made up their mind, as Murphy explains, that Perley should go and settle the matter himself. That fact, having been brought to the knowledge of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., was sufficient to create the impression on their minds that Thomas McGreevy controlled the Minister. As I have said, I may be prejudiced; it may be that many of the members of this House are prejudiced by political feelings; but the facts of this case are of such a nature that we must condemn this conspiracy with the utmost severity. If we find that the Minister is guilty, after the whole discussion has been carried on in the same way as the enquiry has been conducted, with fairness, we must say so. It would be very improper if this Parliament should condemn only the minor parties, and fail to condemn the most guilty party. If the evidence does not go to show that Sir Hector Langevin knew the whole conspiracy, well and good; but, Sir, let us discuss the facts as they are. He has been guilty at any rate of a great neglect of duty; he has been guilty of a great imprudence. It has been said that he had a great deal of work to do. There is no doubt that he had; but when he had to deal with millions he had work that was worthy of his attention. It would have been well for him as a Minister of the Crown to have written fewer letters and to have attended to his great public duties. It is a pity that Sir Hector Langevin, after his long career, should have fallen in such company as we find him in to-day. It is a pity, I say again; and I believe that no one will say it with greater sorrow than I say it myself. I cannot ignore the fact that the race to which I belong is under a cloud, and I will not be found among the men who will try to find Sir Hector Langevin more guilty than he is. I do not want to condemn him as being more guilty than he is; but on the other hand it is not a question of race; it is a question of public duty with us. If that conspiracy had not been discovered by fortunate circumstances, who can tell to-day what would have been the result? Millions of money would have been stolen; there is no doubt about it. Larkin, Connolly & Co. got everything they wanted; they had to take a little time here and there, but they always succeeded. Sir, my duty is done. I brought before this Parliament grave charges. I was accused of a great many things, I know, from the first day that I put my foot in this chamber. There were men deceived by Thomas McGreevy who said: That man Tarte is for sale. Mr. Speaker, if I were an indiscreet man, if I were the man to strike those who have fallen, I could say things to-day that would surprise you. If I had been a man for sale, I think it would have been very easy for me to have made a good little fortune. I have spoiled the game of people who were stealing every year hundreds of thousands of dollars. Money was no object with them. They have tried to ruin my character and reputation in connection with that Baie des Chaleurs affair, in which my name has appeared; they have said that I shared in the money. Well, Sir, there will be an enquiry in the Province of Quebec. It is true that I have been obliged to accept political assistance from my hon. friends on this side of the House. But, Sir, if I got one cent of that mon[illegible] I shall be here during the next session of

Parliament, and you will expel me from this chamber. I have endorsed notes at a time when nobody knew a word about the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. I have endorsed notes to protect myself. I knew that my election would be contested, I knew that my credit was ruined by those men. Mr. Thomas McGreevy controlled, as my hon. friends in Quebec know, banks in that city, he controlled the influence of this Government, he could ruin any man, and he did his best to ruin my credit. I was obliged to pass through all those humiliations. I am sorry to say that among my hon. friends opposite, with whom I have worked very long, were men who believed I would have disgraced myself in such a way. I did not do anything of the kind, and I stand to-day ready to go before any committee. If my hon. friends who endorsed notes had only suspected what has since come out, they would not have done so. The money that represents those notes is still in the Quebec treasury. If Pacaud paid them, he made a mistake, because as a matter of fact he was not obliged to pay them. They should have been renewed, as our money is there. You will pardon me if I allude to-night to this matter; but I do so because I wish to be looked upon by my colleagues and peers just as I am, no better than anybody else and no worse. Another allusion was made to another matter. My hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) put in the Committee a question which was an unfair question, as both sides admitted, and which he would not have put had he reflected, but I must answer that question on the floor of Parliament. I never got any money from Mr. Thomas McGreevy for myself. I subscribed to a political fund in his hands by the direction of the late Minister of Public Works, and none of us who subscribed suspected at the time that we were mixing our legitimately earned money with plundered money. I cannot take my seat before thanking in English, as I did in French at the beginning of my remarks, the chairman of the Privileges and Elections Committee for the dignity and tact he showed all through this enquiry. At the beginning, I believe he was a little prejudiced against our case, and there was some little difficulty between us. At the time I must admit I was rather quick, and I feel bound to repair to-day the wrong I may have done then. The enquiry was conducted with a view of getting at the facts, we had no quarrel, everything went on as it should before a Parliamentary Committee, and I cannot agree in the idea the hon. gentleman has suggested that this Parliament should abandon control of enquiries into the honour of its members. I believe as long as the Parliament of Canada will be worthy of remaining a Parliament, we will be able to take care of our own dignity. I must also thank the members of the Committee for the assistance they have given. Even in our differences of opinion, we have found the ways and means to get at the truth. I resume my seat feeling satisfied that, as far as I am concerned, my case is through. I know it is difficult to give judgment beyond the charges I have made, because I am prepared to admit, I did not at the beginning, when I made those charges, believe that the written and verbal evidence would go so far, but the facts are there. The judgment of the House must be what it should be. I am not prepared to say now what it should be.

Mr. TARTE.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have seen in my short parliamentary career many strange things, but I do not know that for twenty-five years I ever saw a more extraordinary spectacle than that presented to-night. A member of Parliament, a former political friend and supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, has, for three hours arraigned the policy and the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to their administration of Public Works, and yet upon the ministerial benches, behind them and on each side of them, there is not a man who has courage enough to rise in his seat and defend the position of the Government. Hon. gentlemen will remember that this is not an assault solely upon the late member for Quebec West or an assault solely upon the late Minister of Public Works. It is an assault upon every hon. gentleman who was the colleague of the Minister of Public Works while he was a member of the present Administration. They supported and sustained him; and if they know anything about parliamentary constitutional rule, they must know perfectly well that each one of them is just as responsible as the late Minister of Public Works. I am astounded that the Minister of Justice, and the Minister of War, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Minister of Finance, and above all the Secretary of State, should remain silent in their seats. Are they going to plead guilty to the charges levelled against them? Are they going to allow judgment to pass against them by default or are they going to be satisfied with the speech made upon behalf of the Administration by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard)? I have no objections to the statements of that hon. gentleman except this, that he assured Parliament that all the evidence, all the documents, everything that would tend either to incriminate or exculpate was submitted to the investigating committee. That is not the case. What has become of the documents that are missing? What has become of the mutilated books, and where were the explanations of the mutilated books? What has become of the mass of correspondence that we know passed between Sir Hector and Uncle Thomas McGreevy? Not a scrap of that correspondence could be found. It had been in Sir Hector Langevin's private room in this building, a portion of which was occupied by Mr. Thomas McGreevy when attending to his parliamentary duties. The correspondence disappeared. It was destroyed or stolen, and not a single tittle of it produced before the investigating committee. What a tale would have been unfolded had that correspondence only seen the light of day, the secret correspondence that passed between the Minister of Public Works and his bosom friend for long, long years? We were not favoured with the sight of that correspondence. The letters mysteriously disappeared—burnt or destroyed. And what has become of Thomas McGreevy? The very moment that we came to the critical point in the investigation, the very moment when we wanted to bring home the charges to the proper person, at that moment Thomas McGreevy became dumb and would not open his mouth. When we asked Thomas McGreevy what became of the enormous sums of money obtained by the conspirators from the Dominion treasury, Thomas

McGreevy was silent. He was reported to Parliament and the Sergeant-at-Arms went to Quebec to find him, but he was not to be found, and the story that Thomas McGreevy could have told is untold to this hour. What a tale he could have told if he were brought back and made to speak, and that ought to have been done if the hon. gentlemen wanted to clear their skirts and free themselves from the charge of allowing conspirators to rob the Dominion treasury? If they desired to do that they would have brought Thomas McGreevy back, and we would have made him answer those questions. They knew better. Thomas McGreevy told too much, and they did not want to hear anything more from Thomas McGreevy. And so Thomas McGreevy rusticates at the seaside or in the United States of America. We are told by the mover of this report, which is submitted by the majority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, that we should not convict Sir Hector Langevin because he acted under the direction of his employés, that the business of his department was so large, the correspondence so voluminous, and the contracts so numerous, that it was impossible for the Minister to personally attend to the matter, and that things were left largely in the hands of the employés of the department. If I recollect rightly, a gentleman who was called before the Committee swore that of all the departmental heads Sir Hector Langevin was the best, and, more than that, that there was not a detail in his department that Sir Hector Langevin was not conversant with. Yet this man, who was so conversant with every detail of his department, is to be relieved from the consequences of his own act in conspiring with conspirators, if the evidence establishes that, on the ground that he did not know what was transpiring in his own department? We have been told ever since Sir Hector Langevin has been a Minister of the Crown that he was the most efficient and the most accommodating of all the Ministers, and was thoroughly acquainted with all the details of his department. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) has no better defence than that to make, some one else should try some other excuse. He sought to justify public stealing from the public purse in this way, and even the majority of the Committee have had to admit that there was a huge and gigantic conspiracy on the part of the contractors, aided by Thomas McGreevy, to defraud the public treasury. The hon. gentleman seeks to justify that by saying that large sums were paid in the past in connection with the Intercolonial Railway in addition to the contract prices and in defiance of the law, referring to 12 or 15 years ago. Is it any justification for John Jones committing highway robbery that Peter Snooks has also committed highway robbery? Is it any justification for this Government, committing these acts, that the old Government of which it is the rump, and the inferior part of the rump at that, paid claims which should never have been paid? Is that a justification of the outrages and frauds on the country which has been committed by these conspirators? But the Committee have declared that these conspirators shall be indicted with all the form and solemnity that the Minister of Justice can bring to bear in Her Majesty's courts. The small thieves are to be brought to justice, but the big thieves, if there are any such, are to escape scot free. If the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) wanted to satisfy the demand which is made from one end of the country to the other, he ought to have reported that men in or out of the public service who violate their duties shall be punished, and then he would render a service to his country. No defence has been offered to Parliament for the report submitted, no defence has been given of the circumstances that bring these charges directly home to the late Minister of Public Works. This is a great and important question, the greatest question that this or any other Parliament has been seized of. In olden times, Ministers of the Crown were impeached before the high court of Parliament for violating the trust reposed in them. They were impeached, and convicted, fined, and imprisoned by Parliament; but we have reason to be thankful that in the high court of Parliament of Canada this is only the second time that a member of Parliament has been impeached before his peers for misconduct as a member of the House. The question is a great and wide one. I do not pretend, in the short space which I have to address the House, to overtake all the charges the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) has preferred against the member for Quebec (Mr. McGreevy) and the Minister of Public Works. I shall deal only with a portion of them; but, even so, I think I shall be able to show the frauds committed and the frauds arrived at more clearly than is shown by the report of the Committee. I shall deal as shortly as possible with this matter, having in view the presentation of this case before the public of this country as well as the Parliament of this country, in plain and simple words. I shall deal with the frauds, the terrible frauds, that were committed in connection with the Esquimalt graving dock, and the contract in relation to that graving dock, and the changes made in connection with it. In the spring of 1884 the Minister of Public Works called for tenders for the construction of the Esquimalt graving dock. Two tenders were received. It is unnecessary to refer to these two tenders, because nothing was done in respect of them. The engineer of the department having reported to the Minister that one of the tenders was too high and the other too low, in the fall of 1884 the Minister of Public Works again calls for tenders. Eight tenders were submitted, but in dealing with the frauds committed in connection with that graving dock it is only necessary to refer to two of those tenders, namely, the tender of Starrs & O'Hanly, who agreed to do the whole work for $338,945, and the tender of these conspirators, so described in the report of the majority of the Committee, who agreed to do the work for $374,559. These tenders were subject to certain conditions, especially two conditions, as stated by the Minister of Public Works at an interview, which I shall refer to in a moment or two, had between himself and Michael Starrs. One of the conditions was that plant which the Government of Canada took over from the Government of British Columbia should be taken by the contractors at $50,000, and that that sum should be applied in reduction by just so much of the contract price. The other condition was, as stated by the Minister of Public Works, and sworn to by Starrs, that there should be no extras in connection with this contract. Sir, I say

here and now that the evidence discloses that from the very moment the tenders were called for, from the very moment it was ascertained that the tender of Starrs & O'Hanly was the lowest by $35,000, from that very moment we are forced to the conclusion that there was a deep-laid scheme between Thomas McGreevy and the late Minister of Public Works to defraud Starrs & O'Hanly out of the contract, and to award it to the contractors Larkin, Connolly & Co., at a loss to the country upon the contract of $35,000, and an ultimate loss to the people of this country of $242,000. Sir, the first step in this scheme to cheat Starrs & O'Hanly out of the contract will be found in a letter written by the Department of Public Works to Starrs & O'Hanly, as follows (page 91 of the evidence):

"DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
"OTTAWA, 7th October, 1884.

"GENTLEMEN,—Having reference to your tender, dated the 20th ult., for the completion of the graving dock at Esquimalt, B. C., I am directed by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to inform you that he allows you until Saturday next, the 11th inst., at 11 o'clock a.m., to strengthen yourselves financially by associating with you some man financially strong.

"At the time mentioned he, the Minister, will expect to be informed of the name of such associate, if any; and whether he and you will be prepared to sign then a contract for the execution of the work.

"I have the honour to be, gentlemen,
"Your obedient servant,
"F. H. ENNIS,
"*Secretary.*"

Now, here, as I said, is the first attempt on the part of the Minister of Public Works to squeeze Starrs & O'Hanly out of the contract. Will the hon. member for Jacques Cartier or any other hon. member in the House tell me what right the Minister of Public Works had to write a letter to Starrs & O'Hanly that they could not get the contract unless they "strengthened themselves financially?" What business was that of the department? If Starrs & O'Hanly were respectable men, respectable contractors—and there is no pretense for saying they were not—if they were prepared to put up the security, and did put up the security, what right had the Minister of Public Works to say to them: "You come to me in four days, and let me be satisfied that you have strengthened yourselves financially, and we will talk about your taking the contract?" That, Sir, is the first step in the scheme to squeeze Starrs & O'Hanly out of this contract. So far the scheme had not succeeded. These men are business men, they live in the City of Ottawa. They were contractors; one of them is an engineer. They were not men to be trifled with. They were not exactly the men that the Minister of Public Works, or any official in his department, could subdue to their will without their knowing the reason why. So, on the 10th day of October, three days after the former letter of the secretary of the department, Starrs & O'Hanly wrote the following letter to the Minister of Public Works. Now, I regret to find it necessary to take up the time of the House in reading these letters; but as every one of them is a link in the chain that binds down the Department of Public Works and the head of it, I find it necessary, for the information of Parliament and the people of this country, that these documents should go before the people of Canada. As I said before, Starrs & O'Hanly were not men to be trifled with: they were not the men to be bamboozled by letters from the Department of Public Works; they were men not to be terrified by the Department of Public Works. On the 10th October, 1884, they addressed the following letter to the Department of Public Works (*see* page 91 of the evidence):

"SIR,—We have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 7th inst., conveying the wish of the Honourable the Minister of Public Works, *re* our tender for the completion of the Esquimalt Graving Dock, British Columbia.

"In reply, we beg to inform you that after considering the suggestion made of associating another contractor with us, we are of opinion that as we have the necessary means ourselves we will be better able to perform the contract to the satisfaction of the Government, without the assistance of another contractor.

"We will be ready to sign the contract Monday, and make the necessary deposit.

"We have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servants,
"STARRS & O'HANLY."

Mr. Speaker, this letter startled the Department of Public Works. These men were evidently not to be trifled with. The Minister found that correspondence would not bring these men to his terms. Besides, correspondence was dangerous, and the Minister of Public Works, 11 days afterwards, writes the following persuasive letter to Mr. Michael Starrs, inviting him to visit the department (*see* page 91 of the evidence):

"DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
"21st October, 1884.

"MICHAEL STARRS Esq.,
"Ottawa.

"Will you be good enough to call to this department at once, *re* Esquimalt graving dock.

"F. H. ENNIS,
"*Secretary.*"

In pursuance of this letter, Mr. Michael Starrs called upon the Minister of Public Works. Michael Starrs interviewed the Minister of Public Works. You will bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that he was a staunch political friend of the present Administration. Michael Starrs was a strong personal and political friend of the late Premier of the Dominion. He had claims on the Government. He did not want to embarrass the Government, and more than all, he did not want to embarrass the Minister of Public Works. But Michael Starrs yielded to the pressure brought to bear on him by the Minister of Public Works. He yielded to the persuasive eloquence of the Minister, especially, as that eloquence was backed up by some very persuasive hints that it would be so much worse for Michael Starrs if he did not yield. What Micheal Starrs said on that occasion is all-important, because, in my judgment, if his evidence is to be believed, it brings the charge of connivance at fraud right home to the door of the Minister of Public Works. If the evidence of Michael Starrs is to be believed, and it is backed up in some respects by the testimony of his partner, Mr. O'Hanly, these men were unjustly and improperly thrown out of this contract, which they had agreed to take for $35,000 less than the tender of Larkin, Connolly & Co. What was said on the occasion is best told by the sworn testimony of Michael Starrs taken before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I will place before this House and the country the sworn testimony of Michael Starrs, and ask this country to say, under all the circumstances, which of the two men should be believed, the man who gives his testimony without anything to induce him to conceal the truth by perjury, or the man directly interested in the results

of the enquiry. Michael Starrs' testimony is as follows :—

Q. Did any person suggest to you that you should withdraw your tender?—A. I have no recollection of the first tender at all. There was so little talk about the first tenders that went in, I have no recollection of that particular tender at all. There was scarcely anything said about it, either in the department or outside.

Q. Well, then, the second tender? Do you remember whether anybody suggested that you should withdraw your second tender or any tender?—A. Yes. It was suggested that I should withdraw the second tender.

Q. Tell me the circumstances under which that suggestion was made?—A. There was considerable circumstances in connection with that. Sir Hector sent for me and I went up and seen him. He told me, of course, my tender was too low, and he called in Mr. Perley and talked the matter over. He discussed the question and suggested that I was entirely too low.

May I ask what business a public servant, such as the Minister of Public Work then was, had to tell a respectable and responsible contractor that his tender was entirely too low? What motives actuated him, and why did he do it? Did he ever do it in any case, except in the case of Michael Starrs? This witness goes on to say :

WITNESS.—He went on to tell me that I knew myself there was a certain amount to be paid for plant and it was necessary to pay that $50,000, and that there was no getting out of it. He also told me that I could not expect any extras, that in was straight sailing, and so and so; that the work had to be done, and taking the $50,000 that was to be paid for plant out of our total, there would not be enough left to complete the work. That is about the sum and substance of the conversation.

Q. Had you any influence as a contractor?—A. A little.

Q. Were you prepared to carry out your contract?—A. I was.

Q. Were you able to carry it out?—A. I think we could have had means to carry it out with friends to assist us.

Q. Had you any means of your own?—A. If we had not——

Q. Did you put up your deposit?—A. Yes: we did. If we had not means we could not have put up the deposit.

Q. What deposit did you put up with the tender?—A. I think it was $7,500 that the tender called for.

Q. Did you comply with Sir Hector's request?—A. I did at last.

Q. What do you mean by "at last"?—A. At the wind up.

Q. At that interview?—A. He gave me three or four days to consider it, and I took up the balance of the deposit, amounting to $9,000 more, which made the total sum of $17,000.

Q. You brought that at the time?—Was it in money? A. It was an accepted cheque.

Q. Which, with the original deposit of $7,500, would have made $17,000?—A. Yes.

Q. What did you do with that when you brought it to the department?—A. The first cheque went in with the tender and the next I handed to Sir Hector himself.

Q. Why did you hand that second cheque to Sir Hector?—A. Because we had the conversation, and he gave me, as I have already stated, three or four days to consider. I was not anxious to take the work, but my partner was and some friends, and as I told you before, it was I who did the business with Sir Hector and I took the cheque up with me and handed it to him.

Q. Sir Hector assured you that if you got the contract the $50,000 for the plant would have to be paid and there would be no extras?—A. That is right.

Q. And that it was all plain sailing?—A. Yes.

Q. That you need not look for anything above contract prices?—A. I told Sir Hector I thought from the tone of his discussion that he did not want me to take the work, and said: "Sir Hector, I believe our figures are enough to do the work, but I see that you do not feel inclined to give me the work and consequently I will withdraw."

That evidence will be found on pages 1159-60 of the evidence taken before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. That interview took place on the 24th October, 1884. Sir, the Minister of Public Works, by his solemn assurance to Mr. Starrs that certain things would inevitably occur, induced Mr. Starrs to withdraw his tender. By assuring Mr. Starrs that his tender was too low, that from the $50,000, the estimated value of the plant, not one cent would be deducted, that no extras whatever would be allowed; and by telling Mr. Starrs that it was a plain contract at a fixed price, and by suggesting to him every obstacle, raising every difficulty, and by throwing in the way of Mr. Starrs, as he swore, every obstacle that could possibly be placed in the way of his taking a contract, he withdrew his tender. So clearly is that pointed out by Mr. Starrs in his sworn testimony that I will venture shortly to quote a passage or two from it. At that interview the Minister of Public Works succeeded in squeezing Mr. Starrs out of the contract. He wanted not only to squeeze Starrs & O'Hanly out of the contract, but he wanted to award the contract to Larkin, Connolly & Co. He wished also to protect another important individual. Sir Hector Langevin suggested to Mr. Starrs that he had better write him a letter withdrawing his tender. He did more than that. He suggested to Mr. Starrs that he should write a direct and deliberate falsehood to him in order to justify himself before the country in passing over the tender of Starrs & O'Hanly and awarding the contract to Larkin, Connolly & Co. He suggested to Mr. Starrs that he should write to him (Sir Hector) a letter stating that he had made a mistake in his figures and tender. Sir Hector Langevin did that to protect himself, and to guard himself, if possible, when the question was discussed in Parliament and before the people as to why he should have passed over the lowest tender and given the contract to Larkin, Connolly & Co. Starrs & O'Hanly in a moment of weakness yielded to him. They wrote the letter. They gave the reason. They did so because there was a deposit of $17,000, and Mr. Starrs says that he and his partner came to the conclusion, when they saw the hostile attitude of the Minister of Public Works, that he was bound not to give them the contract, or if he did, that it would ruin them: they made up their minds to sign a letter, and the following letter was written to the Department Public Works (*see* page 1193):

"OTTAWA, 24th October, 1884.

"The Honourable Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, K.C.M.G.,
"Minister of Public Works,
"Ottawa.

"HONOURABLE SIR,—We find that we have made a mistake in some of the items in our tender for the Esquimalt graving dock, B.C., and find that our prices are generally too low.

"We consider it therefore not prudent to take the contract, and that it would not be in the public interest if we were to do so.

"We therefore beg to withdraw our tender, and respectfully request that you may be pleased to return our deposit cheque.

"We have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your most obedient servants,
"STARRS & O'HANLY."

If the evidence of Mr. Starrs is to be believed, and I do not think there was a man who heard him give his evidence before the Committee who was not perfectly satisfied that he was honestly telling the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, then a gross fraud was committed. Now, Sir, here is what Michael Starrs swore, and recollect it is not a letter, although letters are valuable as evidence, it is not what he told somebody, but it is his sworn testimony. Sworn upon the Holy Evangelists to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, he tells the following story

of that interview, and how he was induced to write that letter. If Michael Starrs' story is true it discloses the most extraordinary state of affairs that was ever known in the history of any Government in any country. Michael Starrs swore as follows (*see* page 1190):

Q. Were there any reasons in regard to the price of the contract to induce you to withdraw the tender? You say: "We find we have made a mistake in some of the items in our tender for the Esquimalt graving dock, B.C." Is that correct? Had you made any mistakes?—A. I will explain. No: I did not make any mistakes.

Q. You say "We find our prices are generally too low?"—A. No: it is there, and I did not object to it being there, but I want to give my reasons why this was worded that way.

Q. Go on. Will you tell the Committee, please, why you made these statements in this letter?—A. For the very reasons I gave at the last meeting: That Sir Hector threw so many obstacles in the way, and then, of course, we had a deposit of $7,500 up that went in with the first tender, and, of course, there is always supposed to be a risk about getting that back—if the tender is awarded to you and not complied with. So that Sir Hector threw so many obstacles in the way, showing me the lowness of our tender, and the difficulties that we had to contend with—no extras and $50,000 to be paid for plant—I asked Sir Hector: "Well, then, what am I to do to get our cheque back?" He suggested, "Write a letter to the department, officially to me, and I will get you your cheque returned." I said: "What will we say?" Sir Hector himself, I swear positively that he is the man who suggested to write it in the tone in which that letter is written now.

Is that statement true, Mr. Speaker? Is it true that a Minister of the Crown, ruling over a great public department in this country, the spending department of this country, in order to keep out a contractor to whom he did not want to award a contract, in order to enable him to award a contract to a favourite contractor who was always generous in his donations for charitable purposes, should have suggested to this contractor, to this respectable man, that he should solemnly sit down and write a deliberate falsehood and pen a deliberate lie to the Public Works Department? If the story of Michael Starrs is true, then that is the exact condition of affairs in relation to the Public Works Department. Michael Starrs goes on to testify (*see* page 1140):

Q. Did he then make a suggestion on which you made this statement?—A. He said: "You can write a letter representing that you made a mistake," and so on.

Q. Then you say now, on your oath, that this statement—that this letter, wherein you say you had made a mistake in your tender and that your tender was too low, was not your suggestion, but was suggested by Sir Hector?—A. Oh, certainly. It was suggested by him in his own office in the Public Works Department.

Q. Was that the reason and the only reason you wrote him the letter and made the statement?—A. That was the reason—to get back the other cheque for $7,500. Of course the $9,400 cheque when I handed it to Sir Hector, he took and looked at it, and said: "I see you are determined to take this work." I said: "Sir Hector, I have not been very anxious for it," and then after the conversation, the letter was written by my partner.

Q. You handed your cheque to Sir Hector. Did he see the cheque?—A. Yes: he looked at it and examined it.

Q. And afterwards he returned it?—A. He returned it to me before I left the room.

Q. Did he make any observation when he returned it?—A. The last words he said in connection with it was: "Thank God; you have relieved yourself of a great burden."

What an exclamation for a Minister to make! What was he thanking God for? Here was a man who went to the department with $17,000, prepared to take the contract, prepared to run the risks, if there were any to be run, prepared to go on with the contract in good faith, and when Sir Hector gets him to write a deliberate falsehood to the department, he exclaims: "Thank God." It is a melancholy condition of affairs, if the evidence of Michael Starrs is true, and the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) did not claim that it was not true, and, in fact, made no reference to it. Does it not show a degrading and humiliating condition of affairs in the Public Works Department, if not in other departments? So far, you will observe, Mr. Speaker, the scheme that I mentioned in my opening remarks, and which was concocted the moment the tender of Starrs & O'Hanly was received, prospered. The fraudulent plan adopted to freeze Starrs & O'Hanly out of the contract and to award this contract to Larkin, Connolly & Co. at a sum of $35,000 in excess of the sum that Starrs & O'Hanly were willing to do the work for succeeded. Without a moment's delay, the moment Sir Hector thanked God, and Michael Starrs was out of the way, in hot haste, without an instant's delay or a moment's reflection, Sir Hector rushes off to the Executive Council with a report, prepared, written on the spur of the moment, and he presents his report to Council. The report itself is an extraordinary and suggestive one. It speaks loudly; it speaks in no uncertain terms of the scheme concocted and the fraud carried out. I shall read only a portion of this report which relates to the matter I am now discussing. It is as follows (*see* page 93):—

"CERTIFIED COPY *of a Report of a Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council on the 25th October*, 1884

"On a Memorandum dated 24th October, 1884, from the Minister of Public Works, submitting that Messrs. Starrs & O'Hanly, whose tender for the completion of the Esquimalt graving dock was accepted by Order in Council of the 16th October instant, have to-day by letter signified that they made mistakes in some items of their tender, and find that their prices are generally too low, submitting that it would not therefore be prudent for them to take the contract, and requesting to be allowed to withdraw their tender and have their deposit cheque returned to them.

"The Minister states that the chief engineer of his department reports to the effect that their tender was too low and that the work could not be done for the prices named: that the figures for masonry and concrete, the two principal items, are so low that they barely cover the cost of the stone to be quarried, leaving nothing for cement and labour and cutting and setting the stone in the work, and that it is evident that Messrs. Starrs & O'Hanly have made serious mistakes in their tender as regards these items.

"The Minister, in view of these circumstances, recommends that Messrs. Starrs & O'Hanly be permitted to withdraw their tender and have the security deposit returned to them, and that the contract be awarded to the next lowest tenderers, Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co., whose offer is for $374,559.53, if concrete be used for backing, and $403,373.03 if rubble backing be used.

"The Committee submit the same for Your Excellency's approval."

And of course it was approved of accordingly. I state here, without fear of successful contradiction, that this Minute of Council contains at least three, if not four, deliberate misstatements and misrepresentations made by the Minister of Public Works. You will observe that according to the evidence of Michael Starrs, Starrs & O'Hanly made no mistake in their tender. The Minister of Public Works, in his report to Council, stated that they made a mistake in their tender and wished to withdraw; but Starrs & O'Hanly swear they made no mistake in their tender. The Minister of Public Works reports to Council that the prices in the tender were altogether too low; Starrs swears point blank that their prices were

not too low, and judging by the report of the auditors appointed by the Privileges and Elections Committee to investigate the accounts of Larkin, Connolly & Co., if Starrs & O'Hanly had got the contract at their price, and had even paid the $19,000 deducted for plant, they would still clear in hard cash $50,000, and in all reason that is enough on a contract of two or three hundred thousand dollars. That report to Council is a gross misrepresentation of the facts. They did not submit that it would be impossible for them to take the contract; that was the suggestion of the Minister of Public Works. They did not request to be allowed to withdraw the contract; on the contrary, if the evidence of Michael Starrs is to be relied upon at all, backed up as it is by the evidence of O'Hanly, these men did not want to withdraw from the contract. These men did not think their tender was too low: they swear they made no mistake in their contract; and the report to Council was a pure invention of the Minister of Public Works. That report was adopted by Council, and Starrs & O'Hanly were cheated out of the contract, and Larkin, Connolly & Co. got it. The story of the Esquimalt graving dock is a disreputable and disgraceful story to be told in the Parliament of Canada. If we deal with the case as a criminal case, or even as a civil case is dealt with in the ordinary courts of justice, one would say that all these facts and circumstances bring the charge directly home to the implicated and incriminated Minister. Is this not so? If you have followed the evidence of Michael Starrs, if you have followed the history of the tenders, if you have followed the conduct of the Minister of Public Works, if you have followed step by step the different stages in that history, and if you have observed the anxiety exhibited by the Minister to get rid of the tender of Starrs & O'Hanly, and to award the contract to Larkin, Connolly & Co., but one conclusion would strike your mind or the mind of any reasonable man, and that is, that the circumstances which tell for the guilt of the incriminated Minister are overwhelming. If it is not so that the Minister of Public Works squeezed these men improperly out of the contract, and saddled upon the people of the country an addition of $35,000, the difference in the prices of the two tenders, and awarded the contract to Larkin, Connolly & Co., by which the people of this country ultimately lost in extras $242,000, will the Minister of Justice or any other member of this House tell us how it was that Starrs & O'Hanly were assured by the Minister of Public Works that not a cent would be deducted from the price of the plant, $50,000, when the very same Minister deducted $19,000 for the price of the plant when Larkin, Connolly & Co. got the contract? Will the Minister of Justice or any other member on the Treasury benches or in Parliament tell us, if my view is not a correct view, and if the conclusion I have arrived at is not a correct conclusion, why the Minister of Public Works should have told Starrs & O'Hanly that no extras would be allowed on the contract, when the evidence shows conclusively, and the report of the auditors appointed by the Committee to investigate these matters shows, that extras were paid on that contract to the amount of $207,000 or thereabouts? If the conclusion I have arrived at is not correct, will some hon. gentleman explain to us the extraordinary and inexplicable conduct of the Minister of Public Works in reporting to Council that these men had made some mistake in their tender, and that their prices were altogether too low? The thing is impossible. The conclusion one is forced to arrive at from the evidence, and this is only a small part of it, is simply irresistible, bringing the crime home to the doors of the Department of Public Works and the Minister. We have another item which goes to confirm my theory, and it is this: At pages 175, 296, 301, 303 and 321, you will find that on various occasions during the investigation, Owen Murphy swore that he offered the Minister of Public Works 25 per cent. upon the contract prices, if the contract for the Esquimalt graving dock were awarded to Larkin, Connolly & Co. It may be said right here that no importance can be attached to Owen Murphy's evidence. I shall speak of that later on. Every step taken, so far as we have gone, is only confirmatory of the story told by Owen Murphy. If it is not true, what other theory have hon. gentlemen to advance? What other story have they got to palm off on the people of this country if the conclusion which I have arrived at is not correct, that there was collusion, connivance and fraud in the Department of Public Works and the Minister with the conspirators? There are other circumstances, convincing to the minds of thinking, reasonable men, who are not carried away entirely by political partizanship, but who will take the trouble to read the evidence given before the Committee and judge of it on its merits. The contract was awarded to Larkin, Connolly & Co. without any justification; but no sooner was that contract awarded by the Minister of Public Works to Larkin, Connolly & Co. than these same conspirators set their machinery in motion to secure changes in that contract to their own advantage; and several changes were secured, and several changes were agreed to be secured, that were not ultimately carried out. The first change was to allow the contractors to use stone instead of brick in the caisson chamber, and $6,000 or thereabouts was allowed for that change. The next change was in the entrance to the graving dock, the double entrance being done away with, and a circular head substituted; and this change, which was estimated to cost $35,000, really cost about $39,000. Then, on the 16th of April, 1885 (*see* page 122), another change was applied for, the re-coursing of the graving dock and altering the course for the inclination of the bottom; and that change was assented to on the 20th of April, 1885, by the Minister, without cost to the country (*see* page 123.) There was another change in April, 1885, which will be found mentioned at pages 124, 125, and 128 of the blue-book, involving the use of larger stones than those called for by the contract. Leave was given to use larger stones without cost. Now let us see what the sequel was. Everyone knows from the investigation and from the history of Larkin, Connolly & Co., in connection with this contract, that these were pratical business men, who never did any work without getting paid for it, and never expended 50 cents without expecting to get a dollar in return. On the 11th of September, 1885, Michael Connolly writes to Nick Connolly, and among other things he said (*see* page 380):

"Instead of Trutch complying with the request of Sir Hector that we should receive every possible indulgence and encouragement, he is doing everything he can in an underhand way to embarrass us, and Bennett is his tool all through."

Whether this letter reached Sir Hector Langevin's eye or not I am not prepared to say; but he gave them every indulgence; he gave them more than indulgence, he gave them hard cash. The changes were to be made without any cost to the country: yet I find that on the 25th of January, 1886, the Minister of Public Works, by Mr. Perley, sends the following telegram to the agent of the Dominion Government in British Columbia; and mark, it is not done on Mr. Perley's responsibility at all. The telegram is in the following words (*see* page 127):—

"25th January, 1886.

"Hon. J. W. TRUTCH.
"Victoria, B.C.

"Minister directs contractors shall be paid for full quantity of stone in dock and caisson recess, and full measurement on all stones. Letter by mail.

"HENRY F. PERLEY.
"*Chief Engineer.*"

And the letter followed by mail. Now this little scheme, according to the evidence of Mr. Perley, cost $23,000; and according to the evidence of Sir Hector Langevin it cost $40,000. Another change was proposed to be made, a most important change in the construction of the graving dock at British Columbia. On the 26th of January, 1885 (*see* page 95), the contractors applied for leave to lengthen the British Columbia dock by 100 feet. On the 3rd of February, 1885, permission was refused by the department in the following words:—"That no increase in the length of the dock was required." But the question of the Esquimault graving dock was not to be settled by that. These contractors were men of perseverance; they were men of resource and resolution: they were men looking after the almighty dollar, and who would stop at nothing to gain it. And we find Michael Connolly writing his friend Owen Murphy from Esquimalt on the 21st of March, 1886 (*see* page 218):

"FRIEND OWEN,—Yours of 8th inst. came duly to hand. I hope you will soon hear definitely about the extension of the dock, as we have some men we would like to retain. Of course if the estimate passes we will give everything we can afford. We have not heard anything from the $20,000 drawback yet, but perhaps we will in a day or two."

Mark the words: "if the dock is lengthened, if the estimate passes, we will give everything we can afford." To whom were they to give everything they could afford. Was it to be given to Mr. Thomas McGreevy or to Sir Hector Langevin to supplement the reptile fund? On the 15th of February, 1886, Michael Connolly again writes his friend Owen Murphy as follows (*see* page 187):—

"Now about the dock, if the $250,000 pass in the Budget, we of course will have some work to tear down, &c., but if you can get a lump contract for extending at $250,000 we can give $50,000."

To whom were they to give the $50,000? And through whose instrumentality and by whose influence were they to secure the change in the contract by lengthening the British Columbia graving dock? There was no man but the one able to do it. There was no man to intervene and act as go-between except the omnipotent Thomas McGreevy, and he was utterly helpless without the aid of the Minister of Public Works. To show still further upon what these men depended and the reliance they had on Thomas McGreevy and the Minister of Public Works—and their reliance was not in vain—the following letter throws some light on the subject. It is from Mr. Larkin, one of the best of the conspiring contractors, to Mr. O. E. Murphy (*see* page 184):

"I have just got your letter of 17th inst. Our friends call for another $5,000——"

It is very much like old times, Mr. Speaker: "Send me another $10,000." Our friends in Quebec want another $5,000, and Pat. Larkin, now become a little alarmed, said:

"I have just got your letter of the 17th inst. Our friends' call for another $5,000, on account of British Columbia, is not in accordance with the agreement we had when the $50,000 was divided—that was that there was to be no more calls or divisions to be made until the indebtedness of the British Columbia dock and Quebec harbour works to the Quebec dock was paid; that was distinctly stated by me, and agreed to by R. H.; otherwise, I would not have agreed to the division of the $50,000."

In further confirmation of that, let me read an extract from the letter of the 25th of Febraury, 1886, page 186 of the report, written by Michael to Owen:

"I told you in a letter lately that if $250,000 were granted for extending the dock we would give $50,000 of it for some charitable purpose."

Let the hon. Minister of Public Works tell us to what charitable purpose this $50,000 was to be donated? Let any member of the Administration, let the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, tell this Parliament and the country to what charitable purpose this $50,000 was to be given?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Speak now.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Why should these contractors give $50,000 to some charitable purpose? They were not the men to do that unless there was some reason for it. They were not the men to give a red cent, unless they knew it would be recouped by one hundred red cents. These pressing demands upon the contractors—the conspirators as they are called in the majority report—were so great and so frequent that they had to insist upon the Government changing the contract by lengthening the Esquimalt graving dock 100 feet at the cost of $100,000 to the people. Let me read a short extract from another letter to be found on page 18 of the blue-book, in further confirmation of the statement I am making, and as bringing nearer the Department of Public Works and the Minister the charge of fraudulent connivance with these conspirators. Above all things, it is written from the Canadian House of Commons, where it is supposed honesty and purity are to be found, if they are to be found anywhere, and it is written by Mr. Thomas McGreevy, as member of Parliament, on the 26th April, 1887, shortly after the elections of the year and when funds were required and had to be obtained (*see* page 18):

"MY DEAR ROBERT,—I have just seen Perley about dredging. I think he will report on 35 cents and put some conditions which will amount to nothing. He will report when I will be there. I have had a conversation with Shakespeare on the lengthening of the British Columbia dock. I told him to unite with the others and push it. He is prepared to to so."

Prepared to push it, Mr. Speaker—

"I told him to write and get the length of steamers chartered by the Canadian Pacific Railway from the Cunard Company."

In pursuance of these repeated demands made upon the contractors by the conspirators who lived in the Province of Quebec and the City of Ottawa, and yielding to the pressure of these conspirators who had to be recouped for their outlays, the Minister of Public Works penned, on the 18th of

November, 1889, a report to Council in favour of extending the dock by 100 feet at a cost to the people of $100,000. Instead of the Minister of Public Works thanking God that Starrs & O'Hanly were relieved from a burden, the people of Canada, from one end of Canada to the other, have reason to thank God that there is a higher power than the Minister of Public Works. The dock was not lengthened, not through any fault of the Minister of Public Works, but because the Imperial Government intervened, and saved $100,000 to the people of this country. In the evidence, there was a little document produced by Mr. M. P. Connolly, the book-keeper of these conspirators. It is a singular little document, produced as an extract from the books of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and relates to the Esquimalt graving dock. It is as follows :—

"ESQUIMALT DOCK.

August, 1885		$4,000
February, 1886		3,000
April, 1886		1,000
June, 1886		3,000
March, 1887		17,000
do	Three Rivers	5,000
March, 1888		2,000
		$35,000

26th April, 1889. "Certified correct,
"M. P. CONNOLLY,
"*Clerk.*"

The item of $5,000 for Three Rivers is exceedingly suggestive. What does it mean? Was that a charitable donation given by the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. Three Rivers was the constituency of the Minister of Public Works; March, 1887, was very shortly after the general election; funds were required to pay election bills, and what more natural than that the men who had received such pronounced favours at the hands of the Department of Public Works should be called upon to replenish the funds required for election purposes at Three Rivers.

Mr. COATSWORTH. You had better read Connolly's evidence upon that.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have read it, and there is the evidence upon it, and it shows that that $5,000 was charged in the books of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and the document is signed and certified by Connolly himself. Is it disputed by any reasonable man that that money was expended for election purposes? Why should it be in the books marked "Three Rivers, $5,000," if the money was not so expended? Other changes were asked for in this contract, and the Minister was always ready and willing to make the changes, and the Government, for they are responsible for his actions, were always ready to accede to whatever demand was made by the conspirators. Although at first the Government refused to lengthen the graving dock, afterwards they agreed to lengthen it by 100 feet. They made the change from sandstone to granite when they were asked to do so, and when they were asked to change back to sandstone, because the contractors found that they would make more money by using sandstone than they would by using granite, they assented also to that change. Some officials who would not collude with the contractors were on the eve of being dismissed. The Minister and the chief engineer were willing to dismiss them, and all this was in pursuance of the original corrupt contract with Larkin, Connolly & Co. Now, let us refer for a moment to the $50,000 for the plant. The firm of Starrs & O'Hanly were distinctly informed that by the terms of the contract the plant taken at $50,000 cash would be adhered to. Starrs swears that the Minister impressed upon him that he must not expect one cent of reduction from that amount, or any extras, and Larkin, Connolly & Co. took the contract on the same understanding, and paid the amount of $50,000 out of their monthly estimates. But they knew the men they had to deal with. They knew the influence of Thomas McGreevy in the Public Works Department. They knew that they controlled the power behind the throne, and they succeeded in reducing the amount to $30,000. In April, 1885 (*see* page 98) they applied to Trutch, the agent of the department in British Columbia, for a reduction of $12,403 in the price of the plant. On the 16th April, 1885, Trutch writes to the Minister of Public Works, stating that the demand made by the Connollys had been refused by him, excepting to the extent of $10.45. On the 12th May, 1885, Gobeil writes to Trutch that "by the direction of the Minister of Public Works, no deductions can be made." Subsequently things change. The contractors get new light. They make another application for the reduction, and in January, 1886, Perley reports direct to the Minister of Public Works, that a reduction should be made of over $19,000, and I am not aware that the Minister of Public Works has denied that statement to this hour. That report was sent to the Department of Public Works, and it was sworn that it was the constant habit of the Minister of Public Works to examine all these reports and discuss them with Mr. Perley; so that, if this report was not examined and discussed by the Minister, it was about the only one that was not. If the Minister of Public Works did not see this report, it is because he closed his eyes and stopped his ears to all information on the subject. In view of all this, I ask if, in the manipulations of the Minister with the tenders and the contract, the changes in the contract without justification, the reduction in the price of the plant without justification, there is a single man who can lay his hand on his heart and honestly say he believes that all this was going on for years and years and that the Minister of Public Works knew nothing about it. If the Minister of Public Works did not read his reports and did not know what went on in his own office he is not the man we have always supposed him to be. What is the result of all this manipulating of these tenders and the changes which were made in the contracts? The result is, that work which Starrs & O'Hanly were willing to do for $338,945 cost the country $581,841, or a dead loss to the people of Canada of $242,896, in addition to $27,000 given by way of a donation. What is the cause of these startling results? There can be only one of two causes: There must be either gross negligence and mismanagement, or criminal connivance. I leave hon. gentlemen opposite on either horn of the dilemma. One or the other is inevitable. Let me submit a very short *resumé* of the facts and circumstances, either admitted or proved, that I think must carry conviction to the mind of reasonable men. First, there was the shabby and dishonest way in which the tender of Starrs & O'Hanly was passed over and the con-

tract awarded to Larkin, Connolly & Co. Then there was the gross misrepresentation of the facts to Council made by the Minister of Public Works in reference to the Starrs & O'Hanly tender. Now, let us see what all these changes have cost. At this late hour I do not propose to enter into the matter in detail. All I desire to say in reply to what hon. gentlemen, in the face of all this evidence, ask us to believe, namely, that the Minister of Public Works is innocent, is that if he is innocent in this matter, if the conspirators ruled every official in the Public Works Department, then these conspirators were enabled to rob this country of an enormous sum of public money by the gross negligence of the head of the department. The collusion of the Minister of Public Works to betray the trust that the people reposed in him is so clear, to my mind, that I do not believe it is open to a reasonable doubt. The collusion is clearer still, more irresistible, in view of the sworn testimony that was given before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, that a large portion of this money, stolen out of the public treasury, went into the hands of Thomas McGreevy, and by him was disposed of for election purposes, if it did not go into the hands of Sir Hector Langevin. Now, I want to point out a few remarkable pieces of evidence that, in my judgment, I regret to say, still more clearly connect the Minister of Public Works with this conspiracy. Now, we all know that the Minister of Public Works is impeached for a grave crime, a grave misdemeanour. That impeachment rests upon several grounds, and the evidence that was adduced before the Committee on Privileges and Election, and upon which I am now addressing the House, covers several of these grounds. First, it is charged that the Minister of Public Works connived at the frauds perpetrated by these conspirators; that he fraudulently lent himself as a tool in the hands of Thomas McGreevy to pass over tenders that were lower than those of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and to award the contract to them; that he colluded with Thomas McGreevy to award to Larkin, Connolly & Co. contracts that they were not entitled to; that he colluded with Thomas McGreevy to award these conspirators contracts without tenders; that he colluded with Thomas McGreevy to give these contracts on terms that were outside and wholly irrespective of the call for tenders and the specifications; that he colluded with Thomas McGreevy and these conspirators to give to these conspirators exorbitant prices; that he was guided and directed solely by Thomas McGreevy—that he was, in a word, a blind tool in the hands of Thomas McGreevy; that he was as clay in the hands of the potter; that Thomas McGreevy was the power behind the Throne; that Thomas McGreevy ruled the Department of Public Works and the Minister of Public Works. Sir, I have submitted to you evidence that I think sustains the conclusion that the impeachment in that respect is true. We know that this impeachment, like every other charge of a criminal or a civil nature, must rest either upon circumstantial or direct evidence. I have submitted to you a number of circumstances that directly point to the Minister of Public Works, and I propose to submit to you additional facts and circumstances that I think will enable every reasonable man to conclude without hesitation that the Minister of Public Works is not free from guilt in this matter. We know that the weight to be attached to a good deal of the evidence on which this question depends rests largely upon the surrounding circumstances; we know that it is said that circumstantial evidence is more weighty than direct evidence; we know that one of the first judges of England, 100 years ago, declared in a celebrated case that witnesses would lie, but circumstances never. How true or how untrue that may be is a matter of little consequence now, because I believe that the circumstances surrounding this case are so many, so numerous and so clear, that they lead to but one conclusion. It was admitted, and it will be admitted now, that for 20 years Thomas McGreevy was the bosom friend and chosen companion of the Minister of Public Works; it is admitted that for 10 years Thomas McGreevy was an inmate of the residence of the Minister of Public Works at Ottawa, and occupied a room in his private office in the Parliament buildings at Ottawa, as if it were his own. It is admitted, or proved, that Thomas McGreevy was the treasurer of the Conservative election fund in the City of Quebec, and of the eastern portion of the Province of Quebec; it is admitted that the Minister of Public Works was the leader of the great Conservative party, and as such would know something of the workings of that party in the Province of Quebec; it is admitted that for 25 years Thomas McGreevy sat in Parliament behind the Minister of Public Works as the steadfast and unswerving follower of the Minister of Public Works; it is admitted that a voluminous correspondence was carried on between the Minister of Public Works and Thomas McGreevy; it is admitted—if not admitted, it was proved—that 12 years ago Thomas McGreevy donated to the Minister of Public Works $10,000 of hard cash to pay either the election expenses of his own political contests, or the expenses connected with the election protests in which the Minister of Public Works was the respondent; it is admitted that up to this hour Thomas McGreevy has carried and still carries in his possession the promissory note of the Minister of Public Works for that $10,000; it is admited that for these 12 years Thomas McGreevy paid every four months the discount upon that $10,000; it is admitted that the Minister of Public Works expects—he swore it himself—never to pay a farthing of that $10,000, but that Thomas McGreevy is to pay it all. In a word, Mr. Speaker, up to this hour it is clear as the noon-day sun that during these ten years Thomas McGreevy held the Minister of Public Works firmly by the throat, and the Minister of Public Works could not budge except by the will of Thomas McGreevy. It is admitted that Thomas McGreevy out of this fund, stolen from the people of this Dominion, paid $25,000 to subsidize the personal organ of the Minister of Public Works, an organ that he secured in order that he might control it himself; it is admitted, or proved, that Thomas McGreevy, out of this same fund so stolen from the people of Canada, paid $3,000 to subsidize the personal organ of the son-in-law of the Minister of Public Works; it was proved by Thomas McGreevy's own brother, Robert, that out of this fund so stolen from the people of Canada, Thomas McGreevy secured $170,000 odd; Thomas McGreevy admits that he secured $60,000, and the accountants showed that at the very least about $130,000 passed into the hands of Thomas McGreevy. These facts, either admitted

or proved by evidence that cannot be questioned, lead to but one conclusion, and that conclusion is that the Minister of Public Works was an instrument in the hands of Thomas Mc Greevy, and that Thomas McGreevy, as the majority report find, was the paid servant of these conspirators. It is said, as I mentioned a moment ago, that witnesses may lie. Circumstances also may lie; but written correspondence, written calmly, deliberately, after reflection, ought, in my judgment, to have more weight than oral testimony. Let us examine some letters that passed between Thomas McGreevy and his brother Robert; and bear in mind that these letters were written by Thomas McGreevy nine years ago. They were written at a period when the closest personal friendship existed between the Minister of Public Works and Thomas McGreevy. These letters were written on the subject of these very contracts which we are now discussing, some of them on the subject of the Esquimalt graving dock. They were written on the subject of the changes made in the contracts and of the extras paid on the contracts. They were written in strict confidence between Thomas McGreevy and his brother Robert, and are, in my judgment, the best pieces of evidence that can be submitted to Parliament. What object had Thomas McGreevy nine years ago in lying about the Minister of Public Works? What object had Thomas McGreevy nine years ago in writing a deliberate falsehood to his brother Robert, with whom he was on the closest terms of friendship? What object had he in misrepresenting the true state of affairs. None whatever; and yet, if Thomas McGreevy spoke the truth in those letters, the charge of criminal connivance with those conspirators is brought directly home to the door of the Minister of Public Works. On 5th May, 1883, Thomas McGreevy wrote to Robert (*see* page 16):

"The tenders for cross-wall only arrived here yesterday and are locked up until Monday, when he will commence his calculations. I will write you Tuesday and let you know the result."

The evidence has reference to the Minister of Public Works? Will the Minister of Justice, or anyone else, tell me exactly how Thomas Mc Greevy knew on 5th May that tenders directed to the Minister of Public Works had arrived in Ottawa? Will hon. gentlemen tell me how Thomas McGreevy discovered that on the following day, 6th May, the Minister of Public Works would begin his calculations on the tenders? There was only one source of information, and that source was the Minister of Public Works. How could Thomas McGreevy know that the tenders for the cross-wall arrived in Ottawa the day before he wrote that letter? The tenders I have mentioned were addressed to the Minister of Public Works and opened, I suppose, by the Minister. He could not know, unless he knew it from the Minister of Public Works. How did he find out that the Minister would commence his calculations on the following day, and how could he write to his brother: "I will write you to-morrow and let you know the result," except through the Minister of Public Works. The following letter will throw more light on the subject. It is written from the House of Commons, and is dated 7th May, and is as follows (*see* page 17):—

"I hope to let you know to-morrow about the result of cross-wall tenders. Have your arrangement with Beaucage before the result is known. I will give you timely notice. Murphy might approach O'Brien in the matter, but he would have to promise to get Charlebois away. All the others might be passed over."

Here hon. members will see in the clearest possible light the connivance between the Department of Public Works and Thomas McGreevy, else how could Thomas McGreevy write to his brother Robert that all the other tenders would be passed over if Beaucage's tender was out of the way. It was impossible for Thomas McGreevy to say that out of his own mind. The knowledge had to be acquired, and it could only be acquired in one way. There is another letter, an extraordinary letter, a suggestive letter. It was written by Mr. Perley, the confidential friend of the Minister of Public Works as well as his chief engineer, the man in whom he had unbounded faith, to Thomas McGreevy, and it contained bold statements regarding the Department of Public Works. It is from the chief engineer, dated 11th September, 1884, marked "private," and addressed to Thomas McGreevy. Hear what it says (*see* page 137):

"(*Private.*)

"My Dear Mr. McGreevy,—Your private note of the 9th to hand, and in reply I send you herewith a copy of the specification of the graving dock, British Columbia, two copies of tender, and sheets showing the quantities of work to be done to complete the work, these quantities having been computed by the resident engineer in British Columbia. I cannot send the rates supplied by myself, as I have never determined them. My estimate of the probable cost to finish was arrived at *en bloc*, and amounted to $390,000, or, deducting the $50,000 for plant and materials (*see* specification), $340,000 net. I send a photograph of the work as it stands, which may be of assistance to you, but an examination of the plans on exhibition here is desirable. I am told the best and most suitable quarry is 80 miles from Victoria, at or near Nanaimo."

This letter, dated from the Department of Public Works in Ottawa, is marked "private" by the engineer of the Minister of Public Works. Why should the engineer of the Department of Public Works send to Thomas McGreevy, in a letter marked "private," the specifications for the construction of the Esquimalt graving dock in advance? Why should he send Thomas McGreevy in advance copies of the proposed tenders? Why should he send Thomas McGreevy in advance copies of the estimates? Why should he tell Thomas Mc Greevy what the estimate was for the construction of the dock? Why should he tell Thomas McGreevy where he could conveniently get stone? What was done respecting other contractors? I challenge the Department of Public Works and the Government to adduce a tittle of evidence to show that this information was given to other tenderers except Thomas McGreevy. Why should Mr. Perley do this, except at the instigation and command of the Minister of Public Works? He could not do it except by direction of the Minister. Not only was Thomas McGreevy omnipotent in the Department of Public Works, and over the Minister, but he was omnipotent everywhere, and in regard to the officials of both inside and outside services. When the resident engineer in British Columbia does not give satisfaction to the contractors, and will not collude with them to defraud the Government, communication is had with Thomas McGreevy. Thomas McGreevy complains to the Minister, and the Minister agrees to remove the obnoxious engineer, as the following

letter, written by Thomas McGreevy, will show (*see* page 19):

"It is now understood that Bennett, the engineer at B.C., will not suit, so the Minister and Perley are prepared to change him. He asked if I could recommend one."

Is this not a degrading and humiliating position for the Government to be placed in? Here is an official in the service of the country not giving satisfaction to the contractors; because he will not connive to defraud his employers, application is made to dismiss him. Thomas McGreevy writes that he is not the man to suit. The Minister is prepared to change him, and asks Thomas McGreevy to recommend another. But the power of Thomas McGreevy in the department and over the Minister of Public Works is shown in the most conclusive manner in the following letter, portions of which I will read. This is a letter dated Ottawa, 13th May, 1885, and addressed to his brother Robert. The following is an extract (*see* page 21):

"OTTAWA, 13th May.

"MY DEAR ROBERT,—I enclose you letter from Rousseau. You ought to sell him the stone cheap—we don't want it. Telegraph him to Montreal on receipt of my letter price. Tell Kerrigan & Co., plumbers, that they have contract for Marine Hospital. They were not the lowest: Vandery was. I got the Minister to give it to them. Your expense account has not reached Railway Department yet. Will look after it to-day.

"I wish you could get $480 for a week, by cheque or otherwise, to pay $300 to Stanley Smith and Lindsey at once. They have both written for it. I am afraid they will insist on the capital. Tell me to-morrow if you can do it at once; if not I will have to go down and look to it.

"Bradley told me he has sent to Larkin, Connolly & Co. what they asked for by my telegraph.

"Riopel will be in Quebec Friday morning, and will give the necessary authority required to make a beginning on the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, in order to save the charter.

"Yours truly,

"THOMAS McGREEVY."

Now, what a shocking commentary is here upon the management of the Public Works Department. If hon. gentlemen can blush, they ought to blush at this exhibition of the degraded condition to which the department has been lowered. Thomas writes from Ottawa to his brother in Quebec:

"Tell Kerrigan & Co., the plumbers, that they have secured the contract."

Kerrigan was not the lowest tenderer, but what of that? Thomas McGreevy was at headquarters; Thomas McGreevy was manipulating the matter for them. Vandery was the lowest tenderer, but what of that? Thomas McGreevy was at headquarters, and "I," said the omnipotent Thomas McGreevy, "I induced the Minister to pass over the lowest and give the contract to Kerrigan & Co." Is it not a humiliating condition of affairs to which the country is reduced by the misconduct and maladministration of hon. gentlemen opposite, misconduct and maladministration that has been going on for ten years, and every year becoming intensified, until the departments in Ottawa and the Government in Ottawa have become a by-word and a reproach throughout the nations of the earth. If Thomas McGreevy induced the Minister of Public Works to pass over the tender of Vandery for the Marine Hospital at Quebec and to give the contract to Kerrigan & Co., by the influence of Thomas McGreevy, in which contract Thomas McGreevy had no interest himself, is it not a reasonable conclusion that Thomas McGreevy induced the Minister of Public Works to pass over the tender of Starrs & O'Hanly, and to give the contract to Larkin, Connolly & Co., at an advance of $35,000, in which contract Thomas McGreevy had a direct pecuniary interest? Sir, the following letter written again impudently from the Public Works Department, and written before the eyes of the Minister of Public Works, and under the nose of the Minister of Public Works, speaks in thunder tones of the condition to which the Public Works Department had been reduced by the Minister of Public Works and Thomas McGreevy. It shows the power and supremacy of the man over the Minister. It shows the abject submission of the Minister to the man (*see* page 22):

"DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, CANADA,
"OTTAWA, 1st March, 1886.

"DEAR ROBERT,—Nothing new since I wrote you last. I have had a long interview with Perley on harbour works and graving dock at B. C. Fleming was to have signed his report to-day on harbour works. It will be shown to me as soon as signed. I will see it to-morrow and Sir Hector and myself will decide what is to be done for future. He will adopt my views. I will see you and Murphy about it before doing anything. It is a big thing for the future.

"I think the graving dock at B. C. will be lengthened; they are now making estimates. I think he is going to put another $150,000 in estimates for it.

"Yours truly,

"THOMAS McGREEVY."

Not the Department of Public Works, not the Government of Canada, not the engineers or the principal employé's in the Public Works Department, but "the Minister of Public Works and myself will decide by to-morrow." "The Minister of Public Works will adopt my views," wrote Thomas McGreevy. Now, Sir, is it not an extraordinary condition of affairs that a member of Parliament, a friend of the Government, writing from the Public Works Department, should write in that style. "The Minister and myself will decide," "the Minister will adopt my views," "there is a big thing for the future," "the Esquimalt graving dock may be lengthened, and we may get a large sum for that, but at all events we will have a large sum in extras." Did Thomas McGreevy deliberately sit down in the Public Works Department, under the nose of the Minister of Public Works, and before the eye of the Minister of Public Works, and write a lie. If he did, I have nothing more to say upon the subject so far as this letter is concerned; but if Thomas McGreevy wrote the truth when he wrote that letter, then the charge of criminal conspiracy to defraud this country out of a large sum of money is brought right home to the Minister of Public Works. That is not all. There is something else; there is something else that shows that the money of the people of Canada has been used by the Department of Public Works and by these conspirators, including Thomas McGreevy—Thomas McGreevy especially—for unlawful purposes. A letter of the 9th March, 1886, touching the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, throws a flood of light upon the relations that existed between Thomas McGreevy and the Minister of Public Works. Thomas writes to his brother Robert as follows (*see* page 23):

"HOUSE OF COMMONS, CANADA, 9th March, 1886.

"MY DEAR ROBERT,—I send you a letter from Marine Department. You will read it to Fradette and tell him that contract will be sent in a few days. If he wants to copy letter let him do so. Will write you again this afternoon. I had a meeting this afternoon with Sir Hector and Sir Adolphe on Baie des Chaleurs. Sir Hector insisted on an understanding being come to. I refused to do so, and told him at last to let Robitaille make a proposition himself; that I was not going to make brains for him forever and let him take advantage of it. They proposed (not Caron,

Sir Hector) to give me control of road to St. Ann's, with subsidy of $6,000 per mile, if I would withdraw my opposition to B. de C. Railway and relieve you and me of our stock. They are in a complete fix. The Armstrongs can't get anybody to touch them. Isbester sent word by Mitchell that as long as the Armstrongs had anything to do with it they would not.

"Yours truly,
"ROBERT McGREEVY."

Does not this letter show, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Public Works was as clay to be moulded by Thomas McGreevy just at his will? When Thomas McGreevy and his fellow conspirators quarrelled over the spoils stolen out of the subsidy voted by the Canadian Parliament to build the Baie des Chaleurs Railway the Minister of Public Works sought to calm the gathering storm. He interviewed them, and when he found he could do nothing else, he made the proposition to Thomas McGreevy that if he and his brother Robert would withdraw from that railway he, the Minister of Public Works, would give Thomas McGreevy a subsidy of $6,000 a mile for another railway without the consent of Parliament, or without the approval of the people of Canada. Is not that a startling condition of affairs? Is it not enough to disgust a free people in a free country? Now, Sir, I shall submit another piece of evidence to the House as showing the power of Thomas McGreevy, not only over the Minister of Public Works, but over the whole Government. Here is the letter (*see* page 20):

"DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, CANADA,
OTTAWA, 17th March, 1886.

"MY DEAR ROBERT,—Larkin and Murphy are here. Larkin has learned a good deal of what has been done. The estimate for February is through, and amounts to over twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000); that makes nearly seventy-five thousand dollars gone out within a month. They ought to be flush out there now. I sent you to-day the Votes and Proceedings about what Edgar asks about Baie des Chaleurs R. R. Pope sent for me to ask what answer he would give. I agreed that he should give the required information, but will state that I have notified him of my withdrawal from the direction and severed my connection with the company. Other questions will follow. Pope told me that they have put in some answer which he has sent to the Minister of Justice. I will go and examine them to see what they have put in. Your letter received; I will attend to what you ask.

"Yours truly.
"THOMAS McGREEVY."

Why, Sir, the Minister of Railways was not at liberty to answer a simple question in Parliament without first submitting the question and submitting the answer to Thomas McGreevy. Thomas writes to his brother Robert:

"I agreed that the Minister should do this. I will go and see in the department what answer the Government propose to give to the question."

Is that not a startling commentary, I ask again, upon the relationship that existed between the Government and Thomas McGreevy? I have merely read a few letters, but they all show that the Minister of Public Works was passive in the hands of Thomas McGreevy. The correspondence that passed between Thomas McGreevy and his brother conclusively proves that Thomas McGreevy had not only power and influence over the Minister of Public Works, but such power and influence as enabled Thomas McGreevy to dictate his own terms as to the kind of contract which should be given and as to the changes that should be made in it. But there is another piece of evidence which, if not just as conclusive, yet adds great weight to the circumstantial evidence already given. We find in the correspondence which passed between Michael and Nicholas Connolly, and Owen Murphy, a number of letters that throw a wonderful amount of light on this subject. These men relied upon Thomas McGreevy as the intermediary between themselves and the Minister of Public Works. They knew the man on whom they relied, not only to secure the contracts but to procure the necessary changes afterwards. They were not men likely to donate thousands of dollars for political purposes without being absolutely certain that they would be recouped. Now, I find at page 213 of the blue-book, that Michael Connolly writes to Owen Murphy on the 25th of August, 1882, a letter, from which I make the following extract:—

"I am glad to hear that you have ousted Peters, Moore & Wright out of the harbour work. Stick to Tom, and I think we will work matters all right; any way, I have great confidence in him."

Now, why should he stick to Tom? Why should he have great confidence in Tom? Tom was not an extraordinary man. I am sure he was not a brilliant parliamentarian. He may have been a good business man, but he was not an extraordinary man. Why, then, should Michael Connolly write: I have great confidence that Tom will pull you through? Men do not talk in that way to ordinary men, unless they have a good reason why; and the reason is clear. It will be admitted that Robert McGreevy had an interest in almost all of these contracts without putting in a cent of capital, and Thomas McGreevy was a sharer in whatever spoils he obtained from the band of conspirators. A letter written on the 12th of October, 1882, and found at page 212 of the blue-book, written by Michael Connolly to his friend Owen Murphy, also throws some light on the subject. He says:

"You do right in keeping with Hon. Thomas, as just at present he has the whole thing in the hollow of his hand. You tell me you have the contract signed for the harbour work, but I think you have given Bob more than he is entitled to, especially as he is not furnishing any capital."

Bob, I apprehend, is the brother of Thomas McGreevy—

"But of course you, who are on the ground, ought to know best, and it would be better to make a hundred thousand dollars with him in than fifty thousand dollars with him out; so I suppose you have done the best you could under the circumstances."

How did Michael Connolly know that Thomas McGreevy had the whole thing in the hollow of his hand? Was it because he manipulated the other contracts in connection with the Quebec harbour works? Undoubtedly. He knew what he was writing about. Another letter written by Michael Connolly to Owen Murphy, dated the 9th of December, 1882, and found at page 215 of the blue book, contains the following:—

"If you get the cross-wall I think you could have the necessary changes made in design and material to suit; so you had best try hard for it."

Tom can manipulate the tenders, and when the contract is obtained he can manipulate the changes. A letter, written on the 31st of December, 1882, and found at page 212 of the blue-book, from Michael Connolly to Owen Murphy, states:

"I think if you manage your affairs properly there is not a doubt but you will get the cross-wall. By all means keep in with friend Thomas and be guided by him in everything that you do. You will get it, for friend Thomas can work it in many a way. For instance, he can have the engineers in charge make out a report in your favour, which will justify the Commission or Minister of Public

Works in giving you the work, even though you are not the lowest"

Now, I ask again, is not that an extraordinary condition of affairs? I have shown you already how Thomas McGreevy boasted of what he was able to do to induce the Minister of Public Works to meet his views. In another letter, dated the 27th of February, 1883, Michael Connolly writes to Owen Murphy (*see* page 212):

"Yours of the 15th and 18th inst. came duly to hand. I think, as you say, there will not be difficulty about your getting the cross-wall. Even if the Minister has to strain a point, you will find the work will be awarded to you, for he is not over scrupulous when his friends need assistance."

Now, Mr. Speaker, do you suppose that Michael Connolly, writing thus from San Antonio, Texas, would have said what he did unless he knew the influence of his friend Thomas McGreevy with the Minister of Public Works? He advises his friend to work upon Thomas McGreevy, and especially upon the Minister of Public Works, who is not very scrupulous, and who can be manipulated, at all events with the aid of Thomas McGreevy. I would ask you again, if there ever was such an exhibition in any Parliament in any country in the world as the exhibition shown by these letters from which I have just quoted? The influence of Thomas McGreevy over the department was known not only to the Connollys and to Murphy, but it was a matter of discussion in the family; for I find that Michael Connolly, writing to Murphy on the 23rd of March, 1885, found at page 229 of the blue-book, speaking of one of the McGreevy boys, says that he—

"Used to tell herself and mother a little too much about his uncle's influence with the Minister of Public Works."

So it had become a subject of family conversation what Uncle Thomas McGreevy could do with the Minister of Public Works. Such are some of the pieces of circumstantial evidence which in my judgment bring the charge home conclusively to the Minister of Public Works and to the employés of the Public Works Department. In fact, it looks to me as if every person in and about the department were in some way tained and tainted. There is another piece of evidence, which has not been touched on in one of the reports, and not much in the other report, but which to my mind carries considerable weight. It will be remembered by those who paid any attention to the evidence that Owen Murphy swore he went to the house of the Minister of Public Works and offered him a share of 25 per cent. in the Esquimalt graving dock contract. It will be remembered that Owen Murphy swore before the Committee that subsequently he went to the house of the Minister of Public Works with two parcels in his hand, containing $10,000 in two envelopes, $5,000 in each. He went into the Minister's house. He saw the Minister. The parcel upon that occasion was not given to the Minister, but was laid by Owen Murphy upon his table. Owen Murphy said. "A little present;" the Minister of Public Works said nothing; Owen Murphy said nothing; the Minister put out his hand and gathered the parcel into the drawer of his table, and said nothing; Owen Murphy said nothing, and left the house. Owen Murphy said that each envelope contained $5,000, that he did not intend—of course he did not—to bribe the Minister of Public Works. Nobody supposes that; it was merely "a little present." He did not intend to corrupt the Minister of Public Works, because the department was incorruptible. It was just a "little present" which he left on the table. He did not say: Here is a testimonial, Sir Hector, which I am handing over to you. No; he said nothing, but left his little voluntary contribution, given without any particular reason, without his having been asked to give it, and just as "a little present." That is what we were told by Owen Murphy, and he swore to it. Now, there are many ways of testing a man's credibility. Let us test Owen Murphy's: First, had Owen Murphy a motive for committing wilful perjury? Second, was his previous record of such a character as would not entitle him to be believed. The Minister of Public Works met the evidence with a denial, and the question arises: Is the Minister a person in whom the House and the Committee can place reliance? It has been suggested that Owen Murphy got the money and put it in his pocket, and it is further suggested that his previous record does not entitle him to credence. The answer to that is plain and simple. This money, if stolen by Murphy at all, was stolen years before the investigation took place. It was in Owen Murphy's pocket; if stolen by him, it was the money of the firm; the firm never complained; there was never any investigation or enquiry, and it never came out that he paid this money to Sir Hector Langevin until this enquiry. What object, then, had Murphy in lying, since he had the money in his pocket if he stole it? The fact is, this evidence was forced out of him in Committee. But it is said his previous record is not a good one. I know nothing about that except what was said in Committee; but I know that he was the confidential partner of the Connollys, and the McGreevys, and I know that the Minister of Public Works offered to recommend him as a contractor for a graving dock to be built in Halifax. I know that Mr. Giroux, harbour commissioner of Quebec, who appeared before the Committee, said he knew Murphy well, that he bore a good character in Quebec, that he was as good as the rest, if not better, and that he (Mr. Giroux) personally would believe him on oath. If all this is true what object could Murphy have in committing deliberate perjury? What object could he have in swearing his immortal soul away? Men do not commit perjury for the mere fun of doing it, but because there is a motive an almost irresistible motive, impelling them to it. Let us see, with respect to this "little present," how far we can say that the Minister of Public Works received it, and how far Owen Murphy's statement is confirmed by other events and circumstances. It is admitted by the Minister of Public Works in his evidence that he wrote the following letter to a contractor who had claims against the Government at the time he wrote the letter, and the letter is dated at the office of the Minister of Public Works, Quebec, 17th June, 1882:

"MY DEAR MR. PETERS,—You promised to send me something about the elections; will you kindly do so to-day?

"Yours truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN."

It is admitted that letter was written by the Minister of Public Works and sent to Mr. Simon Peters. It is admitted that, in response to that letter, Mr. Simon Peters sent the Minister of Publics Works $1,000 for political purposes. It is admitted by the Minister of Public Works that Mr. Thomas McGreevy gave him $10,000 for election

purposes. It is admitted—it was sworn to, and there is no dispute about it—that the Minister of Public Works received a testimonial of $22,000 in hard cash, the contributors to which were most of them contractors having dealings with the department. It is admitted that not very long ago the Minister of Public Works received from contractors and others a service of solid silver plate valued at over $1,800. Is it not a fair inference, I ask the Minister of Justice, that a Minister of the Crown who would accept a testimonial from one contractor would be equally ready to accept one from another? Was it a greater sin to accept a testimonial from Owen Murphy of $10,000 than to accept a testimonial of $1,000 from Simon Peters, or a testimonial of $10,000 from Thomas McGreevy, or a testimonial of $22,000 from other contractors, or a solid silver service of plate from other contractors? The sin in the one case is as great as the sin in the other, and the Minister who would accept one testimonial would have no scruples about accepting another. But does the Minister of Public Works himself squarely and fairly deny what Owen Murphy has sworn to in his evidence? A careful examination of the evidence of the Minister of Public Works will show you he does not meet the case fairly and squarely as Mr. Murphy puts it. What the Minister swears to is as follows: He swears—you will find the evidence at page 1067—that Owen Murphy did not speak to him about money, gift or loan; that he did not offer to lend or pay him any money, and that he never asked him for money. But Owen Murphy never swore to any of these things. What Owen Murphy swore is that he took the parcel containing the money and placed it on the table and said nothing, but that it was "a little present," and that Sir Hector Langevin said nothing. That is the whole story as told by Murphy. There never was any pretense for the Minister of Public Works denying that Owen Murphy spoke to him about money, gift or loan. Murphy never swore that he did. There never was the slightest pretense for the Minister of Public Works swearing that Owen Murphy never offered to lend him money. Murphy never swore that he did. There never was any pretext for the Minister swearing that he never asked Owen Murphy for money. Murphy never swore that he did, and the denial of the Minister in no sense meets the case, so that practically Owen Murphy's evidence stands uncontradicted by the Minister of Public Works. But there is another significant fact in connection with the evidence given by the Minister of Public Works, which, I think, will largely lessen the weight to be attached to it—and that is this. He was squarly contradicted by other witnesses: On the 11th of August, 1891, the Minister of Public Works swore:

"Mr. Noel having been examined about a testimonial that was begun in 1890, and presented to me in 1883, I wish to state that I did not know of the names of the subscribers to that testimonial until they were communicated to this Committee by Mr. Noel, nor the amounts subscribed by them. I may add that I have not received the list of subscribers or statements of receipts."

Here, in order to test the value of the hon. gentleman's testimony, I point out that he swears positively that he never knew one of the subscribers to that testimonial until the list was produced by Mr. Noel before the Committee. The very next day he admitted that, some years before, Mr. John Rochester, one of the contributors, paid directly to himself $300 in two payments of $150 each. Then, either the memory of the Minister of Public Works must have been treacherous or his honesty was at fault. At least seven years before the period mentioned in his sworn statement he knew who some of the contributors were. In the *Globe* newspaper of the 17th April, 1884, the attention of the public was called to the fact that the Minister of Public Works received from contractors and others a testimonial of $22,000 in hard cash. On the 19th of the same month the *Globe* newspaper discussed it again, and mentioned at least the names of three of the contributors. Did Sir Hector Langevin read the *Globe* newspaper, and did he know the statements which were made therein? He knew them very well, because in the *Hansard* of 1884, page 1465, it will be found that Sir Hector Langevin, as a question of privilege, called the attention of Parliament to the letter and editorial in the *Globe*. He then knew at least the names of three of the contributors to that testimonial. Yet on the 11th August, 1891, seven years after he knew the three whose names were stated, he declared on his oath that he did not know one of the contributors before Mr. Noel gave his evidence before the Committee. There is another piece of evidence given by the Minister flatly contradicted by independent evidence. Sir Hector Langevin's memory must be very treacherous. He further swore:

"In September tenders were called a second time for this work, and in reply eight tenders were received, the lowest of which was that of Messrs. Starrs & O'Hanly, and the next lowest that of Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co.: and I immediately recommended, on the 13th October, 1884, that the tender of Messrs. Starrs & O'Hanly be accepted. However, having before me the report of my chief engineer that their price was too small, I directed them to be asked on the 7th October to strengthen themselves financially by associating some other contractor with them; but although their price was very low, as they considered it unnecessary to have the assistance of another contractor, I (the Minister) being desirous of giving the contract for the lowest possible price, recommended to Council the acceptance of the said lowest tender, on condition that they would deposit to the credit of the Government an additional sum of $9,500 to complete the amount of 5 per cent. security required, and an Order in Council was passed to that effect on the 16th October, 1884.

"However, on the 24th October Messrs. Starrs & O'Hanly wrote stating that they found they had made a mistake in some of the items of their tender, and it would neither be prudent for them nor in the public interest to take the contract, and they asked, therefore, leave to withdraw their tender."

Every word of this is flatly contradicted by Michael Starrs, who, as I have stated, is a strong Conservative and a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. In addition to this, the Minister of Public Works swore:

"I never tried to prevent him taking the contract, and I never intended to do so. I never suggested that he should withdraw his tender."

Michael Starrs swears the exact contrary in express terms. The Minister of Public Works in another part of his statement says:

"The fact is, on the 24th a letter was received from Messrs. Starrs & O'Hanly, in which they say they find they had made a mistake in some of the items in their tender and find their prices generally too low. They consider it therefore not prudent to take the contract, and that it would not be in the public interest if they were to do so. They therefore beg to withdraw their tender and request to have their deposit cheque returned. Their cheque was accordingly returned to them on the 27th. If the contract did not go to Messrs. Starrs & O'Hanly, it is evidently due to their not wishing to have it, they hav-

ing, as they say, made mistakes in their tender and finding their prices generally too low."

Every word of this is flatly contradicted by Michael Starrs. The Minister of Public Works further says:

Q. Mr. Starrs in his evidence says (page 1166) "Sir Hector sent for me and I went up and saw him. He told me of course that my tender was too low." Is that correct?—A. No.

Michael Starrs swears this is false. The Minister of Public Works further gives this evidence:

Q. You told him it was straight sailing?—A. No.
Q. Did you tell him "that the work had to be done, and taking the $50,000 that was to be paid for plant out of the total, there would not be enough left to complete the work?"—A. No. That was read from the report of Mr. Perley. I was reading to him the report of Mr. Perley so that he might understand what the chief engineer had put there about his tender.

Michael Starrs swears that Sir Hector Langevin told him there would be no deduction made and no extras allowed. It was a plain contract at a fixed price. Every statement in regard to the Esquimalt graving dock made by Sir Hector Langevin is flatly contradicted by Michael Starrs, and partly by J. L. P. O'Hanly. Whom should we believe? Starrs or Sir Hector? Michael Starrs solemnly swears that the Minister of Public Works suggested that he should withdraw his contract, and warned him against the hope of obtaining any reduction in the price of the plant, and further warned him against expecting extras. He further swears that the Minister of the Public Works threw every obstacle in the way of his getting this contract. The Minister is further contradicted by his employés. At page 1147 he says the tenders were not submitted to him, but Mr. Perley and Mr. Baillairgé swears to the fact that these tenders were always submitted to the Minister. With all this evidence, some positive and some circumstantial, I am afraid that the conclusion to which the people of this country must come is irresistible, that this country has been robbed by the fraud and conspiracy of these men of the sum of $242,000, in addition to $27,000 for donations, and that the Minister of Public Works connived at it. The deductions to be drawn from the circumstantial and the positive evidence point in one direction. It is true that the Government by their numerical strength in the Parliament of this country may shield the incriminated Minister from the consequences of the great crime he has committed. It is true that the Parliament of Canada may whitewash the Minister of Public Works, but that will not lessen the crime with which he stands charged before this high court of Parliament. It is true the Parliament of Canada might undertake to whitewash Judas Iscariot, but that would not lessen the sin of Judas Iscariot in betraying his master. The Minister of Justice may to-night, as he has on more than one occasion before, crack the ministerial whip over the heads of his followers, and they may reluctantly vote to whitewash the Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Justice may to-night, as upon other occasions during this session he has done, appeal to his followers behind him, and his supporters to the right of him, and to his supporters to the left of him, to come to the aid of this Government in this, the supreme hour of its peril, and hon. gentlemen behind him may yield to the demand of the Minister of Justice—

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

"Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs but to do and die."

But I fear that many a good man will fall in the fight victims to a misplaced confidence in the most corrupt Administration that ever disgraced this fair land of ours. Mr. Speaker, you cannot check the Falls of Niagara with a pitchfork; you cannot quench a conflagration with a two-penny squirt; no more can you check the tide of intelligent public opinion with a false and misleading report acquitting the Minister of Public Works. You cannot stifle the honest sentiments of a free people by declaring that black is white; you cannot silence the voice of the Canadian press, both Grit and Tory; you cannot silence the voice of the American press, both Democratic and Republican; you cannot silence the voice of the English press, both Whig and Tory, that has already denounced you for the last two months as a band of conspirators and a den of thieves; you cannot do so by declaring in the face of the clearest possible evidence that the Minister of Public Works is guiltless of connivance at public plunder, and innocent of sharing in the fruit of a great public robbery.

Mr. COATSWORTH moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:45 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 22nd September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SPANISH AMERICAN TREATY.

Mr. FOSTER laid on the Table the correspondence respecting the Spanish American Treaty.

SECTION B CONTRACT, CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Mr. LISTER. I rise to a question of privilege. My object in rising is to notify the Government that to-morrow I shall make to this House the following statement:—

That James Frederic Lister, Esquire, the member representing the electoral district of West Lambton in this House, having declared from his seat in the House that he is credibly informed, and that he believes that he is able to establish by satisfactory evidence:—

That in the year 1879 Messrs. Alexander Shields, John James Macdonald, Alexander McDonell, James Isbester and Peter McLaren entered into contract with the Government of Canada for the construction of a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Port Arthur and Rat Portage, known as Section B.

The said contract and the work in connection therewith were completed by the said contractors, to whom they were a source of great profit.

During the whole period covered by the said contract the Hon. John G. Haggart, now Postmaster General and a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada, was a member of the House of Commons for the South Riding of Lanark, and is still such member.

That the said Hon. John G. Haggart became and was beneficially interested in the profits of said contract which accrued to the share thereof standing in the name of the

said Peter McLaren, and has received large sums out of the said profits, and has otherwise derived direct and substantial pecuniary benefits therefrom.

That during the progress of the said works, and while the said Hon. John G. Haggart was so interested therein, members of the said firm were called upon by members of the Government of Canada for large contributions for political purposes, and such contributions were paid out of the moneys of the said firm, and with the knowledge and assent of the said Hon. John G. Haggart were charged against the profits of the firm, and while the said contributions were so demanded and paid, the said firm of contractors were in various ways dependent upon the Government by reasons of many matters being unsettled and in dispute in relation to the said contract, which were at the time of such contributions, or subsequently, settled not unfavourably to the said contractors.

I shall thereupon move:

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire fully into the said allegations, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and to employ shorthand writers to take down such evidence as they may deem necessary, and to have the evidence printed from day to day for the use of the Committee, and that the Committee do report in full the evidence, taken before them, and all their proceedings on the reference, and the result of their inquiries, and that Rule 78 of this House as to the selection of committees be suspended, and that the said committee be composed of Messrs. ——

And in order that witnesses whom it may be necessary to subpœna should be known at once, to prevent the possibility of their disappearing, I may state that the Hon. Frank Smith, the Hon. Peter McLaren, Mr. J. J. McDonald, Mr. Alexander Manning, Mr. Trudeau, the Deputy Minister; Mr. D. Nichol, and Mr. John Shields, are among the witnesses I propose to bring before the Committee to substantiate the charge. The Government may fairly say that I have been guilty of delay in bringing this matter forward, that we are near the end of the session, and that a matter of this importance should have been brought before the attention of the House before this day. I can only assure the House that the information and evidence I am possessed of has only come into my possession within the last few days, and it was impossible for me to call the attention of the House to it before; and it is a matter of such grave consequences, in my opinion, and so very serious in its character, that I believe I would not be doing my duty if I did not take this course, even at this season, late as it may be. As all the witnesses live within a hundred miles of Ottawa, I hope the whole investigation may be closed within four or five days at the most.

Mr. HAGGART. If it were in order, I would give the answer at once, but as the hon. gentleman intends this, I suppose, as a notice of motion, I will give the answer to-morrow.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Girouard: That the seventh report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections be adopted.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I trust that in the consideration of the important question we have to decide in connection with this investigation we shall not allow ourselves to be moved by any personal or selfish considerations, or by any considerations except those which are brought under our notice in the voluminous evidence that was taken during the progress of the investigation. In order to make the matter possibly a little clearer to those who have not had the privilege of listening to the evidence from day to day as it has been given, or of reading it as it has been taken, I might preface my remarks with a few observations about the contracts in question, showing what they are, and the relations that the Government have borne to them. The first contract, which goes back to the year 1878, was the contract for the Lévis graving dock opposite Quebec. The second contract is one for dredging in the harbour improvements in Quebec, and was made in September, 1882. The third is what is called the cross-wall contract in the harbour improvements of Quebec, and is dated May, 1883. The fourth contract is the supplementary contract for the Lévis dock, and is dated in June, 1884. The fifth contract is the contract for the Esquimalt graving dock, dated in November, 1884; the sixth contract is what is known as the contract for dredging No. 2, dated in May, 1887; and the seventh contract is what is known as the south wall contract in the harbour improvements of Quebec, dated in February, 1887. There were two or three other matters besides these contracts which were brought into the investigation, the question of the subsidy of the steamer *Admiral* for the use of the Government during a number of years, and the allegation that the steamship was actually owned by Thomas McGreevy; also certain charges against Mr. McGreevy in connection with moneys received out of the parliamentary subsidy to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. It was also alleged that during all these years Thomas McGreevy was the paid agent and representative of Larkin, Connolly & Co. The last charge that was made was that Thomas McGreevy, during these years, made use of the name of the Minister of Public Works in connection with contractors and others in such a way as to lead to the conclusion that he had influence with the Minister. Now, in beginning to consider the question of the responsibility of the Department of Public Works and of the Minister, which is all that I propose to deal with this afternoon, we have in the first place to try to satisfy ourselves so far as we can, by a reference to the statutes, as to the liability and the responsibility of the department and of the Minister of Public Works in relation to the different contracts, as it is my purpose only to refer to those that affect the department and the Minister. I will, therefore, have to refer to only four of the contracts, because in the others no charge is made and no finding is made against the Minister of Public Works. The contracts that I shall refer to are, first, what is known as the cross-wall contract of 1883; in the second place, the supplementary Lévis graving dock contract of 1884; next, the Esquimalt graving dock of 1884; and, lastly, the contract known as the dredging contract, No. 2, of May, 1887. The first enquiry that naturally arises is, what was the relation of the Department of Public Works to those four contracts? When we find out the relation that the department bears to these contracts it will enable us, to a certain extent at least, to determine the responsibility and liability of the Minister and of the department in connection with the charges and findings brought against them. In the first place, I would like to impress this fact upon the House as being very important, that in connection with the harbour works

at Quebec the moneys that were paid and expended on those works were not moneys belonging to the Dominion of Canada. It is true that the moneys at the time came from the Government of the Dominion, but these moneys were loaned under authority of the different statutes by the Dominion Government to the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec, and very strict and explicit provisions were made in the statutes authorizing these loans, for the repayment of the advances which from time to time were made. The first of these statutes I shall refer to is that of 1873, chapter 62, intituled an Act further to amend the Acts to provide for the management and improvement of the harbour of Quebec. In this Act it is provided that the Government of the Dominion may loan $1,200,000 to the Harbour Commissioners for the purpose of carrying out their improvements. Section 17, containing the provision for the repayment of that sum by the Harbour Commissioners, reads as follows :—

"Upon the payment or advance of any sum by the Government under the foregoing provisions the said corporation shall deposit with the Receiver General their own bonds for the same amount in such form as he may approve, bearing interest at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum, and 1 per cent. per annum for a sinking fund, and the sinking fund so created shall be kept by the Receiver General as a special account, and interest at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum shall be allowed by him on all amounts received from it from time to time, or investments of such amount as may be made by him from time to time in securities approved by the Minister of Finance, and interest thereon credited to the corporation in said accounts."

So in that statute there is a provision for a loan of $1,200,000 to the Harbour Commissioners at Quebec, repayable according to the terms and conditions that I have read from the statute, and secured in the way that the statute indicates. The next statute relating to the same subject is in the year 1880, chapter 17, which is intituled an Act to authorize the raising of a further sum to enable the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to complete their tidal dock; and it provides for the raising of a sum of $250,000 on the same terms and conditions as those mentioned in the original statute, and to be repaid in the same way. There is one more statute relating to the harbour works and providing for the raising of a further sum of money, that is the statute of 1884, chapter 9, where authority is given to the Government to loan $300,000 more to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners. I thought it well, Mr. Speaker, that we should perfectly understand, at the outset, that these moneys were moneys that belonged at that time to the Harbour Commission, because in the report made by the minority they are referred to as public moneys of the Dominion of Canada, and the impression has gone abroad that the moneys which have been expended on those contracts were moneys belonging to the Dominion Government, whereas the fact is that the moneys were loaned by the Dominion Government to the Harbour Commissioners under authority of the statute for the purpose of carrying out those works. A further similar provision exists in relation to the Lévis graving dock, which might not be strictly considered as a harbour improvement; but, in the Act of 1875, which authorizes the Government to assist the Commissioners in the construction of the graving dock, they are authorized to loan $500,000 to the Harbour Commissioners, and provision is made for the repayment of this amount somewhat similar to the provision made for the repayment of the loans for the other harbour works. It is true that subsequently, within the last year or two, a statute has been passed by the Dominion taking over this graving dock at Quebec and making it a work of the Dominion of Canada; but with that we have nothing to do at present. What I want to impress on the House is the fact that the moneys paid over by the Government for the purpose of carrying on these works were moneys loaned by the Government to the Harbour Commissioners, and that the responsibility of the proper expenditure of these moneys rested with the Harbour Commissioners; and so far as those moneys were obtained by fraud, so far as they may have been wrongly obtained, they were not obtained as moneys of the Dominion Government, but as moneys belonging to the Harbour Commissioners, for which they gave security to the Dominion Government. There is no doubt we cannot go very far into the evidence before we discover the traces of a very great conspiracy. That conspiracy has extended its ramifications in Quebec for a number of years, between 1880 and 1890. It was a conspiracy, not against the Dominion Government alone; it was a conspiracy against the Harbour Commissioners as much as it was a conspiracy against the Government, because it was in the main the money of the Harbour Commissioners that was obtained by those contractors and used for their own purposes. So we must bear in mind that a conspiracy existed, not merely against the Dominion Government, and not only against the Dominion Government, and not to its fullest extent against the Dominion Government, but it was largely against the Harbour Commissioners, and to obtain from them moneys on the various contracts which they had borrowed from the Dominion Government. I have heard it said recently, in discussing with various parties the evidence that has been taken in this investigation, that it could not be possible for the Minister of Public Works not to have known what was going on, that it was not possible for all this fraud and wrong-doing to go on and for him not to be cognizant of it. At first sight that may appear very reasonable. It may seem reasonable to suppose that it was impossible for the Minister as the head of the department not to have known that fraud was committed. Yet when we consider the other parties that were interested, when we come to consider analagous cases, we find it to be not at all surprising that these frauds could be committed, and were committed, and this conspiracy be successfully carried on, and the Minister all the time be unconscious of it. It is not claimed by any person that the Harbour Commissioners were aware of this wrong-doing. It is not claimed by anyone that they were parties to the fraud. Yet, as I will take occasion to show in going through the various contracts, they had more to do with the details of the contracts, and with carrying them out, and with personal supervision over them, than the Minister of Public Works. They were living in Quebec, seeing the works every day, seeing the contractors every day, knowing exactly what was going on; while the Minister of Public Works spent most of his time at Ottawa directing the affairs of his department. No one ventures to say that the Harbour Commissioners were cognizant of or in any way lent themselves to this conspiracy; and yet we are forced to this conclusion, that if the Minister of Public Works knew of this conspiracy, by so much

stronger reason the Harbour Commissioners must have been cognizant of it. So, when we absolve the Harbour Commissioners from any connection or knowledge of it, we must at the same time admit that they were more likely to know, in a better position to know and to ascertain the workings of the conspiracy than the Minister of Public Works, and it is very unfair to say that, because he was at the head of the Department of Public Works, because of that very fact, he must have known of these things going on at the time. There is another illustration I might give in connection with the same works, and it will show that the point I am taking is well taken, and that is the connection of Mr. Boswell, the engineer, with the inspectors. The evidence shows very clearly that during the time the dredging contract was going on under the personal and daily supervision of Mr. Boswell, the inspectors, who were working under him, who were reporting to him from day to day, were paid large sums by the contractors for giving false reports and aiding and assisting them in various ways. It is not alleged, it is not even suggested, that Mr. Boswell had any knowledge of the conspiracy between the inspectors and the contractors; and yet during the short time the dredging contract was going on, the inspectors received in small sums no less than $5,000 from the contractors for the purpose of assisting them in carrying out the conspiracy. All that was done without the cognizance and knowledge of Mr. Boswell, who should have been intimately acquainted with all the details connected with carrying out the work. We next ask ourselves: What were the relations of the different parties in this conspiracy to each other, and what was the object of the conspiracy? In the first place, we have the firm of Larkin & Connolly, a firm of contractors, whose avowed object it was to make money out of the contracts. In the next place, we have Robert McGreevy, who became a member of the firm for the purpose of, and with the object of, making money out of the contract and assisting them in carrying on their work. Then we have, unfortunately, brought into it a member of this House, Mr. Thomas McGreevy, who, being a creditor of his brother and desiring the payment of his debts, lent himself to this conspiracy and was the active medium, was an active participant, we must admit, for the evidence shows it, in enabling the contractors to carry out their conspiracy to a successful issue. There is no doubt that, if Thomas McGreevy had been true to the confidence and trust reposed in him, we would not have been called on to make this investigation. There can be no doubt, if he had been faithful and true to the Minister who relied on him, this investigation would never have taken place; but, with the avowed object, or the object, if not avowed, of obtaining payment of this large claim against his brother, he lent himself to the conspiracy and became an active participant in it. We look, however, in vain for any connection of that kind on the part of the Minister of Public Works. When we ask ourselves: Where did the moneys go that were obtained by these contractors? we do not find one single cent finding its way into the pockets of the Minister. There is not a single piece of evidence, I do not think there is even a suggestion through the whole of the evidence taken, that the Minister put into his own pocket a single dollar of those funds wrongfully obtained: and yet they say he was connected with them, and we are asked to believe that he lent himself to the conspiracy. It is said there are two proofs brought forward that go to show the connection of the Minister with this conspiracy. In the first place, he had a newspaper under his control, and, in the second place, he had a political fund, which was assumed. In regard to the newspaper, the evidence does not bear out the conclusion that whatever Thomas McGreevy may have invested in that newspaper, and it is very uncertain what amount he did invest, was invested for Sir Hector Langevin, or invested at his request, and he had no connection in any way whatever with it, or any knowledge of it, at any rate until this investigation took place. Now, with regard to the claim that the late Minister of Public Works obtained political funds out of these moneys, the only evidence we have on that point is this: That the Minister of Public Works, during the progress of his election and the contests that resulted after the elections, became indebted to the extent of about $10,000, and in order to accommodate him Mr. McGreevy discounted notes for him in the bank to pay this $10,000, and those notes have been carried forward from that time until the present, so that no part of these funds has gone to the payment of these notes or for the payment of that amount. I claim, Sir, that we cannot discover that Sir Hector Langevin in any way whatever obtained any benefit from this conspiracy. On the other hand, what is the result of this successful conspiracy? It is that after a long period of service, after serving his country for thirty or forty years, the greater part of that time in a high and important office, by reason of this terrible conspiracy that was successfully brought to bear against his department he is taken from his office and he finds himself in such a position that he resigns in order that this House may, without prejudice and without fear or favour, pronounce a judgment upon the evidence that has been taken. We do not find, therefore, after the most careful consideration of the evidence, that of all this $130,000 which the minority report says Thomas McGreevy received out of these funds, a solitary cent went into the pocket of Sir Hector Langevin. We do not find, that on that newspaper a solitary cent was spent at his request or with his knowledge and consent, and we do not find that the political fund has been paid out of this $130,000, but that if the money was received by Thomas McGreevy it was all retained by himself, and there was none whatever of it went for the benefit of the Minister of Public Works. It is said, Sir, in some parts of the evidence that the Minister of Public Works was very familiar with all the details of his department, and I am sure it is very creditable to any Minister that he should be familiar with the details; but there are certain details that it is impossible for a Minister to know thoroughly. When we consider, as was stated in the evidence of Sir Hector Langevin, and which is not contradicted, that during last year there was written from his office and signed by him over 30,000 official letters and that he signed 8,946 cheques, we can readily understand that in the case of these outlying works, while he may be familiar with the details of them, that it must be through the reports of his subordi-

nates, and that only to the extent they report to him can he possibly have any great familiarity with the works that are going on in different parts of the Dominion. A number of letters were put in evidence, and the hon. gentleman who spoke last night (Mr. Cameron, Huron) referred to a number of them in order to establish as he thought, and as I think he desired, a connection between the late Minister of Public Works and the conspiracy. Now, there is this weakness about all that correspondence: that in no single case is that correspondence, or a knowledge of it, brought home to the Minister of Public Works. Not one of these letters in which he is referred to is shown to have come to his knowledge, nor is it shown that with his authority or consent or to his knowledge that any one of these letters were written. That is a very important consideration. It is true, Sir, that when a conspiracy has been established, that if we once establish the fact that the Minister of Public Works lent himself to the conspiracy and that he was aiding and abetting these contractors in carrying out their fraud, that we would be entitled to read these letters as evidence against him; but I say, Sir, until we establish the connection, until we show that the Minister of Public Works was a party to or lent himself to this conspiracy we cannot bring to bear against him letters that are written between those parties without his knowledge and without his consent. In fact, Sir, I think that the object of these letters, or that the letters themselves in the way that the hon. gentleman made use of them last night, go to prove too much. No one knows better than the hon. gentlemen who drafted the minority report, as do many other hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, that we have in court very often evidence that proves too much, that goes so far beyond what is necessary to prove the case that it shows clearly that the witness, whoever he may be, is not telling the truth. Now, I say that some of these letters bear intrinsic evidence of proving too much, and giving too much influence to Thomas McGreevy. I have just now referred to one of these letters; for instance, the letter that he wrote in which he referred to the late Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Pope), seeking to throw out the idea, seeking to fasten upon his friends the impression, that he had as much influence with the late Minister of Railways and Canals as he had with any other Minister, and as he had with all the other Ministers. I say, Sir, that that letter shows us that he is trying to prove too much, and it goes very far to weaken all that he says, as between themselves, about his influence with the Minister of Public Works. In dealing with the different contracts, Mr. Speaker, I propose to follow the order that has been taken in what is called the minority report. It must strike us at the outset in that report, that it goes very far beyond the charges that are laid. I know that our friends on the opposite side of the House have claimed all through, and perhaps truly, that the investigation was not limited to the charges that were actually made, and yet this unfortunate result comes from that fact, and I think I can show pretty clearly to the House presently that it was a very unfortunate thing, that we were not able to grasp the full scope of the investigation at the outset. The unfortunate result was this: That a large amount of the evidence which is necessary to enable us to form a proper opinion as to certain findings which are in this minority report has been omitted altogether and has never been taken; that is very strikingly illustrated in the case of the Lévis graving dock. The charge there was in connection with the supplementary contract; but in the finding, as you will notice, the original contract of 1878 is brought in, and the finding is based, not on the supplementary contract, on which the charge was based, but on the whole work from 1878 down to the time when it was finished. Now, what is the result of that? The result is that we have no clear and satisfactory evidence to show the condition of the work at the time the supplementary contract was made, or to show the reason for making the supplementary contract at the time it was made, in the year 1884. In fact, Sir, the findings present to us this anomaly. It is as if we charged a man with a misdemeanour and found him guilty of a felony; as if we charged him with misconduct and found him guilty of a misdemeanour; as if we charged him with manslaughter and found him guilty of murder. That is just the relation which the original charges bear to the findings contained in the report of the minority. It may be that to a certain extent that is a necessary evil. I am not prepared to say that it is not, because it was claimed during the investigation that we were not limited to the charges, but were entitled to go into anything at all in relation to these works; but, as I have pointed out, the result of that is that the evidence in many respects is incomplete and inconclusive, and does not enable us at all to find in the way the minority report would have us find. The first of the contracts in which the finding of hon. gentlemen opposite implicates the hon. Minister of Public Works is the dredging contract of the 23rd of May, 1887, wherein Larkin, Connolly & Co. obtained a contract for dredging in the wet basin, at 35 cents a yard. The charges, which I have summarized so as to put them into few words, are: That for and in consideration of $25,000, Thomas McGreevy agreed to get Larkin, Connolly & Co. 800,000 yards of dredging at 35 cents a yard, although the previous dredging had been done at 27 cents a yard; next, that he used his influence as a member of the House of Commons and as a Harbour Commissioner, both with the department and with Mr. Perley; next, that Larkin, Connolly & Co. paid him $20,000 and retained $5,000 which they subsequently used in the election in which he was a candidate; next, that pursuant to the above arrangement between them, the contract was obtained without putting in a tender. Now, the findings of the minority report on these charges are as follows: (*a*) that the contract was let as the result of a corrupt bargain; (*b*) that Thomas McGreevy successfully used his influence; (*c*) that enormous sums of money were paid to Larkin, Connolly & Co. beyond the true value of the work of dredging done; (*d*) that on the 9th of January, 1887, Perley had received jewellery and diamonds to the value of $1,885 as a bribe; and (*e*) that the facts connected with the contract and its subsequent execution were known to Sir Hector Langevin, the Minister of Public Works, and that the frauds were perpetrated at least with his passive connivance. Now, I will give a short statement of the facts connected with the letting of this contract and the relation that the Minister of

Public Works bore to it. The contract was let by the Harbour Commissioners; their engineers supervised it; the Minister of Public Works had no control over it whatever. All the relation that the Government had to that contract or those works at that time was, that they advanced money pursuant to the statute of 1873 authorizing them to lend the Harbour Commissioners the sum of $1,200,000 for the purpose of carrying out their works. So that this was a contract let to Larkin, Connolly & Co. by the Harbour Commissioners, let on the report of their own engineers, supervised by them and their engineers, and the Department of Public Works had no control over it, and no connection with it, so far as we are able to ascertain from the statutes or from the evidence. It may be worth while to say something about the constitution of the Board of Harbour Commissioners. This board was formed in the year 1870, and consisted then of eight members. Four of those members were selected by the tax-payers, one by the Board of Trade, and three were appointed by the Government; and it may be that a very nice question arises in this connection. Mr. Dobell, in his evidence, at pages 762 and 763, speaks of the formation of the Board. He speaks of the fact that the Government at the time wanted control over the Board, desiring a majority of the Commissioners to be their appointees. "But," he says, "we resisted that, and resisted it successfully, so that at the time the Board was formed in 1870 the Government had only three representatives, while the tax-payers and the Board of Trade had five." But about the year 1875, under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, the Board was changed, and after that time it consisted of nine members, of whom five were appointed by the Government and the others by the tax-payers and the Board of Trade. At that time the Chairman was allowed a salary of $2,000 a year, and the Commissioners also were each to receive a salary after that date. So that the hon. gentlemen opposite must take the responsibility of establishing the precedent of having the majority on the Board consist of Government representatives. I do not think, however, that point amounts to anything, because it is not shown that the Harbour Commissioners used any improper influence. Now, the question arises: Why was this contract let without tenders being called for? Why was it Larkin, Connolly & Co. were given the contract at 35 cents a yard without going through the formality of tendering? The evidence on that point is rather meagre, and I do not know that we ought to justify the action of the Harbour Commissioners in letting that contract without tenders. The facts as stated in the evidence are these: Larkin, Connolly & Co. were the only firm who had the plant and machinery necessary to carry out successfully the dredging, and were consequently in a position to do it much cheaper and to better advantage than any other contracting firm. Whether that explanation absolves the Harbour Commissioners or not on the charge of not having advertised for tenders or not, I am not prepared to say. It depends entirely on the circumstances of the case; but be that as it may, the contract was let by them at 35 cents per yard, on the report of their engineer, without calling for tenders. It is alleged that this price was very high, and we do not find that the Commissioners were perfectly satisfied. We find that one of them, Mr. Giroux, considered it necessary to make some enquiries before he would give his assent. He tells us that he made enquiries at Montreal before the contract was let: and that, after considering the price paid for dredging Montreal harbour, he concluded that 35 cents per yard was a reasonable figure and consented to the letting of the contract. Considerable effort was made to establish a connection between the Minister of Public Works and this contract by showing that it was let through the influence of Mr. Thomas McGreevy, acting on the Minister of Public Works and the engineer of the Harbour Commissioners. No less than five Harbour Commissioners were called to give evidence on this point. The first one called was Mr. Valin; and if his evidence had been sustained, it might have appeared somewhat damaging. It is true, he says that he asked Sir Hector Langevin what he would do, and Sir Hector told him to follow Mr. McGreevy and to go with him. Now, we must bear in mind, in weighing the evidence of Mr. Valin—and it is very curious that hon. gentlemen, in making up their report, did not refer to it—that Mr. Valin subsequently contradicted that statement and made a declaration in which he says that this statement was not correct, and he signed a declaration to that effect. Which are we to believe? Are we to believe his evidence that Sir Hector told him to vote with Mr. McGreevy, or his declaration in which he says Sir Hector did not tell him anything of the kind? When we have evidence before us of that contradictory nature, the only thing we can do is dispense with it altogether and rely on the evidence of other witnesses. Such evidence, standing alone, uncorroborated and contradicted as it is, must be struck out altogether. There is another fact in connection with Mr. Valin's evidence to which hon. gentlemen opposite omitted to refer in their report, and that is that Mr. Valin was very anxious to be a Senator, and has been very much disappointed since because he did not receive the appointment, and we do not know to what extent his evidence may have been coloured by that fact. He evidently was very much disappointed and annoyed at not having his ambition gratified. The next Harbour Commissioner who was called on was Mr. Dobell. In his evidence, at page 976, he stated what his dealings were, so far as any connection with Sir Hector Langevin is concerned. The evidence is as follows:—

Q. Speaking of Mr. Thomas McGreevy's position upon the Board in relation to the Department of Public Works and the Minister of Public Works, what would you say you understood it to be?—A. Nothing irregular. Nothing that I would regard as other than being one conversant with large contracts; he gave the benefit of that experience to the Harbour Commission. Q. And in respect of the mutual interests of Sir Hector Langevin and the Dominion Government, have you anything to say with regard to his position?—A. I have no reason to doubt any action he took while on the Commission. Q. Were you or were you not aware that on account of Mr. Thomas McGreevy's double position, as it may be called, it would be inconvenient—and it was so treated by the Board, that he should communicate with the Department of Public Works at Ottawa in respect of matters of common interest—as a member of Parliament and a member of the Board?—A. Coming to Ottawa so frequently, he was the natural medium by which we would learn what the Minister of Public Works' views were.

Now, Mr. Dobell was personally largely interested in the successful carrying out of the works, because, as he tells us subsequently in his evidence, he contributes $5,000 to $6,000 a year out of his own

money in taxes to support the harbour. Further on, he is asked this question :

Q. I think you said that the Commissioners relied mostly on Mr. McGreevy because he was a man of great experience in public works?—A. I do not think I said that. I did not say we relied on Mr. McGreevy, but I said we looked upon him as having great experience in public works, and being a member of Parliament, he naturally would be the medium of communicating with the Minister of Public Works. Q. Is it not a fact that you also took into consideration his relations with Sir Hector Langevin? Was it not a fact—had it not come to be a matter of notoriety in Quebec—that his influence with Sir Hector was paramount?—A. We did not look upon it as anything we need be afraid of in communicating with Sir Hector through Mr. McGreevy. Q. But was it not a fact generally known among the Harbour Commissioners, that Mr. McGreevy's influence with Sir Hector Langevin was paramount?—A. No; our chairman claimed that he was all powerful at Ottawa. Q. What is his name?—A. Mr. Valin. He laid claim that he was running you all here. Q. How long had Mr. Valin been there?—A. About ten years; he claimed he was going to be made a senator.

The next Harbour Commissioner brought to testify on this point was Mr. Giroux. He states his experience as far as this is concerned. I would ask the House to mark this fact that, although so much force and point was made in regard to this connection during the evidence of Mr. Valin, although Mr. Dobell in his evidence repudiated it, and the other Commissioners, one after the other, repudiated any connection of the kind, when the last Commissioner, Mr. Forsyth, was put into the box, he was not asked the question whether there was such a connection between Sir Hector and Mr. McGreevy or not. This is the statement of Mr. Giroux. He is asked :

Q. What I want to get at is whether it was due to the intervention of any one member or more of the Commission, or whether it was given on the report of the engineers?—A. It was on the report of the engineers.

Q. Did the report of the engineers meet with approval on the part of the Commissioners?—A. I think so.

Q. Was there any attempt by any Commissioner to influence the Commission in any direction?—A. Not that I am aware of.

Q. As far as you know, it was done wholly on the report of the engineers?—A. Yes.

Q. And the report recommending itself to the Commissioners as it did?—A. Yes.

Q. You approved of it as best under all the circumstances?—A. Yes.

Q. And accordingly passed the order, believing all the Commissioners thought likewise?—A. There were no dissensions.

Q. Do you recollect the dredging contract in 1887?—A. Yes.

Q. And the circumstances?—A. Yes.

Q. State how it came to be given without tenders being asked?—A. The contract of 1882 came to a conclusion, I think, and the Commissioners desiring that there would be no delay in the continuance of the works, concurred in Mr. Perley's recommendation to give the contract for 35 cents per yard.

Q. Was that price considered by the Commissioners as a reasonable price?—A. As far as the Commissioners knew it was, because it was strongly recommended by Perley as a reasonable price.

Q. From what the Commissioners knew in view of the contract of 1882, and of the possible difficulties in connection with the work, do you yourself consider it reasonable as a business man?—A. I think I compared these prices with the dredging done in Montreal, and I came to the conclusion it was a low price.

Q. Now, will you state with reference to the Hon. Thomas McGreevy. Was he a more prominent member of the Harbour Commissioners than others?—A. I do not think so.

Q. Did he appear to take the direction of the Commissioners?—A. Certainly not.

Q. Have you any recollection that McGreevy stated at a meeting of the Commissioners that he represented the views of the Minister of Public Works, and imposed his views, and those of the Minister upon the Board?—A. I do not recollect it.

Mr. COATSWORTH.

Q. Have you any recollection that the Hon. Thomas McGreevy at any time spoke as being the mouth-piece of the Minister of Public Works, or of the Government, upon matters before the Board?—A. My recollection is that the Hon. Mr. McGreevy being a member of Parliament, we often requested him to put before the Minister of Public Works any matters in which we were interested. We very often did that, and it was by request of the whole Commission.

Q. In any case did he hold himself forth as being the organ of the Minister of Public Works, or as being specially instructed?—A. I do not think so.

So that you see that Mr. Giroux distinctly repudiates in his evidence any connection whatever such as is sought to be established in the finding. The next witness put on the stand in regard to that is Mr. Rae, of the firm of the Allan Steamship line, and he is asked :

Q. Now, Mr. Rae, do you remember whether there was any pressure exercised of any sort to influence you or any other of the Harbour Commissioners, to your knowledge, to have that contract awarded to Larkin, Connolly & Co., otherwise than on merit?—A. I may as well say for once and for all time, that I never was present at a meeting of the Harbour Commissioners that I did not to the best ability exercise it in discussing anything that came before us, and as for pressure of any description, the very possibility of being influenced in favour of any particular contractor is absolutely impossible. The only thing in my mind in connection with any business transacted before the Commission was what is best in the interest of the work, and when we were giving a contract we were particularly careful as regards that.

Q. Now, let us see if I can get you to remember one thing. Are you in a position to state with absolute certainty that you never at any time concurred in the award of any contract or payment of any sum of money to any contractor unless you were absolutely certain it was in the interest of the public?—A. I cannot use stronger words than yours. I never would have acquiesced if I thought otherwise. I agree most positively, without reservation, in what you have said.

So we see, as the Commissioners come forward, one after another, they grow even stronger in their denial, that any improper influence was brought to bear on them in connection with this contract. Now, the evidence of Mr. Forsyth, another of the Commissioners, was the next taken, and I may say that they dropped that question entirely on that point, that is reported at page 987 in the old volume, and any hon. gentleman can see that they did not ask him anything in regard to the connection with Sir Hector. I would like to refer to the statement made by the Minister of Public Works on that point, and in connection with it, I would like also to refer to the statement made by the hon. gentlemen in their reports. We must, of course, sympathize a great deal with the hon. gentlemen in the enormous task they had in reading through this evidence, as I suppose they did, and compiling their report, but I do not think these difficulties will justify their statement as to the evidence of Sir Hector Langevin. It seems to me either that the hon. gentlemen who drew up the report omitted to read a very important part of the evidence, or that they have forgotten it, or that their report must be taken to be intentionally misleading. That part of the report is this: Going over the details in relation to these contracts, after giving the evidence of Mr. Valin, which they take care to set out in full, without stating that he had contradicted it in another place, they say :

"The entire statement made by Sir Hector on this contract is as follows."

I ask you to notes these words. Then they give the statement made by Sir Hector in the following words, contained in about eight lines of their report :—

"Mr. Tarte contends that by the influence which Mr. Thomas McGreevy had in the Department of Public Works, the Chief Engineer made a report for the purpose of obtaining for Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co. the dredging at exorbitant prices. I had nothing to do with the contract of this work. The Commissioners have themselves given the contract, as the statute authorized to do, without being bound to obtain the approval of the Government to their draft contract or the dredging work. I had no other duty but to recommend the payment at the request of the Commissioners, backed by the advice of the Chief Engineer of my department.

"I have never attempted to influence the Harbour Commissioners, and I have not been subjected to any undue influence in connection with the payments which I have recommended in their favour."

Now, the hon. gentlemen who drew this report say that that is the entire statement of Sir Hector in regard to this matter. Now, I say that is not true, and I can convince the House in a very few moments that it is not true. But I will just mention this fact, that this statement made by them as to Sir Hector's evidence immediately follows the evidence of Mr. Valin that they set out in full, and it is given for this reason, evidently, as much as to say: Here is Mr. Valin's evidence, here is the entire statement of Sir Hector Langevin. Sir Hector does not deny the statements made by Mr. Valin, and therefore they must be true. Now, what I have to say to the House is this, that the statement made in the report by the hon. gentlemen who drew the report is not true—I do not say it is wilfully untrue, but it is a fact that that statement is untrue. Now, I would like to turn to the evidence of Sir Hector Langevin at pages 1154 and 1155, where we will see whether the statement made in that report is true. Now, you will bear in mind that what they say is this, that the entire statement made by Sir Hector Langevin on this contract is as follows—and they give it all in about half a dozen lines. Now, then, I have a statement here made by Sir Hector Langevin in his evidence, occupying almost a page and a half of this report, in which he reiterates, in answer to the questions put to him, his denial of Mr. Valin's evidence, and repudiates every bit of it. I think it is of sufficient importance, in view of the fact that they have put it in their report, that I should read this evidence to the House, although I desire to be as brief as possible. He is thus cross-examined by Mr. Lavergne:

Q. In your statement of yesterday you say: "Mr. Valin states in his evidence that I told him to follow always Mr. Thomas McGreevy at the Quebec Harbour Board, and that he always did so, convinced as he was that it was my wish and desire: this I most positively deny." Mr. Valin is evidently mistaken. I understand that you have read the evidence of Mr. Valin?—Yes.

Q. Mr. Valin says at page 492: "I told the Minister that the names of Gallagher and Murphy might cause trouble with the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. because he was one of its members, and that it did not from that seem to me to be a different firm, and that it might cause trouble. He said: "I have spoken to Mr. McGreevy about that: both vote for and follow Mr. McGreevy, and I tell you everything will be all right. You know we meet frequently and that we consult together." Will you undertake to swear that this is false?—A. Mr. Valin is quite mistaken about this; I did not do that.

Q. Will you undertake to swear that he is swearing falsely?—A. Well, a man might be quite mistaken; you must have seen in my statement that I have avoided anything of this kind, because I would be the last to suppose that a man like Mr. Valin would come here and state a deliberate falsehood under oath.

Q. That is not true, then; you say that no such conversation took place as mentioned there?—A. No; it is not true.

Q. Then, is it false?—A. I gave you my answer.

Q. If this statement was only one of its kind, it might be all right, but if you look at page 493 you will find:

Q. "This was after the conversations that you had?—A. It was very nearly always the same thing repeated. I had several conversations with the Minister; every time anything important came up I consulted him and had always very nearly the same answer." Do you suppose that Mr. Valin would make the same mistake so many times?—A. Mr. Valin came, as I have stated before, repeatedly to my house; I would say he came too often. At all events he came very often, and the object that he had constantly in view was to remind me that he wished to be a Senator, and that I should have him appointed as a Senator. This was his hope all the time. Now he would speak about what passed in the Harbour Board, and he would say: "Well, what can I do" and "What shall I do." I would say to him to hear the discussion that was going on and give it the same amount of attention as others did, and if you are different from the others you cannot help that. You are there on the Board, a number of friends together whom you can consult. You have Mr. Hamel, Mr. McGreevy, Mr. Giroux and others, and you must just do the best way you can. Mr. Valin had this difficulty that he was very deaf and he could not follow all the discussions that were going on there, and at times he would be in this position: that another subject would come up and he would not see very well what they were deciding about or the manner in which the first subject had been dealt with or decided, being a little deaf, he would not hear that. He spoke to me about this once or twice. He said: "I cannot hear them." I said: "Why don't you ask your neighbours. If Mr. McGreevy is near you ask him. If not, ask some other member." I never told him to be there and be like a piece of wood and not use his own intellect, and go according to the will of another man.

Q. Is it not as he says that you have several times told him this?—A. It is just as I have stated. I did not tell him to be the tool of Mr. McGreevy or follow him implicitly or anything of the kind.

Q. You see that he said so several times?—A. Yes; and I state the contrary to that.

Q. At page 498 I read this: "Q. Now, when you were appointed Chairman of the Harbour Commission, were you put there as a safeguard to the interest of the Commission or to do as Mr. McGreevy would tell you to do?—A. That is what I told at my examination in chief. When I saw that Mr. McGreevy wanted to take the control, then I asked the Minister whether I did well in following his advice or not. Q. Then when Mr. McGreevy proposed anything before the Commission, you considered that you had nothing to do except accepting his propositions?—A. Not always, since on various occasions I consulted the Minister of Public Works. If you want to know a little more, Mr. Fitzpatrick, I will tell you. On one occasion, Mr. Langevin said to me: "If the Commission does not act properly I shall dissolve it."

Q. Is that statement true?—A. I do not say that.

Q. You deny that?—A. I deny that. I read that before, and it is not so.

I should like to know, on the face of that long cross-examination on that particular point, how the hon. gentlemen who prepared that report can distinctly say at page 16, that the entire statement made by Sir Hector Langevin in this connection is as follows, and then give about half a dozen lines, when I have read nearly a page and a half of his evidence on cross-examination. It appears to me to show a great weakness in their report; and no doubt they will withdraw that unfair statement, and desire to have the report amended on that point. They would not, of course, have it go to the country in an untrue form as it is. The question is, how many more misstatements or misleading statements are contained in that report. I must say I have been able to find one or two others in important particulars, misstatements made in the report or misleading statements—statements intended to mislead the public, either wilfully or not, and such must be the effect of the statements. In dealing with this branch of the case, that is the contract for the dredging, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that there was no suspicion in the minds of the Harbour Commissioners that there was anything wrong going on. They came up one after the other and gave evidence, and even that man Valin

in his contradictory evidence, where he swore one thing one time and contradicted it by a declaration at another time, even his evidence does not go to show that there was any improper connection, any improper influence, that that contract was let under circumstances which would justify the House in finding there was any evidence that wrong influence was brought to bear on the Commissioners. I say, therefore, when we find that fact, that the Harbour Commissioners were perfectly satisfied with the work, that they saw nothing wrong about it, that they were conversant with every detail of it and visited the work every day, and consequently were conversant with everything that took place--when they were not able to see there was anything wrong, how can we assume and infer, because it is merely an inference, that the Minister of Public Works in Ottawa, having no cognizance of the work, no supervision over it, had any connection whatever with this contract, or that any improper influence was used, as hon. gentlemen opposite ask us by their report to infer? It is impossible for us to come to that conclusion. The next contract in which their report assails the Minister of Public Works is the contract for the completion of the Lévis graving dock, dated 23rd June, 1884. Under that head the charge was this:

"That Thomas McGreevy agreed to secure for Larkin, Connolly & Co. this supplementary contract in consideration of their agreement to pay him all they should get on the contract over and above $50,000."

That is a very simple charge. That charge does not in any way implicate the Minister of Public Works; yet we have a very long finding in that report, in which hon. gentlemen opposite attempt to connect the Minister of Public Works in these words:

"And we find that all the facts were known to Sir Hector Langevin and his engineer, Perley, and that their conduct in assenting to the giving of this contract was highly censurable and a violation of public trust.

"We further find that the payment of $65,900 to these contractors as alleged damages was illegal and unjustifiable. That the conduct of Perley in recommending it, and of the Minister in sanctioning it, was a violation of public trust.

"That the express condition on which Sir Hector recommended the Governor in Council to agree to the supplementary contract, viz., 'that the contractors should make no claim for extras for the future,' was deliberately violated, and claims for extras to the amount of $50,214.02 were made and allowed, and that in permitting and sanctioning these payments both Sir Hector and Perley, his engineer, were guilty of violations of public trust."

I should like to say in reference to that contract that it has a history, and that the history of it goes back to 1878, a year long to be remembered in the history of this country. That contract was let in August, 1878. The relation of the Government to that contract was, perhaps, a little more intimate than it was to the contract for the dredging to which I have been referring. In this way: Plans and specifications for the work were approved by the Governor in Council under recommendation of the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine. The moneys to be paid therefor were to be paid from time to time as the work proceeded, upon the report of the Minister of Public Works that progress was satisfactory. If hon. gentlemen will read the report of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to this matter, they will find it seems to set up a state of facts that would justify, or tend to convince anyone that he would be justified in supporting their finding. But we must go back to 1878 before we can form a proper conclusion as to that contract, and as to their finding being a fair or an unfair one. If we commence there and go from 1878 to the present time we will find this report is misleading in almost every respect so far as the findings are concerned, and the facts stated in it are concerned. This is one of those cases where, owing to the investigation extending so far beyond the charge that was made, a large portion of the finding is based upon a mere statement by the accountant and not upon evidence of the progress and condition of the work at any time. Incidentally, however, and in connection with one or two of the reports we glean some idea of the difficulties that were encountered in the progress of this work, and we begin to feel a certain amount of sympathy with the contractors who took hold of the work and carried it to a successful conclusion, although we are bound to condemn their acts in many other respects. What was the position of affairs in 1878 when that contract for the Lévis graving dock was let? The plans and specifications were prepared, based upon surveys and explorations made by the engineers of the Harbour Commissioners. Their plans and specifications contained certain representations. Among the representations contained was this, that there was a good bottom to the dock, a good foundation to the gates of the dock at the entrance, that experiments had been made by boring in order to ascertain what kind of a bottom would be found. As the facts subsequently transpired, and as the evidence on them in a scattered and meagre way showed, when these surveys were made for the purpose of finding a bottom to build that dock upon, the engineer when he ran down his rod struck it on a boulder and took it for granted that this boulder was a rock bottom, and therefore the representation was made in the plans and specification that at a certain distance down they would find a bottom sufficient for the carrying out of the work. These contractors then commenced the work and continued for several years, but instead of being able to complete according to the plans and specifications, when they dug down to the depth required for the purpose of getting a foundation, and when they built their foundation to a considerable height, they were surprised to find, and the engineers were surprised to find, that the wall was caving in and that that solid rock bottom which they expected to get was, on investigation, shown to be a bed of sand thirty-five feet in depth. Yet hon. gentlemen insert in their report a clause to this effect:

"Special clauses were inserted throwing the risks and the responsibilities on the contractors with respect to the foundation on which any of the works were to be erected, and with regard to the materials to be excavated."

You see, Mr. Speaker, they knew what the trouble and difficulties were, but they were not fair enough to state in their report that the plans and specifications misrepresented the foundation to the contractors, as it stated that they were going to build a wall upon a good rock bottom, whereas it turned out to be a bed of sand. I say that if these gentlemen were fair in their report—I would not say, if they were honest, because I would be called to order again—they would have stated some of the difficulties that those contractors had to contend with, they would have stated that the original plans and specifications upon which the contract was based

were not true in their representations, and that the engineers who made the original survey had made a great mistake.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has the hon. gentleman read the original contract? He had better read that before he makes such a criticism.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I think I have read all the papers in connection with it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think not.

Mr. COATSWORTH. And I have more here which I will read to you presently. I will read to you in a very short time the report of the engineer, Mr. Tomlinson, who investigated the work in order to report upon the difficulties which existed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The contract is the important paper.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman had better not interrupt the hon. member until he hears what his argument is.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I quite understand the hon. gentlemen wanting to interfere, because they have made an improper, and I believe an unfair statement in that report. They have not set out truly or fairly the difficulties that had to be contended with owing to the improper plans and specifications submitted to the contractors. These improper plans were submitted under the Government of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and I charge that they were responsible to a large extent for the fact that these works were carried on so long, and with such great difficulty and expense. Now, Sir, what are the facts during the progress of the work? When it was found out that the walls had caved in, information was sent to that effect to the engineers in the old country; and if these engineers who had charge of this work had taken the same view as hon. gentlemen opposite, they would have telegraphed back in the words of this report:

"That clauses were inserted in the contract throwing the responsibilities on the contractors and they must carry out the plans and specifications."

But the engineers did nothing of the kind. They cabled back: "Move it 70 feet further back again," and so the work had to be put under reconstruction. After a year or so word was sent again to the old country: "Seventy feet further back has been gone and the walls are again without a foundation, what are we to do?" There were delays and difficulties standing in the way of the contractors all the time, and after consideration Kinipple & Morris, the engineers, cabled again: "Move it 70 feet further back." They were determined that they would move back until they got the foundation if they had to move back as far as New Brunswick. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was after some years of delay, that was after the contractors had been put to all these difficulties, that was after enormous expense had been incurred in extra work, that the instructions came from the engineers, not as my hon. friends in their report say, to keep the contractors to the contract, but to "move it 70 feet further back." Twice that order came by cable from the engineers in the old country in order to find a proper foundation. A good deal was said in the evidence as to the dismissal of the engineers, Kinipple & Morris, and I say, in connection with this point, that Mr. Dobell, one of the Commissioners, who incidentally brought up this question, made the statement that he considered that the engineers were so grossly negligent of the work at that time, that they deserved to be dismissed. He said that if they could do nothing more than cable out from the old country to move the dock 70 feet further back, that they were not entitled to have the supervision of it any longer, and that he was satisfied they should be dismissed then, although he protested against it before. Now, Sir, the difficulties did not end there. The work went on from year to year, and four or five or six years had passed and the contractors were not doing anything during the time, but struggling with the difficulties that were imposed on them by reason of the original wrong survey. There is no question, in the mind of any fair man, who will read this evidence, that if the dock had been established upon a proper foundation in the first instance, none of this trouble would have occurred. After Mr. Perley, the engineer for the Harbour Commissioners, was appointed the engineer over these works, in place of Kinipple & Morris, he found it necessary to move it back twice to the extent of 55 feet, before he was able to get a proper foundation for the work. Now, is it fair that we should endeavour to come to a finding upon this supplementary contract in the way hon. gentlemen opposite ask us to do, without taking these difficulties and the responsibility of the Government into consideration? I say it is very unfair, and the report which says that the contractors were bound to carry that out, in spite of the false representations of the plan, is not a fair report. I would like at this stage to read the official report that was made by one of the engineers, Mr. Tomlinson, on 3rd December, 1880, and this will show you that I have not exaggerated the difficulties, and I do not think I have exaggerated the responsibility when I throw it upon hon. gentlemen opposite, because it was under the supervision of their Government that the contract was let in 1878. This report of Mr. Tomlinson, addressed to the hon. Minister of Public Works about two years and a half after the contract was let, says:

"In compliance with your instructions, I have examined the graving dock at Point Lévis, and have the honour to report as follows:—

"The wing-walls forming the entrance to the graving dock were designed for their foundations to rest on clay overlaying rock, but on examination, and on borings being made, it was found that fine sand extended to a depth of 35 feet, no rock being reached except at the inside soundings.

"The foundations for the walls have been built according to the original design for a clay bottom, and have consequently proved insufficient for either supporting the walls or for making the water-tight dam to the inner works as was intended.

"After the sand had been dredged to a uniform depth the outside piles were closely driven to a depth of 8½ feet into the sand, the back ones to a little less depth and the space between was filled with concrete, upon which rests the masonry. The latter is of a superior description and well laid, the stones being considerably larger than the dimensions called for in the specification.

"The proportions of the walls are such that they would undoubtedly have been a substantial piece of work, if the foundations had been of a reliable character. The long wing-wall has settled considerably and has been forced outwardly some inches, so that most of the bottom vertical joints of the masonry have opened, and some of the cracks extend from the bottom to the top.

"There is no possibility of making the present design for the dam answer the purpose. A new dam will have to be built inside the wing wall and should extend past them to where the rock reaches the level of high water.

"The new dam should be planned at once so that everything required may be prepared this winter for the earliest possible prosecution of the work. It must be of the

most reliable description and the parts under the entrance masonry should be designed so as to form a part of the permanent work.

"I would respectfully suggest that the engineers be asked to furnish plans for the new dam, as it will be impossible to execute the work without them.

"I am fully convinced that the westerly wing-wall can last only a short time if some plan is not adopted to prevent it getting more out of place."

That is the report of the engineer sent by the Minister of Public Works to examine the work before the change was made to move the dock back 70 feet; and that shows that owing to the original mistake in the plan and surveys, it became necessary to construct a new dam. Now, the importance of that will present itself to the House when you become aware, from looking at the accounts, that the new dam which became necessary by reason of the mistake of the engineers, cost upwards of $140,000. We have, as I said, very little evidence in regard to this. I would like to read a few words from the evidence of Sir Hector as to this graving dock. At page 1055 he says:

"Mr. Tarte insinuates that the Minister of Public Works has caused this contract to be granted in June, 1884, against public interest, after a promise made by Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co. to Mr. Thomas McGreevy to pay him certain sums of money.

"According to the provisions of the Act of Parliament, 38 Vic., cap. 67, the Minister of Public Works had to cause to be approved by the Governor in Council a report made by him jointly with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries about the choice of a site and the dimensions of the dock, the plans and specifications and the draft contract of the work, and to recommend, according to the progress of the work, the payments to be made to the Harbour Commission.

"The choice of a site of the dock, the first plans, specifications and draft contract have been made and approved under Mr. Mackenzie's Administration. I have not to discuss it here.

"On the 19th of May, 1884, the Harbour Commissioners informed the department that they had given to Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co. the contract for the works yet to be executed, and sent the draft contract to be submitted to the Governor General in Council to be submitted for his approval. On the 7th of June following the draft contract was approved, on the favourable advice of the chief engineer of the department.

"The above is all I had to do with the matter. I have acted conscientiously, to the best of my knowledge, not being aware whether Mr. Thomas McGreevy might have an interest in the work tendered for by Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co., having been subjected to no undue influence on his part, or on that of anyone else, and having myself tried in no way, directly or indirectly, to induce the Harbour Commissioners, or any other person to favour the tenderers whom I have just mentioned."

Now, the evidence does not disclose it clearly; but, as far as one can gather from it, it appears that the condition of the works at the time this contract was awarded was such as justified the Commissioners in entering into a new arrangement. Any idea of carrying out the original contract had been abandoned altogether. For a long time the contractors had been supplying materials and working by the day; so that any pretense of carrying out the original contract according to its terms, had long been abandoned by the Harbour Commissioners. Consequently, for the purpose of bringing the work to a successful termination, they arranged to give the contract to the men who were constructing it on time, for the completion of the whole of the work, so that they would know exactly what it would cost, and that was let for about $74,000. There is not a tittle of evidence to show that the Minister of Public Works had any connection with this. As he states in his evidence, the contract was prepared by the Harbour Commissioners, they had all to do with the arranging of it, it was submitted to him and approved by him and the Governor General in Council, and the payments were made from time to time on the reports of the chief engineer, as submitted to him. Now, the report of the hon. gentlemen finds, first, that there should not have been any supplementary contract let: and, second, that a large claim for extras was made and allowed by the contractors, notwithstanding the clause in the report of the Minister of Public Works that no future claim for extras should be allowed. It appears to me we are justified in coming to the conclusion from the evidence that the Harbour Commissioners had the right and acted wisely in bringing to a certain definite amount the sum they had to expend on that dock, and in letting a supplementary contract for the purpose of completing it. With reference to the extras, is it a fact, as stated in the hon. gentlemen's report, that there were $50,000 of extras allowed after this contract was let? I do not think they will pretend to prove that. I do not think they will pretend to say that after this contract was let the contractors acquired a claim for $50,000 of extras. The work that this claim for extras represents was, I think, in whole, but if not in whole, in the greater part, done prior to the time this contract was let, and the claim for extras existed at that time, so that the report of the hon. gentlemen opposite is, in regard to that, misleading. The supplementary contract was let on the 23rd of June, 1884. At that time, and up to that time, the contractors had done a large amount of extra work, amounting to between $40,000 and $50,000; so that you will bear in mind that a claim for extras had accrued at that time. The Minister of Public Works at that time reported in favour of the supplementary contract and against any further claims for extras being allowed. The hon. gentlemen report that a further claim was allowed the contractors of upwards of $50,000, although, as I read the evidence, and I feel sure I am right, that claim for extras existed almost in entirety before the supplementary contract was made. If I am right in my interpretation of the evidence, and I am reasonably certain I am, because I have looked at the accounts and papers, and find the account was put in prior to the time the contract was let, the report of hon. gentlemen on that point is misleading, as there was no further claim after the 23rd of June, 1884, put in for extras to the extent of $50,000, and there were no extras done after that time to that extent. It appears to me, on summing up the evidence with regard to this contract, that we are not justified in sustaining the finding of hon. gentlemen opposite. It appears to me that they have failed entirely in their evidence and in their argument, so far as we have heard any argument yet, to establish any connection whatever between the Minister of Public Works and any wrong-doing in connection with the Lévis graving dock. But I must pass on to the next contract, and that is the cross-wall contract, dated 26th May, 1883. It is charged in connection with that contract that Larkin, Connolly & Co. took into partnership Robert H. McGreevy and gave him an interest of 30 per cent. to secure the influence of Mr. Thomas McGreevy, and that other tenders were put in by this firm besides their own, to the knowledge and with the consent of Mr. Thomas McGreevy. These were tenders of Beaucage and Gallagher, and that while the tenders were before the department, Mr. Thomas Mc

Greevy obtained information from the department concerning them which he gave to Larkin, Connolly & Co. It is stated that Mr. Thomas Mc Greevy knew of the Beaucage and Gallagher tenders, that he knew they were lower, and that, in consideration of a payment to him of $25,000, he assisted in manipulating all the tenders so as to secure the contract for the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and that there was also in connection with this contract $1,000 paid to the Langevin testimonial fund. It is also alleged that while the works were in progress changes were made against the public interest and to the advantage of the contractors. The finding of the minority report on these matters is :

"We find it difficult to absolve the Minister from a knowledge of the existence of a conspiracy. We find further that the Minister had been guilty of a breach of public trust in permitting double payments for the dredging used in filling the cross-wall."

It is claimed that, concurrently with the contract for dredging, for which work Larkin, Connolly & Co. were paid 35 cents a yard, they had another contract for this cross-wall, that they were to receive 40 to 45 cents a yard for filling the cross-wall, and that a large portion of the material which they dredged out of the harbour at 35 cents per yard, they placed in the cross-wall at 45 cents per yard ; and the finding is that the Minister was guilty of a breach of public trust in permitting that double payment to be made. What was the position of the Minister in reference to that contract? I do not know whether hon. gentlemen find it easy or difficult to bear in mind the relative positions of the Public Works Department and the Harbour Commissioners in regard to each of these works. You will remember that the Public Works Department had nothing whatever to do with the dredging contract, except to pay over such money to the Harbour Commissioners, from time to time, as they demanded it for the work. With regard to the Lévis graving dock they had further duties. The plans and specifications were submitted to and approved by them, and they had to see to the proper application of the money. Now, in this cross-wall contract, the plans and specifications were prepared under the direction of the chief engineer of Public Works, approved by the Governor in Council, tenders were to be asked for and the contract was to be awarded by the Governor in Council. But you will remark in regard to this, and it is important in connection with the finding which hon. gentlemen bring against the Minister of Public Works, that the department had nothing to do with the seeing to the application of the moneys lent by the Government to the Harbour Commissioners for the purpose of carrying on the work. All that the department was authorized to do was to lend this money to the commissioners, and the commissioners were bound to see to its expenditure. Now, in dealing with the report of the hon. gentlemen in regard to that, there is one thing in which I think they gave themselves away a little, and, if that was misleading, it was misleading in the right direction, and I am always glad to acknowledge any fault of that kind. I want to dwell upon that fact, because it will go to establish in our minds that Sir Hector was not guilty of any connivance with the conspiracy and had nothing whatever to do with it. The statute authorizing this work, or the advancing of moneys for the purpose of carrying on this work, apparently, is capable of two constructions, or at any rate two constructions have been placed upon it. It says that the plans and specifications are to be prepared under the direction of the chief engineer of Public Works, the tenders are to be called for and the contract is to be awarded by the Department of Public Works. You see that divides it into three parts : first, the plans and specifications are to be prepared under the supervision of the Public Works Department ; then the tenders are to be called for, and thirdly the contract is to be awarded by the Department of Public Works. It is the second of these that I wanted to call attention. That was apparently construed to mean that tenders should be called for by the Harbour Commissioners. Hon. gentlemen opposite—and I will not say they are wrong, because I am inclined to think they are right—say that these tenders were to be called for by the Public Works Department. That seems to me to show that Sir Hector was not cognizant of any conspiracy or took any part in it or lent himself to it in any way. It was very simple for Sir Hector, if he wanted to do so, to put the same construction upon it and say that the whole thing should be done from his office, but on the contrary, and it may be a providential thing for him, because it shows that he was not trying to keep the thing in his own hands, he construes that to mean that the tenders were to be called for by the Harbour Commissioners. So we have first the plans and specifications prepared by the department, next the tenders advertised for by the Harbour Commissioners, and then the contract let by the department, and then it is carried out under the supervision of the commissioners. As to these tenders, in which, beyond doubt, there was a great deal of manipulation, if the department had placed the construction put on that paragraph by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the tenders should be called for by the department, then the department would have been open to more suspicion as to the manipulation of tenders than they are now : but the fact that they allowed the tenders to be opened by the Harbour Commissioners absolves them from having had anything to do with the tenders. The plans and specifications were prepared, the tenders were called for and sent to the Harbour Commissioners and opened by them, and read by them, and sent by them to the Department of Public Works for the purpose of their letting the contracts. That there was a manipulation of the tenders there is no doubt. Every one who has read the evidence is aware that Larkin, Connolly & Co. sent in three tenders, one in their own name, one in the name of Beaucage, lower than theirs, and another still lower, under the name of Gallagher. Every one also knows that they made a mistake in those tenders, so that they might have an opportunity of withdrawing them, and the result was that the Department of Public Works wrote asking them what their meaning was in regard to certain items of their tender. In one case, that of Beaucage, he wrote back to say that he meant so-and-so, which made his tender higher than that of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and made him the second instead of the third lowest tenderer. Gallagher withdrew his tender and Larkin, Connolly & Co. wrote, keeping the figures of their tender. So there was the Gallagher tender withdrawn, the Beaucage tender increased, and Larkin, Connolly

& Co. left the lowest tenderers for the work. An effort has been made in connection with this to show that there was a wilful miscalculation of quantities in these tenders, and that Larkin, Connolly & Co. were not really the lowest tenderers, but that the lowest were Peters & Moore. If we are to accept the report of the expert engineers, there is no doubt that is shown to be the fact. We must, however, read that report of the engineers with a great deal of reservation, because the original plans are not all forthcoming. The original estimates prepared by Boyd are not forthcoming, and, therefore, the expert engineers had not the material to show them how Boyd made the mistake. In their conclusions they state that Boyd did make the mistake. They take the plans and specifications that remained and worked them out, and they say that, according to their judgment, the lowest tender was that of Peters & Moore, and not that of Larkin, Connolly & Co. While dealing with that question last night the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) referred to a letter from Thomas McGreevy to his brother dated the 3rd May, 1883, in which he says: "He will commence his calculations," and my hon. friend in dealing with that letter insinuated—because I cannot characterize it as anything less than an insinuation—that the word "he" referred to Sir Hector Langevin, and that he was discussing it with McGreevy, and they were going to make a calculation, but the evidence shows that it referred to Boyd. In the letter of the 8th of May, a day or two afterwards, he says: "I have seen Mr. Boyd this morning, and he has not yet finished the cross-wall." So the evidence is clear that at that time Mr. Boyd, the engineer, was referred to, and not Sir Hector. Now, Sir Hector himself denies very explicitly that he had any connection with the manipulation of the tenders. In his evidence, at page 1061, he says:

"I have complied with all these conditions in good faith. I have had no knowledge of the manipulations Mr. Tarte complains of in connection with the tenders, nor of information unduly communicated by officers of my department or others. I never authorized any one to make any such communications; I was not aware that the Messrs. McGreevy were interested in the contract for the works tendered for. I had in view under the circumstances only the public interest."

Now, in regard to the dredging that was put into the cross-wall contract, and which forms a subsequent part of the finding of my hon. friends, they find this:

"We find the Minister to have been guilty of a breach of public trust in permitting double payment to be made for the dredging material used in filling the cross-wall."

I would like to ask the hon. gentlemen if they think that is a fair finding on the evidence, if they think that, taking the Minister's connection with these works, it is fair to charge him with the knowledge of that payment for filling the cross-wall. Why, there is not the slightest tittle of evidence to show that he had any knowledge of it whatever. He could have had no official knowledge of it. The work was being done under the Harbour Commissioners, was being paid for by them, and it was not reported to him in any way, and I feel assured that the fullest reading of the evidence by any hon. gentleman will show that Sir Hector had no connection whatever with the filling of the dredging into the cross-wall. Now, in regard to the finding in connection with the Esquimalt dock, I do not think it is quite fair for me to go into all these contracts. Other hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the evidence are doubtless better qualified to deal with them, and I have occupied so much of the time of the House this afternoon——

Mr. ALLISON. Give us something Tarte.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I do not catch the remark of the hon. gentleman. It is like a great many of the remarks made by that hon. member: we can neither hear them nor understand them. The contract for the completion of the Esquimalt dock of 1884 was entirely under the supervision of the Department of Public Works, and the charges made in connection with it are that Thomas McGreevy agreed to help, and did help, by obtaining information and figures from the department, and that with his knowledge and consent Larkin, Connolly & Co. took Robert McGreevy into partnership and gave him an interest of 20 per cent.; that during the execution of the works Thomas acted as the paid agent of Larkin, Connolly & Co. in dealing with the department, and obtained from them important alterations and more favourable conditions which enabled them to realize large profits; that large sums of money were paid by Larkin, Connolly & Co. to Thomas McGreevy for services in dealing with the Minister of Public Works to obtain his influence, and he furnished information and procured from the department alterations which cost large sums; that Thomas McGreevy endeavoured to induce certain members of Parliament to join with him in this part of the conspiracy; and also that he endeavoured to procure the dismissal of certain officials who were objectionable to the contractors because they bound them to the terms of the contract. Now, the findings on that, so far as they affect the Minister, are as follows:—

"That before the contract was entered into Sir Hector Langevin secretly assented to changes and modifications of the contract which were to be afterwards made in the interest of the contractors, amongst which was a rebate of part of the $50,000 to be paid for plant.

"That there was a change to be made in the re-coursing which was not to cost extra, but notwithstanding these facts the Minister subsequently improperly paid the contractors for this a sum of $32,839."

Now, in regard to the first finding, that the Minister secretly agreed beforehand with the contractors that there was to be a rebate of this $50,000 that was to be allowed on the contract price for the plant that was assumed, I would like to ask the hon. gentlemen how, in the face of Mr. Perley's evidence, they come to that finding. I suppose we will have to assume that they have read all the evidence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You are very generous.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I would be prepared to guarantee that the hon. gentleman has not read all the evidence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is pretty clear that you have not.

Mr. AMYOT. We heard it.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Nor heard it all, either. But in reference to this secret agreement that they say existed between Sir Hector and the contractors for the allowance of a rebate for this $50,000, I challenge hon. gentlemen to produce one tittle of evidence to establish that finding. I am prepared to show to them the only evidence that has been given on that point, and it directly refutes the statement they have made in their report. Now,

I do not know whether they have read Mr. Perley's evidence on that subject. They surely cannot have read it and come to the conclusion that they have come to there. I will inform them that it is to be found at page 145 of the old edition. Mr. Perley, when questioned in regard to this allowance of $50,000 for the plant, makes a statement at some length that he had gone out to British Columbia and inspected the plant for himself, and had found it almost worthless, or comparatively worthless. He says :

"I think my report is dated January, 1886. I refer therein to this very matter, and state that the claim would come up when the final estimate was made. I had obtained a statement showing that the articles were worthless, and I struck $19,000 off. The contractors, had these articles been good and of value, could have taken them and used them in their work, but as they could not be furnished, as they were worthless, they had to buy other articles to take their place, and therefore I considered it was only fair and just not to call on them to pay it. That is my explanation of it. Mr. Trutch had nothing to do with it. I had all to do with it, and in my position as chief engineer I took that course."

In another place he said that he took that course without even consulting the Minister of Public Works, and he was not prepared to say that the allowance of $19,000 allowed by him to the contractors for plant came in any way to the knowledge of the Minister of Public Works at any time whatever. What does the Minister of Public Works say about the matter? His evidence is confirmatory of that of Mr. Perley. He states the matter was not referred to him and he had no knowledge of it, that it was done, as Mr. Perley stated, entirely on his own responsibility. How can hon. gentlemen opposite, in the face of Sir Hector Langevin's evidence, in which he stated he had no connection with the matter, in the face of Mr. Perley's evidence, in which he stated he did it on his own responsibility, state as their finding that there was a secret agreement beforehand that Sir Hector was to make an allowance. There is no possibility of sustaining any such finding. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House gave a good deal of attention to one part of the contract, and that was as to the letting of the contract and the discussions in regard to tenders previous to the contract being let. But there were some points in the evidence which the hon. gentleman was guilty of leaving out. It must be a matter of surprise that the hon. gentleman omitted those parts of the evidence that were favourable to us or to the Minister of Public Works, while he quoted all those portions that seemed to be against the Minister. At page 1116 we have the evidence of Mr. Starrs. Mr. Starrs was asked the following questions :—

Q. Were you able to carry it out? A. I think we would have had means to carry it out with friends to assist us.

Further on he said in cross-examination :

Q. Were you ever in British Columbia? A. No. Q. Nor your partner? A. No. Q. Have you ever built a dock like that before? A. No.

That brings us to the root of the difficulty. The chief engineer of the Public Works Department made his report to the department and he estimated the cost of finishing that work at $390,000. Then the department called for tenders. Two tenders were put in ; the tender of Larkin, Connolly & Co. was for $374,569, something below the estimate of the chief engineer ; while the tender of Starrs & O'Hanly was for $338,945, or over $50,000 below the estimate of the chief engineer. Here was the position of the matter : Messrs. Starrs & O'Hanly, who were men without any financial responsibility, according to their own admission, put in a tender for the work at a price $50,000 lower than the chief engineer had estimated for the work and $30,000 or $35,000 lower than the other contractor. They had never done any work of this kind before. Larkin, Connolly & Co. had gone on successfully in the face of all difficulties and completed the Lévis graving dock. Although Starrs & O'Hanly state in their evidence they are contractors, it is well known that such a firm as Starrs & O'Hanly does not exist. It is well known in Ottawa that the head of the firm, Mr. Starrs, has a bowling alley and sells groceries in this city, and Mr. O'Hanly is a civil engineer and has been an unsuccessful contractor. So here were two men, without means of any consequence, without the ability to carry on the work, because Mr. Starrs said in his evidence "I think our friends could have helped us to carry out the work," these men put in a lower tender than the Minister thought the work could be done for. They came before the Minister with that tender, and asked him to accept it, and give them the contract. The Minister's statement contains a reasonable explanation of the whole matter. He said :

"I called their attention to Mr. Perley's report, and on my calling their attention to that report and that they were $60,000 lower than the estimated price, they withdrew the tender, and would not have anything to do with the work."

That seems a reasonable explanation. These men had never done that kind of work before ; they knew nothing at all about it. Mr. Perley was thoroughly familiar with that work, and had made his estimate of the cost, and these men had evidently made a miscalculation as to what it cost them and had put in too low a tender, and they withdrew it when their attention was called to the thing. In regard to the allowance for re-coursing, I do not know whether the hon. gentlemen who find so strongly against the Minister on that point, have read the report that was not fyled. I must assume they did not read the report which was omitted to be fyled or marked as an exhibit. I am sure if they take into consideration the report of Mr. Perley on that subject, to be found on page 30 of the majority report, they will be of opinion that they should at least modify their finding, if not withdraw it altogether. Mr. Perley in that report said :

"According to the specification, the stone work is backed by concrete, each being paid for at a different price. By the substitution of larger courses of stone, the quantity of stone used has been increased beyond the quantity originally specified and the quantity of concrete backing proportionately lessened, and the change thus made will increase the cost on the dock about $35,000."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman defending the allowance made for re-coursing?

Mr. COATSWORTH. I am defending the Minister of Public Works in reference to it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not quite catch what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. COATSWORTH. What I said was this : That I thought that if the hon. gentlemen had fully considered this report of Mr. Perley's or had considered it at all, that they would not have thrown the whole responsibility for it on the Minister of Public Works. Mr. Perley goes on to say :

"I may here mention that originally the masonry in the graving dock at Lévis, Quebec, was intended to be

in comparatively shallow courses, but, it having been found possible to obtain a very much heavier class of stone, the courses were doubled in thickness to the material advantage of that work."

So that it appears Mr. Perley had had experience in increasing the thickness of the courses of stone and knew the advantage it would be to the work.—

"The stone used at Esquimalt is a sandstone, not differing much in hardness and texture from sandstone generally and not so well adapted for wear and tear as limestone, granite or hard stone of that class, and in view of the great amount of wear and tear to which a dock of this nature is subjected, it is in my opinion a most fortunate thing that the contractors were able to obtain so large a class of stone as they have used, and, as a direct benefit has been conferred, I have to recommend that they be paid full measurement for all the stone they have placed in the dock, due care being taken to reduce the quantity of backing."

It appears to me that if the hon. gentlemen had attached any weight to that report that they ought to modify their finding.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman kindly read to me on that particular point what portion of the finding he complains of? I think the finding of the majority report on that point is stronger than ours.

Mr. COATSWORTH. At the top of page 40:

"That the change made in the re-coursing of the dock was applied for by the contractors in their own interest, they having discovered a quarry within accessible distance, which furnished suitable stone for the proposed change, and was assented to by the Minister on the distinct understanding that it should not increase the cost of the work to the Crown; nor does it appear why it should have done so, inasmuch as Engineer Perley pointed out at the time the cost of the work to the contractors, in the use of the larger stone, would be lessened.

"That notwithstanding these facts, the Minister subsequently improperly paid to the contractors for this change the sum of at least $22,839."

Now I submit that in all fairness to the Minister, the report should have stated that he recommended that payment on the certificate of his chief engineer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would the hon. gentleman kindly read the report of the majority on that one point?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has no right to interrupt. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) is making his own argument.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I will leave the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to read that for himself.

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

After Recess.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, before six o'clock, in speaking of the allowance made by the Minister of Public Works for re-coursing, the question was suggested by my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) that the majority and minority reports did not disagree on that point, and he asked the question, in what respect they did disagree? I may point out to my hon. friend that they disagree in this: That the report of the minority finds that the Minister recommended the payment of that sum in pursuance of, and in connection with, the alleged conspiracy. There is no such finding as that in the majority report. They admit the payment, of course that is undisputed, and they feel that the payment should not have been made, but they do not think that payment is any evidence of, or was made in connection with, any conspiracy between the Minister or any other person. There are one or two points more I would like to refer to before concluding. The report of the minority in reference to the Esquimalt graving dock deals with several questions, in which it does not seem to me there is a great deal of point. One of them is the proposed change to lengthen the dock, and the suggestion was made that that was part of the corrupt agreement between the contractors and the Minister of Public Works. In this connection I would call the attention of the House to the fact that the report of the Minister of Public Works in favour of the lengthening of the dock was conditional on the Imperial Government concurring in it and agreeing to share a portion of the expense. If that had been part of a corrupt arrangement we would not have found that the Minister of Public Works would have made such a recommendation as that the Imperial Government should take part in it. I think that is conclusive evidence that the Minister of Public Works was acting in good faith, and as he thought in the interest of the country in having a longer dock, if the Imperial authorities, who are chiefly interested in it, would share in the expense; and as they did not concur, the length is not increased. Considerable space is allotted in the minority report to the alleged attempt to procure the dismissal of Bennett. The best evidence that the Minister was acting in good faith in that matter is the fact that Bennett was not dismissed, and that he continued as the engineer all along to the completion of the work. My hon. friend, in speaking last night on this matter, referred to the $5,000 alleged by him to have been contributed towards the Three Rivers election, and he produced in support of that a memorandum made by the accountants from the books; but he forgot, or else he intentionally omitted to remark, that when Martin P. Connolly was examined in regard to this item, he stated that he had made the "Three Rivers" entry on his own responsibility, that he had no authority to do so except his own surmise, and that he was not authorized to do so by any member of the firm. There is, therefore, no evidence to show that that $5,000 had any connection with Three Rivers. I was rather surprised also that my hon. friend made some effort to connect the Minister of Public Works with the payment of money directly to him from Murphy, one of the contractors. I was surprised at that, in view of the fact that the hon. gentlemen who drew up the minority report did not feel that they were justified in finding that the money had been paid, and I am sure that the House will concur in the minority report on that point, that the evidence does not justify the finding that Sir Hector Langevin received any money whatever from Murphy. The hon. gentleman also raised the question of the testimonial fund to the Minister of Public Works and referred to the speech of that hon. gentleman in the *Hansard* of 1884, page 1465. He did not read that speech to us, but referred to it as evidence that Sir Hector at the time knew the names of some of the parties who contributed to that fund, although he had stated in his evidence that he was not aware of any of the names. I have looked up that report, and I do not find that it

bears out what the hon. gentleman said, and I would like to read a short extract from it to show that Sir Hector at that time did not know and that there was no evidence to show that he knew who the contributors were. After referring to one of the names mentioned in the *Globe* newspaper, he said:

"Well, I see to-day in the papers—though of course I could not say whether it was the case or not, because I do not know the names of those parties who were kind enough to contribute to that testimonial; the list was never shown to me, and therefore I do not know the contributors—I see in the papers a statement which is evidently coming from that gentleman, in which he says that he never contributed to the fund."

So that there was the best evidence present to the mind of the Minister of Public Works that at least one of the gentlemen whose names were mentioned had not contributed to the fund, and that, so far as the other names were concerned, he had no evidence brought before him that they were actual contributors. In conclusion, Sir, I would just like to say that I do not see how we can possibly concur in the report of hon. gentlemen opposite. There is no direct evidence on any of the charges to connect the hon. Minister of Public Works with the transactions in question; but I think there is abundant evidence to show that he had no connection with them whatever. We are asked practically to infer that the hon. Minister was guilty, and that the findings brought against him are correct. I submit that no such inference would be right. I submit that there is not even circumstantial evidence which would justify us in agreeing to such a finding. It appears to me, taking into account all the circumstances and all the evidence that has been brought before us, that the severest finding we would be justified in coming to against the hon. Minister of Public Works is that contained in the report of the majority.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I can hardly find fault with the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Coatsworth) for the length of time he has taken up, on the assumption that he was put forward to attack the report which my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and I have the honour to submit, and to support the one which the hon. gentlemen on the other side have submitted to the House as the majority report. I had not the knowledge before that my hon. friend had the honour to belong to the long robe. When he was speaking I learned for the first time that such was the case, for we live in different parts of the Dominion; and perhaps that may account to some extent for the particularity with which he went into the evidence. I cannot say that I congratulate him altogether on the manner in which he has approached this case. My hon. friend at my left (Mr. Mills) and myself felt the responsibility which rested upon us when, after differing from our colleagues, we had to present a minority report; and when I say that we approached the consideration of that report seriously and solemnly, I do not think I shall ask the House to assume more than they already believe. We felt that we were not acting as partisans, that we had no right to present a partisan report; if we had done so, we would get no credit for it; so we tried to present a document judicial in its tone, judicial in its conclusions, and which we respectfully submit can be judicially defended. Under the circumstances, Sir, I resent strongly the unjustifiable charges which the hon. gentleman has several times made in the course of his speech, that my hon. friend and myself had wilfully misrepresented the facts and the evidence. It will be impossible for me, in view of the duty which I think devolves upon me, of defending more or less the report which we have presented, to follow the hon. gentleman through his long speech. I understand that he presented to the House five or six different statements as reasons why he should not only vote for the report presented by the majority, but why he should go much further than that report, and completely absolve the Minister of Public Works from all responsibility whatever for any of the admitted frauds which have been committed upon this country. The hon. gentleman argues that inasmuch as the Harbour Commissioners were not proved to have known of the frauds, therefore we may justly draw the conclusion that the Minister did not know of them. The hon. gentleman argues, with a disregard of the facts which to me was Napoleonic, that the Minister derived no benefit from these frauds. The hon. gentleman argued that the money which was squandered, which was paid improperly, which was robbed by these contractors, was not money belonging to the Government, but belonging to the commissioners—ignoring the fact, which one would suppose as a member of Parliament he must have been acquainted with, that two years have not elapsed since this country, at the request of the Minister of Public Works assumed the whole of the debt, every dollar of it, of that commission. The hon. gentleman argued that the report which I, coupled with my hon. friend who was the senior member on the Committee, have the honour to present, was wilfully wrong in that it did not give a fair or honest statement of the facts connected with what is called the 35 cents dredging contract—that we did not give an honest statement of the facts connected with the Lévis dock and the enormous amount improperly and illegally paid for extras in connection with that dock; that we did not give an honest account of the Minister's connection with the money paid improperly on the cross-wall; and that we did not attempt to prove the existence of any secret agreement which we alleged to exist with respect to the rebate of moneys on the Esquimalt dock. The hon. gentleman will not imagine that I intended to treat him with disrespect if I say that I propose to take up these different points as I reach the different portions of the case, because it would not do to take them up by themselves. I beg to say, with regard to this report which my hon. friend and I have presented to the House, that it may be true and defensible, or it may be untrue and indefensible; but I want the hon. gentleman to understand that it has been honestly presented to this House by men who felt the responsibility resting upon their shoulders, and who desired to present a report which would not disgrace the reputations which I venture to say we each hold in our respective provinces. Sir, I am not going to charge against those who differ from me that they do so from improper motives. The evidence on which we formed our conclusions is very voluminous and very extensive, and men may honestly differ as to the conclusions to be drawn from that evidence; but while I will not charge against the majority of the sub-Committee that they presented a fraudulent and corrupt report, as

the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) has not scrupuled to charge against my hon. friend and myself. I claim from the House and the country that the same courtesy may be extended to us as we willingly accord to our friends who differ from us. Sir, before I pass to speak of that report, I may be allowed to re-echo what is, I think, in the mind, not only of every member of this House on both sides, but in the mind of every thinking man in this country, that there is one gentleman to whom Canada at present is under a very heavy debt. I say the man who had the pluck, the persistence and the courage to cut away the ties which bind a man to party in this country, and make these serious charges on his responsibility in the House, and press them with the care, the ability and the assiduity with which he pressed them to a conclusion, deserves the gratitude of every true Canadian. I say that the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) is not only justified in the position he took: but in the minds of honest men on both sides of politics, he stands forward as a man entitled to the gratitude due to everyone who deserves well of his country. We cannot ignore the fact that in this matter a Minister of the Crown, who occupied a position second only to that of the First Minister, has been impeached of high crimes and misdemeanours. We cannot minimize the fact. He stands before this country to-day impeached, on his trial, and awaiting our verdict. At an early stage of this enquiry, I took occasion to present the view which I personally held, and which I have never seen any reason to retract, that that hon. gentleman, charged as he was, on the responsibility of a co-member of Parliament, with having improperly received public moneys from contractors, had a duty to discharge, in the first place to himself, in the second place to the colleagues with whom he is associated, and in the third place to the constituency he represents and the country at large, and that was to step down and out from the high position he held as Minister of Public Works until these charges were investigated. I held this view for two reasons. The first was that, as Minister of Public Works, he was the custodian of the evidence which was to prove his guilt or his innocence, and secondly because when he was so charged in this House, he did not deny the accusation frankly and squarely, but only went so far as to say that he had not received the money for his own personal use and benefit. And I stated then, with that charge, with that impeachment hanging over him, and with only that qualified denial in his favour, looking to English history and English precedent, looking to what was in itself right and just, and to the position he held as the head of the Public Works Department, he had a duty to discharge primarily above all others, and that was to resign into the hands of some other colleague the custody of the papers he held and the control of the department, the duties of which he was accused of having abused. It is argued that Sir Hector Langevin's long services should weigh very strongly in his favour, and I do not think there is anybody who sits as one of the jury on the trial who would dispute the force of that argument, always provided he was reasonably satisfied that there was a doubt of the guilt of the member incriminated. I say if a man's course of conduct for thirty or forty years has been above suspicion, and if he is charged with a political offence, and there is reasonable doubt of his guilt, his past conduct should count for something: but I entirely deny that if a man is charged with a political offence, a criminal offence, and that charge is brought home with reasonable certainty to the minds of those who are to try him, he is to be absolved because he has been thirty or forty years in the public service. I think myself that the long time during which he has been engaged, the responsibilities which attach to the position he held, so far from leading us to decide in his favour, only add to his guilt, if guilt in fact exists; and, therefore, we have to approach this case irrespective of the fact that he had long service, because there cannot be a gentleman on either side who will deny that the evidence is of such a character as to raise doubts, which no man can rid his mind of, that if Sir Hector Langevin has not been actively engaged in this conspiracy he has been a passive and willing party to it. These charges were made against the Minister, and I regret the manner in which he met them in this House and afterwards before the Committee. If the hon. gentleman will take the charge as it was first presented, he will find that the Minister of Public Works was accused directly, in these words, of having received public moneys:

"That certain members of the firm of P. Larkin, Connolly & Co. paid and caused to be paid large sums to the Minister of Public Works out of the proceeds of the said contracts, and that entries of such payments were made in the books of the firm."

Nothing could be more specific, nothing could be more certain. How did the hon. gentleman meet them? When he came before the Committee, he attempted to make the Committee believe that this was something he had then heard of for the first time. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen who are to judge in this matter between Sir Hector Langevin and the country to the fact that he had made a qualified denial, and only a qualified denial, of that charge when it was stated before this House. He said: "I did not receive the money for my own personal use and benefit." The inference, the only inference which could be drawn by any honest man from that statement, was that he had received the money, but had received it for other purposes than his own use; and when he came before the Committee—*see* page 1048 of the evidence—he said:

"On reading the minutes of the proceedings in this Committee, I find that my name was connected with this enquiry, and have thought fit to come forward of my own accord and make a statement before the Committee."

He wishes to lead the Committee to believe that that was the first time he heard there was a charge made against him, when, as a matter of fact, that charge was made two months previous by the hon. member for Montmorency, on his responsibility, from his place in this House. The hon. Minister went on to say:

"If Mr. Tarte, when he brought his accusations in the House of Commons on the 11th of May, 1891, had made his charges directly against me, I would have at once, pending the enquiry, put my resignation as Minister of Public Works in the hands of the Prime Minister, in accordance with the custom followed in such cases in England. But his statement apparently aimed only at Mr. McGreevy, and the facts with which he subsequently connected my name were not stated at the time as directly implicating me in any improper act or as indicating on my part any guilty object or any intention of failing in my duty, and so far as they seemed directly directed towards my conduct they were vague and indeterminate."

I only quote that to show the frame of mind in

which the hon. Minister approached the charges, for remark that in the two paragraphs of the charge which precede the last one, the hon. member for Montmorency charged that there had been a political conspiracy to defraud the Government and the people of Canada out of large sums of public money in the letting of public contracts; after charging that accusation home upon the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and after charging it home upon the officers of Sir Hector Langevin's department, he wound up his charge by stating that:

"Certain members of that firm had paid and caused to be paid large sums of money to the hon. gentleman himself personally."

Yet two months later, the Minister of Public Works said he did not understand that any charge had been made against himself. I quote this to show the extraordinary condition of mind in which the Minister of Public Works approached this matter. No man doubted, every one knew, that the charge had been made across the House, that the Minister was personally guilty of corrupt conduct, and I repeat again, in my humble opinion, his duty to the country should have compelled him to resign the responsible position he held the moment that charge was made. Now, before passing to the evidence on which my hon. friend and myself based the report we have presented to this House, I wish to make one or two preliminary observations respecting the character of the witnesses and the relations the different parties bore, the one to the other, in that enquiry. Sir, a good deal depended on the evidence of Mr. Owen Murphy and of Mr. Robert McGreevy, and it is open to any hon. gentleman on either side to affirm what opinion he likes as to the credibility to be given to the statements of these gentlemen. I wish to make only one or two observations and they are these, that, so far as both these gentlemen are concerned, they produced before the Committee every document they had which had any relation to this enquiry. Their private diaries, entered from day to day for eight or ten years, containing every secret transaction they had during that time, were produced and subjected to the strictest scrutiny and enquiry, and that voluntarily. There was no reason why they should have produced those documents. They had no money at stake in this enquiry. No one knew them to have those documents to produce, but it is one of the strongest pieces of evidence in favour of these men that they produced their private diaries for six or eight years, showing every transaction with which they were connected. Compare their conduct in that regard with the conduct of other gentlemen who were more or less incriminated in that enquiry. I want to ask you, did or did not the hon. gentleman from Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy), who was incriminated and who has been found guilty by both reports of the highest crimes a member of Parliament can be guilty of, produce his private books or papers? Did he produce one letter? I challenge those who are prepared to defend him in this House to show that in the long series of years during which he is charged with a long series of crimes, he ever produced a letter or a document, of a private nature, to show that he was innocent. They were all suppressed, or all destroyed, or all stolen. Where was Sir Hector Langevin, who has been occupying a public place before the people of this country so long and who has occupied such high positions in the state? He was charged with having received moneys from time to time. He was charged with having received ten thousand dollars at one time, paid into his own hands, as a corrupt bribe. Did he produce his bank books to show that no ten thousand dollars was ever deposited? The point may be strong or weak, as hon. gentlemen may regard it, but I remind you that he produced nothing. You have the evidence, the recollection, the oral testimony of Thomas McGreevy and of Sir Hector Langevin, and you have the sworn testimony of their opponents coupled with the production of their books, papers and letters. There is one thing upon which both reports agree, and that is that the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. collectively and individually were parties to a corrupt and wicked conspiracy to cheat the public. That is admitted on all sides. I have not even heard the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) defend the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., although I think he defended everyone else concerned in the transaction. They are admittedly corrupt, and I think some gentlemen are apt to assume that, whereas Murphy, one of the guilty parties, is as black as the devil, all the others are almost as white as angels. We will weigh the credibility of the respective parties in that firm when we come to consider the different points hereafter, but I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that, during the very period of time when the production of the cheques of that firm could have shown who was lying or who was telling the truth with respect to the moneys paid to Sir Hector Langevin and the money paid for Sir Hector Langevin's election, the cheques of Larkin, Connolly & Co. were missing. There was not a man in the Committee who believed a word that Nicholas Connolly spoke in reference to these transactions. There was not a man there but knew that Nicholas Connolly deliberately stated what was untrue, and the book-keeper of these parties swore that he believed the cheques were brought up here and put in the Committee room, and if they had been produced they would have shown who was telling the truth and who was telling a falsehood, but most extraordinarily, when we come to look for the cheques for six or seven months, those cheques have mysteriously disappeared, and the Committee are without the benefit of that evidence. So we find that the books of the firm have been scraped or erased in order to destroy, as the book-keeper honestly admits, the incriminating testimony, and, further, we have the fact that either Michael Connolly or Nicholas Connolly endeavoured to spirit the book-keeper away and he was only brought back because one of the counsel stated that, if he was not brought back, he would throw up his brief. Yet, in face of all these facts, there are men who do not scruple to say that they will believe Michael and Nicholas Connolly rather than Murphy. I am not going to detain the House on this point. I am going to plunge *in medias res*; but, first, let us see what relations these parties bear to one another. We have the Minister of Public Works charged with complicity with these frauds. We have the member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) charged as one of the chief conspirators, and we have the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., admitted on

all sides to be conspirators. What relation do these persons bear to one another? It has been proved, that as far back as 1876 or 1877, Sir Hector Langevin and Mr. Thomas McGreevy were united together as bosom friends, that at that time Mr. Thomas McGreevy advanced Sir Hector Langevin $10,000 to pay some election expenses and that up to this day that amount is still due, the notes having been renewed every two or three months, and to that extent Sir Hector Langevin is obligated to Thomas McGreevy for the last 12 or 14 years. You can draw what conclusions you like from that. You find that Thomas McGreevy was his bosom friend, lived in his house at Ottawa, dined at his own table, and had his private desk in Sir Hector Langevin's private room in the Parliament buildings. You find that, like David and Jonathan, their souls were knit together, that there was nothing that one knew that the other did not appear to know, and that the very papers that Thomas McGreevy says he lost, were stated by him in the first instance, before he thought the matter over and consulted other people, to have been taken out of the private room of Sir Hector Langevin. It is necessary to know these facts and to bear them in mind when considering the weight to be attached to different pieces of evidence as you go along. If Thomas McGreevy, the bosom friend and intimate companion of Sir Hector Langevin, the man who lives in his house, who dines at his table, who lives with him day and night, occupies his private rooms—if he writes letters contemporaneous with the facts saying such and such things are going to occur, why, there is much more reason to believe that he has knowledge whereof he writes than if a stranger was writing with respect to them. But when you come to estimate the degree of weight to be given to Thomas McGreevy's letters, mind you, not letters written years afterwards, but letters written contemporaneously with the facts to which they relate, and if you want to give an honest judgment you must not eliminate from your mind the fact that Thomas McGreevy and the man to whom he was writing were the closest bosom friends. Sir, they both knew Murphy well. It is now said that Murphy was a scallawag, that his past history was one of which no man need be proud, and that no weight should be attached to his statements, because he admitted himself that in the City of New York he had been guilty of conduct somewhat similar to that which he admits to have been guilty of here. That may be so, but there is this to be said, that from beginning to end of the evidence you will see that McGreevy, the Harbour Commissioners, and each individual member of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., treated Murphy with the utmost confidence, that he was the man to whom they entrusted the duty of carrying out their biggest schemes, their most secret designs, their most secret purposes; and that if he was not the head and front of the offending, he at least was the man upon whom they all relied as the one who was capable and able to carry out their schemes. Sir, if you take, for instance, the Lévis graving dock, when the Harbour Commissioners wanted to determine whether they would give a supplementary contract, who did Thomas McGreevy recommend them to see? He told them to go out into the anteroom and see Murphy, and the whole deputation of Harbour Commissioners went out into the anteroom to see—whom? Why, the goal bird who is not to be believed now, but the man in whom at that time they had every confidence, and the record shows that the three commissioners appointed, Thomas McGreevy, Mr. Rae and some other gentleman, whose name I forget, adjourned to the anteroom, and after consulting with Murphy, returned and advised that the new contract be given. And I say you will find all through Larkin's correspondence with Murphy, that he had most implicit reliance upon him. You find Nicholas Connolly and Michael Connolly corresponding with Murphy and evidencing by their correspondence that he was the man upon whom they relied. And although you do not find letters from Sir Hector Langevin corresponding with Murphy, I think I will be able to show to the House evidence so clear and so conclusive that there can be no reasonable doubt that he knew of this entire conspiracy and was a direct party to it. Now, Sir, let us go on into the facts. We find that these parties had contracts to the amount of $3,000,000; we find that they divided as profits about $1,000,000; and we find that they dispensed in bribery about $170,000. The question is here right at the threshold—between what parties are you to apportion the responsibility, and how far is the Minister of Public Works responsible? Well, let us get down to that argument. A distinction has been attempted to be drawn between the contracts carried out by the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, and the contracts carried out for the construction of the Esquimalt dock, on the ground that the Quebec Harbour Commissioners were a buffer between the Minister and the public, and that he was authorized and justified in depending upon an authority constituted as they were, and authorized as they were, by Parliament—that he was justified in depending upon them and in assuming their honesty and in relying very largely upon their integrity. The argument at first sight, I admit, is a very strong one; but I propose, Mr. Speaker, to show you that the argument will not hold for this conclusive reason, that Parliament, not once, but twice, and three times, by its express statutory declaration, took the power and the responsibility from the Quebec Harbour Commissioners and vested them in explicit language upon the Minister of Public Works alone. Sir, I am not going to enquire to-day why Parliament did that; I am not going to spend time upon an enquiry as to the motives which prompted the Parliament of Canada to declare that the power to let the contract, and the power to spend the money, and the responsibility for the expenditure of every dollar, should be vested in the Minister of Public Works and not in the Quebec Legislature.

Mr. COATSWORTH. You cannot find that in the statutes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman says I cannot find it, and, therefore, if I cannot, to that extent he has the better of me, to that extent he is justified in the course he has taken. But when I read him the statutes I will expect him, as an honest man, to rise in his place and say that he was wrong. Sir, I will call attention, in the first place, to the statute of 1875, because I think this is an important point, and the hon. gentleman evidently thinks so by his interruption. Before the statute of 1875 was passed, the Harbour Commissioners were an independent board, the Govern-

ment had not a controlling power over them, the Government could not nominate a majority. But in 1875, a statute was passed altering that, and vesting the power in the Government of appointing a majority of the board, so that the Government should have a controlling power and influence upon the Quebec Harbour Commissioners. In 1875, another statute was passed which declared as follows :—

"The Minister of Finance shall not pay to the Quebec Harbour Corporation any moneys under this Act until the location and dimensions of the graving dock and the location, plans and specifications, and proposed contract for the construction thereof, shall have been approved by the Governor in Council, upon the joint report and recommendation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and of the Minister of Public Works, and any moneys to be hereunder paid to the Quebec Harbour Corporation shall be so paid from time to time as the work proceeds, upon the report of the Minister of Public Works that such progress is satisfactory."

Mr. COATSWORTH. That is only as to the Lévis graving dock ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes ; and to that extent the hon. gentleman acknowledges he is entirely wrong.

Mr. COATSWORTH. No ; I read that myself, I read it to the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then I only wish the hon. gentleman could have read it intelligently.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I read it distinctly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not concerned to bandy words with him. I am not arguing the case with him, I am arguing the case with the House, and I want to ask whether I have not proved my point to that extent.

Mr. COATSWORTH. That is the point I proved.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then I take up the Act of 1887 which authorized the expenditure of $1,250,000. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has read that Act or not ; but if he has read it, he will have found that the Minister of Public Works was to pay out that money to the Harbour Commissioners in the same form and on the same conditions as are expressed in the Act I have read. The Act said :

"The Governor in Council may advance from time to time to the corporation of the Quebec Harbour Commission, such sum or such sums of money, not exceeding in the whole $160,000, as may be required to enable them to complete the graving dock now in course of construction at Quebec harbour; and also, a further sum not exceeding in the whole $1,100,000, to enable them to complete improvements in the harbour ; such sum or sums to be in addition to the sums already authorized to be advanced to them for the same purpose, and to be received as advances by the said corporation in the same way and on the same terms and on the same conditions, and subject to like provisions as the appropriations for increased draught of vessels, &c., and to pay for the interest as is enacted in the Act passed during 38 Victoria (which Act I have just now read.)"

So the hon. gentleman and the House will see, and I want to enforce the point on those who believe, and honestly believe, that a broad distinction should be made between works under the direct supervision of the Minister and those executed through the superintendence of and supervision of the Harbour Commission, that Parliament had expressly charged upon the Minister of Public Works not only the responsibility of the expenditure of the money, but in so many words it declared that he should see from time to time how the money was expended and should report himself satisfied with the work before he paid out any more dollars. If that is true, we will now come to the contracts themselves. The first contract we meet is the contract of 1882, a contract for the dredging of the Quebec harbour works, the tidal dock at Quebec. Both the reports concur that Thomas McGreevy knew of his brother's interest in that contract when it was acquired. Both reports, therefore, condemned the member for Quebec West in that respect. We need not waste any more time on it ; I assume the House is unanimous on the point. But the minority report declared that he used his influence to get Larkin, Connolly & Co. the contract. The majority report says there is no evidence of any interference or the exercise of influence by Thomas McGreevy. So in regard to this small contract of 1882, the two reports differ to that extent only. On what evidence did my hon. friend the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and myself report in our opinion Thomas McGreevy used his influence to get that contract ? Hon. gentlemen will remember that the contract was let as far back as 1882, and they will remember that, when tenders were first called for it, two tenders were received, and that Larkin, Connolly & Co. did not tender at that time, because, as Murphy swears, they were told by Thomas McGreevy not to show their hand, that the contract would not be let on those tenders, that they were bogus. What is the fact ? The contract was not let ; the tenders were cast to one side ; Larkin, Connolly & Co. did not show their hand, and new tenders were called for. Everything transpired just as Murphy was told by Thomas McGreevy would be the case. Then, we find that Askwith's tender—I will not say anything about Fradette & Miller's tender, because there is evidence to justify that tender being put to one side, as the engineer said he thought the tender was too low—is by many thousands the lowest tender. Why did he not get the contract ? The contract was formally awarded to him, and he was asked to come in and complete and sign. He said : This is a very large contract, and I am not quite sure whether the dredges I have in view are as good for tidal water as they are on the lakes ; and the commissioners said they wanted security from him, an additional sum of $10,000, and he would have to put it up within 24 hours. The man very naturally said : Give me time, a few days only, only a fortnight, to see whether those dredges I have in view on the lakes will do for the tidal waters. The answer of the Harbour Commission, of which Thomas McGreevy was a member and the controlling spirit, was : Close up within 24 hours or withdraw. The man said : I cannot do it. And he withdrew. They forced him out ; and then Larkin, Connolly & Co. came in. What about the 24 hours ? They had no dredges. They did not pretend to have any. They were not required to close up within 24 hours or within 24 days. They had time to the following spring to begin operations, and that was in August. They had 10 months to do what was denied a fortnight to the other man. Their contract was very much higher ; but they got the time and the contract. They built their dredges ; and I tell the hon. gentleman who spoke of the desire of the Harbour Commissioners to give the contract to men who were qualified to fill it, that at that time when their contract was put in and Askwith afterwards forced out, Larkin, Connolly & Co. had not

one dredge in Canada. They had to build them that winter. They got 12 months' time and they began work next spring. That contract was a reasonably good one, it paid fairly well. Although only entered into for one year, 1883, it was continued during 1884-85-86 without new tenders being called for. They made very reasonable sums out of it, as I will show directly. What is the next item of proof we possess? While this contract was being carried on from year to year, beyond the time when the contract expired, the money ran out. But were they to be stopped from making money, because the money ran out? Not at all. An arrangement was come to, between whom? Between Thomas McGreevy and Sir Hector Langevin, and we have it in black and white, in an official letter written from the Public Works Department, in which Sir Hector Langevin agreed, although no money had been voted by Parliament, with Thomas McGreevy for a further expenditure of $50,000, but the contractors were to take the chance of Parliament voting it, because he could not take it out of the treasury. Knowing that that would be perfectly safe, they went on with the work, and of course they got the money. Hon. gentlemen who desire to follow the testimony will find on page 974 the evidence and letter from which I am quoting. Many years afterwards this contract was called up. Mr. Boyd, the engineer, had deducted 5 cents per square yard on the quantity of dredging material they had deposited in the river instead of on the embankment, amounting to $16,000; and when Boyd was dead and gone, the Department of Public Works and the engineer turned round and gave the contractors back $16,107, to which they had no right whatever. Sir, I will tell you during that period of time these men made profits, as shown by the report of the accountants, amounting to $135,844. But it was not enough. The elections of 1887 were approaching and although profits to the amount I mentioned were made, Thomas McGreevy was not satisfied. Now, Sir, I will pass from this contract, reminding the House that the facts upon which my hon. friend and myself based our report were contained in the evidence of which I have given you a short summary, and I say there is no man who looks through that evidence who can doubt that our report is not fully and amply justified. We come now to the 35 cents dredging contract. How do the reports differ there? Both reports concur that Thomas McGreevy agreed in consideration of $25,000 to use his influence to obtain 35 cents per yard for 800,000 yards of dredging, or an increase of 8 cents per yard; in other words, Thomas McGreevy corruptly agreed—the Minister of Justice and my friend from Northumberland (Mr. Adams) and my friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) report that he corruptly agreed—in consideration of $64,000 to be stolen from the public treasury, to give Larkin, Connolly & Co. the contract if the contractors would give him $25,000 for political purposes. The country was to be robbed of $64,000 in order that a portion of the people might be debauched by the expenditure of $25,000. Sir, that is not the report of my hon. friend and myself, but that is the report of the Minister of Justice, and the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) and the member for Northumberland (Mr. Adams). Nobody can doubt that finding, and why? We were not depending upon the oral testimony of witnesses, or upon the weak memories of frail men, but we had the agreement down in black and white, written by that paragon of perfection, Michael Connolly. If Murphy had written it, it would not have been believed, perhaps; not even Nick; it was Michael wrote it, the man who was ashamed to go on the stand and give his evidence. There it was, in black and white, signed by Larkin, Connolly & Co., that corrupt agreement sworn by Murphy and Robert McGreevy to have been carried, after being written by Michael, and shown to Thomas McGreevy, who said it was satisfactory. And so both sides cannot help but agree in the face of the oral testimony and the written document that the corrupt agreement was proved. Now, Sir, wherein do the reports differ? The majority report says substantially:

"There is no evidence that Thomas McGreevy used his influence with the Department of Public Works in connection with the making of this contract. The contract was not let by the Department of Public Works but by the Harbour Commissioners, and it appears that the department had nothing to do with the contract. Mr. Perley was connected with it only as engineer of the Harbour Commissioners.

"The only evidence of the use of influence upon Mr. Perley, as the chief engineer of the Harbour Commissioners, is that constituted by the inference arising from Thomas McGreevy's letters."

The minority report says substantially:

"That McGreevy successfully used his influence to procure the contract for them without calling for any tenders.

"That under the contract enormous sums of public moneys were paid to Larkin, Connolly & Co., beyond what the work was worth, and beyond the actual quantities dredged by them.

"That Mr. Perley had received from the contractors jewellery and diamonds on the 9th of January, 1887, to the value of $1,885, which were intended as a bribe to improperly influence his conduct as chief engineer of the Department of Public Works, and as engineer of the Quebec Harbour Commission, and that the facts connected with the letting of the contract and its subsequent execution were known to Sir Hector Langevin, the Minister of Public Works, and that the frauds were perpetrated at least with his passive connivance."

These are very serious findings, and we will see how far the evidence justified us in making them. The first finding is that Thomas McGreevy successfully used his influence in the premises. Did he do so? I will ask any hon. gentleman to turn to the evidence which is published on page 11 of our report and he will find that Thomas McGreevy stands on record as having written what to my mind—I do not know how it would strike other hon. gentlemen—is almost conclusive evidence; that is contemporaneous letters written by Thomas McGreevy at a time when he had no object to state anything falsely, and reciting what the facts are. He is writing to his brother, he could not have any prévision that ten years afterwards this matter would be brought before a parliamentary committee. He was quite satisfied that it was all to be kept quiet and he writes to his brother in April that he has just seen Perley on the dredging. Before I read his letters let me say that Murphy swears:

"I met Thomas McGreevy and I bargained with him that if he would give us the contract for 35 cents a yard instead of the 27 cents we are getting paid for dredging, we would pay him $25,000."

Eight cents per yard extra for 800,000 yards gave $64,000 extra and they were only going to pay $25,000 of that for corruption, and so they could well afford it. Thomas McGreevy in pursuance of the contract which Murphy alleges, comes to

Ottawa, sees the Department of Public Works, sees Perley, and writes :

"My Dear Robert,—I have just seen Perley on dredging. I think he will report on 35 cents and put in some conditions which will amount to nothing. He will report when I will be there."

Now, is that true? He succeeded. A few days afterwards you find Mr. Perley writing down to these gentlemen, asking them if they want to take the contract for dredging in the harbour and at what rate, and the day after Perley writes his letter, you find Larkin, Connolly & Co. accepting his offer for 35 cents a yard ; the exact sum previously and corruptly agreed upon, and stating :

"That the difficulties are greater than we had to contend with during the progress of our previous dredging, inasmuch as the passage is narrower, the currents stronger, and the distance to the place of deposit further."

Now, Sir, every one of these statements are false and are proved to be false by the evidence of Charles McGreevy, of Peters, of the engineer Boswell and of Robert McGreevy, who swore positively that there was not a shadow of ground for any one of these statements. What were these false statements put in for ; to deceive Mr. Perley or Sir Hector Langevin? They could not do that, because the witnesses proved to you that Sir Hector gathered his knowledge on the ground that nobody knew as much as he did, that he was there frequently enquiring into the details, and Mr. Dobell swore that no man had such a knowledge of details as he had. These statements were not to deceive Sir Hector, they were to deceive Parliament in case Parliament asked for the papers. So, Sir, the contract was entered into, and what does it provide? They had been paid 27 cents for that same work and I have shown you they had made in the three years they had carried out the contract at that price over $100,000. It paid pretty well, but they got a new contract and it provided expressly that the contractors should place and level the dredging materials on the Louise Embankment or on some other locality belonging to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, or that might be thereafter required by them. So that they had to dredge this down to a depth of not more than fifteen feet and they had to put it in the Louise Embankment or some other work belonging to the Harbour Commissioners. They did put it in some other work ; they put it in the cross-wall. Sir, a number of witnesses swore that a quantity was put in the cross-wall which would give them over $50,000 in payment ; but Mr. Boswell came along and swore that the quantity only gave them $22,000 ; and my hon. friend and myself accepted the lowest statement ; and I stand here to-day to state that those gentlemen were paid in defiance of the express words of the contract, with the positive knowledge of the engineer, and with a knowledge on the part of the Minister which must be assumed—it cannot be otherwise, for he had the contract before him, ratified and approved of by him ; they were paid at the least $22,000 of cash for putting that dredged material in the cross-wall over and beyond the 35 cents. So they got 45 cents for putting it in and 35 cents for dredging it, and the sum paid was what I have stated. Now, Sir, how much did they make out of that? They made the $64,000 and the $22,000, stolen out of the treasury—I use that language, because I think it is justifiable—in all, $86,000. Now, it is important, vitally important, to determine whether Sir Hector Langevin knew or did not know of that. If he knew of that, I think, Sir, the case is closed. I am not going to ask Mr. Murphy. I assume that there are those who would perhaps not be prepared to accept his testimony ; I will not take it. I will not ask any of the contractors. I will not ask any of Sir Hector Langevin's political opponents. I will take his own friend and supporter, Mr. Dobell, and I will ask you what Mr. Dobell said as to Sir Hector's knowledge of these facts. I have never heard it suggested by anybody that Mr. Dobell was anxious to incriminate Sir Hector Langevin. I think my hon. friend beside me would rather be inclined to think that Mr. Dobell, within the limits of what was reasonable and honest, would be inclined to shield him. What does he say upon his examination? He was asked by my hon. friend Mr. Edgar :

Q. Then, during your membership, which has lasted from the first to the present time, you were not aware of any impropriety in the relationship between Mr. McGreevy and any person whatever, either contractor or persons in authority in connection with the work? A. No. I may state that I had no suspicion of anything wrong, except when the dredging contract was given, and then I protested. I did not like that dredging contract. It was forced upon us, and in a way I did not like.

Now, who forced it on the Harbour Commissioners? Will the hon. member for East Toronto or any other member tell me what Mr. Dobell meant? Who forced it? Who was the authority, the only authority, above and beyond the Harbour Commissioners? The Government of Canada acting through the Minister of Public Works. There is no other person to do it. The engineer was their servant—he could not force it ; the Minister was their master—he could. Mr. Dobell says it was forced on them.—

By the Chairman :

Q. What was your protest? A. That they should not be allowed to throw any more of the dredging material into the river, and I thought the price was far too much for the work performed. Large portions of the work were forced upon us time after time.

By Mr. Edgar :

Q. What dredging are you speaking of? A. The thirty-five cents contract. My suspicion was that this work was being forced upon us and that it was not done as we wanted it.

Q. Then you did not consider the way it was being done was in the interest of the trade of the place? A. Of the public; and I believed the dredging could have been done at far lower cost.

Q. State your reasons? A. We decided that we would have no more dredging done after the $100,000 contract was completed; still we found them going on with it. After the Commission, as a body, decided that no more material should be dumped in the river, and instructed the engineer to that effect, the engineer having told the contractors that no more dredging would take place, we still found the dredging continued, and we then claimed that they should not be paid for that dredging, but they were paid.

Now, who is this person or power or authority that defied the Harbour Commissioners and paid the contractors for dredging after the Harbour Commissioners stopped it? Can any hon. gentleman tell me? There is only one person—the Minister of Public Works. I am not going to abdicate my reason and my common sense because I am a judge for the moment. Why, Sir, we are told that we are to judge by evidence. So I am prepared to judge, but I want to bring an intelligent mind to bear on the evidence. I am not going to abdicate my common sense and my common knowledge, and in judging by evidence you must apply your common sense and common knowledge.—

By Mr. Mills (Bothwell):

Q. I understand you to say you yourselves were of opinion that 35 cents was altogether too high? A. For dumping it into the river. If they placed on the embankment and levelled it I don't know that it would be too high—I would not have raised a difficulty about it; but it was taking it out of the bank and throwing it into the river—taking what we had been protesting against for years and allowing it to be thrown into the river.

By Mr. Edgar:

Q. If you had been aware that they were going to be paid 45 cents a yard for the portion of this excavation which they put into the cross-wall, would you not have thought that 45 cents in place of 35 cents was somewhat of a high figure? A. I should not have approved of it.

Q. If you had known—as a matter of fact, I think I can tell I have been informed it will be proved here that out of the dredging under that contract which was paid for at the rate of 35 cents a yard these contractors filled in all the cross-wall and were paid over $79,620 for it—how would you have characterized such a thing? A. I leave it to every gentleman present to know.

I do not think anything stronger could have been put than that statement of Mr. Dobell.—

Q. But you were a party to giving the 35 cents contract, and you were unaware that they were going to be paid during that contract 45 cents a yard for part of this stuff they were taking out at the rate of 35 cents a yard? A. I stated distinctly the cross-wall section we had nothing to do with, but I should say, with everyone here, if we were paying 70 or 80 cents for what ought to be done at 35 we were paying too much.

With respect to Sir Hector Langevin's knowledge of these contracts and of the details of the work, Mr. Dobell testifies:

By Mr. Edgar:

"Q. From your acquaintance with Sir Hector during all this time you have been on the Harbour Commission, you consider that he was very careful about details, and looking after all matters himself, giving personal attention to them? A. I never knew a man that seemed to be able to take in every detail as completely as Sir Hector has been in these works, and he did not seem to neglect it. He seemed to be familiar with them all.

Q. He was perfectly *au fait* with all the details of the contract?—A. With everything.

By Mr. Amyot:

Q. So he must have known the dredging was paid at the rate of 35 cents and then 45 cents? A. I should say he must have known.

Now, Sir, Sir Hector Langevin, I will do him the justice to say, never posed before this country as a great statesman. I do not think the Statute-books show that he has ever placed upon them any great law reforming the body politic. I do not think he ever claimed to be an orator; I do not think he ever claimed to possess any particular knowledge of the routine of the public business of the House. I never heard him or anybody on his behalf make such a claim. But he did claim that over and above everything else he was a thorough administrator—not superficially attending to the policy of the department, but digging down to and carrying out the details. His cry and that of his friends was this: "I have no other claim; I am not a brilliant man; I cannot speak or move crowds as my rivals can; but I can administer a department; I know what is going on everywhere; I can see everything." And Mr. Dobell says it is all true; and he says that Sir Hector Langevin knew all about that 45 cents contract and all about the payment of the 35 cents besides. Well, Sir, that is not all. Then you have Mr. Valin's testimony, and I am not going to read the whole of it. The hon. gentleman charged in that portion of his remarks to which I took the strongest objection that my hon. friend and myself had wilfully misrepresented the facts.

I hurl the indecent and improper accusation back in his teeth. I tell the hon. gentleman that nothing but his ignorance can excuse him. He has not the excuse of having charged a man in the heat of debate with making a statement that he must know or may know to be untrue, but he charged two men with making a wilfully false representation in their report, and I am going to prove that his charge is false. He has charged two men, with the responsibilities of judges on their shoulders, with having made a wilfully false statement. I tell the hon. gentleman that the statement made in our report is literally and substantially proved to the letter, and I will prove it. What is the statement? It is with reference to Mr. Valin's testimony. I will read the testimony first, and then I will deal with the charge the hon. gentleman has made. On this very point, this crucial point, does the evidence show, beyond reasonable doubt, that Sir Hector Langevin knew or must have known of these frauds? What does Mr. Valin say? He is asked:

Q. Had you any connection or occasion to confer with the Minister of Public Works with reference to the dredging contract of 1882—the 35-cent contract? A. Yes; I spoke to him about that. He told me that from information he had received he believed the change—that is, from 27 to 35 cents—was desirable, that he had spoken of it to Mr. Thomas McGreevy, and he believed it was the best thing to do.

Now, I am going to repeat what is stated in the report, and that that statement is absolutely uncontradicted, not only uncontradicted but not commented upon even by Sir Hector Langevin. Sir, when we made the report, we quoted verbatim every word that Sir Hector Langevin said in his written defence with respect to this contract. More than that, we put in the report the only statement made by Mr. Valin, of the numerous statements he did make reflecting upon Sir Hector Langevin, which that hon. gentleman dared to deny. We gave him the benefit of everything; but we drew this conclusion: When an hon. gentleman occupying Sir Hector Langevin's position stands charged with a public crime, and a witness charges against him seven or eight specific points, and when, after having taken three weeks to consider that evidence, the incriminated Minister comes in and denies one, but remains silent with regard to the other six, I say that, as judges, we have to draw one irresistible conclusion, and that is, that if he could have denied the other six he would have done so. Why, that is common sense; and I challenge the hon. gentleman or anybody else to show that in his written statement presented to the Committee, three weeks after he had read over all that had been said against him, he gave expression to one word of denial with reference to Valin's testimony on that 35 cent contract which I have just quoted. We have embodied in our report the *ipsissima verba* of his denial. But the hon. gentleman says: Why did you not give his cross-examination? Because the cross-examination had no reference to the 35 cent contract. Does the hon. gentleman see the point? Let him turn to the page and a-half he read, and if he will show me one word of denial with reference to that point I am prepared to vote to modify the statement made in our report. Said the hon. gentleman: Why did you not quote the page and a half of matter which had no reference to the charge at all? He talked a good deal about a general statement Mr. Valin made, and gave us a long rigmarole about Mr. Valin's wanting to be a senator. What

had all that to do with this contract? What had it to do with the specific charge sworn to by Mr. Valin when he said:

"I consulted Sir Hector Langevin with reference to this particular change, and he told me he had consulted with Mr. Thomas McGreevy, that it was the best thing to do, and that I should do it."

Well, you may vote to declare Mr. Valin a gentleman who made false statements. I decline to do so. I propose to accept the sworn statements of these two men, coupled with the surrounding circumstances which not only give colour to their statements but convince me they are true. Now, I lay this down as a general proposition, which I will submit to anybody. I am repeating myself, it is true, but the point is so important that I cannot pass it over without repetition. There is that sworn specific statement: "I told Sir Hector Langevin about this particular thing, and he told me he had consulted with Mr. McGreevy and it was the best thing to do. And I went back and ratified it because Sir Hector told me to do so." Sir Hector Langevin is brought on the stand, and he does not dare to deny one word of this statement. Yet, Sir, you are asked to say that you do not believe it. Why? Is it because you believe that Mr. Valin perjured himself for nothing? Is it because you believe that, for no earthly object under Heaven, he came forward and made a wilfully false statement which Sir Hector Langevin dared not deny? And are you, when Sir Hector Langevin would not deny it, prepared to vote that Mr. Valin's sworn statement is not true? But, Sir, you will find that in addition to all that, in addition to the facts reiterated in the letters, Sir Hector Langevin, after that contract was entered into, came to Parliament and asked for this vote of $1,100,000 to pay these men for this new contract he had entered into, and explained to this House why he wanted that vote. Hon. gentlemen are asked to say, on their responsibility as members of this House, that the Minister of Public Works did not know what he was doing. I propose to leave that part of the case altogether; and I think I can make this statement to the House, that the evidence on which we base our findings in the report amply justify them. Now, we come to a very important branch of the case, to which I wish particularly to call the attention of those who desire to follow up the connection that Sir Hector Langevin must have had with these contractors. I refer to the Lévis graving dock; and I must say, in introducing that branch of the case, I can only express my regret that an hon. gentleman, representing such an important constituency as Toronto East (Mr. Coatsworth), should have made such a charge as he has made in this House against my hon. friend and myself with reference to our findings on the Lévis graving dock matter, findings based to a very large extent upon the words of the contract and the specifications attached to the contract, which the hon. gentleman himself had to admit he never to this day had read. Does the hon. gentleman say he has read the contract and the specifications? Because if he says so, I will have a more serious charge to bring against him than that of ignorance. The majority have reported with reference to this graving dock that there was an understanding between Mr. Thomas McGreevy and Mr. Murphy that the former was to receive a sum or sums from Larkin, Connolly & Co. in connection with this contract, and that, in pursuance of that understanding, he did receive an indefinite sum. That is quite true, but we go a little further. We report that Mr. McGreevy agreed with Larkin, Connolly & Co. to secure for them a contract to complete the Lévis graving dock on condition of his receiving all over $50,000, and he did procure it, and he did get the money, $22,000. So that we allege two things: We allege a corrupt agreement in the first place, and we allege the fulfilment of that corrupt agreement by the payment of $22,000 afterwards. Now, how do we prove that? Let us see what the profits were in connection with this contract. I am sure it must have been a matter of regret to the contractors that in this matter of the Lévis graving dock the profits were comparatively so much smaller than they were in other matters. Why, in this matter they only cleared $125,931—nothing at all—and the poor fellows had to pay out of that $22,000 to Mr. Thomas McGreevy to start with. We find further that the supplementary contract for $74,000 was given without any consideration—in other words, that it was a corrupt contract, a present of $74,000 given wickedly to these men for nothing, the contractors being bound by their original contract to do all the work they were bound to do by the supplemental one. There is one exception and one only, that I desire to make with respect to that want of consideration, and that is the caisson, $10,000. I take that out of the amount, leaving $64,000 which was agreed by Sir Hector Langevin and his commissioners to be paid to these people. There was not, with the exception of that caisson, the shadow of foundation for a consideration. It was a pure gift. It was a wicked steal. I cannot find language strong enough to condemn it. It is intolerable that the public works of this country and the public money of this country can be stolen and squandered in this way, and Parliament would have known nothing about it, if it had not been for my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Tarte), who made this charge. Not satisfied with taking this money, the minority of the Committee find that Sir Hector Langevin corruptly paid $50,000 for extras. The member for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) rose to-day in his place and told us we had wilfully put that in our report. I throw that back in his teeth as being born of ignorance or of some improper motive. If the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to read both reports he would not have found that my hon. friend and I would risk our reputations by any silly or unfounded insinuations. I hold in my hand the original contract for the construction of the graving dock entered into in 1878, a contract so thorough and so complete in all its details that, if he undertook to read it, as I have done, from page to page, he would find that nothing was omitted and that the interests of the people were conserved and preserved in every page. By that contract they bound themselves to construct that dock for $330,000, and that dock was to be 55 feet longer than the one they ultimately did construct. I tell the hon. gentleman that in that contract the responsibility for ascertaining the character of the foundation, whether it was sand, or clay, or rock, was explicitly placed upon the contractors, and, if language was capable of binding anybody to anything at all, the men who entered into that contract were bound to take the sole and entire responsibility for the foundations of that work.

The hon. gentleman had the temerity to say, quoting superficially from the remarks of some of the witnesses, that the plans had misled these men and they were deceived in that way. If he had gone further, as he was bound to do before making such charges, if he had gone to the contract itself which was before him in evidence, he would have found how silly and unfounded his charges were. This contract provided for a dock 500 feet in length and 55 feet in width. In page 2 of specification it says:

"Borings have been made over the site of the proposed works and indicate generally that the strata in which the works will be situated are sawdust, top-soil, clay and rock, as shown on the sections in the contract drawings. Should the various strata, on opening out, be found to vary in any degree whatever from the sections, or at any of the sections tend to produce false information as to the nature of any ground lying between them, whereby loss may be incurred by the contractor, the contractors shall have no claim whatsoever upon the Harbour Commissioners for any extras in respect thereof.

"The levels of the ground and the soundings beyond low water mark from which the sections are made are supposed to be correct, but the contractor is at full liberty and desired to take any other levels or soundings he may deem fit to test their accuracy, and he alone will be held liable for the consequence of any errors which may be discovered at any time after his tender has been accepted by the Harbour Commissioners."

And further on:

"The contractor is to examine the grounds, foreshores, banks, the bed of the river and borings, and fully satisfy himself as to the nature of the materials to be excavated or dredged, or on which any works are to be founded, before he fills up his rates or prices in the schedule affixed to this contract, for excavation and foundations situate in any position about the works, lands, foreshores, banks or bed of the river, &c."

And he is to take the sole responsibility. The hon. gentleman sees, therefore, that the agreement explicitly provided not only that the contractor was to take the borings and find what the foundations were, but if he made any mistake it was to be on his sole and entire responsibility, and so the contract which he, with a fine sense of satire, remarked was made under the regime of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and so, of course, might have allowed a loop-hole for corruption to creep in, was a contract complete in every respect. These men went on with their contract and were paid, up to and before entering into the supplemental contract, extras amounting to $40,000, and in addition to that they were paid the sum of $141,326 for their efforts to try and get a foundation at the entrance to the docks. But my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) and I have made no charge against the Department of Public Works with respect to those items. We thought they were wrong, but we did not want to raise any issue here as to whether that $141,000 was paid out rightly or wrongly, because, as we say in the report, we had not sufficient evidence to enable us to come to a right judgment, and it was the same in regard to the $40,000. It may be wrong, it may be rotten, but we made no finding, because we had not sufficient evidence on the subject. Now, I bring the hon. gentleman to what we did find after the $40,000 and the $141,000 had been paid out. After the foundation has been found and everything was right, then the devil entered into somebody's head, and a proposition was made that, if they would complete the contract within a year —a contract they were bound to complete already and in the completion of which they were five years behind—they would be given this $64,000. I have that supplemental contract in my hand, and I offer a challenge to the most astute member who has listened to that evidence to show one atom of consideration for the $64,000 in that supplemental contract. I charge, on my responsibility as a member of Parliament, that that $64,000 was a pure unmitigated steal, without any mitigating circumstances whatever. Now, that is a very strong statement to make. I would be a fool to make it if I was not sure of my ground. Hon. gentlemen opposite have heard the statement; if I am exaggerating they can throw me over. The hon. gentleman from Toronto triumphantly asks: How do you connect the Minister? Can the hon. gentleman have failed to read the evidence which is before his own eyes? If he takes up this contract which I hold in my hand he will find that Mr. Perley, the engineer of Sir Hector Langevin, reported in favour of giving that supplemental contract to the Minister, but the Minister did not accept his report. The Minister could not go before the Council with a bald report such as Perley had made to him, and the Minister, I allege—I do not want to put it too strong—deceived the Council and got that report adopted by giving them to understand that if it was adopted there would be no claim made for extras. Sir, I will read the report made by the Minister on which he induced the Governor in Council to pour out that money of the public. The Council ratified that contract on the 5th day of June, 1884, on a memorandum from the Minister of the same date, submitting that:

"The Harbour Commissioners of Quebec state that they have awarded, subject to approval, to the present contractors for the Lévis graving dock, a contract for the completion of that dock for the sum of $64,080, with the erection of a caisson for the sum of $10,000, it being understood that the new agreement does in no way prejudice the rights or claims of either party for the past up to date."

So far the Commissioners' report, so far Mr. Perley's report. Now, the Minister wanted to induce Council to accede, and reports further:

"The Minister recommends that the action of the Harbour Commissioners in this matter be approved on the conditions——"

And I want to ask special attention to this—

"—that the caisson shall be completed by the first of December next, that all risks and responsibilities be assumed by the contractors, and that the contractors shall make no claim for extras in the future."

Sir, the Council acceded to that. They did not read the old contract, they did not know they were paying $64,000. I am charitable enough to assume, without any consideration at all, and they approved of the Minister's report on the expressed stipulation that there should be no extras. Sir, let me invite the attention of the House to the sequel. The $64,000 was paid, and later on the hon. gentleman had the temerity to say that there were no extras charged. The hon. gentleman has heard me read that up to the date when the supplemental contract was entered into, the extras were $40,000. Now, let him do me the justice to follow me as, page by page, I point out to him his blunder, and then let him rise and apologize and withdraw. Sir, if he will turn to page 1173 of the revised evidence he will find in January, 1887, an estimate given by Perley, and passed on that date, in which the $331,000 for the original contract is allowed; the $40,000 of extras up to the time the supplemental contract is entered into is allowed;

the $141,000 for digging a foundation at the mouth of the dock is allowed; the $64,000 for the supplemental contract is allowed; the $10,000 for the caisson is allowed; and then the details of the $50,241 of extras which the hon. gentleman——

Mr. COATSWORTH, Give the dates?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman so absolutely stupid? Don't I tell him that I hold them in my hand; I hold in my hand the details of the $40,000 of extras up to the date the supplemental contract was entered into on the 23rd of June, 1884. The $50,000 were for further extras incurred after the supplemental contract of 1884. The date for each is not given. It does not matter, they were after that, between 1884 and 1887—$50,241. Sir, I am not reading just now the account which Connolly & Larkin presented; I will read it in a moment. I am reading now the account which Perley and the Minister sanctioned; I am reading the amount which was paid on that date.

Mr. DICKEY. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to give the page?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Page 1173 of the revised edition. Now, Sir, follow me a moment longer. On that date Mr. Perley reported in favour of paying that much. That made $640,000. They had already received $562,000, and he reported in favour of paying the balance of $77,000. But that was not the total claim of Larkin, Connolly & Co., because if you turn back to page 1171 you will see that they presented a claim embracing $110,000 for damages, for delay, if you please, for damages for their own delay in not completing their own contract. Because they had been behind four years, they presented a claim against the Government. It does seem ridiculous, but it is there in black and white, and in addition to that is the $35,000 for an additional foot in the depth of the dock. Well, Sir, what do you think transpired? Did Mr. Perley allow them the whole? Not at all; it was too much to swallow. They were allowed $640,000; they were allowed $50,000 for extras, but none of that $110,000 just now. You must wait a little while. In a little while the claim is pressed. Mr. Perley reports what that $110,000 consists of. Let the hon. gentleman turn to page 1166 and he will see the details of this claim. It consists of the salary of Mr. N. K. Connolly, salary of O. E. Murphy, salary of M. Connolly, salary of T. Hume, salary of bookkeeper, salary of T. H. Gallagher, salary of time keeper, salary of stable boys, salaries of two watchmen; interest on $90,000 capital, at 7 per cent., which they had invested; cost of maintenance of organization at Lévis, $11,350, making in all $27,500, or, multiplied by four years, $110,000. Mind you, they were engaged all this time. They had received $40,000 of extras, and the $141,000 for the amount they had spent at the mouth of the dock, the $50,000 for extras, and $64,000 for the supplemental contract, and they wanted $110,000 besides. Well, Mr. Perley reports a few months afterwards: I have considered the matter, and I do not think they ought to be allowed the whole amount, but I think if you paid them $30,000 they would take it in full. And, Sir, Larkin, Connolly & Co., finding their claim is admitted, that it is simply a question of amount, and that the principle is admitted that they are entitled to damages and the only question is the amount, said: We will not take it, we will go to arbitration. They go to arbitration. Arbitrators are appointed. After a time they seek to change their arbitrators. What does the Minister know about it? He is following the whole matter, and he interferes. On 28th March, 1888, Sir Hector writes that he objects to this change of arbitrators and he will not have it. He is following the matter closely. He is willing to pay the $30,000, but he is not willing to change the arbitrators. I only quote this to show what a close watch he is keeping on the proceedings. But he does not allow new arbitrators, and in a short time Mr. Perley comes in and writes another report. He thinks he will allow $35,000 in addition to the $30,000 previously recommended, and so they got $65,000 out of $110,000. I want to ask the House this question: At whose instance was that infamous claim presented to Parliament? Who was the man who suggested that that claim should be presented? Was it Mr. Perley? No. Was it the Harbour Commissioners, or any of them? No. Then who was it? It was Sir Hector Langevin himself. Sir Hector Langevin over his own signature, for the claim never was thought of, wrote a letter to Thomas McGreevy and suggested that those men, whom he had reported to Council could have no claim whatever for extras of any kind, should submit their claim to the Harbour Commissioners, and the Harbour Commissioners would report to the engineer. So this infamous claim to which I have referred was submitted at the instance of Sir Hector Langevin himself. Hon. gentlemen can find at page 17 of the report we submitted this letter signed by Sir Hector Langevin.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) It reads:

"OFFICE OF THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS, CANADA,
"OTTAWA, 20th September, 1886.

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—The contractors for the Lévis graving dock should ask a settlement of their account from the Harbour Commissioners, who will then most likely consult with their engineers. For the Esquimalt dock it is different, because the work there is altogether under my control.

"Yours very truly,
"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"HON. THOMAS MCGREEVY, M.P., Quebec."

What account? The hon. gentleman declared a short time before that these men should only have the supplementary contract on the express condition that they should not be allowed any extras whatever. The ink was hardly dry on the Minute of Council, to which the Minister of War was a party, before the other Minister wrote stating they should hand in their account. How did he know they had an account? How did he find out that these men who were not to have any extras, had a claim of $50,000 for extras, and one for $100,000 besides? So I charge that the Minister of Public Works was directly cognizant of this fraud, and we found he was guilty of violating his public trust, and that not only did he stand charged but that he had been proved guilty of high crimes and misdemeanours against this commonwealth. For a moment let me call attention to the cross-wall contract. I will not dwell much on that, because the matter has been very well brought to the attention of the House by the hon. gentleman who preceded me on this side. But those hon. gentlemen who will do me the honour to turn to the passages of the report dealing

with the matter will find that the majority report says:

"(1.) That in the year 1883 Larkin, Connolly & Co.' amongst others, tendered for the cross-wall, and that before tendering, and in order to secure the influence of Thomas McGreevy, they agreed to take into partnership with them Robert H. McGreevy, brother of Thomas, giving him thirty (30) per cent. interest in the work, and that this was done with the knowledge of Thomas McGreevy.

"(2.) That among the parties tendering were George Beaucage and John Gallagher. That with the knowledge of Thomas McGreevy the tenders of Larkin, Connolly & Co., of Beaucage, and Gallagher, were prepared by members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co.

"(3.) That while the tenders were being examined and quantities applied in the Department of Public Works, Thomas McGreevy obtained from the late John E. Boyd, an engineer in the Department of Public Works, information in relation to said tenders, which he communicated to Larkin, Connolly & Co., before the result of the application of quantities to the tenders was officially known.

"(4.) That to the knowledge of Thomas McGreevy, the tenders of Gallagher and Beaucage were lower than those of Larkin, Connolly & Co., but that Thomas McGreevy co-operated with O. E. Murphy and Robert McGreevy to secure the acceptance of the tender of Larkin, Connolly & Co.

"(5.) That in July, 1883, Thomas McGreevy received from the proceeds of certain notes for five thousand dollars each, made by the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and endorsed by Patrick Larkin and Owen E. Murphy and N. K. Connolly, respectively, the sum of $14,344.51."

The majority find those conclusions, and there they stop. I find no blame attached to any one. Substantially, although they do not say so, their findings result in this: there was a corrupt agreement, but no one was to blame. I charge on the hon. gentlemen who drew that report, that when they came to the crucial point, they failed in their courage, and had not the courage of their convictions. Who was to blame for this matter? The conclusion was inevitable. Some one robbed the public of, they say, $14,000; we say of $20,000. The amount does not matter much, as it is the principle we are talking of. Who did it? They do not say; we do say who did it. The minority report reads:

"That in consideration of offers of large sums of money by members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. the said Thomas McGreevy entered into agreement with the said Larkin, Connolly & Co., whereby, for the consideration of $25,000 to be paid to him, he agreed to secure the contract for the cross-wall for the said firm, notwithstanding they were not the lowest tenderers.

"We find also that the fact of Peters & Moore's tender being lower than that of Larkin, Connolly & Co. was well known to said Thomas McGreevy, and was communicated by him to the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. before their tender was accepted, and that in pursuance of the corrupt arrangement made between said McGreevy and the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., he, McGreevy, so manipulated and arranged matters in the Department of Public Works that the tender of Larkin, Connolly & Co. was falsely made to appear lower than any of Peters & Moore, and was accepted.

"We find also that the said McGreevy was paid by Larkin, Connolly & Co. the sum of $25,000.

"We find that the loss to the public treasury arising from the acceptance of Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s tender, instead of that of Peters & Moore, amounted to, at least, the sum of $69,860.96, and that, in addition to this loss, there was improvidently paid to Larkin, Connolly & Co. a sum of $22,412 for placing certain material they dredged from the wet basin in the cross-wall."

I want to know if the figures and conclusions in this report have been challenged. I have not heard them challenged. They are admitted as true so far, and I will pass them by without adducing any further proof and corroboration until their truth is denied, and then my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) who prepared this report with me will be prepared to substantiate their accuracy. The report further says:

"We find there must have been a conspiracy between McGreevy and some one or more of the engineers of the Department of Public Works to procure the contract for Larkin, Connolly & Co., and we find it difficult to absolve the Minister from a knowledge of the existence of that conspiracy.

"We find the Minister to have been guilty of a breach of public trust in permitting the double payment to be made for the dredging material used in filling the cross-wall."

Let us see what proof we have further of these statements. It is admitted on all sides that these tenders were put in in the interest of Larkin, Connolly & Co., tenders under the name of Gallagher, Beaucage, and Larkin, Connolly & Co. It is admitted they were opened at Quebec and forwarded to Ottawa. On that point I wish to call attention to the statute I read in the early part of my argument, which provided expressly that all matters should be taken out of the hands of the Harbour Commissioners, and the preparation of plans, the calling for tenders and the letting of contracts should be vested in the Minister of Public Works. I want to call attention at the threshold of the argument to the fact that allowing the Harbour Commissioners at Quebec to call for these tenders, and allowing these tenders to go before the Harbour Commissioners previous to their coming before the Public Works Department, was a direct breach of the law, for which the Minister is directly responsible. But what harm was there in it? The only harm was, that it was successfully used to get information for Thomas McGreevy and those associated with him, as to which was the lowest tender. Peters swore, and Murphy and Robert McGreevy also swore, that they gathered sufficient information at the time the tenders were opened at Quebec, and before they came to Ottawa, to know the relative position they held. That, I charge, was one of the objects sought by the Minister, when, in violation of the law, he allowed the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to call for the tenders. What have we more? Immediately it was learned that Mr. Peters' tender was lower than that of Larkin, Connolly & Co. Thomas McGreevy wrote advising them—I need not read the letter, as it is known to everyone—to stick to the tender submitted in Beaucage's name, which was lower than that in the name of Larkin, Connolly & Co. Thomas McGreevy came to Ottawa, and he obtained information from the Public Works Department how these tenders stood, and just now it is important for the Committee to determine how the tenders then actually stood and how they were made to stand after the operation which one witness denominated as "manipulation," and which Murphy denominated "as figuring up and figuring down." I will not quote the evidence recited by my hon. friend and myself in the report, but I will quote the conclusion we came to. You will find from the report of the engineers appointed in this matter that taking the plans which were produced in evidence, and which I may remark, in passing, were sworn to by the engineer, Boswell, by Nicholas K. Connolly, by Mr. Perley himself, to be the only and identical plan on which the tenders were made; and taking the quantities from these plans and applying to the quantities which have been taken from these plans the tenders made by the respective parties, we find the engineers report as follows:—

"By a comparison based on quantities of crib-work, concrete, stone ballast, sheet-piling and earth-filling, taken by us from the said original plan and specifications, we find the following result in these items alone:—

S. Peters & Moore	$281,009 00
Larkin, Connolly & Co.	369,971 70
G. Beaucage	389,871 00
J. Gallagher	405,346 32

"And this comparison carried out by the addition thereto of the items in schedule of quantities used in above comparisons, and not obtainable from plans and specifications, we find the position of the tenders to be :

S. Peters & Moore	$ 736,243 50
Larkin, Connolly & Co.	753,371 70
J. Gallagher	762,378 32
G. Beaucage	765,510 50

Now, leaving the plans and going to the records of the Public Works Department, and taking therefrom Mr. Boyd's private memorandum in his own handwriting, we find, Sir, and I will read in the words of the engineers themselves :

"A further comparison based on quantities in cribwork, masonry, concrete, stone ballast, pile-driving to any depth, &c., sheet-piling, and timber in piles, all as taken from the late Mr. Boyd's 'estimate book,' and evidently made up prior to changed form of entrance, and before cribs were built, or any considerable amount of work had been done (say in the spring of 1884), shows the following :—

S. Peters & Moore	$586,436 63
Larkin, Connolly & Co.	620,733 10
G. Beaucage	629,635 25
J. Gallagher	658,930 46

So that, figure it out as you may from the plans, from the specifications, from the plans plus the specifications, from Mr. Boyd's private estimate book, from every possible mode of making the estimate up, the engineers prove conclusively that Peters & Moore's tender was by many thousands of dollars the lowest. Sir, what became of it? Peters & More were not the lowest when the extensions were made out, and why? Because false extensions and false quantities were made out ; because the original document produced to us, which, on the 15th May, was first submitted to the Minister and added up by Perley with the items figured out, had false quantities put on it for the purpose of making the tender which was the highest to be apparently the lowest. A gross, wicked fraud of the worst kind was perpetrated in that. The evidence is absolute, the evidence is conclusive, and the report of the engineers appointed by the Committee says that, twist and turn it as you may, apply the final quantities when the work was finished to the tender prices as put in by these several parties, even then Peters & Moore are the lowest tenderers by thousands and tens of thousands of dollars. Sir, what was done then? These tenders were brought into the Minister. I want to call your attention to the fact that Peters & Moore figured them up from the information they got in Quebec, and had written to the Public Works Department stating that they were the lowest tenderers. I refer now to the letter to Mr. Baillairgé, published in the evidence at page 147. On the 5th day of May Mr. Peters, being aware that he was the lowest tenderer, writes to the Deputy Minister of Public Works that he is the lowest tenderer, and on the 16th of May the Deputy Minister writes to him and states : He has received his letter, that he has communicated that letter to the chief engineer, and that the schedule tenders have been handed to the Minister himself. Now, Sir, we have three facts there. We have the fact that Peters & Moore were the lowest tenderers, that, being the lowest, Peters communicated that to the department officially, that that communication was handed by the Deputy Minister to Mr. Perley, and that the schedule showing him not to be the lowest was handed the day after to the Minister, so that he had the whole facts before him. What did he do? Mr. Perley tells him that there is an apparent error in the three tenders put in by Larkin, Connolly & Co., and, contrary to custom, he writes to these parties to know what they are going to do about the error; and, of course, Thomas McGreevy is at hand, and anticipating the letter that the department is going to write, he advises his friend :

"Be sure to get a good plan and as quick as possible, in answer to a letter that Gallagher and Beaucage will receive about their tender, to bring them over Larkin, Connolly & Co."

Why, Sir, you might draw an indictment of twenty pages, you might draw a brief for counsel, and you could not put in a stronger evidence of conspiracy than is contained in these two lines. Here is an outsider addressing himself to the three tenderers ; and he says to Connolly : "You will get a letter from the department calling your attention to certain errors ; in the meantime, try and get a good plan by which you will put the tenders of these two parties above that of Larkin, Connolly & Co., so that you will get the tender at the highest price you have put in." There was a corrupt bargain, the good plan was secured, and these men sent in an amended tender, Gallagher having previously withdrawn, and I think Beaucage wrote saying that he meant $19 per foot where he had put in 19 cents. The result of all that manipulation, the result of this error, this palpable error as Perley called it, the result of putting in false quantities, and of getting the "good plan" which the conspirators agreed upon, was that Larkin, Connolly & Co. were made the lowest tenderers, whereas in point of fact they were the fourth from the lowest. Sir, you tell me that the Minister did not know that. Mr. Perley himself says that he took those tenders into the Minister on the 17th, before the letters were written, and that he wrote those letters, if not by the direct order, yet with the full knowledge and at the instance of the Minister.

Mr. DICKEY. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I). I will read the words exactly. On page 156 Mr. Perley says :

"He (Mr. Boyd) discovered the errors in three of the tenders, marking those errors on the margin of the schedule sheet. I believe it it in evidence : he called my attention thereto, and as it was my duty to do so, I laid that schedule sheet before the Minister of Public Works and discussed with him the errors that had been detected, and that unless those errors were cleared up in some way it was impossible to make a comparison between the three tenders which were incomplete and the two tenders that were complete. At that discussion I have no doubt no direction was required, but as it is the course I have always pursued in cases of tenders, and as I have done in many instances since—I won't say by direction of the Minister, but with the knowledge of the Minister—I wrote the three letters to the parties."

Now, I will ask my hon. friend this question : If a chief engineer takes such a sheet as this was into the Minister and tells him there are errors there, and it is impossible to make a comparison, and if, although he had not the direction of the Minister in so many words, he wrote the letters as the result of that interview, and with the knowledge of the Minister, is it going too far to say that it was at the Minister's instance?

Mr. DICKEY. It is going too far to say that was his testimony when it was not his testimony.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have read his testimony word for word :

"These letters, with my copies, went in to the Minister, and I altered in red, on the schedule sheet, the Beaucage tender."

The hon. gentleman acknowledges therefore that the letters were written as a result of the interview that Perley had with the Minister, with the Minister's knowledge, and after the department had been informed by Peters that he was the lowest tenderer. And further, the facts were fully within the knowledge of the Minister when he authorized the writing of those three letters which we now know were written for the fraudulent purpose of devising some plan by which the lowest tenderer should be made higher than that of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and they should appear to be the lowest. And Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s tender was figured down, just as that man Murphy—who seems to be corroborated in nearly every statement he made—says, in the first part of his evidence, had been agreed, and Mr McGreevy had told him, he did not know exactly what the plan was, but in some way or other one was to be figured down and the other was to be figured up. That was the homely way of putting it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him this question, for information ? I understand him to say that this tender of Simon Peters & Moore was, by the introduction of false quantities, made to appear the highest tender, and that that was done by Mr. Boyd. That does not appear from the Schedule A, at pages 1320 and 1321, which the engineers have attached to their report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said that Boyd's book was produced.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is in evidence that the extensions were made by Boyd.

Mr. McCARTHY. But I mean the figures. This extension appeared to be $643,000 for Simon Peters and $634,000 for Larkin, Connolly & Co.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is speaking of the totals. They were made by Perley. The original documents were produced, and Perley swore that these were in Mr. Boyd's writing, that the quantities were put in by Boyd, and the extensions made by him, and that he, Perley, merely added up the columns.

Mr. McCARTHY. What I wanted to know was whether the quantities here were put in the different tenders, or whether there has been an assumption of false quantites in order to make the quantities different.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They are figured out rightly in the private book of Boyd, which is in evidence.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not printed here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No; it is not printed. It contains a series of calculations which no one but an engineer could understand; but the engineers understood them and figured up from it. They took their plans, and said the quantities should be so-and-so from those plans, and they took Mr. Boyd's book, and it showed the same thing; but when we take the exhibit itself, we find that the figures are not what they should be. If they had been what they should have been, Peters & Moore's tender would be the lowest, whereas, because of the false quantities put in, they are made the highest on the crib-work, the earth-work, &c. There is no dispute about that; it is not denied by anybody; and the only vestige of argument offered by anybody was the feeble suggestion made by the engineers that it was incredible that these could be the plans at all. It is very well for the engineers to say: "We refuse to believe that these were the plans, because if they were a fraud was evidently committed." We, in this House, have nothing to do with the result; we have to do with the facts—and that these were the plans, St. George Boswell, the sub-engineer at Quebec, Mr. Perley, the chief engineer of the department, Nicholas K. Connolly and Mr. Verret all swear, and that there never were any other plans; these were the plans; and when you have contractor, chief engineer and secretary of the Harbour Commissioners all uniting on that one fact, and nobody denying it, I think we must accept it. Therefore, I say it stands here beyond contradiction, indisputable and undisputed, that there was a conspiracy to cheat the lowest tenderer out of his rights, that this conspiracy took the form of inserting false quantities in the extension sheet from which the relative positions of the tenderers was ascertained, and that was brought about at the instance of Mr. Thomas McGreevy, that Mr. Thomas McGreevy had conspired with some one in the department to do it, and had notified his *confrères* in Quebec in advance it was going to be done, and advised them to get a good plan to complete the corrupt bargain. That was done on the very same day, the 17th of May. The letters are there, and the letters from the department written to Gallagher, and Beaucage, and Larkin, Connolly & Co., on that very day. There is a concurrence of testimony so powerful and of such a character, being contemporaneous with the fraud itself, not based on the weak memory of man, that nobody can deny that a wicked conspiracy was devised and executed between the Public Works Department and Mr. McGreevy, and Larkin, Connolly & Co., whereby this fraud was carried out. As regards the payment of moneys, I do not think that is disputed. I am not going into that branch of the case, for I do not think this House is interested in determining whether Mr. Thomas McGreevy received $14,600 of the swag, as the majority report, or whether he received the $25,000. We believe he did. It does not matter whether one of the conspirators intercepted the other $10,000 or not. That is a matter of no public moment whatever. Murphy agreed to pay and McGreevy agreed to receive $25,000, and he got it; and although it is attempted to be said that a portion of it never was given to him, the vast preponderance of testimony is in favour of the contention that it was paid. I, at any rate, am not going to waste time on that point, and I just want to call the attention of the House to this fact, that we were very careful in our finding on this particular branch of the case, because, although there was very strong evidence to establish the direct interposition of the Minister, there was no written testimony catching him squarely, and therefore we merely reported that we found it difficult to absolve him from a knowledge of the facts. Our finding, therefore, is very moderate and reasonable. We find that owing to the circumstances it is difficult to absolve the Minister from a knowledge of the facts when this fraud was committed by his

bosom friend and by the chief engineer and the other engineer, right under his nose. It is alleged by an hon. gentleman in this debate, and I think it is insinuated in the majority report, that it is consistent with the evidence that Mr. Boyd may have carried out this fraud and that the Minister was innocent. Sir, such a thing might be possible; but in common justice to the dead, it is fair I should here state that there is not a scintilla of evidence, from beginning to end, to show that Mr. Boyd received a dollar of bribery money. There is not a scintilla of evidence to show that Mr. Boyd had any personal or pecuniary interest in being a party to this fraud, and although we find that he must have been, from the fact that his figures in the extension sheet differ from his figures in his private books, a party to the fraud, we do not go further than to say that he may have obeyed the orders of his chief or sought to please his chief, and that is the only excuse we can find for his course in the matter. He may have done as he was told. There is no evidence to prove that he was bribed to do wrong. I will go further, in justice to a man whose name has been blasted in this enquiry, Mr. Perley, and say that outside of the paltry $1,800 worth of jewellery which he took, there is no evidence to show that he received any money. Where did the fruits of this wrong-doing go? Who profited by the moneys stolen from the public? Into what coffers and for what purposes did they go and were they paid? Sir, there is a consensus of opinion that outside of the $15,000 or $20,000 which Mr. Thomas McGreevy paid for himself on the judgment of Cameron and somebody against him, the balance went to *Le Monde* newspaper, of which Sir Hector Langevin was the controlling power and to the party of which he was the head, and to further the political purposes of the party in Quebec over which he presided. Sir, in looking at these points and deciding as judges whether such a man is responsible and wholly responsible, you must go below the surface and see where is the motive for doing wrong. There was every motive for the Minister. There was money, there was place, there was continuance in power, there was patronage and political life. For him everything was at stake and he got it and won; while for Boyd and for Perley there was nothing but degradation, if discovered, and the retention of their offices if they obeyed their chief and were undiscovered. And now, Sir, a few words upon the Esquimalt dock contract, and on this branch of the case I will only ask for a few words, because it was admirably exposed by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) and by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron). But I may be permitted, very shortly, to call the attention of the House to one or two matters which, perhaps, were not put in the same light as that in which they struck me. What were the charges in respect of the Esquimalt dock contract? The charges were substantially that Robert McGreevy had 20 per cent. interest in it, that Thomas McGreevy agreed to help Larkin, Connolly & Co. to get the contract in the first instance and to procure for them profitable changes and extras afterwards, and that he did help by getting secret information, and received in consideration of his services large sums of money, and that Thomas McGreevy corruptly endeavoured to procure Bennett's dismissal. Those were substantially the charges made. What are the findings? The majority find that he did receive money, but that the amount is unknown, from Larkin, Connolly & Co. in remuneration of his services. To that extent both findings agree—that Thomas McGreevy received a large amount, an unknown amount, for his corrupt services, from Larkin, Connolly & Co. Then the majority find that he did endeavour to procure Bennett's dismissal. The evidence is there, in black and white, over his own signature, on that point, and we need not waste time in discussing it. He did his best to secure Bennett's dismissal, and he succeeded. As far as the Minister is concerned, he was prepared to dismiss Bennett. If anybody doubts this, let him read Williams' evidence—the evidence of the man who was to be appointed by Sir Hector Langevin in Bennett's place at Mc Greevy's instance, and who was not appointed because he went himself personally to Sir Hector Langevin and gave him private reasons why he could not go. The majority again find that the sole responsibility for the rebate of $19,876 rests with Perley, the Minister having been ignorant of it. Upon that finding, we, the minority, take distinct issue; and I rise here to-night for the purpose of proving, as I believe I can, that the Minister, and not Mr. Perley, is directly and primarily responsible for that steal of $19,000, that he personally had made a secret agreement with Larkin, Connolly & Co. to return them that money, and that the evidence of it is right here under our hands. The majority further report that they disapprove of the allowance in respect of the plant and re-coursing, but they do not say, in respect of the re-coursing, who is responsible. The hon. member for Toronto was prepared to defend everything. He found no fault with the re-coursing although the majority did. They do not say whom they blame, but they blame some party or parties unknown. The hon. member for Toronto, however, was prepared to hold that there was nobody responsible at all and that there was no harm done. What did the minority find? We found that all Mr. Tarte's charges were proved except the one relating to members of Parliament; that Mr. Thomas McGreevy received moneys from Larkin, Connolly & Co. to get the contract and changes made, and for his influence with the Minister of Public Works; that other large sums were corruptly paid out by Larkin, Connolly & Co., but the recipients were hidden, that Sir Hector Langevin had secretly assented to changes in the contract before it was entered on, which were subsequently made, the rebate of $19,000 being amongst them, and that the $32,000 paid for re-coursing was improperly paid, and that the Minister was responsible. That the Minister improperly agreed to lengthen the dock and substitute granite, but was unsuccessful in carrying out the first change, and afterwards revoked the second at the contractors' own instance. Sir, I say deliberately that the history of that dock, from beginning to end, if all the other evidence relating to the Quebec harbour works and the Lévis dock were out, is sufficient to prove the conspiracy between Larkin, Connolly & Co. and McGreevy, and further to prove that the Minister was as deep in the mud as McGreevy was in the mire. What do we find? We find that when the call was made for tenders, Starrs & O'Hanly and Baskerville & Co. tendered. Larkin & Connolly at that time were not in the race. On the

8th May it will be found that Baskerville & Co. wrote a letter at Perley's suggestion agreeing to make a certain change in their tender, on which change Sir Hector agreed to give them the contract, if they would dispense with the use of concrete and brick backing, and substitute solid masonry. They wrote the letter, and Perley wrote that Sir Hector had agreed to give them the contract, and that they were to hold themselves in readiness to take the contract. The next day Perley makes a formal report in favour of their getting that contract, because the amount to which their tender had been reduced, $362,000, is, as he states, "a fair value of the work to be done to complete the dock." On the next morning Sir Hector Langevin goes to Quebec. When leaving Ottawa he had agreed to give the contract to Baskerville & Co., and his chief engineer had reported in favour of it. When he got to Quebec, Murphy met him, and, if Murphy is to be believed, he offered to give him 25 per cent. on a certain amount of money if they got the contract. Murphy swears, and Sir Hector does not deny, that Sir Hector said at first he did not see how he could do it, but, after talking the matter over, Sir Hector thought he had better readvertise and he came back to Ottawa, and in spite of the influence brought to bear on him by Baskerville's brother and in spite of the promise he had made to give Baskerville the contract before going to Quebec, he re-advertised. There is the first evidence that Sir Hector Langevin intended to do anything wrong to the public, and I say that Murphy's evidence as to that point stands uncontradicted as far as I can see, and all the surrounding circumstances and the results confirm the statement of Mr. Murphy. The Minister advertises and throws over Baskerville & Co. and just at that time, when Larkin, Connolly & Co. are appearing for the first time, their co-conspirator, Thomas McGreevy, writes to Perley asking for information. Perley sent him the information in a letter dated the 11th September, 1884:

"My Dear Mr. McGreevy,—Your private note of the 9th to hand, and in reply I send you herewith a copy of the specification of the graving dock, British Columbia, two copies of tender, and sheets showing the quantities of work to be done to complete the work, these quantities having been computed by the resident engineer in British Columbia."

Giving away information to these people which never ought to have been given outside of the department, and giving them information which no other party had. Murphy swears that they took this information, and that with this information obtained in this corrupt way, they figured out and sent in their tender. What were the results? There were two tenders—the tender of Starrs & O'Hanly at $338,945, and the tender of Larkin, Connolly & Co. at $374,559. Why did not Starrs & O'Hanly get the contract? The story was well told last night by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron), and I cannot improve upon it. Starrs was sent for, not by Perley or by any subordinate, but by Sir Hector himself, and he was frightened out of the contract. The Minister told him that there were to be no extras, that there was to be no rebate on the $50,000 to be charged for government plant, and in fact he could not make a dollar, and he was begged to give it up; and when he asked how he could get his cheque back, he was told to write a false letter, to tell a lie, to say he had made a mistake in his tender and he went to his partner, and said, as he was going out: "Sir Hector, I see you do not intend to give me the contract and therefore I will withdraw." Sir Hector's reply, and the evidence that he made, and it has been uncontradicted, was: "Thank God, you have got rid of a great burden." Starrs withdrew his tender, and the very day he withdrew it, Sir Hector reports to Council that Starrs had withdrawn, Council having previously agreed to give the contract to Starrs, and then Larkin, Connolly & Co. get it. There was to be no rebate of the $50,000. Do not tell me that Sir Hector knew nothing about that. How do we report that Sir Hector knew? We have conclusive evidence to my mind that Sir Hector made a corrupt bargin with Larkin, Connolly & Co., that they should have the rebate though the contract said they should not. You ask what is the evidence. The first is Nicholas K. Connolly's letter to Larkin, dated 29th October, and to be found at page 32 of our report:

"Dear Sir,—You will see by the enclosed message that we are offered the Esquimalt graving dock. I cared nothing about tendering for the dock and scarcely expected to get it, but now we are offered it, and under the circumstances, I think it would be best to accept it, with the proviso that the changes we suggest are made and have been partially agreed between parties. They say there will be no security (cash) required by us. Our friends propose to arrange this; moreover, there is no money paid for securing contract."

How did Nicholas Connolly know on the 29th October that the changes had been partially agreed to between the parties? Nicholas was astonished that no money had to be paid. It was the first grand contract he ever got without being obliged to bribe somebody to get it for him and without paying money in advance. Now, I only want to quote that letter to show one point, that so far as Nicholas Connolly was concerned, he was aware that there had been an agreement partially come to between the parties that the changes should be made. What is the second piece of evidence? On page 798 of the evidence, we find in Mr. Larkin's examination, that he states:

"The following morning I went to Sir Hector Langevin's office. I drew his attention to the amount of material that we were called on to take over and pay $50,000 for. I told him that one-half of that stuff was no use to us. In reading it over any man accustomed to contracts could see at a glance that the stuff represented there was good for nothing at all. There were derricks, and those sort of things which are never used with us. When I mentioned the matter to him Sir Hector sent for Mr. Perley and Mr. Perley came in. We had some sharp words over the thing. I wanted a clause added to the contract that we should only pay for what material we could use. Mr. Perley would not consent to putting any such clause in."

He further stated that the reason he signed the contract was that he relied on Sir Hector's assurance that he would have the matter looked into, and he expected that the reduction would be made, but that Sir Hector did not say so. Now, everybody might say: That is not very strong testimony because it only amounts to this, that Larkin said: "I must have a deduction made, it is outrageous to charge me for this," and Sir Hector Langevin replied: "We will look into it." But is that the only evidence? I hold in my hands a copy of a letter written by Robert McGreevy at that time, from Ottawa, in which he states that a memorandum of these proposed changes had been submitted to the Minister and that the Minister had agreed to make the reduction. Mr. Speaker, this is not the memorandum of Robert McGreevy in the

year 1891; this is a letter written by Robert McGreevy in the year 1884, on the very day that the secret memorandum was handed to the Minister, containing the secret agreement whereby the Minister pledged himself to make that rebate to them. Just look at it. The hon. gentleman smiles. The statement was made in 1884. What earthly object had he in writing just then? He was writing to his partners. When you read the letter you will see that it bears evidence and contains statements which show it must be true. I will read it:

"My Dear Sir,—(Private). Memorandum of yesterday *re* British Columbia dock is with the Minister. He says that these conditions cannot be embodied in the contract as it will be the same one as submitted to O'Hanly & Starrs, and it would not do to make it different. But he says that all what is asked for is so fair that there will be no trouble in obtaining them, especially the $50,000 material one. However, you are to urge them just as if nothing had transpired. It is for you and your partners to say that you will sign without them being embodied in the contract. Politics changes, so does Ministers. I will be back Tuesday. My address will be St. Lawrence Hall."

Does any man doubt in the face of such contemporaneous evidence that the memorandum was handed to the Minister, that a secret agreement was come to that these changes would be made, that in order to deceive the public they were not to be put in the contract because they were to sign the same contract that Starrs & O'Hanly first had submitted to them; they were to go through the farce which Patrick Larkin went through in poor Perley's presence, of pressing all these changes and that the Minister was to refuse and to say that he would think them over, but that all the same they were to be granted in the long run. There, Sir, is evidence so strong that I say no reasonable man can doubt that all these changes which were subsequently made, were secretly and fraudulently agreed by the Minister to be made, and that memorandum was reduced to writing and handed to the Minister. We are asked to show the hand of the Minister subsequent to this. Why, Sir, I do not take the Minister to be a fool. He had made his agreement in writing, he had pledged his honour to these parties to make them a rebate, and he took mighty good care that his subordinates should carry out the contract. He even went so far as to refuse to Patrick Larkin to make any change. He says: Not a *t* shall be crossed, not an *i* dotted of that contract; you must sign the same contract that the others signed. But I can almost see the wink of his eye as he referred to the memorandum in his pocket that Larkin knew all about. He says to Larkin: You are to press for the changes the same as if this agreement was not made, and Larkin presses for them. I want to point out that when the matter is referred to Bennett, and when Bennett receives the claim from the contractors themselves, they only ask to have a rebate of $12,600 made them, whereas the Minister afterwards generously gives them $19,600, or $7,000 more than they asked. He is a good, kind, benevolent Minister, the kind of man with whom one would want to do business. Large sums of money are being dealt with. If $10,000, more or less, is wanted as a rebate in a contract by the contractor, the Minister gives it up. If $20,000 is wanted by the Minister for an election, it is handed over at once. If $10,000 is wanted at a pinch at Three Rivers it gets there through some unknown channel, nobody knows how. Mr. Lachance may deny that he got the money, but the money gets there all the same, and these contractors, so free with their money, are just the men to whom to make a generous and liberal allowance of $7,000 more than they asked for. Now, I ask these hon. gentlemen whether, with these three pieces of evidence, I have not proved direct personal knowledge on the part of the Minister of Public Works *quoad* that change and that rebate of $19,000. Now, we have the subsequent corrupt payment of $35,000 by the contractors. We find that these contractors, out of the moneys received by them for constructing the Esquimalt dock, paid $35,000 in bribery. Hon. gentlemen can turn to the report of the accountants and they will see the facts which we have transcribed in the report we have presented. Look at pages 32 and 33. Now, I want to ask the attention of the House so as to do justice to one man, to one conspirator. I am not going to justify or even palliate any portion of his conduct, but I noticed a disposition prevalent amongst many members who attended that Committee to throw the whole blame of the fraudulent expenditure upon Murphy. Sir, out of the $35,000 of bribery money paid out of the Esquimalt contract, Murphy handled only $2,000; the other $32,000 was handled and paid by the two leading conspirators, Nicholas and Michael Connolly. Fraud there was, bad enough; Murphy was as bad as the others, I acknowledge. But remember when you come to this contract you are not dealing with the evidence of a Murphy; you are not dealing with the payments made by Murphy, you are dealing with the written evidence of the cheques drawn by, and endorsed by, and the money drawn out of the bank by those two paragons of perfection, Nicholas and Michael Connolly, these twin brothers and angels of light, who shone so brightly during the investigation. Where did that money go? Two of those cheques for $5,000 each were drawn by Nicholas Connolly in his own handwriting, signed by himself, endorsed by himself, drawn out of the bank by himself. Murphy swears and Robert McGreevy swears that Connolly told them at the time he had sent it to Three Rivers to help Sir Hector's election. Martin P. Connolly, the clerk, swears he made an entry at the time from the conversation he overheard between Nicholas Murphy and McGreevy that $5,000 went to Three Rivers. Laforce Langevin swore that the Three Rivers election was on at the same time as he went to Connolly, and that he said he would like $5,000 or $10,000 for the election, as it was wanted. Further than that deponent saith not, for he says he did not get it and did not forward it. Nicholas drew the money. When asked: What did you do with that money, to whom did you pay it and for what purpose? Nicholas Connolly said: I do not remember. That will do very well as a story for the marines, but ordinary sailors will not believe it, and men of the world will not believe it. $10,000 were drawn in cheques of his own out of the bank, and Nicholas says he does not know the purpose for which they were paid. $5,000 of this amount of $35,000 was sworn by Robert McGreevy to have been paid by himself to Thomas McGreevy. $4,000 was paid by Nicholas Connolly to Thomas McGreevy. $10,000 was paid by Nicholas Connolly to Sir Hector Langevin's election at Three Rivers. Sir, we have the concurrent testimony of Robert McGreevy and Murphy and the written evidence and recollection

of Martin P. Connolly, combined with the two cheques drawn and endorsed by Nicholas, showing the money was drawn out at that time by him—and these facts place beyond reasonable doubt that Three Rivers is the spot where the money went, and it was the consideration of the corrupt agreement for the re-coursing of the dock and of the rebate allowed for plant of $19,000. Where is the other money? $2,000 of it was paid by N. K. Connolly, who said: I do not remember to whom I paid it. $3,000 was transferred from the Quebec harbour improvements, and $3,000 was drawn by Michael Connolly and paid by him, and $2,000 constituted the money which bought the jewellery for Perley. I desire to read quotations from the evidence at pages 348-49 given by Nicholas Connolly. I have no hesitation in saying that he swore falsely deliberately. I did not believe one word he said with respect to the payments of these moneys. If there is such a thing as indicting for perjury, that man should be prosecuted, and that is a pretty strong statement to make. What did he say? He gave evidence as follows:—

Q. Mr. Connolly, one question. Mr. Geoffrion placed in your hands two batches of notes, containing one for $25,000 and another for an amount of $22,000. and you endorsed personally one of the notes in each batch; he showed you the books with these two sums of $25,000 and $22,000, showing they were charged to expense account, and he showed you two trial balance sheets, one for Quebec harbour improvements, and the other for graving dock—these two amounts are charged respectively to expense account in each of these sheets; and he showed you your signature signing you approved of these trial balances, and of the audit, and that you found it correct. Do I understand you to tell the Committee you have no knowledge whatever where that $40,000 went? A. I have no personal knowledge of where it went.

Q. I don't ask your personal knowledge. Do I understand you to swear to the Committee that in the two years from March, 1883, to May, 1885—two years and two months—$47,000 were paid out, and that you signed the trial balances acknowledging it was paid out correctly? You had signed one of the notes in each batch, and do I understand you to swear you don't know where that money went? A. I don't know where it went. Mr. Larkin signed the trial balances first and I signed afterwards.

Q. Or for what purpose it was paid? A. No.

Q. Did nobody ever tell you? A. No.

That is simply an incredible statement. No one believed it at the time he made it, and no one believes it now. But he went further. He was asked with respect to the specific sums, and he said, as will be found on page 458, as follows:—

Q. In the evidence given before the sub-Committee, it was stated by Mr. Martin P. Connolly, your book-keeper, that on 3rd January, 1887, there was a Union Bank cheque made out to your order for $5,000, to be charged to dock. Can you tell me the purpose for which that cheque was drawn? A. No, I cannot.

Q. On the 4th of February, 1887, there were two cheques. The first was on the Union Bank to your order, B.C. division, $5,000. The other was British North America Bank cheque to your order, B.C. division, $5,000. Can you tell me what those cheques were for? A. No, I cannot.

Q. On the 3rd of March there was a cheque to your order for $5,280. Can you tell me what that was for? A. I cannot.

Q. On the 3rd of August, 1887, there was also a cheque to N. K. C. for $1,000. The book-keeper remarked: "The blank is there, because I did not have any explanation for what the money was for." Can you give an explanation? A. I cannot.

Q. On the 8th of August there is a cheque to N. K. Connolly for $4,000. Can you give any explanation about that? A. I cannot. My private cheques may show something about that.

Q. I am asked by a member of the Committee to ask you if you could give any explanation of the letters "E.W." which appear in the evidence at page 344? A. I do not know.

The Committee will remember that these were the initials to designate Robert McGreevy; he was called the "east wind."—

Q. In Exhibit "L3" page 346, on the 8th of March, 1888. "N. K. Connolly for amount of his private cheque for donation *re* B. C. as agreed, $2,000." Mr. M. P. Connolly explained: "It was agreed by the members of the firm that Mr. Connolly should get $2,000, which I suppose he had expended.' Did you state that you paid out this money with a private cheque and afterward got it returned to you, and do you swear you do not know for what purpose any of it was paid? A. I never had any such agreement with the firm.

Q. Do not escape me with the word "agreement." Did you pay that money out of your private cheque, and do you swear you do not know what it was paid for? A. I do not.

I think any judge in the world having a blank mind brought before him like this man's would dismiss his evidence altogether as being unworthy of credence, and he would look to the other parts of the evidence to find out where the other money went. If he found that $10,000 was drawn just before the election at Three Rivers, if he found that Murphy and Robert McGreevy swore that Connolly told them at the time he had sent it to Three Rivers, if he found that the book-keeper, Martin P. Connolly, had made an entry "Three Rivers" in the books at the time opposite the sum charged, because he heard these words when Nicholas Connolly and Murphy were talking about it and understood from the conversation the money had gone there, if, I say, he had this combination of evidence, coupled with the cheques proving the fact that the money had been drawn from the bank, he would have found it established conclusively that the money was drawn by Connolly, and paid at Three Rivers for Sir Hector Langevin. There are only two things to infer. That it was drawn by Connolly was admitted; and it was either stolen by him, or paid at Three Rivers. It was said at the time that it was to be paid at Three Rivers, and Sir Hector's son went and asked for money for the Three Rivers election, but he said he did not send it. The entry in the book made by Martin P. Connolly said it was sent to Three Rivers, and if all this evidence is to go for nothing, why we would stultify ourselves. Now, Sir, the changes in this contract are substituting one circular head for the double entrance which cost $17,025 and changing granite for sandstone. Although that latter change was not carried out, there is evidence which conclusively establishes the conspiracy which existed, and that Sir Hector Langevin was a party to it. The parties wanted granite substituted for sandstone, and they said that if that was done and the dock lengthened, they could give $50,000 for charitable purposes. McGreevy came to Ottawa, Perley reported in favour of it, the Minister went to Council and recommended it, and it was on the eve of being carried out, and the country would have been mulcted in $100,000 more, when suddenly there appeared upon the scene a messenger from Larkin, Connolly & Co. in hot haste, requesting that the change be not made: We want no change, see the Minister and have sandstone substituted again." Robert McGreevy rushes to Ottawa and the change which was agreed to by the Minister, substituting granite for sandstone was not made. In the words of the witness: they had a "close shave, they just caught the Council as it was ratifying the change from sandstone to granite," and at the instance of these parties it was brought back again. There was no

change in their interest or for their benefit that they had not the power to induce the Minister to make, and if this change had been carried out this country would have been mulcted in $100,000 more than it was. It was not carried out so far as the granite was concerned, because the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. discovered after the change had been agreed on, a quarry which would enable them to provide sandstone at a cheaper and more paying price, and then you had the lamentations of Jeremiah copied in the letters which Murphy wrote out to them and in which he stated: "What a false position you put your friends in before the Council; after they had agreed to changes and done everything, we had to rush up in hot haste and they had to make fools of themselves before the Council, by recalling the very changes we suggested." Was there ever such humiliation? The evidence is conclusive, and any one who wants to read it will find it in that report. There was another question about the lengthening of the dock and the Minister of Public Works was willing to do that. It was recommended by Sir Hector Langevin to Council, and it was only stopped because the Imperial Government said that the dock was long enough for all the ships in Her Majesty's navy, and they would contribute nothing more to it. Therefore, that change which would have involved this country in an enormous expenditure and which the Minister in his reckless prodigality was willing to make, provided the Imperial Government would contribute to it, was not carried out, and we have to thank the Imperial Government for it and no one else. Hon. gentlemen will recollect, Mr. Speaker, that there was a charge of personal corruption against Sir Hector Langevin, to the effect that he was paid $10,000 in cash by Murphy, and I have been troubled more in conscience over the finding I have made in that matter than over anything else. My hon. friend and I after a great deal of doubt, after weighing the evidence carefully *pro* and *con*, came to the conclusion that we ought to give the Minister the benefit of the doubt, and find a Scotch verdict of "not proven." We could not find "not guilty;" the evidence was too strong, but we were willing that a verdict of not proven should be rendered, and I doubt very much whether we are altogether wholly justified. Sir, the evidence upon that matter is very very strong. We find, in the first place, that Murphy swears explicitly that he did pay Sir Hector Langevin or give to him two sums of $5,000 in his own house. Murphy explicitly swears that he was not asked for it, he says no conversation took place further than three words: "a little present." Murphy says he did not make it as a payment, he simply left it there. Sir Hector Langevin goes to great pains in denying that he ever asked them for money; he goes to great pains in denying what Murphy never said, but when he comes to the point he says:

"I add that Mr. Murphy did not speak to me about money, gift or loan."

Murphy never says he did.—

"That he did not ever lend or pay me any sum of money."

My hon. friend and I, after a long deliberation, came to the conclusion that Sir Hector Langevin must have intended to deny that he received the money. He does not say he did not, but we think that is what he must have intended, and we gave him the benefit of the doubt, inasmuch as nobody else was present, and Murphy's evidence alone went against Sir Hector Langevin's. But there are these facts to be considered: The money was drawn out of the bank by Murphy, but it was not drawn out of the bank by Murphy on his own cheque or his own responsibility. It was drawn out of the bank by Murphy in conjunction with Nicholas K. Connolly, and Nicholas K. Connolly's own name is written on the cheques which drew the money out. The money was drawn out, and Murphy said: "I do not remember the day, the month, or the year, or the season of the year when I paid it, but if the cheques are turned up they will show the day and the season of the year, and I stand by the cheques." The counsel urged on him that there was no entry in the book, and Murphy urged strongly that there were entries in the book, and he would stand by them; and afterwards it transpired and is reported to us that the entries were there. The cheques were produced drawn by Murphy and endorsed "Nicholas K. Connolly," and entered in the books at the time. Murphy says he left the money on the desk for Sir Hector Langevin and Sir Hector says he did not. We cannot find a verdict of guilty on this, we cannot find not guilty, we simply report that we do not feel ourselves justified, owing to the contradiction in the evidence, in reporting that the charge was true. It remains so far not disproved, it remains not proved and we return the Scotch verdict of "not proven." Sir, I have spoken much longer than I intended to, but I have felt that being responsible in conjunction with my hon. friend, Mr. Mills (Bothwell), for this minority report, responsible for the important statements and findings it makes, responsible for a verdict which impeaches the second Minister of the Crown of high crimes and misdemeanours which will drag him down from his high place, disgrace his character and relegate him to the cool shades of private life for the rest of his natural existence; I felt it was due to myself, due to my friends, due to the House, due to my colleague, that so far as in me lay I should submit to the country, and to the House, the evidence on which I came to that conclusion. Sir, I never came to a conclusion more reluctantly than this one. I hope I will be credited with having some kindly feelings and instincts in my heart, and that my word will be accepted by all when I say that it was with feelings of regret and pain I was forced to bring in such a verdict against a man with whom I have sat for ten years in this House. We have nothing to fear from him. He was a doomed man politically whichever way we found; his race had been nearly run, and he could not be much of an obstacle to the Opposition any more. Sir, having sat ten years in the House with that gentleman my desire would naturally run in the direction of excusing him if I could excuse him consistently with the discharge of my stern duty. But I had a duty to discharge in conjunction with my hon. friend—almost a sworn duty; a duty as strong and as binding as if it had been a sworn duty; and from that duty I could not deviate, I could not swerve, even to save an hon. gentleman with whom I have been sitting in this House for the last ten years. Sir, I regret the findings very much, but they only go to show the corruption, the deep political degradation to which

this country of Canada has been reduced. Sir, no man takes up the leading newspapers published in the great centres of the world, whether in the United States or in the mother country, without feeling his cheeks tingle with the blush of shame as he reads his native country spoken of as a bye-word and a reproach among the nations; and if, with the evidence before us, convincing, damning evidence, we fail to find a proper verdict awarding punishment to wrong-doers irrespective of their station, if instead of condemning we condone, instead of punishing we palliate, we will rightly share in the common disgrace, and our names shall be held in deserved reproach among the people. I move that all after the word "that" be struck out, and the following substituted :—

That the report of the sub-committee, as submitted to the Committee by the Hon. Mr. Mills and the Hon. Mr. Davies, be adopted by the House.

Mr. DICKEY. In rising to discuss this case—I hope not at quite so great length as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies, P. E. I.) who has just sat down—though I do not blame him, in view of his intimate connection with the minority report, for taking up the time he did—I wish to premise that I do not intend to go at any length into the evidence on which the conclusions reached are based. I also wish to say that I speak only for myself. In a matter of such magnitude, with the evidence spread over some 1,500 pages, and involving a large number of distinct issues, it is impossible that a large number of persons can come to a conclusion which will, in all its details and in all its arguments, commend itself to the individual judgment of each person concerned in the decision; and, therefore, I do not consider myself bound by every argument and every word that is to be found in the majority report, although I propose to support it as a whole. Nor do I propose to be bound by the line of argument which any hon. gentleman on this side of the House may adopt in support of that report. My views are my own, and I do not wish anybody else to be bound by them. I am always glad to hear the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). He always speaks pleasantly, and it is always a great pleasure to hear him. I have seen him here, as Shakespeare says of man, playing many parts; I have heard him address the House in a great many characters; but I have had the pleasure to-night of hearing him in a new character, the character of an impartial judge; and I must say that the hon. gentleman in that character, coming to decide this question entirely upon the evidence, without political or other prejudice and addressing to the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) such remarks as he did during the first part of his speech, gives very little encouragement to his political friends to put him on the bench of his native province, where some of these days I hope he may be. I do not know how the hon. gentleman, on the bench of Prince Edward Island, would be regarded by his brother judges if he accused them, in consulting with them over a case, of ignorance, of malign motives, of making silly statements, of showing great temerity, of quoting superficially, of making statements that were silly and unfounded, of being absolutely stupid, and of making a speech that was full of blunders. I do not know how the hon. gentleman's brother judges would appreciate compliments like these coming from him in deciding an important case. The hon. gentleman, towards the close of his speech, said a great deal about the supreme importance of this case to at least one individual, and in fact he thinks to the whole country. And yet the hon. gentleman during the first part of his speech approached the decision of this momentous and important matter in the spirit which is indicated by those epithets which he thought proper to throw at the hon. member for East Toronto. Now, I am sorry that the hon. gentleman has left the House. He says that the majority report lacks in conviction. Well, I do not think that any hon. gentleman in this House who listened to the hon. member for Queen's just now will say that in this case he lacks any conviction. I think he is ready to convict on every possible charge and on every possible ground. I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman through the whole of his remarks; but I wish, in justice to my hon. friend from Toronto, to point out one or two instances in which he was right and my hon. friend from Queen's was wrong in those *ex cathedra* and self-sufficient statements that the hon. member made as to the state of the law upon this subject. The hon. member for Queens said that the hon. member for East Toronto ought to know that these expenditures were all by statute under the direction of the Minister of Public Works, and he stated that in the statute of 1873 the Government took power to appoint a majority of the Harbour Commissioners. I beg to say that the statute of 1873 prescribes nothing whatever of that sort.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). 1875.

Mr. DICKEY. Exactly; and therefore the hon. member for Queen's misquoted the statute, or else, as he charged against the hon member for East Toronto, he was speaking in ignorance or he had some malign intention of deceiving the House. It may be only a coincidence that the Conservative party was in power in 1873, and he wished to throw the responsibility of that Act upon them, whereas his party were in power in 1875, when the Act was passed. That may be only a coincidence. I can forgive any hon. gentleman in this House for making a misstatement because we cannot be infallible; but when an hon. gentleman gets up and talks about ignorance, and stupidity, and imputes motives to another hon. gentleman, it behooves him in the matter concerning which he professes to correct his opponent to show at least moderate accuracy in his own statements. As a matter of fact, the expenditures in connection with the Quebec harbour works were not required to be under the supervision of the Minister of Public Works, except with regard to the graving dock, only under the statutes of 1875 and 1887; and before the statute of 1887, all the expenditures which are here in controversy had been made and completed. Therefore, with regard to the dredging and cross-wall contract, over which the hon. member for Queen's has been so eloquent, there is not one word in the statute requiring the Minister of Public Works to report as to the progress of the work. Yet the hon. member for Queen's attacked my hon. friend from Toronto for having stated that, in his judgment, the law did not affect that result as to the whole of these works. So that, in his statement of the law, I submit the hon. member for Queen's is not altogether justified in taking the high and lofty tone he did towards my hon. friend from.

Toronto. I will follow him just a little further, and will speak of the dredging contract of 1882. I do not propose to discuss the details of the contracts made by the Quebec Harbour Commissioners. I take the ground that, with regard to this dredging contract of 1882, the Minister of Public Works had no legal duty thrown upon him, as that contract was made by the Harbour Commissioners themselves, on their own responsibility, and they alone must answer for it. I, therefore, transfer to the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec those strong and eloquent adjectives which the hon. gentleman from Queen's County used in characterizing this transaction when referring to the Askwith tender: and I say that whatever odium may be attached to getting rid of the Askwith tender, must be taken by the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec, aside from that part which Larkin, Connolly & Co. and McGreevy took in it, which is not now in issue. The hon. gentleman says there was $22,000 stolen, because the stuff dredged was put in the cross-wall and paid for. That is not in dispute here; but the hon. gentleman knows that that was done by the Harbour Commissioners themselves, and they are responsible. Now, the hon. gentleman talked also a good deal about his impartiality in making quotations, and he said he would prove out of the mouth of Mr. Dobell that Sir Hector Langevin forced the dredging contract on the commissioners.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, if he objects, but I would like to call his attention to the Act 47 Victoria, chapter 47, which relates to the cross-wall, and which provides that public tenders for the said work shall be called for, and the contract awarded by the Governor in Council, so that the contract to pay 45 cents per cubic yard for putting the dredged material into the cross-wall was a contract let by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. DICKEY. I am quite aware of that, but the hon. gentleman will see that it does not touch the point I am stating. Now, with regard to Mr. Dobell, the hon. member for Queen's said he would prove that Mr. Dobell said Sir Hector had forced this dredging contract upon the Harbour Commissioners, and he read to the House the statement in the minority report. I say most positively that, so far from making such a statement, Mr. Dobell distinctly negatived it, and it is extraordinary that in a report purporting to repeat the evidence upon this point, and the minority report need not have given the evidence, but have simply given the conclusion—only that part was given which, if not read in connection with what followed, might bear out the conclusion at which the minority arrives. The hon. gentleman who prepared this minority report did not quote the whole of the evidence, but only a small portion which suited him, in order that the balance might not go to the country in that connection, and thus lead members of this House, who are not familiar with all the evidence, to come to a conclusion not warranted by it. This is what the hon. member for Queen's quoted as establishing his proposition that Sir Hector Langevin forced the contract on the Harbour Commisioners. Mr. Dobell said:

"I may state that I had no suspicion of anything wrong except when the dredging contract was given, and then I protested. I did not like that dredging contract. It was forced upon us in a way I did not like."

The hon. gentleman, knowing all the evidence, as I assume he does, was content to give that piece out of the whole, and to base an argument upon that one statement, when he knew that a few pages further on Mr. Dobell explained that he did not mean that the contract was forced upon them, but that he meant that, in carrying out the contract after the $100,000 was spent, the contractors acted in spite of the Harbour Commissioners. On page 775, under cross-examination by Mr. Tarte, he gave the following evidence:—

Q. You told us that the dredging work of 1887 was forced upon you?—A. Not the contract, but that the dredging was exceeded and forced upon us continually, over and above the $100,000.—I don't know how much was expended—instead of confining it to that figure.

Q. By whom was it forced upon you? You are not ready to accuse the Department of Public Works?—A. No: I accuse the Government members on the commission.

The point I make here is, that the hon. member for Queen's stated to the House that Mr. Dobell complained that the contract was forced upon the commission, and he quoted a part of his evidence to induce this House to vote a censure upon Sir Hector Langevin, and to send him, as he expressed it, at the close of his address, to private life in disgrace. He sought to induce this House to do that without quoting the evidence further on, where Mr. Dobell, under oath, in the same examination, explained that he did not mean anything of the kind. Now the hon. gentleman also made use of Mr. Dobell's evidence to prove that Sir Hector Langevin was very careful: and I do not know of anything this House could have which could be more significant of the spirit in which the hon. gentleman approached this question, which is more significant even than these elegant epithets he addressed to my hon. friend from Toronto, than the use he made of the evidence of Mr. Dobell, in order to fasten a criminal knowledge of these transactions upon Sir Hector Langevin. To do this, the hon. member for Queen's quoted Mr. Dobell's opinion that Sir Hector was a very careful administrator and knew all the details. Now, even a Crown counsel before a jury, prosecuting in the public interest, would not demean himself by taking a piece of evidence relating to a criminal and trying to force a verdict on that portion, without giving the whole evidence relating to the point in question. I think the hon. member for Queen's would have done himself more credit if he had read the further evidence of Mr. Dobell. Mr. Dobell said:

"My experience of Sir Hector has been that no one could blow hot and cold with him. He has always appeared to me to be better up in the details of his department than any man I know."

Now, if the hon. gentleman had wished to act in a judicial spirit, I think he would have favoured the Committee with the question which led to that answer, and the whole answer. Mr. Langelier asked:

"Was it not considered by the Harbour Commissioners, as well as by the general public of Quebec, that Mr. McGreevy's influence with Sir Hector Langevin was paramount—that he could blow hot and cold, and do what he liked with the department?"

The answer is:

"I do not think so. My experience of Sir Hector has been that no one could blow hot and cold with him. He has always appeared to me to be better up in the details of his department than any man I know. He was always at us in regard to the tremendous cost of the works at Quebec, whether they were going to be useful, &c. His

anxiety was always, I believe, very great to keep the cost down."

That is a statement made by Mr. Dobell in the same deposition, and one or two pages away from the statement the hon. gentleman quoted, and I thought it might fairly be laid before the House. If he was going to attempt to fasten a criminal liability on Sir Hector Langevin, as to his capacity, by Mr. Dobell's opinion, he might have given Mr. Dobell's opinion on the subject, of which he could give a better opinion at the time than any body, and that is, in regard to Sir Hector's actions then, his endeavour to keep down the cost of the work and his anxiety that it should be useful. The hon. gentleman, rising to a high plane, says that, as a judge, looking at this garbled testimony, this testimony which he has picked out from Mr. Dobell and others, and has tacked together, he approaches the subject as a judge, and in that capacity is bound to find that Sir Hector is guilty. I do not know anything more calculated to edify the public, more calculated to elevate Canada and to remove the stigma which has been attached to Canada, than the picture of the hon. gentleman as a judge arraigning the Minister of Public Works on evidence he picked out in the manner I have described. I will follow the hon. gentleman further, by speaking very shortly of the Lévis graving dock. On that subject the hon. gentleman has elaborated in his report and in his speech to the House the tremendous difference between the cost of this work and the original estimate, and in order to fasten a criminal liability on the Minister of Public Works he has read the contract and said: "There is your bond." But my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) says that in 1880, whether rightly or wrongly, on the report of an engineer, that contract was set aside and the work was done by days' work. We are not trying Sir Hector Langevin for the administration of his department in 1880, and my hon. friend from Toronto proved that on the report of an engineer the original contract was found impracticable, and was set aside, and the Harbour Commissioners went on by days' work. It is clear that that was the work of the commission. It is proved by Mr. Dobell, and, I think, every other commissioner who was examined. But the hon. gentleman says the supplementary contract was a steal, and nothing but a steal; and how does he prove it? Because there was no consideration for it. Why, no consideration is one of the pleas that we attorneys sometimes put into a suit on a promissory note, when we have no other defence, and I can only suppose that the hon. gentleman is taking some such technical view as that. The consideration was the work that was done, and whatever was over and above that, and was stolen by the Murphys, the Connollys and Mr. McGreevy, is another thing. Up to the amount of the work done there was plenty of consideration for the contract. I call the attention of the House to this, that the papers on which the charge in regard to the graving dock is based were put in on the very last day that the Committee met. They were put in by Mr. Edgar in a very quiet way, and I do not say anything in regard to him; but I know that he looked over the papers, fished out some more information than the Committee had seen, and it is upon these papers unexplained that the hon. gentleman is asking for a verdict of the House. With regard to the rest of the evidence, it is quite different. As to the Lévis graving dock, we have not material enough to convict any one—the full evidence to justify us in convicting any man accused of the high crime and misdemeanour which is charged here. Would any hon. gentleman like to have a man convicted on testimony put in in the manner in which a great mass of this testimony was put in, without being submitted to the Committee, without being read, or without any opportunity for real investigation? With regard to the contract itself, it is perfectly clear that we have the information, because all the profits which it is claimed were made out of this transaction, amounting to $125,000, and the amount they received was $726,900, so that work cost them $601,000 according to their books. The hon. gentleman wants us to believe that that is the same work that they tendered for for the sum of $330,000. The thing is absurd on the face of it. It shows there were alterations, modifications and changes in the contract as the work went along, because in the face of that report Larkin, Connolly & Co. have performed $601,000 of hard work, and, therefore, that amount of work was done. The hon. gentleman says, no. But I am not discussing now whether it was right to allow the contract. That is not a criminal charge. The change was made from the original contract. We do not know why it was made, but it is quite clear that we have no evidence to enable us to come to an intelligent conclusion in regard to it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The change was shortening the dock 55 feet.

Mr. DICKEY. I will ask the hon. gentleman, when he addresses the House, to give us a full history of the changes made in the Lévis graving dock, and to give us the information in detail which will be sufficient to convict the Minister of Public Works on that point. Now, with regard to the cross-wall, there is no doubt that the department had the letting of that work. According to my reading of the statute, the department had both the advertising and the letting of the work. Now, I ask the House to consider the view taken by the hon. member for Queen's with regard to this work. The Minister, instead of advertising himself, as he should have done, or as he might have done under the statute, instead of advertising for tenders for the cross-wall, through some error sent that matter down to the Harbour Commissioners at Quebec, and the advertisements were made there, and the tenders were sent up here to be investigated. Now, what conclusion did the hon. member for Queen's draw from that? That hon. gentleman has got his mind into such an inflamed condition that the sending of the advertisements down to the Quebec commission at once struck him as an indication of some tremendously deep scheme. It would naturally strike one that if Sir Hector Langevin wanted to manipulate these tenders, if he wanted to commit some fraud to benefit Larkin, Connolly & Co., he would have advertised himself, he would have kept the whole matter under his own control. Instead of that, he sends the advertisements down to the Harbour Commission, and the member for Queen's thinks that the Minister did that in order that Thomas McGreevy might get information before the Harbour Commission. The hon. gentle-

man contends that Thomas McGreevy had such complete control of the Public Works that he could get any information he liked with regard to those tenders, and yet the hon. gentleman contends that the Minister sent these tenders down to Quebec to be advertised, in order that Mr. McGreevy might get information down there. I do not know in what respect information down there would be better than information here, if Mr. McGreevy could get it in both places. The fact of the matter is, that it was a mere accidental omission in the department, and it is just like a good many other points in this case which the hon. gentleman has contemplated so long that he has got into such a state that everything he sees which is a little out of the usual course becomes a matter of grave suspicion to his mind. With regard to the cross-wall tender, there is no evidence whatever to show that the Minister had any connection with the manipulation of the tenders. I was rather surprised, in considering the estimates made by Mr. Boyd as compared with the estimates made by the engineers who reported on this matter, that the hon. member for Queen's did not draw the attention of the House to the difference in the figures between these two tenders, an apparently irreconcilable difference. It seems to me that the difference has a very serious bearing on the question whether the engineers have found the right plans. The figures given by Boyd, with regard to the Larkin, Connolly & Co. tender for the cross-wall, were $637,000, and for the tender of Peters & Moore, $643,000. The figures that the engineers arrived at are $736,000 and $743,000. Therefore, it is doubtful if the engineers got the original plan right in their report which is reproduced in the report of the majority. It is quite clear that there is some enormous element of error which has not yet been discovered, as in comparing the quantities made by Boyd and those made by the expert engineers, to whom this matter was referred, it is a matter of indifference to Boyd what the gross amount was. Boyd had no interest in making Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s tender $637,000 as against $737,000. His interest was only as to the relative position of these tenders. But the House is fully seized of the engineers' report, which is copied in the report of the majority of the Committee. With all deference to the member for Queen's, I think that the engineers, whose statements he accepted on every other point, have given very good reasons for us to hesitate before we accept their figures as being final, so as to convict Boyd of fraud in manipulating the tenders. Now, a good deal has been said in regard to letters written by Perley to Beaucage, Gallagher, and Larkin & Co. Mr. Perley states that he did that in the ordinary course; that it was in the ordinary course of business, when an error such as that was found, to call the attention of the contractor to it. He assumes that the errors had been pointed out to the Minister, and that it was done with the Minister's knowledge, not by his direction. Every step in regard to that cross-wall matter is taken by the Minister on the report of his expert officer beneath him. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how the Minister of Public Works was to know which tender was the higher and which was the lower? They came into the department without any quantities applied. They were sent to his engineers to apply the quantities. But how was the Minister of Public Works to know which was the higher and which was the lower tender, unless he depended upon the report of his engineer? It has been suggested here that the Minister of Public Works went to Mr. Boyd and instructed him to make fraudulent quantities. Now, I do not know how that strikes the mind of hon. gentlemen opposite, but I must say that it seems to me a monstrous proposition that any Minister, with the responsibility of his office upon him, with the ordinary feeling of self-preservation belonging to every man having regard to his own character and his own dignity, should instruct an officer like Mr. Boyd to commit a fraud upon the public treasury. It seems to me you can imagine almost any sort of fraud that a man might commit to advance his own aims, always allowing reasonable regard for his own safety and for his own reputation. A man in ordinary life with ordinary reputation for respectability, if he is going to steal, surely will take some precaution with respect to the way he goes about it, and not adopt such a method as will proclaim his guilt and damn his reputation from the house-tops. It is preposterous to believe the statement that Sir Hector Langevin would have gone to Mr. Boyd, his inferior officer, and told him to fraudulently manipulate those tenders in the interest of Larkin, Connolly & Co. One thing is quite clear and that is, that Boyd gave Thomas McGreevy figures with respect to the tenders, and it was quite clear that the explanation given on behalf of Boyd will not justify his action. The excuse put forward is that he, being in the employ of the Harbour Commission, had a right to give the information to Thomas McGreevy, who was a member of that commission. But, unfortunately, Boyd was not appointed an officer of the commission until some months afterwards. The whole transaction is open to this conclusion that he was put on the Harbour Commission because he had done this, rather than that he did this because he was on the Harbour Commission. I wish to draw the attention of the House in regard to the cross-wall contract to a letter dated 25th May, printed on page 20, for I consider the expressions used are very significant. It reads:

"I believe no report will be made on any of them for this session or for the estimates only after the close. The tenders for cross-wall only arrived here yesterday and are locked up until Monday, when he will commence his calculation."

There is no person mentioned in that letter to show who Thomas McGreevy meant by "he;" and for myself it is very difficult to resist the inference that there was an understanding or a common knowledge between Thomas and Robert as to who was to extend those tenders or calculate those tenders, because Thomas McGreevy on arriving home wrote immediately to his brother that "he" will commence his calculation to-morrow—not Boyd or the engineer, but as if there was some understanding between them, "he" will commence the calculation to-morrow. Although the majority report does not say whether there was fraud in the manipulation of the tenders or not, whatever manipulating there was must certainly have been done by Boyd who made out the schedules and applied the quantities, and there is no evidence and no attempt on the part of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to connect the Minister of Public Works with it, except the statement that it having been

done in his department he must be regarded as having known it. I will now refer shortly to the Esquimalt graving dock, which was directly under the charge of the Minister of Public Works; and I desire to preface my remarks by stating that in carrying out a public work such as that, it seems to be almost impossible in the present state of engineering to have plans and specifications prepared in such a shape that there will not be extras. We know that even in building houses for ourselves it is almost impossible, even by employing the most expert architects, to finish the work without something turning up during construction that results in extras being charged. Hon. gentlemen opposite, therefore, are to some extent open to this charge, that they are using a feature that is common to all large contracts as if it were a feature particular to these contracts, and they are making a great deal out of it. There are extras in connection with this Esquimalt dock, and there are extras with regard to all these works. Some of these are excessive and were improperly obtained no doubt, but I wish to emphasize the fact that the mere fact of finding extras does not show anything wrong or irregular, and extras are certainly nothing uncommon in carrying out large works. The first irregularity refered to by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) with respect to the Esquimalt dock was the Baskerville and Starrs' tenders on the first advertising. The hon. gentleman complained that Baskerville being ready on 8th May to perform this work, Perley having told him the Minister would give him the contract, there was some indication of fraud in the circumstance that he did not get it. The facts on record are these; these tenders came in. That of Starrs was too low, while Baskerville's tender was too high, and on 19th April Council passed an Order in Council rejecting both of those tenders on that ground. From that moment the power of the Minister of Public Works to deal with the tenders or make any other arrangement with respect to those tenders ceased. The matter was taken out of his hands by Council, which rejected the offer made by Baskerville, and then the Minister of Public Works had no authority. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) would have had much more of which to complain if after that action Baskerville had been given the contract. It is said by the member from Queen's that this arrangement with Baskerville should have been carried out, that no new tenders should have been asked, and the work should not have been put up again. I do not think Sir Hector Langevin can be blamed for taking the course he did by readvertising and throwing the work open to public competition again. It gave Mr. Baskerville and Mr. Starrs an opportunity to again tender with the knowledge they had gained on their first tender, and there was an equal chance for all concerned, so far as the readvertising was concerned. Therefore, so far as that particular charge was concerned, that Mr. Baskerville should have been given the contract, there is nothing in it outside of the routine of the department, in fact it was following the routine of the department and might be expected to be the course to be adopted in a properly conducted department. With respect to Baskerville's evidence, I may say that he is entirely mistaken as to his dates. Sir Hector Langevin was in Ottawa on 26th May. On the 26th May, or thereabouts, Sir Hector Langevin instructed his clerk to write to Mr. Baskerville's brother that the contract would go up for tender again, but Mr. Baskerville says that it was not for three or four months afterwards that he heard he was not going to get the contract. It is quite clear that Mr. Baskerville is mistaken as to the length of time that elapsed before he heard this, because the matter was talked of in the newspapers and it was made the subject of remonstrance by an Order in Council of the British Columbia Government within a month after that. In connection with this I may refer to the fact that Murphy swears he offered Sir Hector Langevin 25 per cent. if they would get the contract, and Sir Hector referred him to Mr. McGreevy. I was very sorry that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), without taking the responsibility of stating that he believed that statement, steered the middle course of refusing the responsibility of adopting the statement, and yet withholding the generosity of disbelief. I think the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) might have taken the one course or the other. He might have said in regard to the statement of Murphy: "I believe it," and if he had said that the only way it could have been met was by an attack on Murphy credibility: or he might have said: I disbelieve it on the whole of evidence; but the hon. menber does neither. On this and on every other point in which Murphy is contracticted by any credible or respectable witness whatever, I distinctly say that I attach no reliance or credit whatever to any statement Murphy may make on oath or otherwise. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) did try to rehabilitate Murphy's character a little. He put a little dash of paint here and a little dash there and fixed it up a little as he went along. I dare say that if he went back over it he would find that he had got Mr. Murphy dressed up into a pretty respectable member of society, if he picked out all the compliments he paid him as he went along. Perhaps it was not that he loved Murphy so much as that he hated the others more, but whatever the reason was, I think the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) must be troubled with a little weakness for Murphy. Murphy's statement that he offered a Minister of the Crown 25 per cent. interest in a contract betrayed such an utter want of all sense of morality on the part of a man who would make the offer that, on that ground alone, I would not believe him when he came to swear to it. To think that any contractor would go to a Minister of the Crown and offer him $25,000 of the people's money to put in his own pocket, and to expect anyone to believe him when he made the statement, is something that, so far as I am concerned, I am not prepared to endorse. I believe that statement to be utterly and absolutely untrue and unfounded, and I think also that it is an after-thought of Mr. Murphy's, got up as a great many of Mr. Murphy's statements were, to fill a little gap in the evidence with regard to the Baskerville tenders and to offer a pretext for finding a charge against Sir Hector with regard to these Baskerville tenders, which without this made-up statement of Murphy's are perfectly innocent and straightforward on their face. Now the next charge that has been made is one with regard to getting Starrs & O'Hanly out of the way. It is charged that Sir Hector drove Starrs & O'Hanly out of the field, and if we believe that of Sir Hector we must credit him with

being a very awkward man, to say the very least. The hon. gentleman wants us to believe that Sir Hector wanted from the start of this project in May to give Larkin, Connolly & Co. the contract, and that he deliberately set to work to crowd Starrs & O'Hanly out of the contract. How did he set about doing that? The tenders came in, and that of Starrs & O'Hanly was the lowest. Mr. Perley, the engineer, reported to the Minister that the tender of Starrs & O'Hanly was too low, and that the work could not properly be done at their price. I ask any fair-minded man in this House, that if in May Sir Hector Langevin had conceived the design of giving the contract to Larkin, Connolly & Co.; when his engineer made a report like that to him, a report that would justify him in the face of Parliament in refusing them the contract; does any sane man believe that Sir Hector, if he was a rascal trying to do what he was represented to be doing, would let a chance like that pass? Would he not at once have said: If that is the case, Starrs & O'Hanly cannot get the contract. On the contrary, Sir Hector declines to receive this recommendation of Perley's. He says these men tendered before, and they were too low, and they have tendered again. Now, you say they are too low, but we will give them a chance. How did he give them a chance? He wrote to them and asked them to strengthen themselves, they being men of no substance, by adding another contractor. Is there any wrong in that? Is there any symptom there of any desire to crowd Starrs & O'Hanly out, or is it not a desire to protect the public interest. Starrs & O'Hanly came and said: We cannot or we will not do it. Well, Sir Hector, with this report of Mr. Perley in his hand, which would have shielded him for all time to come, does not use it. He deliberately refuses to shelter himself behind this report of Mr. Perley, that Starrs & O'Hanly's tender was too low to do the work. No; he says: These men have tendered twice; I believe they are too low; but I will give them a chance; I will recommend Council to adopt their tender. Council did adopt it, and awarded the contract to Starrs & O'Hanly. Now, comes the stress which is laid by hon. gentlemen opposite. They wish us to believe that Sir Hector, having thrown away this opportunity of carrying out this scheme in such a manner that it could never have been charged against him, called Starrs into his place and crowded him out of the contract. Now, Sir, I have another explanation to offer in regard to the matter, though I do not think it will commend itself to the hon. member for Queen's, because from his point of view it has one fatal defect; it does not go to convict Sir Hector Langevin. I am afraid for that reason the hon. member would totally reject it. Yet it seems to me a wholly reasonable explanation. Sir Hector had impressed upon his mind that the tender of these men was too low, that if they took the contract at their own figures, they would be ruined and would have to throw the work on the department half done, and the result would be that new tenders would be called for, and more expense and trouble would be entailed. Mr. Perley swears that that was his constant practice—that he constantly begged the Minister to reject the lowest tender when he thought it too low for the work. Sir Hector Langevin sent for Starrs, and put the question to him plainly. It makes no difference to me whether he read Perley's report or not; as he says himself it seems probable that he did. He says what Starrs says: there is no substantial difference between them. There is no doubt that Sir Hector Langevin expressed to Starrs the doubt he had, and told him that he thought he was a very foolish man to take the contract at that figure. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite want us to think that that was done in the interest of Larkin, Connolly & Co. We say it was done in the interest of the country. It is plain and palpable on the face of it that it was done to prevent the contract going to a tenderer who was not able to carry it out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that Starrs & O'Hanly's tender was some $30,000 higher than the actual cost of the work as reported by the engineers.

Mr. DICKEY. I will answer that in a moment. Sir Hector pointed out to him that the work would cost more than he would get for it, and very naturally Starrs said: "I see you do not want me to have it," as Sir Hector very properly did not want him to have it. Then Starrs said: "I will give it up," and Sir Hector said to him: "Thank God you have relieved yourself of a great burden." The hon. member for Bothwell says the tender of Starrs & O'Hanly was more than the work cost. Would the hon. member find Sir Hector guilty of a fraud committed in 1884, because years afterwards it turned out that the conditions were not what his engineers in British Columbia and here reported to him at the time? Would the hon. member for Bothwell try to induce this House to find the Minister of Public Works guilty of a fraud committed with regard to these contracts when he knows that the only evidence the Minister had before him was the reports of his own engineers? He knows that the Minister was no prophet, that he could not tell how these works were going to turn out. The hon. member for Bothwell knows that the works cost less than it was expected they would cost, that the conditions of the stone work were different, and that 40 per cent. was saved in labour: and yet the hon. member for Bothwell would throw some suspicion on Sir Hector's action in 1884, for not delving into the future and finding out what was going to happen. This is just the trouble with a great deal of the evidence in this case. We have all the facts plain before our eyes; everything is explained to us; and we ask: If we can see all these things after they have happened, why could not Sir Hector Langevin see them at that time? The difficulty is one which I am afraid the hon. member for Queen's has not been able to meet, that is: Put yourself in Sir Hector Langevin's place at that time; take the information which he had before him, the figures he had, and the limited technical knowledge he possessed, and then try to arrive at a better conclusion than he did; and if you can, then consider yourself a superior man to him and censure him for neglect of duty or for fraud as the case may be. But do not, as the hon. member for Bothwell attempted to do just now, use your knowledge acquired after the fact, to charge the Minister because he had not equal knowledge at the time these transactions occurred. Now, the next item to which I will refer is the agreement as to the conditions in the contract. That, as the hon. member for Queen's stated, rests

on Larkin's testimony, and on certain expressions in the letters of Robert McGreevy and Nicholas Connolly. Now, what is the statement that Larkin makes? Larkin says that he went to the Minister and asked him about the $50,000 worth of plant. He wanted it to be put in the contract, but the Minister would not put it in. The Minister said: I will look into it. Now, I only wish hon. gentlemen opposite, when the Government state about any matter brought before them, that they will give it their consideration, would be as easily satisfied as Larkin was when the Minister of Public Works said to him that he would look into it. I think anyone who is familiar with Sir Hector Langevin and the working of his department would be very chary of accepting his statement that he would look into a matter, as an assurance that what was asked of him would be done. On the evidence of Larkin himself, re-enforced in terms by the evidence of Sir Hector Langevin, what took place was that Larkin spoke strongly about the plant, and Sir Hector said he would look into it. Robert McGreevy's letter refers to the same occasion as Larkin does, no doubt, and amounts to the same thing; it may have been based on a report from Larkin to him. Hon. gentlemen opposite want us to believe that Sir Hector Langevin made a condition with Larkin that he would give him something of that $50,000. Here, again, we find that Sir Hector Langevin had a very curious way of carrying out his fraudulent objects. If he wanted to give part of this $50,000 to Larkin, Connolly & Co., one would think that the very last thing he would do would be to put on record in his own department an official letter stating it could not under any circumstances be done. Yet that is exactly what he did. On the 12th of May, 1885, an official letter was written by Mr. Gobeil, the secretary of the department, in which he says:

"I am directed by the Minister of Public Works to state that the specification is very clear, that there is no option on the part of the contractors to take what plant they please and refuse what they do not want, and that they will have to take over all that is named in the schedule."

I do not know what course it would have been more crass or stupid for the Minister to adopt if he had formed the scheme credited to him with regard to this plant. I was glad that the hon. member for Queen's did not tackle the evidence, if I may use that expression, with regard to the payment or the allowance on that plant, because by Mr. Perley's evidence it is absolutely clear that the allowance was made on his own responsibility entirely, that it was passed by him into the final estimate, that that final estimate went in the usual course, and as a matter of fact, did not in this instance go before the Minister, that it was paid without the knowledge of the Minister; and Mr. Perley went further and assumed the whole responsibility. So that you have, as against this alleged agreement to defraud, the official letter from the department showing no such agreement was made, so far as Sir Hector Langevin is concerned, and that he had no connection with the matter. Now, with regard to the change from granite to sandstone. In the first place, it is clear it was recommended, that the Minister approved of it, and that subsequently it was not granted. The evidence as to its having been stopped rests on Mr. Robert McGreevy's letter of the 24th of February, page 35 of the minority report, in which he says:

"The granite substitution was just about being sent to Council, but happily my letter came in time to put it back to sandstone, where it is now; high courses and beds will be put—the additional length will hereafter be settled."

I have this to say with regard to this letter, that it is a letter written by Robert McGreevy to Murphy, and as such, unless it bears internal evidence of genuineness, it is a suspicious document. A letter written by one of these gentlemen to the other might have been concocted, and these gentlemen were quite capable of concocting it, so that I hold it is subject to suspicion. In the next place, it contradicts Murphy's letter on the same subject, because it states that it was a letter of Robert McGreevy's to somebody else which stopped the substitution of granite, whereas Murphy says:

"I had our friend send a dispatch to Ottawa to stop the substitution of granite."

"Our friends" presumably being Thomas McGreevy. So that the evidence resting on those letters is self contradictory, and McGreevy's letter is one which may have been made for the purpose. At any rate you will observe that Robert McGreevy says the substitution was just about being sent to Council but that he stopped it. Now, it is perfectly clear that it was before Council, and that in that respect the letter was false, for Sir Hector Langevin has sworn that it was before Council and the Council rejected it. I might call attention in this connection to the fact that the minority report at page 36 only quotes a portion of Sir Hector Langevin's evidence. It quotes this portion:

"I have only a word to say on the proposed substitution of granite for sandstone. When Mr. Perley, who was favourable to that change, consulted me, I was inclined to consent to it. For prudence sake I spoke of it to Council. Council was of opinion not to accept the change, and I informed Mr. Perley accordingly."

It is only fair to say that Sir Hector said a great deal more than that about it. He was cross-examined at length on this matter—see page 1135 of the old edition. In answer to Mr. Davies he said in reference to this matter:

"I will give you what I can. Of course I am on my oath as Privy Councillor. This question of putting in granite in place of sandstone came up. It was recommended, I think, by Mr. Trutch and then it was recommended by Mr. Perley. On that I submitted it, with my recommendation, to Council, because that is the only way I could reach Council—by recommending it. I recommended it to Council, and the result of the deliberations of Council was that I brought back the report and stated to Mr. Perley that Council would not consent to the change."

The question for us is whether those two letters of Robert McGreevy and Murphy are, in the case of a charge like this, to counterbalance the sworn statement of Sir Hector Langevin. Another matter to which the hon. member for Queen's alluded, and it is a characteristic matter, is the proposed lengthening of the dock. The hon. gentleman pictured how Murphy stated that they would give $50,000 if they got the contract for $250,000, and that Sir Hector Langevin was willing to do that, and recommended it to Council. I think it would have been better if the hon. gentleman had been a little more frank and told the House what the facts were. It would have been better, in dealing with a criminal matter of this kind, if he had put all the evidence before the jury, and not only a part of it. I do not know what the House will think as to the hon. member for Queen's ideas of fair-play in this matter, when I tell them that this proposition to

lengthen the dock was made by Murphy, I believe, three years before the Canadian Pacific Railway stated that they were about to put on steamers and applied to the Government to have it lengthened, and that it was on their application Sir Hector Langevin made his report to Council.

Mr. AMYOT. Do you find that in the report, about the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. DICKEY. Yes, on page 155.

Mr. AMYOT. That was before the English Government refused the allowance of fifty thousand pounds?

Mr. DICKEY. Yes.

Mr. AMYOT. The Minister himself declared it was not necessary for that then.

Mr. DICKEY. The Order in Council is on page 105 and is dated the 21st of November, 1889. It states:

"On a report, dated 18th of November, 1889, from the Minister of Public Works submitting that the secretary of the Canadian Pacific Railway represented to him that the company has entered into contracts for the construction of three steamers for service across the Pacific Ocean * * * the Minister, in view of the representations of the Canadian Pacific Railway and of the growing importance of the Pacific trade, and the necessity of affording it proper facility, is of opinion that the length of the graving dock at Esquimalt should be increased by 100 feet and that its extension would cost at least $100,000."

I will not discuss Bennett's dismissal, as that has not been much touched upon. As to the recoursing of the lines for the larger stone, it is quite clear from the documents that the change was allowed in the first place on the distinct understanding that it should not cost the country any more. Some read it to mean that no more would be allowed for the stones in price because they were larger, but I understand it to mean that no more was to be allowed in the gross. There, again, an injustice is done, and it is one of the characteristic injustices which abound in this case. In a letter of Perley's, dated 4th May, 1885, he says:

"I am of the opinion that the contractors should have preferred their request in writing before being permitted to change the courses, but as they have not done so, but have informally applied here for permission to do so, it has been granted to them."

As I understand that, the reference there is to an application by the contractors' engineer, who has not yet entered into this case as a conspirator, but who on the 16th April, 1885, submitted his design as appears from a telegram of that date from Perley to Trutch:

"Contractors' engineer has submitted his design for recoursing graving dock, and also for alteration in the course for inclination or drip in bottom, and informs me that he furnished Bennett with copies of changes proposed."

Then on the 4th May, in the course of a letter, Mr. Perley naturally says:

"I am of the opinion that the contractors should have preferred their request in writing before being permitted to change their course; but as they have not done so, but have informally applied here for permission to do so, it has been granted."

The changes have been rung on that, and all sorts of innuendoes have been made out of this "informal application," which seems to be the report of the contractors' engineer. So there goes another of these imaginary cases of fraud. I may say that the report itself refers to the fact that the application was made to the Minister personally, but it is the application of the 16th April which is referred to by Perley in his telegram of that date. Now, Sir Hector Langevin allowed the payments for this recoursing. Thus far we can go, that the additional size of the stone improved the work, if Mr. Perley is to be believed. Mr. Perley swears positively that it improved it very materially:

By Mr. Osler:

Q. Which is the better for this work, large or small? A. The large courses.

Q. Much better? A. So much was I struck with the work that was done with the large courses in Quebec that I was very glad to give a recommendation increasing the size of the courses in Esquimalt, and when it fell to me as chief engineer of Public Works to design the graving dock at Kingston, I did not put any courses in it less than two feet eight inches, except one. I used the big, heavy courses purposely, because I was struck with them. You get stronger work, better work and lasting work by using the heavier stone.

So far we are on safe ground, that the work was better. Perley reported this improvement, and that he thought they ought to be allowed for it and the Minister recommended the payment. There is no doubt that the payment was illegal. Because it was illegal it was not necessarily fraudulent. Because it was not justified, therefore we are not to say it was fraudulent, but, being illegal, it is very frankly and fairly condemned by the majority report which this House is asked to assent to, and I think that is the proper course for this House to take in regard to a payment which, while admitting of some justification in argument, was not justified by the contract entered into by the parties. A crucial point is what was Sir Hector's relation to the Harbour Board in Quebec. Are we to accept the theory of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), that these members of the Harbour Board were pawns to be moved by Sir Hector Langevin, that they were puppets to be moved as he pulled the string? What kind of business men are they in any city of Canada who could be brought together and act as the hon. gentleman says? It is an insult to them, and not only an insult to their honesty to lend themselves to the supposed fraudulent courses of Sir Hector Langevin, but it is also an insult to their integrity, their intelligence and their business abilities. I do not know the views of Mr. Valin on that subject, but it is peculiar for him to come here before the Committee and insist that he was a puppet of Sir Hector Langevin. He would not accept any suggestion that he was not a puppet at some one time. He insisted that he was a puppet of Sir Hector Langevin, and the strings were pulled by Thomas McGreevy. That is not a very high standard for any man to lay down for himself, and we certainly cannot form a very high opinion of Mr. Valin when he gives that statement in regard to himself. But we have to take his evidence as we find it. We find that Mr. Valin is a disappointed office-seeker. We find that he is charged in the books of Larkin, Connolly & Co. with having been paid improperly $3,625 of their money.

Mr. TARTE. No; that is not true.

Mr. DICKEY. He is so charged in their books.

Mr. TARTE. It was disproved afterwards.

Mr. DICKEY. We find that Mr. Valin signed a declaration which is inconsistent with his testimony under oath given before this Committee. We find that Mr. Valin is contradicted by Sir Hector Langevin, we find that Mr. Valin's testimony is absolutely irreconcilable with the testimony of every other harbour commissioner that was called before the Committee. Now, the hon. member for

Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) calls my attention to the fact that this is disproved. It is disproved by a witness in whom the member for Montmorency has a great deal of confidence, Mr. Murphy. Mr. Murphy states that, although the other charges in that book are right, although charges of this kind with other people are right, that this $3,000 of Valin is a mistake. Mr. Valin admits that he received money from Larkin, Connolly & Co.; he admits that he received money for his election from these people. He will not say it was not $3,000. He says: I will take whatever Murphy says, and Murphy had already sworn that this $3,000 was a mistake.

Mr. AMYOT. Murphy said it was a mistake, and Michael Connolly too.

Mr. DICKEY. But independently of them, and assuming, as may be quite possible, that a mistake may have crept into those books, assuming that there is a mistake in the statement submitted to the Committee, we find Valin in hopeless contradiction to Sir Hector Langevin, to Mr. Dobell and to the other Harbour Commissioners. In the first place, he swears that Sir Hector Langevin directed him what to do in regard to all matters. Now, here is his statement signed by himself. I will read first the article from *Le Canadien*:

"QUEBEC, 16th February, 1891.

"SIR,—Passing along the street just now, I saw Mr. P. V. Valin come out of your house. On Tuesday last, in the afternoon, he was at my office on Fabrique street. He came there to describe you to me as the most culpable of all the criminals whom I deemed it my duty to denounce in *Le Canadien*. Mr. Valin assured me that he was in a position to prove that it was at your request and by your order, that the Quebec Harbour Commissioners awarded to Larkin, Connolly & Co. the contracts out of which Thomas McGreevy has made, since 1882 or 1883, his quarter of a million. 'You have written the truth,' he said to me, 'but you do not know the whole truth.'"

There is a distinct statement exactly in line with the evidence sworn to by Valin before the Committee. It is consistent with that, it is the same as his evidence. Now, what does he say about that? On the 19th February, 1891, he signs a paper written to Sir Hector Langevin:

"SIR,—I read this morning the letter published to-day in *Le Canadien* by Mr. J. I. Tarte. Mr. Tarte did not understand me."

I would like to know whether the member for Montmorency believes this, and which document is true?

"I did not tell him that I had things to say to him, or to say against you; the fact is I told him nothing against you."

He further states that he never made those statements at all to Mr. Tarte. Now, I have already read Mr. Dobell's testimony. He says there is nothing improper, so far as he knows, except the pressing of a dredging contract after it had expired. Edmond Giroux denies that Sir Hector's name is used before the board by Thomas McGreevy. J. B. Forsyth says that he relied on the engineers. William Rae says he relied on Mr. Perley. He says:

"I remember we had great trouble in selecting the inspectors. We had a great many applications. The commissioners exercised their best judgment in the men they selected."

Unfortunately their selection was not very good. Thomas McGreevy and Sir Hector Langevin also contradict Mr. Valin. Therefore, we have this position of affairs, that in order to connect Sir Hector Langevin criminally with the Harbour Commission, you have to rely upon Valin's evidence alone, and he stands contradicted by a mass of evidence and by himself, in a such manner as to wipe his testimony out of consideration altogether. Therefore, it is that I have not entered into the general question of the 35 cents for dredging, and the other dredging contract, because, before any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House can make that relevant to the question whether Sir Hector is guilty, he must first establish that Sir Hector's relations with the Harbour Commission were improper. Now, a few words with regard to the general probabilities of this case. I do not wish to get rid at all of the proper principle of ministerial responsibility. It would be of no avail, of course, for me to say that Sir Hector relied upon his engineer, in a case of departmental action. In a matter of ministerial responsibility in the ordinary sense of the term, it is no protection to him at all. He is the head of the department, and he must be responsible. But in regard to criminal responsibility you must judge of the evidence according to the rules laid down in criminal law, and if Sir Hector relied upon his engineer, that clears him of all criminal responsibility. It is exactly the same as in cases where men take the advice of counsel and act upon their advice, and if a man acts upon the advice of counsel I can scarcely conceive of a case where he would be held guilty of a crime. In this case if Sir Hector relied honestly upon the advice of his engineers he cannot be charged with anything criminal, although he may be chargeable with negligence. In that connection I would say that the majority report that the House is asked to adopt, distinctly condemns the administration of the department; it distinctly says that this state of affairs has led to consequences which were greatly to be regretted in the administration of that department. The evidence against Sir Hector is unsubstantial and is all indirect, and the main argument in favour of it is Sir Hector's intimacy with Thomas McGreevy, the number and extent of the frauds, and the fact that political subscriptions came out of them. These facts have been elaborated by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). I wish to draw the attention of the House to a few of the letters in connection with this matter to support the proposition that these letters show a disposition on the part of contractors to go direct to engineers, which fact seems to negative any presumption that they had control over the Minister. At page 23, Thos. McGreevy writing to Robert McGreevy on 6th May, says:

"The tenders for cross-wall only arrived here yesterday, and are locked up until Monday, when he will commence his calculation. I will write you Tuesday and let you know the result."

That is Boyd. On page 22, Thomas McGreevy writing on 16th April, 1887, says:

"MY DEAR ROBERT,—I have just seen Perley about dredging. I have arranged to meet him on Monday to discuss his dredging report before he sends it to Harbour Commissioners, also other matters about graving dock, &c."

On the same page, 26th April, he says:

"MY DEAR ROBERT,—I have just seen Perley on dredging. I think he will report on 35 cents, and put some conditions which will amount to nothing. He will report when I will be there."

On page 22 under date 2nd May, 1885, he says:

"MY DEAR ROBERT,—As I telegraphed you this morning about estimate for graving dock at B.C., Perley has telegraphed Trutch to send amount of estimates to-day without fail."

On page 23 under date 4th May he says:

"DEAR ROBERT,—As I telegraphed you this morning, no estimate has been telegraphed. Everything and every order has been sent to them that was possible to make them understand. But still there was a dispatch from them to-day which cost $15, which they had in writing for over a month out there. Perley went to see Page this morning to try and get another engineer to send out at once and dismiss Bennett."

On page 24 under date 1st March, 1886, he says:

"I had a long interview with Perley on harbour works, and graving dock at British Columbia. Fleming was to have signed his report to-day on harbour works."

At page 189 under date 9th February, 1886, Larkin writing to Murphy says:

"I was in Ottawa on Tuesday last and had a long interview with Mr. Perley, he assures me that the dock will not be lengthened before completion, as Sir H. is bound to have it completed by the time specified in the contract, even if it has to be lengthened immediately afterwards: he also read me the telegram he sent Trutch and the letter confirming it, to allow us full measurement on the masonry all over, and for masonry in the caisson chamber where we had put it, and for which Trutch only allowed a price for a 17 inch brick wall. So far so good. I spoke to Perley about the $18,500 security: he advised not to ask for it now, that Sir H. did not like to return security until the work was completed, as it would be establishing a precedent which he did not want to do."

That, again, is Perley. At page 208 under date 11th January, 1885, Michael Connolly writing to friend Owen, says:

"I hope Mr. Perley has made the proper report on the retention, and that you have the funds ere this."

At page 215, under date 21st January, 1886, Michael Connolly writing to friend Owen says:

"We sent to Mr. Perley at his request recently a list of the materials the Government turned over to us which we decline taking, and our reasons therefor. I think the amount of the rejected materials will reach about $20,000, so you see it's worth looking after."

At page 604 under 8th May, 1883, Thomas McGreevy writes:

"MY DEAR ROBERT,— * * * I seen Boyd this morning. He has not finished cross-wall yet. I will meet him this afternoon about it and know the result."

At page 613 on 17th—, 1884, Robert McGreevy writes to Murphy:

"MY DEAR SIR,—The result of the interview between Mr. Perley and my brother was that he, P., will write you to ascertain the rate at which you will complete the dock, giving a guarantee of completion within this year or season of navigation."

At page 637, under 8th March, 1888, Thomas McGreevy, writing to Robert, says:

"MY DEAR ROBERT,—Tell Murphy I have seen Perley, and he will report to arbitrators or to commission of the amount to be submitted to them, which will be total claim of $814,000."

At page 642, under date of 27th January, Robert McGreevy writes to Murphy:

"MY DEAR MURPHY,—I reed. your memo.; but did not understand the whole of it. P. has been seen to-day, his report on St. Joseph D. is $100,000 under claim, or as I understood it for about $100,000 more whether this includes the $30,000 certificate you got during the summer I will explain you further when I see you."

In Perley's report of 3rd March, 1887, page 700, it is said:

"I am personally aware of many of the difficulties Messrs. Larkin & Co. have experienced with this work, also with the progress they have made and the excellent character of the work they have executed, and I have the fullest confidence in their ability and intention to bring it to conclusion."

I have not referred to the oral evidence in regard to this matter, but have simply taken the letters, and I think it is shown, although the hon. member for Queen's has said it is very ungenerous tactics to blame men who are dead, and men who are ill, still the question is here, and the report throws the blame on them, and it seems to me these various letters show dealings with the engineers which certainly appear to be very extraordinary if the Minister were in the hands of the contractors. There are also letters referring to interviews with Sir Hector Langevin. That is to be expected. A Minister will naturally have contractors interviewing him on many matters connected with their work. But it is quite an unusual thing for a man like Boyd, the assistant engineer and even for the chief engineer to be interviewed with regard to these reports. One would think that if Sir Hector Langevin was instructing Perley to make these reports wrongly, that he would be approached, and that he would send instructions to Perley to have the report made as he wanted it, but you find that the contrary is the case. It is also very important to remember the origin of these transactions. The origin was in 1881 when we find Murphy pressing Thomas McGreevy to get Kinipple & Morris dismissed. The first contract was the dredging contract made in 1882, and it is not pretended that Sir Hector Langevin had any interest in that contract. Thomas McGreevy went into that matter because Robert McGreevy was made a partner. It suited Thomas McGreevy to have Robert McGreevy as a partner because Robert was heavily in his debt and he wanted him to be supplied with funds to pay his indebtedness, and subsequently Robert McGreevy paid to Thomas portions of the profits out of these contracts. In connection with that look at Murphy's testimony. He says on page 37 of the evidence:

"We took in Robert McGreevy to secure the influence of Thomas with the Minister of Public Works."

He is speaking of the dredging contract of 1882, and he made that statement on oath. That statement on its face is absolutely false. The firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. had then no contract with the Department of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works had nothing whatever to do with the contract in which they took Robert McGreevy as partner, and, therefore, this statement of Murphy's is one of these after-thoughts put in to blacken the case against Sir Hector Langevin, and so false is that statement that the minority itself contradicts it and says what is perfectly plain on the face of it, that they took Robert McGreevy into their partnership to secure the influence of Thomas McGreevy with the Harbour Commissioners, which of course is perfectly evident. But Murphy did not allow an opportunity like that to pass, and over-reaching himself in his anxiety to injure Sir Hector Langevin he swears that it was to get the influence of Thomas McGreevy with the Minister of Public Works who had no right to deal with that contract at all. There we have the beginning of these transactions in this contract of 1882 in which the Minister was not interested directly or indirectly. So far as the cross-wall is concerned, Thomas McGreevy got some money out of it, and put it into his own pockets, or paid his judgments with it. What I

want to know from hon. gentlemen opposite is, when did Sir Hector Langevin enter that conspiracy. It is evident it was conceived without him and it is evident that it carried on very extensive operations in the contract of 1882 without Sir Hector Langevin being in it. The fact of the matter is that the Harbour Commission of Quebec is just as liable to suspicion and just as liable to conviction here to-day as Sir Hector Langevin is. The same fraud has been perpetrated on the Harbour Commisson, the same course of dealing has been carried on with regard to their contract as with regard to the Esquimalt dock, and yet I am surprised to find that while the minority report condemns the Minister of Public Works and wants to invite the censure of this House on him, they make no comment whatever, so far as I have been able to discover, on the conduct of the Harbour Commissioners in allowing themselves to be misled; the fact of the matter being, as the majority report puts it, that the Harbour Board was misled and the Minister of Public Works as well. As an instance of that I will cite a letter writen to the Harbour Commission in reference to this contract by Sir Hector Langevin. It will be found at page 892 of the evidence:

"OFFICE OF THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS, CANADA,
"OTTAWA, 31st July, 1882.

"SIR,—Your letter of 29th July, with accompanying statement, has reached me. Before being able to take into consideration the matter of awarding the contract for which the Harbour Commissioners indicate their preference I desire to know: 1. Whether the commissioners have reasons to believe that the tenders received, which are lower than the one they prefer, have been made in good faith, and that there has not been any collusion with respect to the withdrawal of these tenders. 2. Whether the commissioners, after enquiring from their engineer, consider the amount of the tender which they prefer is a reasonable amount, and not out of proportion with the work to be done.

"An immediate answer will oblige.

"Yours very truly,
"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"A. H. VERRET, Esq.,
"Quebec."

That shows that at that time Sir Hector Langevin was guarding the interest of the public as well as he could through the Harbour Commission, to prevent fraud, and I would ask the hon. gentleman opposite if he wishes to contend that that letter of Sir Hector Langevin's is a piece of solemn jugglery meaning nothing at all, or whether he will accept it as a genuine document, written at the time for the purpose expressed in it. I do not think the hon. gentleman will go so far as to say that it was not *bonâ fide* as it purports to be. I have dealt with the question of the improbability of the Minister of Public Works placing himself in the hands of the chief engineer, of the assistant engineer, of the members of the Harbour Commission of Quebec, and of these contractors by joining with them in a conspiracy to rob the public. It certainly seems to me a most extraordinary proposition that he should do so. I cannot believe, nor is there any evidence to show, that Sir Hector Langevin knew that Thomas McGreevy was getting money out of these contracts for his personal profit, or that he was getting Robert's profits to the extent of $67,000, and if he did not know that, why should he know anything else with regard to the criminal part of the charge. The great argument made by hon. gentlemen on the other side was that Sir Hector Langevin had a motive. The first question I submit is: What is the evidence, and then what are the motives? I have shown what the evidence is; and I think the evidence does not justify the imputing of any motives to Sir Hector Langevin in this regard; but I can quite conceive motives prompting Mr. McGreevy to carry on this work in the way he has done. He had strong monetary reasons for keeping Robert McGreevy employed and in order to get repaid by him out of the profits of these contracts. He was an ambitious politician; he had many rivals in the field in Quebec. It was of immense importance to him, from a political standpoint, to have the command of funds to serve his own purposes of ambition and to keep control of the constituency against ambitious rivals, of whom he had so many. It was quite conceivable and quite possible that Mr. McGreevy would use these funds for the purpose of strengthening himself with the leaders of the party, and if he were a friend of Sir Hector Langevin he certainly would not tell him. If he were a particular friend of Sir Hector Langevin he certainly would conceal from him that he was getting money for this purpose. Of course, these are but inferences, and they are simply a set-off against the inferences that are drawn on the other side. The facts, it is admitted by the other side, are in favour of the verdict rendered by the majority report, but it is argued that there are circumstances against Sir Hector Langevin, and these inferences of mine are given as a set-off against the inferences which are drawn by gentlemen on the other side. It should be remembered by the House, and more particularly by the country, that a member of Parliament has a legitimate influence with the Government, and a legitimate influence with the Minister, and Thomas McGreevy particularly had a strong, legitimate influence with Sir Hector Langevin; he had also a strong legitimate influence with the Quebec Harbour Commission. Both of those influences he abused. He had an influence with Sir Hector Langevin as an old friend and a prominent supporter; and no matter what party is in power here, under our system of party government, the Administration must place some reliance upon their supporters with regard to matters connected with their constituencies. They must to some extent, and within certain defined bounds—which I am quite prepared to admit Mr. McGreevy went far beyond—accept their recommendations. Therefore, having that legitimate influence with the Minister and the Harbour Board, and using the engineers as the evidence shows he did, Mr. McGreevy has been able to produce the result that we see to-day. At least, that is the theory which I for myself offer, and which is consistent with the majority report. In conclusion, I would say, as hon. gentlemen before me have said, and what is quite apparent to everybody, that this is a very serious matter to Sir Hector Langevin. If this House should condemn him its condemnation would stain back through every page of his life's history, and it would stain forward through every page of the history of his family. We must not forget that Sir Hector Langevin is a man of long public service, and in some instances of great public public service; that he is one of the fathers of Confederation, so many of whom are gone; and that once at any rate, in a very trying crisis of this country's history, Sir Hector Langevin stood by what at any rate he thought were the best

interests of this Dominion, strongly and manfully against the cries of race and creed; and although these considerations should not influence a verdict if the facts are clear; still I think they should make hon. gentlemen opposite pause before adopting a verdict that would have such disastrous consequences. At any rate, speaking for myself, and I think for other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, seeing that we can support the majority report, these considerations will enable us to do so, not only with a sense of duty, but with a great sense of relief and joy that we can properly and conscientiously render the verdict which that report contains.

Mr. AMYOT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.30 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 23rd September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PAYMENT OF DEBATES TRANSLATORS.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga) moved that the Fourth Report of the Special Committee appointed to supervise the publication of the Official Debates, be concurred in. He said: The Committee recommend that, owing to the unusual length of the session, the salaries of the translators, and Mr. Boyce, the secretary of Chief Reporter, be increased on the basis of the increase that was granted to them in 1885 on account of the unusual length of that session. It was considered then that the amount of work done, and the time given by them to that work, were of such a character as justified the House in granting them an increase. On that occasion the increase was $500 each, but in this report the Committee recommend that the increase be calculated according to the time this session has lasted above the usual length of the sessions.

Mr. LAURIER. I regret that my hon. friend had not given notice of this motion. I would suggest that he let the matter stand for a day or two in order that we may give it some consideration.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). Will you accept this motion as a notice of motion?

Mr. LAURIER. Yes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is quite proper, I think, that the House should have a little notice of this motion, and I am glad that the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) has agreed to let it stand. But I think that there will be great difficulty in the House concurring in this report. It involves a money vote, and according to the view I entertain, this is a matter that ought not to be initiated by a vote of the House.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). The last time an increase was voted to the translators, it was done through a recommendation by the Committee to the House, in the same way that the Committee are making a recommendation on the present occasion. The recommendation had to come from some quarter, and it could not be made otherwise than by the Committee who supervise the publication of the Debates, and who know the amount and the character of the work done. Both the translators and the reporters were appointed and their salaries fixed, by a recommendation of the Committee to this House, and then the Government took action.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am aware that moneys have sometimes been passed by the House in that way; nevertheless, I think it very irregular. This is not a recommendation that the matter should be considered by the Government, it is a recommendation that the translators be paid; and a vote of the House adopting the report, according to my motion, would be an order to the Government that they should be paid. This is not the initiation of a money vote in the usual course by the Government bringing down an estimate, but it is a recommendation of the House to the Government that these men be paid.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). I always supposed that the officers of the House were to be paid in this way, by the House recommending their payment to the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. I believe that the point or order just taken by the Minister of Justice is not well taken—at least, there are numerous precedents to the contrary, and I believe the House can vote any money it pleases to carry on its own business. However, I do not care about the point of order at this moment; it is in order that we may have more time to consider the merits of the proposition, that I think the matter ought to stand for the present.

CHARGES AGAINST THE HONOURABLE THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Mr. LISTER. In accordance with the notice that I gave yesterday, I beg to move:

That James Frederic Lister, Esquire, the member representing the electoral district of West Lambton in this House, having declared from his seat in this House that he is credibly informed, and that he believes that he is able to establish by satisfactory evidence:

That in the year 1879 Messrs. Alexander Manning, Alexander Shields, John James Macdonald, Alexander McDonell, James Isbester and Peter McLaren entered into a contract with the Government of Canada for the construction of a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Port Arthur and Rat Portage, known as section B.

The said contract and the works in connection therewith were completed by the said contractors, to whom they were a source of great profit.

During the whole period covered by the said contract, the Honourable John G. Haggart, now Postmaster General and a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada, was a member of the House of Commons for the South Riding of Lanark, and still is such member.

That the said Honourable John G. Haggart became and was beneficially interested in the profits of said contract which accrued to the share thereof standing in the name of the said Peter McLaren, and has received large sums out of the said profits, and has otherwise derived direct and substantial pecuniary benefits therefrom.

That during the progress of the said works, and while the said the Honourable John G. Haggart was so interested therein, members of the said firm were called upon by members of the Government of Canada for large contributions for political purposes, and such contributions were paid out of the moneys of the said firm, and with the knowledge and assent of the said Honourable John G. Haggart were charged against the

profits of the firm; and while the said contributions were so demanded and paid, the said firm of contractors were in various ways dependent upon the Government by reason of many matters being unsettled and in dispute in relation to the said contract, which were at the time of such contributions, or subsequently, settled not unfavourably to the said contractors.

That a Select Committee be appointed to enquire fully into the said allegations, with power to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and to employ shorthand writers to take down such evidence as they may deem necessary, and to have the evidence printed from day to day for the use of the Committee, and that the Committee do report in full the evidence taken before them, and all their proceedings on the reference and the result of their enquiries, and that Rule 78 of this House as to the selection of Committees be suspended, and that the said Committee be composed of Messrs. Mills (Bothwell), Edgar, Barron, Lister (who shall not have the right to vote), Dickey, Wood (Brockville), Girouard and McLeod.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the motion of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), in which he stated that while I was a member of Parliament representing the South Riding of Lanark I became beneficially interested in the profits of the contract which was made with the Government in 1879 between Alex. Manning, Alex. Shields, Jno. Jas. Macdonald, Alex. McDonell, Jas. J. Isbester and Peter McLaren, and that the share thereof standing in the name of Peter McLaren I was beneficially interested in, and that I have otherwise derived direct and substantial pecuniary benefits therefrom, let me, in the first place, give the most explicit and full denial to that statement. Perhaps I had better make now an explanation in regard to the whole matter. In the year 1880, the same charge was made. I took the first opportunity of denying it. A Royal Commission was appointed by the Government to enquire into all matters relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I came down here and upon my oath before the said commission I gave this evidence:

Q. Have you had any personal interest in any of the transactions of the Canadian Pacific Railway?—A. I never had, or in any other contract with the Government, directly or indirectly.

Further on in the same enquiry, I was asked about the same questions in regard to Mr. John Ryan. To these I said:

"I was not aware but what he was going on to complete his work when I was up there, and the first intimation I had of the contract being cancelled was seeing it in the public press. I wish also to state as emphatically as I can, because there have been insinuations in some of the papers, especially in a paper published in my own county, that I was connected in some way or other with these matters, that I am in no way connected, and have no interest in any contract or sub-contract; that I never received a cent from any contractor or any person for any service in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other matter as a member of Parliament."

Afterwards in Winnipeg there was a suit conducted there between Lockwood and McLaren. I was examined on oath before that court, when I stated I had not directly or indirectly any interest in connection with Mr. McLaren in section B. Mr. McLaren was examined in the same suit and gave the same denial. Now, it may be necessary to make a statement in reference to my connection with section B. The contract for section B was let in the first place to two tenderers, Fraser, Pitblado & Co., and another firm, connected with the same firm, consisting of Alex. Manning, Alex. McDonell, Jno. Jas. Macdonald, James Shields and Jas. Isbester. After they had received the contract from the Government, from some quarrel or some disagreement between themselves, Fraser and Pitblado could not get along with the other parties, and there was an arrangement entered into by which they left the work to the rest of the partners connected with the contract. In order to strengthen themselves, or in order to carry on their engagements, Mr. McLaren was requested to become a partner and to assist in the purchase of the other partners' interests. At the solicitation of Mr. McLaren, I arranged the partnership between him and the other parties for the purpose of carrying on section B business, and at his solicitation and at his request I overlooked the carrying on of the contract and the final settlement. At the time of the final settlement between the parties in Toronto, at the request of Mr. McLaren and at his solicitation, I went there for the purpose of arranging the pecuniary difficulties between them; but, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members of this House, that I received no large sums of money from Mr. McLaren for doing this business. The only sums of money which I received during the five or six years which I was looking after that affair were my travelling expenses and bare hotel allowance. I may tell you I was interested with Mr. McLaren in other business, that I was his partner in another transaction, and that I had a good many pecuniary relations with him, but I was always very careful that in all the transactions connected with section B I should have no communication with the Government or any member thereof in reference to the contract, and that I should receive no sums of money in any shape of the profit arising from that contract. The only sums of money that I received from Mr. McLaren was, as I have stated before, barely the travelling expenses to and from attending to his business, and perhaps small sums of money which I got as my hotel fares. I do not know what sums of money are entered in Mr. McLaren's books as against me, because I have not had since the charge has been made an opportunity of looking at those books, but for the six years that I attended to that business I do not think that the sum of money charged against me, amounts to over $1,500, and that was barely the amount that paid my travelling expenses. Yesterday I heard that Mr. McLaren was going to Virginia, but when the hon. gentleman made the statement in the House I had him telegraphed not to go on any account. I hear he is in Perth to-day and that he will be down this evening in Ottawa, and I will take the first opportunity of getting a statutory declaration from him, and reading it to the House, in which declaration I am sure he will confirm every word I have said. As to the rest of the hon. gentleman's declaration that I was the medium—I had better read it in his own words:

"That during the progress of the said works, and while the said the Honourable John G. Haggart was so interested therein, members of the said firm were called upon by members of the Government of Canada for large contributions for political purposes, and such contributions were paid out of the moneys of the said firm, and with the knowledge and assent of the said Honourable John G. Haggart were charged against the profits of the firm."

If it is so, I have no knowledge whatever of that statement. I can state here that not to my knowledge did the contractors of section B contribute any sum of money towards any political purpose or to the Government, and I certainly was no medium of communication between the Govern-

ment and them in reference to it. As that constitutes the whole charge, I think, Mr. Speaker, I have given an emphatic and positive a denial as I possibly could on this motion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, before you put this question to the House I wish to call to the attention of the House, certain features connected with the motion which the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has made, and certain principles which are involved in it, which I think require the very careful consideration of the House for its own interest, for its own dignity, and for the preservation of the rights of its members. There must come a time when, irrespective altogether of the opinion of the hon. gentleman presenting a charge to the House as to whether he would desire an investigation or not, and irrespective altogether of the preference of the hon. member against whom the charge is made as to whether he would not prefer an investigation before a committee in order to completely remove the accusation, the House will be called upon to decide how far it shall go in dealing with allegations as regards private transactions of a by-gone time. That is the more necessary when we consider how frequently, with regard to parliamentary proceedings, and with what force, the weight of precedent is urged upon the House. The suggestion was made a little while ago that a provision of the British North America Act had become inoperative because the House has occasionally failed to observe it. I do not entertain that opinion for a single moment; but, in any case, whether that be so or not, the House must, irrespective of the impulse of the moment, irrespective of the preference of the members immediately concerned in the charge, consider what limit there shall be to charges and to the exercise of jurisdiction of this kind on the part of the House. That is the more necessary, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, because, in taking control of charges of this kind, the House is practically exercising jurisdiction with regard to them. We do not sit here for the purpose of trying different questions in which one or two members are interested. We entertain charges of this kind only for the purpose of exercising control over the member whose conduct may be impugned, and it is essential to the rights of every member of the House, and essential to every constituency of this country represented by a member of the House, that the House should be careful to keep its own jurisdiction in proper and well-defined channels. I would ask the House, therefore, to consider with care the position of its jurisdiction as regards questions of the kind now before us. I admit that it is an unfavourable moment to do so, because of the heated state of feeling which has prevailed during the last few months, in consequence of charges, and counter charges, having led members on both sides of the House to prefer that anything which is put forward, even by the way of mere attack, should not be resisted so far as investigation is concerned, and should be allowed free course and an investigation before a committee. But, as I said before, members on both sides of the House are interested in seeing how far the jurisdiction of this House could extend upon questions of this kind. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it would have been perfectly competent for me at this stage, to have called your attention, and to have asked your ruling upon this motion as being, or not being, a question of privilege. I would ask the members of the House, who will do me the kindness to follow the observations I may make, to reflect for a moment or two upon what the charges are which have been preferred by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), and to examine them for the purpose of satisfying their minds on this question. What question of privilege is involved in his motion from beginning to end; what question of privilege as regards the rights or powers of this House, or of any member who sits within its walls? The charge will be examined in vain to find that, even if substantiated, even if proved; the rights, the privileges, the powers of the person impugned, or of any member of the Government, or of any member of the House would be in the slightest degree infringed. If that be the case, Sir, this is not one of the questions which should have come before the House in this way. The rule is perfectly well ascertained, Mr. Speaker, and I presume it would be enforced at any time that you would be called upon to enforce it. The rule laid down by the Speaker of the House of Commons in England is that a matter of privilege should relate to some subject which has recently arisen, and which fairly involves the privileges of the House, and calls for its immediate interposition. The rule of the Speaker of the English House of Commons is:

"A matter of privilege which claims this precedence should be some subject which has recently arisen, and which clearly involves the privilege of this House and calls for its immediate interposition. I stated to the hon. Baronet that as this subject has already been twice under the notice of this House as questions have been asked twice in this House concerning it, it did not appear to me to come under the character of something which had recently arisen and required the immediate interposition of the House without notice. I told the hon. gentleman that he could move in the ordinary way."

My memory recalls one or two instances in which an hon. gentleman who at one time led the Opposition in this House, in preferring charges of this kind against some gentlemen on this side of the House, sensible of the fact that not being of recent occurrence, and not immediately affecting the privileges of those members or of the House: it was his duty, in asking for an investigation, to give notice of his motion, and to put it on the Order paper, and to reach it, and ask the decision of the House upon it in due time. But I refrain from taking the objection. Considering the lateness of the session, considering the impossibility of the hon. member reaching his motion if he took the ordinary course, I am willing to waive any point of that kind. I am willing to treat this motion coming now, as if it were a motion placed on the Order paper and reached in due course, and I shall ask the judgment of the House upon it with regard, not to any technical rule of order, but to the decision that the House should come to as the judge of its own privilege, and the judge of its own jurisdiction; feeling sure that the House will be careful to keep in mind the cardinal principle laid down from the time that the privileges of members and the privileges represented by members came to be appreciated—the cardinal principle that the House has power, where members have been guilty of a positive crime, or have offended against the laws and regulations of the House, or have been guilty of fraudulent or other disgraceful acts which proved that they were unfit to exercise the trust which their constituents had

reposed in them, and unfit to continue to associate with the other members of the Legislature ;—to exercise its control ; but remembering, too, the cardinal principle, which runs side by side with it and is of equal value for the preservation of the liberty of constituencies and of members, that it is not for the House in the exercise of that jurisdiction to create a new disability or to enquire into the private transactions of members of the House. Now, let me ask the House, as I did at the outset, to consider carefully what the charge is which is put forward by the hon. member for West Lambton. I will assume, in dealing with it, that it conveys to the House far more than its expressions contain. I will assume the interpretation which is the widest that can be adopted ; although the right of the hon. Postmaster General is that the charge should be strictly stated and strictly proved. Adopting the very widest interpretation that can be put upon this charge, it is that twelve years ago the hon. member for Lanark then, the hon. Postmaster General now, violated the Independence of Parliament Act. I will refer presently to the charge for the purpose of showing that if we ought to take jurisdiction in regard to such a charge now, enough is not contained, and should be contained, in the notice itself. But let me assume, as I have said, that it impugns the Postmaster General for having violated the Independence of Parliament Act in 1879 or 1880. Let me ask the House at the outset this question : What consequence follows if that charge be proved ? Why, Sir, the acting as a contractor under a contract with the Government, express or implied, by which any sum of money may possibly be payable from the Crown to a member, is a statutory offence, which has been created for the purpose of keeping Parliament independent of the control of the Government of the day ; and the penalties which follow the commission of that statutory offence are well defined in the statute which creates it ; and I humbly submit that no other penalties than those can possibly be imposed. What are those penalties ? In the first place, there are pecuniary forfeitures ; there are fines which can be sued for ; and let me remind the House that in making that provision, Parliament at the same time made current with it the limitation that those penalties should not be recovered after the lapse of 12 months. There is a further forfeiture of the seat of the member who violates the Independence of Parliament Act. It is very doubtful, indeed, whether the forfeiture of the seat can be enforced after the lapse of 12 months. But let me ask you what sense is there in instituting an enquiry into an allegation that twelve years ago the member for Lanark of that day forfeited his seat ? Sir, assuming that the facts are otherwise than stated by the Postmaster General, assuming that they are otherwise than as sworn to by himself in the testimony which he read to the House to-day, the hon. member for Lanark lost the seat which he then held in this House. He lost that seat by the expiration of the Parliament of that day ; he lost it by the expiration of the next Parliament ; he lost it by the expiration of a third Parliament ; and to-day there is not one provision of the statute relating to the independence of Parliament which attaches any penalty to the Postmaster General, even if every charge which the hon. member for West Lambton has preferred were proved. It cannot be supposed that I am making a merely legal argument on the question. Does not the common sense of every hon. gentleman tell him that if that penalty is incurred by any member of this House, he is completely absolved when a new election takes place and he acquires his seat by another title ? The member for Lanark, if it is true that he violated the Independence of Parliament Act in 1879, forfeited his seat. He got another afterwards ; he got another a third time ; and it is by the fourth title that he holds the seat which he occupies in this House to-day. Now, Sir, while no pecuniary penalty attaches at this day, and while the loss of the seat by no means follows now—because it is perfectly clear that a seat gained in the elections of March, 1891, is not forfeited by reason of the forfeiture of a seat which occurred in 1879—can it be contended for a single moment—and I am stretching to its utmost limit the argument which may be advanced, I suppose, on the other side—that any stigma attaches to the man who violated the Independence of Parliament Act in 1879, which would make him unworthy now for a seat in this House or unworthy now to be a member of the Government ? Why, Sir, is it not the every-day practice with regard to matters of this kind that the member who has been accused of having forfeited his seat, gains it a second time by re-election, and has as much right then to his seat in the House without any stigma attaching to him, as if he had then sat in the House for the first time ? I suppose it will be said, or at any rate it is implied in the mind of the hon. gentleman making the charge, that a stigma does attach : and I think I heard an echo from the other side intimating that that might be urged. Why, Sir, we have settled that matter by precedents in this House as fully and as effectually as such a matter could be settled. The House will not forget the eventful period of 1877 when charges were made against members on both sides of the House, when the action of the House was invited, and when actions were taken in the courts of law. On that occasion a Minister of the Crown, the Minister of Militia of that day, was charged with having violated the Independence of Parliament Act. That Minister was accused of having, as a member of a printing partnership, had received from the Government of that day about $10,000—I am speaking within limits—and the charge was so capable of proof that the Minister of Militia resigned his seat in this House and sought re-election by his constituents. The doctrine was not then held—I do not know whether it was even advanced by anybody—that a stigma would attach to him, which would prevent his sitting again in the House or in the Government. But I know that he went and sought re-election as Minister of Militia and that he did not cease to be Minister of Militia until he was defeated by his constituents. But we had a more striking case occurring at precisely the same time. Another member of the same partnership was the Hon. Mr. Jones, of Halifax. Mr. Jones was not a member of the Government ; he resigned his seat after the Hon. Mr. Vail resigned his ; he sought re-election as every member does who is unseated under those circumstances and desires to return to the House, confident of course that no allegation would be made against him that he had a stigma attached to him for having violated the Independence of Parliament Act, and that he had committed one of those fraudulent, dis-

creditable acts, which would have made him unworthy of a seat in the House, because such a doctrine had never been then advanced and has never been advanced until to-day. But having resigned his seat for having violated the Independence of Parliament Act, let us recollect the fact that while he was seeking re-election, he was appointed by the Governor General to be a Minister of the Crown, and when nomination day came, he went to the poll, with the oath on his lips as a Privy Councillor, in the place of Mr. Vail who had been defeated. But we have a more striking instance still, because in the same session of 1877, no less a personage than the Speaker of this House was accused of having violated the Independence of Parliament Act, in the grossest manner, by having received for his own use and benefit, under a contract with the Crown, a sum upwards of $19,000 of public money. At the close of that session, that charge was found to have been proved. The report of the committee appointed to investigate it was presented, and the head of this House resigned his seat and sought re-election, on the principle again that no stigma attached to him which would prevent his occupying a seat again in this House; and when he came back from his constituency, instead of its being charged against him that he was unworthy to sit here, the House, on the first day it met, made him its Speaker again. Under these circumstances, I do not need to seek for old precedents on this question as to whether this charge ought to be investigated on the ground of its implying in the least degree a stigma which would mark the Postmaster General as unworthy to sit in the Government, or unfit to exercise the trust his constituents repose in him, or unfit to continue to associate with the other members of the Legislature. I do not make these observations or cite these precedents, by any means, for the purpose of applying the *tu quoque* argument to the other side of the House. On the contrary, I do not understand, and the little search I have made into the question does not lead me to believe, that the course which was pursued on that occasion was challenged on the ground which is implied in the resolution to-day, or that it was argued that men who had regained their seats by a new title were at all unworthy of any office or trust which the House or the Crown might think proper to impose on them. It may possibly be said, but it would be quite beside the question, that in those cases the violation of the Independence of Parliament Act was made unconsciously by the members impugned. I trust that argument will not be advanced. It makes no difference in the principle whatever, and it was not only utterly incapable of proof but capable of the most distinct disproof on those occasions, that the printing contracts which were held by Messrs. Vail and Jones and their partners were held without their knowledge. It was capable of quite distinct disproof that the Speaker was unaware that upwards of $19,000 of public money went into his pocket, under a contract with the Government, while he was sitting, Sir, in your chair. But that does not touch the question of principle or the question as to the jurisdiction of this House. Now let me call the attention of the House to what else we must find in this accusation, in order that it may justify the hon. gentleman's resolution. The accusation against members of the Government is that in 1879—twelve years ago—members of the Government of that day solicited subscriptions from certain contractors who were the contractors for section B; that those contractors, while in the position of contractors, contributed for political purposes, at the request of members of the Government of that day; and the hon. gentleman goes on to add further that at that time the contractors had matters pending before the Government, which were not unfavourably disposed of by the Government afterwards. The hon. gentleman has carefully refrained from charging that any improper decision on those claims was arrived at by the Government of that day, and he has carefully refrained from charging that any decision upon those claims was in the least degree induced by the subscriptions which these contractors had given. And yet the hon. gentleman desires investigation to be made by this House in the same way as if those charges were contained upon the face of his accusation. Let me call the attention of the House to what then, after all, his charge amounts to. It is an imputation that the Independence of Parliament Act was violated by Mr. Haggart, and that members of the Government of that day received political subscriptions and decided questions which these contractors were interested in, with no charge whatever that these decisions were improperly made or even improperly influenced. Now, there is nothing more fully admitted, in every discussion which takes place on such matters, that when the jurisdiction of this House is invoked to deal with the conduct of a member in relation to so serious a matter as one which may cause a forfeiture of his seat, or at any rate in relation to so serious a matter as to cast a doubt upon his fitness to exercise a trust which his constituents reposed in him and to continue to associate with other members of the House, the accusation shall be explicitly made, and shall be made on the responsibility of a member of this House. The House would never entertain an accusation made by an irresponsible party outside. The charges may fill the air, they may fill the press, but they are not investigated under a resolution of this kind, as a matter of privilege, or as a matter affecting a member's seat until some person in the House, who has a seat to lose, takes the responsibility of making the charge and invoking the jurisdiction of the House. But you will find, Mr. Speaker, on looking through the resolution the hon. member has moved, that he has taken no responsibility at all, and that if every charge he made here should be distinctly disproved, his answer might well be: I made no charge whatever against the Postmaster General of fraudulent or dishonest conduct, I did not impute to him anything more than that some years ago he might have been turned out of his seat for having violated the Independence of Parliament Act; and I made no charge against the Government even of 1879 of having been influenced by any money considerations to do any favour to the contractors, or of having rendered an improper decision with regard to any claim which those contractors preferred. So that the principle which requires that somebody must be responsible for the accusation into which an investigation is demanded, is utterly uncomplied with. But let me ask the indulgence of the House while I call its attention, turning from the assumption I made a few moments ago as to what may be intended by the hon. member for Lambton, to

what he says. I call your attention, Sir, to the fact that there is no accusation in reality here, even that the hon. Postmaster General ever violated the Independence of Parliament Act. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has steered clear, and carefully steered clear, of even making that accusation which I have dealt with on the assumption that it was made. On the contrary, instead of alleging, in the words of the Independence of Parliament Act—for those words must be made applicable to such a case—that the Postmaster General had a contract with the Crown, that he was interested in a contract with the Crown by which the money of the Crown would be payable to him, he alleges that he was beneficially interested in the profits of the contract under a share standing in the name of Peter McLaren. If it should transpire that, in consequence of any other business connections between Mr. McLaren and Mr. Haggart, in which the interests of Mr. Haggart were deeply concerned in other ventures with Mr. McLaren, it being to Mr. Haggart's interest to improve Mr. McLaren's chances in regard to section B, the member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) would say: I have proven my charge: but he would not have proved, even in that case, that Mr. Haggart had violated the Independence of Parliament Act or had committed any act that the most scrupulous member of Parliament might not commit, preserving in his conscience every principle that members of this House should preserve. Let me call attention further to the fact that the hon. member is asking the House to return to transactions which took place twelve years ago. I am not asking the House to adopt any hard and fast rule as to how far back we should go, or to say that we should not go back to a period before the last general election and before the existence of the present Parliament. But here is an accusation laid as the basis for an investigation, as to things which occurred twelve years ago against a Government, only one member of which sits in the House to-day, and against that member there is not the slightest insinuation made in this case. Under these circumstances, let us consider whether there must not in reason be some limit to the extent to which we are to go back. Would the House feel disposed, for instance—I am not putting it as a hard and fast rule at all—to now appoint a committee to investigate all the accusations which may be made, or which may have been made against the Government that held office between 1873 and 1878? I am sure that the good sense of the House would be inclined to say, that those transactions might have been investigated by Parliament at the time, and that ample time and opportunity had existed to investigate them. Although there is no statute of limitation in matters of this kind, it would be said that there must be some limit, and that every stale charge is not to be brought up for the exercise of the power of this House. Let us consider, in regard to the charge made against the Postmaster General and the members of the Government, whether this objection in regard to the point of time is not a reasonable one. As to the charges made against the Postmaster General we have found, from his own statement, that this subject is not new to the House, that it was the subject of an enquiry by a Royal Commission who heard him under oath, that he was cross-examined in reference to this matter, and that the Royal Commission reported to this House in 1880 or 1881 the evidence as well as the conclusions at which the Commissioners arrived. That Royal Commission was appointed to investigate all the payments made in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they discharged that duty. Their report was laid upon the Table of this House, and this House, which is asked in 1891 to take cognizance of this as new matter brought up by the charge of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), having received that report and distributed it for the public information, never questioned for a moment the conclusions then arrived at, nor does the hon. member for West Lambton venture to say that any evidence has come to his knowledge since that time, which would disturb the conclusions then arrived at.

Mr. LISTER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I stated so to the House yesterday.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was not aware that such a statement had been made. The hon. gentleman then puts himself in the position of a person who has come here eleven or twelve years after this matter was investigated, and who now says: I have got some further information, let us have this all over again, let us have it all investigated again. I think, while I do not desire to press it too strongly on the House, that the stage of the session has something to do with the investigation of a matter of this kind. We have been laboriously discharging our duties here during the past five months, and now, within what everybody who has only human endurance hopes are the closing days of the session, the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) asks the House to enter into an enquiry on the ground that what has kept for twelve years cannot keep for four months more. The hon. member says that, after being here through May, June, July, August and September, in an Ottawa climate, we should wait a few days in October in order to give him about four days to investigate this matter, but I am afraid he forgets that there is another side to the question, and that possibly the other side will not be content with the small allowance of space which he takes for his own side. I do not intend to weary the House by referring to precedents on this subject. There are precedents established in the old country which no Parliament in a civilized country would now be disposed to follow, precedents which are stigmatized by all writers on parliamentary practice as specimens of arbitrary exercise of power in regard to the jurisdiction of the House of Commons. But I say you will look in vain, either among old precedents or new, for a charge as vague as this being referred to a committee to investigate the conduct of the Government for an expenditure of this kind occurring twelve years ago. There is a view in connection with the recent precedents of this Parliament which, perhaps, I ought to refer to, because it was suggested from across the House—I do not know whether the remark was intended for me—that it was a parallel case to the charge in respect of which this House has just been holding an investigation. Sir, these cases have no parallel whatever. In the case which the House took up and investigated last session, for example, the case of the then sitting member for Lincoln, there was a question of privilege involved; there was not merely

an accusation that the member for Lincoln had violated the Independence of Parliament Act, but there was an accusation that being a member of this House, he had sold his influence as such with the Government, or if he had not sold his influence, he had obtained money under the pretense that his influence was for sale: and there was an accusation that as a member of the House, and having influence with the Government of the day, he had induced the Government to deprive certain applicants for the public domains of that which they were entitled to by law and by right. And there was the further question of privilege involved, that the letters which the member for Lincoln had written, impugning the honesty and integrity of members of the Government, who were, of course, members of this House, involved a question of privilege with regard to them, and affected their privilege in this House; and nobody could pretend that the members of the Government who were impugned had not a right to treat his accusations as a question of privilege, if they pleased. When the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved his resolution, he conveyed an intimation of that kind, if I remember aright, to the House, and told the members of the Government that they were the guardians of their own honour and of their own privileges, and if they chose not to accept his resolution, it was a matter concerning their own honesty and their own right. They did act upon the assumption that it was a matter concerning the privileges of the whole House, that a member should be accused of having thus abused his position in the House, and that it was a matter affecting their privileges that they should be charged with having abused a public trust out of favour to the member for Lincoln. Then, in the charges which have been investigated during the present session, presented by the member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte), it is true that the expenditures which were investigated extended back over a period of upwards of eight years, but they continued down to the present time. Moreover, the charges which the hon. member for Montmorency preferred were made and published during the last session, and were answered by the then Minister of Public Works and by the member for Quebec West in their places. But, Sir, apart from any question of privilege at all, these charges contained an accusation that the public moneys voted by this House and which had been expended under the authority of this House, had been improperly and corruptly expended. We need not search for precedents: it will be admitted at once that in relation to expenditures which are going forward, or expenditures of a recent time in respect of which any charge is made of misappropriation of public money, the charge ought to be entertained by the House and investigated. But if that case should be cited, we have not only to consider the remoteness of these occurrences, but we have to consider this fact, that the charge before us to-day preferred by the member for West Lambton, does not accuse anybody of having misspent one dollar of public money: so that the case of the charges made by the member for Montmorency cannot possibly be drawn in as a precedent here. Now, under these circumstances I feel confident that I can appeal to the fair judgment of the House, that I am bound to appeal to it especially regarding the period of the session at which this charge is brought forward. But even at an earlier period I would have appealed to it equally, until the hon. member for West Lambton had altered his accusation in such a way as to accuse either the Postmaster General or the Government of some wrong-doing, some misapplication of public money as having taken place at a period not unreasonably remote from the present time. When the hon. member makes such a charge, it will be a matter to be considered, but when it is put forward to the House in such vague terms as not to impute even a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, and when no misappropriation or misapplication of public money is charged against the Government, and all that is insinuated is in relation to a bygone Government: and when the member for Lambton does not even suggest that the action of the Government was improperly taken or improperly influenced, I think I can appeal to the House with confidence to say that its power and authority, great as they are, and ready as the House will always be to exercise them in the public interest, are not required to be exercised at this time: and that to exercise them now upon a complaint of that kind, would be subversive of, instead of sustaining, the privileges of this House, and the rights of the people who sent us here. Under these circumstances, I will move that the House having heard the statement of the hon. member for West Lambton, and the statement in reply thereto, of the Postmaster General, do now proceed to the Orders of the Day.

Mr. LAURIER. I had understood from the argument of the hon. gentleman that he objected to this motion on points of principle, until he came to refer to the lateness of the session, when I understood him to object to it in point of expediency. I do hope and trust that the members of this House, whether they are political friends or foes of the Postmaster General, will not allow the question of expediency to weigh with them one single moment. In relation to this accusation we have a duty to discharge to this House, and a duty to discharge to ourselves; and though the period of the session is late, and though the motion, if granted, will involve some delay and prolong our stay here, still I am sure there is no member who would not be ready, at whatever inconvenience to himself, to discharge the duty which would be imposed upon him by the granting of this motion. Sir, this is not a question of expediency, it is a question of right and a question of duty. But I have no objection at once to meet the hon. gentleman upon the ground upon which he has based his objection to this motion, namely, that this House has no jurisdiction to investigate the charge brought by the member for Lambton. I cannot do better—and I hope in this I will have the full concurrence of the hon. gentleman—than to refer the House to what is the well-known practice in England with regard to these matters. The privileges and the rights which we have in this Parliament, I am sure, we will always be glad to exercise in the light of the precedents which have come to us from the mother land. Now, Sir, let me quote the rule that prevails in England in these matters. That rule is as broad as it can be, and it extends thus far, that the House of Commons will not tolerate as one of its members any man who has dis-

graced himself in any manner whatever. If that is the rule, then we have only to ascertain whether the charge made by my hon. friend from Lambton comes within the purview of the House according to the rule thus laid down. But before I come to this, let me quote from one of the standard authorities on this matter, May, who says :

"Members have been expelled as being in open rebellion, as having been guilty of forgery, of perjury, of breaches of trust, of misapplication of public money, of conspiracy to defraud, of corruption in the administration of justice or in public office, or in the execution of their duties as members of Parliament, of conduct unbecoming the character of an officer and a gentleman, and of libels and various other offences committed against the House itself."

As I said a moment ago, this rule is as broad as possible, and it extends to this, that no man shall be tolerated as a member of the House of Commons whose conduct is in violation of those laws which should guide and direct a gentleman's life. Let us now look at the charge brought against the hon. gentleman and see if it comes within the rule as laid down by this authority. I agree with the Minister of Justice at once that the charge which has been brought against the Postmaster General is, in fact, for a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. The hon. gentleman stated that the Postmaster General was not charged with any misapplication of public money. He is not charged, indeed, with any misapplication of public money, but he is charged with misappropriation of public money, and certainly, if, apart from the quotation from May which I have cited to the House, it would be, as the hon. gentleman himself admits, an offence against the law of Parliament for a member of Parliament to be guilty of a misapplication of public money, it is a greater offence for him to be guilty of a misappropriation of public money. As the hon. gentleman stated, the offence is not only a moral one, but is also a statutory offence ; but because an offence is a statutory offence, the hon. gentleman, I am sure, will not claim that it may not be a moral offence as well. What is the fact ? I take the charge against the Postmaster General, and though I must say at once that the Minister of Justice at one portion of his argument stated that the charge was one of having violated the Independence of Parliament Act, yet he rather questioned that point a little later on in his speech. I take the case such as it is, and no one, I am sure, will contend that the charge which is embodied in the motion does not come directly within the four corners of the Act for securing the independence of Parliament. The charge is :

"That the said Honourable John G. Haggart became and was beneficially interested in the profits of said contract which accrued to the share thereof standing in the name of the said Peter McLaren, and has received large sums out of the said profits, and has otherwise derived direct and substantial pecuniary benefits therefrom."

Certainly, nothing can be clearer than that charge. It is here stated that the Postmaster General was interested in the interest of Mr. McLaren, and out of the profits of Mr. McLaren received large sums himself. This is enough, in my humble opinion, to lead any one who reads these words to admit that they bring the charge within the four corners of the Act. I admit that the circumstances have been altered by the facts which have taken place since. It is stated, and this is a fact to be investigated, but I assume it for the sake of argument, that this offence took place in 1879. I think it took place also later on ; but let us say it took place then. Three elections have occurred since that time. What is the effect ? If the charge had been brought home to the Postmaster General during the term of the Parliament then sitting, the consequence would have been that the hon. gentleman would have forfeited his seat. This offence has been made a statutory offence and there has been statutory punishment applied to it, and if the offence had been brought home to the hon. gentleman the House of Commons would not have to enquire into it or to pass judgment upon it, or to express its approval or disapproval of it. The punishment would have been applied by the law itself, and the hon. gentleman's seat would have been forfeited. Will it be pretended for one moment that because the statutory punishment attaching to the offence, has been, as it were, limited, and it can no longer be exercised, the moral offence is also limited, and is not to be gone into ? This is the argument made a moment ago by the Minister of Justice. He stated that no other penalty could visit the offence than that provided by statute. I deny that assertion. The hon. gentleman and the House have only to look at the authorities to see how fallacious that contention is, that while the punishment of the law which should visit that crime would be visited upon him through the power of the law, yet the House of Commons cannot now take charge of the case and apply to it the censure which it passes on like cases. What are the facts of the case ? We will take the case as stated by the Minister of Justice. The Postmaster General has been guilty of a serious offence, the punishment for which can no longer be visited upon him ; and I again ask, will it be pretended that if during those years—and assuming that everything charged is true—he had been guilty of sitting here without any right to occupy a seat, it was not a moral offence that an hon. gentleman guilty of such a crime, because crime it is, of having deceived the House, of having occupied a seat to which he had no right, had not been guilty of conduct unbecoming a gentleman, and therefore should not be visited by punishment ? The distinction, I say, is this : If the Postmaster General committed this offence during the period stated, and had been proved guilty of it during that Parliament, by that simple fact he would have forfeited his seat and have ceased to be a member ; but because he committed this offence at some period anterior to the present Parliament, then it is the duty of the House to investigate the case and ascertain whether or not his offence was unbecoming a gentleman, or whether or not it is one to be approved in every particular. This is the extent of the charge, this is the way I put it to the House at this moment—though the hon. gentleman has committed, it is alleged, a statutory offence which cannot be punished, and a moral offence in the eyes of the law, yet it is the duty of the House of Commons to pronounce upon it, either to absolve or to condemn as the case may be. If, as the Minister of Justice stated, at one period of his argument, it was useless to go into the matter because at this moment the seat of the hon. gentleman could not be attacked, and he might be re-elected, I hold that such an argument is simply begging the question. When the House of Commons expels a member for undignified conduct, it does not create a disqualification, but

it simply expresses its opinion that the member is not entitled to a seat in the House. Let me refer to May on this point. He says:

"But notwithstanding their extensive jurisdiction in regard to election, the Commons have no control over the ineligibility of candidates, except in the administration of the laws which defined their qualifications. No power exercised by the Commons is more undoubted than that of expelling a member from the House, as a punishment for grave offences; yet expulsion, though it vacates the seat of a member, and a new writ is immediately issued, does not create any disability to serve again in Parliament."

That is the well understood law, and, Mr. Speaker, it is no argument to say that the hon. gentleman might be elected again if he were unseated on account of the offence charged against him. In the same manner I give the same answer to the case which had been cited by the hon. gentleman, of a late Minister of Militia, and of another Minister of Militia, and of a former Speaker of the House of Commons. In all these matters, true it is said, that the report of the committee which enquired into the case stated that the offence had been committed unwittingly, but still the law being violated—and though in consequence the law was amended afterwards—still the case had been investigated, and that is the only thing which we ask at this moment from this Parliament. We simply ask to investigate the case and to ascertain whether or not the member who is supposed to have been guilty, who is charged, at all events, with being guilty, and of having deceived for years the House of Commons, is a fit and proper member of the House of Commons. That is the way that I put the question, and that the question which has to be investigated is whether or not the charge is true. If it is true that the Postmaster General has been all these years occupying his seat under false pretenses, having no right to it, deceiving his colleagues, deceiving the country, deceiving his electors, then the question is whether or not under such circumstances he is a fit member of the House of Commons. But, Sir, it is preposterous, in my opinion, to say that we should not do it because at one time his seat might have been forfeited. What, Sir, if the hon. gentleman, assuming that he is guilty, which I will assume just for the sake of argument at this moment—had been so cunning as to deceive the House, and to deceive the electors, and to deceive the country at large: should that be an argument why his offence should not be visited upon him? In my humble opinion, it would be a stronger argument why his offence should be visited, because it seems to me that the House of Commons, for its own dignity, should punish not only the offence, but the attempt to conceal it from the House of Commons itself. It is also said, Mr. Speaker, that these charges have been investigated by a commission, and upon this I join issue with the Minister of Justice. The commission which sat upon these matters never had any special warrant to investigate these charges against the Postmaster General. The commission had warrant and authority simply to investigate generally that contract, along with other contracts, but no one certainly would pretend that the commission which sat at that time had authority to determine whether or not the Postmaster General, then member for Lanark, was or was not a member of the firm of contractors who built these works, or whether he had or had not violated the Independence of Parliament Act. This was not the question, and no opinion which may have been given on that point would be of any avail. In fact no opinion has been given on that point. True it is that the hon. gentleman was heard as a witness before this commission, and that he denied the charge that is now brought against him. So far, so good. His denial will go in his favour, but at the same time I submit humbly to the judgment of the House of Commons, that the hon. gentleman must stand on this question in just the same position as any other man. His denial may go for what it is worth, but his denial cannot go against the charge at this moment. I refer the House to a statement which was made by the Postmaster General. He stated that as soon as Mr. McLaren would come to this city, he would have a statutory declaration and would have it published and communicated to the House. Is that the way this charge is to be investigated? Does not the Postmaster General himself give the case away and show the necessity of having an investigation, since he finds that although the Government are ready to absolve him, although the Government are ready to ask their followers not to proceed with the charges, although the Government ask their followers to accept the version of the hon. gentleman, still he finds himself obliged, in deference to his own dignity, in deference to public opinion, to give some evidence that the charges brought against him are not true? Well, Sir, if we are to have an investigation, I submit to the fairness of the majority—not to the minority of this House—I submit to the fairness of the majority that this is not the way that the hon. gentleman is to clear himself of the charges brought against him. There is only one way he can so free himself, and that is by an investigation held by a committee of this House where he and his accuser can be heard, and can be heard with all the advantages accruing to both upon such an occasion. Mr. Speaker, the only thing which I regret in this matter is that it comes late in the session. This is very true, but, Sir, the fault does not lie with my hon. friend who makes the charge to-day. If he has brought it so late in the session it is because so far the evidence upon these charges has been well concealed. As has been stated by the Postmaster General himself, the charges have been known to the public. There has been a general impression in the public mind that there was in section B contract some such thing as is now charged against the Postmaster General, but it was only an impression, and it is only within the last few days, four or five days, that my hon. friend has obtained the evidence on which he is now prepared to bring the charge, and to say he is ready to prove it. Although it is late in the session it is no fault of his why the evidence did not come sooner into his hands, and I submit again that it is not a question of expediency but it is a question of duty for every man, whatever may be the inconvenience to himself, to see that justice is done in this matter, not only to the Postmaster General, but to the public as well, who are still more interested than the Postmaster General in having these charges cleared.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I, for one, am very glad indeed that at last a stand has been made with regard to accusations of this kind. I think that we ought in our own interests, and in the interests of this House, to remember that we

are not here for the purpose of enabling charges to be made against hon. members under the cover of the protection which the privileges of this House afford, and which in point of fact enables these charges to be made with absolute impunity to the member himself preferring them and to those that are in privity with him. The privilege of this House is absolute and complete, and necessarily and properly so in the public interest, but if in moments of excitement such as at present prevail, we are to take advantage of them in order to hurl charges against one another, and to ask that these charges should be investigated, then I am sure that my hon. friends who sit on the opposite side of the House will see that it is they, and not the majority, who would be in danger. In the interest, therefore, of each and every member of the House, and more especially, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of the minority in this House, whether it be composed of one political party or the other, it is well we should weigh with care, and decide with judgment, before we accept any charge that has been made, and before we permit it to be referred to a committee. No person doubts the absolute power of this House to expel any one member, but, Sir, that power is restrained and restrainable by constitutional rules and constitutional usages, and we are bound to respect these constitutional rules in the interest of the public we represent, as well as in the interest of the gentlemen who sit on the floor of this chamber. Now, Sir, a man can be expelled for forgery, perjury, or any other crime he may commit; but it is perfectly well settled that the House of Commons in England—and I join with the leader of the Opposition in saying that we look to that body for light and guidance in these matters—never undertakes to try a man for a criminal offence. The laws of the land are open for that: and it is only after a man has been tried by his peers and upon his conviction or upon his outlawry, as the case may be, that the House of Commons acts. This year we have had examples of that. Two members were accused, one of abduction, and the other of a still more abominable crime. Did the House undertake to investigate those charges? Did a member rise up and accuse those men, and ask for a reference of the charges to a committee? No, Sir; it was remembered that the business of Parliament is not to try men accused of criminal offences: they knew that the law of the land is open for that purpose; and they waited, in the one case until the conviction was obtained—that of Captain Verney—and the other case they are at present dealing with, the member having absconded. But even after the member, who represented one of the divisions of Belfast, had absconded, even after the criminal charge was made against him, and he was ordered to attend in his place in the House, they would not made against him, because he sent a medical certificate that his health would not permit him to comply with that order. They even went to the extent of sending physicians over to France, where the hon. gentleman was in concealment, in order to test whether the medical certificate was genuine or not; and upon the report of their own medical men, they agreed that the matter should stand over till next session. Now, I do not pretend here, and it would be presumptuous in me to lay down any hard and fast rules in a matter of this kind; but I think there are some general principles—and it is in the interest of us all as well as of those whom we represent that we should know them, which we can and ought to adopt with reference to charges of crime. Now, if an hon. member who sits in this House is charged with a crime, why should his case be prejudiced, why should his chances of a fair trial be jeopardized by accusations made here?—by it being made, in point of fact, a political question, as was done in the case of the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) the other day? Why, I say, should that course be taken? If an hon. member here commits any offence, no matter what it may be, no matter in what category it may be, the proper way is to let that man be tried, and tried fairly by his peers: and when he is found guilty, and upon the record of his conviction, and not upon the decision of a committee—which as we all know is, generally speaking, apt to act in a partisan sense—to deal with that hon. gentleman on the case which is already established. There are, however, cases of breaches of our privileges, breaches of our own rules, offences against this House, which we are not only bound to investigate, but with the investigation of which we would not permit any court of law to interfere, if I understand the principles which regulate these matters. These are matters which can only be dealt with here. Then you come to a third class, and it is one of that class which we have now before us. There is the case which is not criminal, there is the case which involves no breach of our privileges, in reference to which we cannot act in accordance with constitutional usage, and there is the case of mere scandal, making the committees of this House, and this House itself, vehicles for scandal and for abuse. Those, I say in all calmness and sincerity—not desiring to shield any person—we ought to stop on the threshold, and not give countenance to them by referring them to a committee. Now, what is this charge? The hon. member who last addressed the House (Mr. Laurier) has told us that it was not merely an illegal offence, but an immoral offence; it was not merely *malum prohibitum*, but *malum in se*. Any man who has read parliamentary history will acknowledge that that is not a correct statement. Why, Sir, when the Independence of Parliament Act was passed, professional contractors could sit and did sit in this House, and no man could expel them; and it was no offence of a moral character—no offence, to use my hon. friend's expression, unbecoming an officer and a gentleman.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it an offence now?

Mr. McCARTHY. It was no offence at that time, and no contractor could be expelled from the House. But my hon. friend says that because Parliament has decreed that no contractor may be elected a member of this House, and that if a member becomes a contractor he shall thereby lose his seat, that thereby becomes a moral offence. I think the hon. gentleman has been associating with very immoral men for many years past if that is true. I think the hon. gentleman was a member of the Administration which put that immoral man, Mr. Anglin, into that chair after he had committed that immoral offence. I think the hon. gentleman was a member of the Administration which countenanced His Excellency the Governor General giving his commission to empower to sit on these Treasury benches, men who committed that offence.

But the hon. gentleman is not serious. Parliament says that if a man is a contractor he is ineligible to sit in this House. It does not say that because he has been a contractor he has thereby become ineligible to sit in this House or is an immoral man. For what purpose, then, is this enquiry? Grant that the charge is proved. Grant that the charge—which the Postmaster General has denied, not only in his place in Parliament, but on oath—is well founded and true, that after the hon. gentleman was elected in 1878, and during the time of that Parliament he became a Government contractor. Grant that that charge is sufficiently explicit in the statement made by the hon. member for West Lambton. Assume all that. Assume that a report is brought to the Table finding that the charge is true. What are we to do? What is to follow? Can you expel him? On what ground? Parliament has not said so by its Act: Parliament has not said so by its precedents. The report would lie there. It might be useful possibly as a compaign document to hon. members on the opposite side. But for all parliamentary purposes it would have to lie there as a dead letter, as every member of this House perfectly understands.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend from Bothwell says "hear, hear." I respect my hon. friend, although I do not always concur in his arguments or conclusions. But I think my hon. friend will admit that when the hon. member for South Lanark sits here under the writ which called on the people of South Lanark to return their representative, it does not lie with this Parliament to turn out that representative and disfranchise that constituency except under the law, under the constitution, or under precedents which any man can cite. Now, I need not go on repeating the argument which was so well put by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, and which the hon. gentleman who last spoke has not in the slightest degree attempted to controvert. He has pointed out that, stale as the charge is, there was no pretense that there was any cause and effect, any bargain, any exercise of improper influence by the Postmaster General or any wrong-doing on the part of the Government in connection with the hon. gentleman, supposing him to have been the contractor they allege. No charge of that kind is made. Surely, we ought to deal here not as partisans. This is a matter that concerns the honour and dignity of the House: this is a matter that ought to be dealt with on that principle. If that was the charge, surely the hon. member would have made it. The hon. member knows that these charges are not to be lightly made: and no doubt every word of this statement has been carefully and deliberately scanned and weighed, before being presented to this House; and the charge, therefore, contains all that the hon. gentleman pretends he can prove. Now, I submit, with every degree of confidence, that no man who has any regard for the dignity of this House, no man who has any regard for the principles which should guide our parliamentary practice, would for one moment countenance an accusation of this kind presented in the language in which it has been embodied. An hon. member said something about the Postmaster General having given the case away. I utterly deny that it rests with him or anybody else to determine that question. No doubt the Postmaster General desires an enquiry; no doubt he fears personally to have this charge made here and be denied the opportunity of disproving it before a committee: but that is a matter which concerns the Postmaster General simply and purely, and which does not concern this House. He may well desire that this thing should be set at rest once and for all—this stale charge which was made so long ago that I forget when it was made, my hon. friend beside me says ten years ago, before a commission: which came up afterwards before a court where not only Mr. Haggart himself, but Mr. McLaren was examined and cross-examined on the subject; which has, in point of fact, been public property during all these years. And yet, at the tail end of the session we have it again brought forward, with, I am confident, the best motives on the part of the hon. member for Lambton, but, I venture to say, without full consideration of the consequences involved in the application.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I agree with one observation made by the hon. member who has just taken his seat, namely, that we ought not to approach the consideration of this question as partisans. We ought to approach it with the view of following the ordinary parliamentary rule and of exercising, or refraining from exercising, our parliamentary authority. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) referred to events which have recently transpired in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and he pointed out that in certain cases that Parliament awaited the decision of the courts before taking any action on the conduct of members accused. The hon. member's statement is entirely accurate in that particular; but it is worthy of observation that the accusations brought against those hon. members were accusations affecting their private conduct and not their conduct as members of Parliament. The accusations made against them were not for offences against the law of Parliament but against the ordinary law of the land, for the enquiry and determination of which the ordinary law of the land makes proper provision. This is no new rule. It will be remembered that in the case of Lord Cochrane, which took place many years ago, he was accused of having speculated improperly in the funds, with a view of affecting their value and putting the money in his own pocket. That was a criminal offence, and he was tried for it and found guilty. It was subsequently shown that the verdict had been unjustly found against him, but Parliament took action upon the decision of the court, and refused to make any enquiry into his conduct, because it was a transaction altogether apart from his duties as a member of Parliament. Now, I understand that this accusation is of a very different kind, and I do not understand, from reading the charge made by the hon. member for West Lambton, that it is of the light character described by the Minister of Justice and by the hon. member for North Simcoe. Sir, if such a defence were made of a judge as the Minister of Justice has made here of a colleague, he would at once indignantly repudiate it. I remember the case of Lord Bacon, who accepted bribes from suitors when Lord Chancellor of England. In his own defence he declared that his conduct had never been influenced in the slightest

degree by the acceptance of those bribes. Was that regarded as a defence? The Minister of Justice says that it has not been charged here that the conduct of the Government or the conduct of the Postmaster General in reference to these matters was at all improper. Let me say this, that I altogether repudiate that proposition. I say when the hon. member for West Lambton comes into this House and charges the Government with having received large sums of money from these contractors while their claims against the Government were still pending, that of itself is a charge of a high crime and misdemeanour against the Administration. I say it is not necessary that the hon. member for West Lambton should have said that the Government had corruptly received moneys from the contractors. I declare it my conviction, as a member of this House, that it is utterly impossible for an Administration to receive large sums of money from contractors to promote the interests of themselves and their party at elections in any other way than in a corrupt way; I say that the acceptance of money is a corrupt acceptance, and that when the hon. member charged that fact he made a charge sufficient to warrant an enquiry by a committee of this House. It is not necessary to go beyond that. The Minister of Justice and the hon. member for North Simcoe intimated that this was not a proper subject for enquiry by a committee. I would like to know what body is the proper body before which such an enquiry should be had. Where is the court in which the conduct of the Minister in having improperly received money from contractors is to be investigated? Is it not in this House? Is it not the most important duty of the high court of Parliament to enquire into the proper appropriation or misappropriation of the moneys of the people? The Crown has not moneys of its own. It has what we choose to give it, and we give the Crown what we are authorized, as deputies of the people, to give and grant. This money granted is money held in trust for public purposes, and who are the parties who should see whether that trust has been honestly discharged or not? Is it not this House, by a committee of this House, which should investigate this matter? Sir, we are the only tribunal which has jurisdiction. I know it has been sometimes suggested that a Royal Commission should enquire into these matters. I utterly repudiate that doctrine, as at variance with the principle and spirit of our constitution. It is not right that a Royal Commission should investigate into a matter of this kind. We do not propose to delegate to the accused parties the right to appoint the court by which they may be tried. That would be a most improper proceeding. When may a Royal Commission be appointed? It may be appointed for enquiry into subordinate matters, and is appointed upon the recommendation of Parliament in the mother country. Take the case of Lord Torrington, in the matter of the rebellion in the Island of Ceylon. A Royal Commission was appointed there, as it was too far away for Parliament to investigate: but it was appointed upon the express authority and recommendation of Parliament, and not upon the mere motion of the Government. We say here that the only proper parties, the only tribunal by which this enquiry can be made, before whom these parties can be brought, is this House, or a committee appointed by this House to take the evidence and report upon the subject. There can be no doubt of that. I was astonished to hear the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) referring as he did to the case which was before us of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane). What tribunal has a right to enquire into the conduct of a member? It is true that other parties may be implicated, or that other parties may have violated the statute and may be brought before the courts of law, and may be punished for their offences, but this House has a right to enquire into the conduct of its own members, it has a right to enquire into the conduct and methods of administration. It is said by the hon. the Minister of Justice and by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that this is a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, and that the Parliament in which the hon. gentleman had no right to sit, if these charges were true, is dead, that the hon. member was elected under a new writ and to a new Parliament, and that we have no right to investigate what transpired before. I am not going into a discussion of that matter at all. I may say that the violation of the Independence of Parliament Act is the violation of a statutory law, that, when the opportunity for punishment has gone by, there is no opportunity for enforcing the statute, and that, if there is simply an offence against the statute and against the statute alone, I agree with the hon. gentleman that this House would have no right to investigate the case, and that the election of the hon. member afterwards would be a regular and valid election, and his seat could not be touched, or, if it was touched, it would be done by an arbitrary act of the House, as the House of Commons in England acted arbitrarily in the case of Mr. Bradlaugh. But the question here is totally different. The question is not whether the hon. member's seat is affected, but whether the facts, if they are established, leave the hon. gentleman a proper officer of the Crown, a worthy representative of this House in advising the Crown; is he a worthy representative of this House as a member of the Commons which is to give advice to the Crown? That is the question, and that question is as fresh to day as it was on the day when the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was sworn in a member of the Administration and received his patent as Postmaster General. The question, therefore, which we have to consider in connection with these charges is whether the hon. gentleman was a contractor with the Government at that time, or was so connected with the parties who had contracted with the Government, as to have a beneficial interest in the contract: did he, as one of the parties, pay out to the Government large sums of money for the purpose of influencing the election? Every hon. gentleman will understand that these men were not going to pay out money at a loss. Every hon. gentleman knows the evidence connected with that section B contract. Everyone knows that there were charges made against the engineer by the contractors, that he was removed, that the work done was remeasured, that the contractors received something in the neighbourhood of $400,000 more under the remeasurement than they were entitled to under the measurement of the engineer who was there before. If that be so, was that a correct measurement, was that man sent for the purpose of making such a measurement as would put money

into the pockets of the parties more than they were entitled to receive? That is a proper thing to consider, when it is said that hundreds of thousands of dollars have been paid by these contractors over to the Administration for election purposes. Will the hon. gentleman say that, when members of the Administration who assumed the responsibility of dealing with these contractors, of in my opinion violating a public trust, if these charges are true, of taking money which was paid to the contractors in the first instance and repaid by the contractors to the Government in the second instance for improper purposes, it can for a moment be argued that they did not take out of the public treasury a much larger sum than would have been taken out if these contractors had been fairly and squarely dealt with? So, when we look at the statement contained in this allegation, this charge of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) affecting, as it does, the Postmaster General, and still more largely the members of the Administration who received that money; if the charges be true, looking at these facts, it is important that this House should investigate these charges and ascertain whether they have any foundation in fact or not. Surely, if this is not a proper subject of investigation by a committee of this House, then nothing we have done this session in that way was a proper proceeding. Take the case of the *Admiral*. Charges were made by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) against the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, that he had, in violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, between 1883 and 1888, had a contract with the Government in the name of another party by which he received the amount of $12,500 a year for services in connection with the Intercolonial Railway in the Baie des Chaleurs. Did the Minister of Justice rise and say: This is an old matter, the House has nothing to do with it, the Independence of Parliament Act has nothing to do with the case, new writs have been issued and we should not investigate that matter in the present Parliament?

Mr. GIROUARD. The offence was committed up to February, 1891.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The offence ceased before the writ was issued.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That does not appear by the charge, and I think the hon. gentleman will in fairness admit that it was only one in a large number of charges.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I admit in all fairness, as I only desire to be fair, that this was only one in a number of charges, but still the hon. gentleman reported it and censured the party charged. If that was a proper matter to investigate, this is an equally proper one. There are other matters which have been investigated this session which are quite as old as this one. The hon. gentleman says this is about eleven years old. He is mistaken. It is true that this contract was begun eleven years ago, but it was not ended eleven years ago. I understand that in 1884 over $200,000 were paid under this contract. I understand that this contract was not terminated until 1886 or 1887. The year 1887 is not so remote a period in antiquity that it is not proper for this House to investigate the matter. We say that the parties who are charged with acting improperly are still here. The parties who are charged with acting improperly are advisers of the Crown. If these charges are true, if a member of this House concealed the fact that he was a contractor with the Government, if he denied the fact on oath, and if my hon. friend is able to show that it was all true nevertheless, and that he was a contractor, that he did receive large sums of money, and that he contributed as one of the contractors large sums of money to the Government for election purposes, I think he will have gone a long way to establish that those gentlemen are not parties who ought to be entrusted with the duty of advising the Crown with regard to our public affairs, or of taking charge of the expenditure of the public moneys of this country.

Mr. BOWELL. Then you accuse the Postmaster General of perjury.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I point out this, that the Postmaster General has made oath that he was not a member of this partnership, that he was not beneficially interested.

Mr. BOWELL. You stated positively that the member for Lambton could prove that it was not true.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say that the member for Lambton states in these charges that he can prove that the hon. Postmaster General was beneficially interested in this contract. Now, that is what he says.

Mr. BOWELL. That is what you say.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, that is precisely what I say, and the Postmaster General has said to the contrary. He said the contrary to-day. He proposes to produce here a solemn declaration made by Senator McLaren that he was not a member of the partnership, that he was not beneficially interested in it. Certainly that is a clear issue. Parties could not stand in more direct antagonism with each other with regard to a question of fact than the hon. member for West Lambton in his charge and the hon. the Postmaster General in his denial. Is not that a proper matter for this House to enquire into? Has it no public importance? When Ministers take large sums of money from those contractors and use it in an election, will hon. gentlemen say that that does not affect the amount of money paid on the contract? Will any hon. gentleman say that if the Government received $200,000, or a less sum, from contractors for election expenses, that the work does not cost the country any more? Is this to be a matter of commission over again? Will it be contended that the payment of 10 per cent. did not add anything to the amount of money that was taken from the public treasury? I apprehend that the country will not accept any such defence; and I say again that when my hon. friend states that he is prepared to establish, if given a committee, the fact that the Government did receive large sums of money from these contractors, there is a charge made against the Administration that it is the duty of the House to enquire into. It is one of those cases that fall wholly within the purview of this House; this is the proper tribunal in which to make the enquiry; and there is no other tribunal known to the law that can enquire into the validity of those charges other than this House, or a committee of the House appointed to investigate the matter.

Mr. SKINNER. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down generally argues a case with a closeness that links principle and fact together so as to carry in the minds of hon. members at least a conviction that he understands himself what he is speaking about. But in this case he feels, I fancy, the weight of the arguments that have been used against the position he takes in reference to the staleness of the charge, in reference to the uncertainty of the charge, and in reference to the fact that if it were proved, it would have no effect upon the seat of the hon. member who is so charged; and also in reference to the fact that no moral offence is charged. He feels the weight of all these things, and practically casts them over, and makes what might be called an election or a hustings speech, instead of one applicable to the case now before the House. Now, what does the hon. member for Lambton say, in the first instance, in reference to this charge? He says he is credibly informed and believes that he is able to establish by satisfactory evidence such-and-such things: in other words, he makes no charge at all. It cannot be said that the hon. member for Lambton stands at the back of any charge. He says that he thinks, if he is given an opportunity to do so, that he will be able to establish thus and so, but he does not say that thus and so are true, he does not say that the hon. member did this or that with reference to these matters, but he only alleges that if he had an opportunity to do so he could prove them. He does not make any direct charges against the Postmaster General, but he merely casts a slur or a suspicion upon the Minister of having done something for a political purpose. With reference to the case the hon. member for Bothwell has cited, that of Lord Cochrane having speculated in public funds, as he says, in that case a crime had been committed, and Parliament acted upon the conviction of the party. Now, is there any parallel between that case and this? Has any crime been committed here? Is there any charge of crime here? Does the hon. member for Lambton say that he has even a suspicion of crime, or that he could prove it if he had an opportunity to do so? Nothing of the kind. The precedent has not in it the weight of air. With reference to the case of Lord Bacon having accepted bribes, surely the hon. member is hard pressed when he has to go back through the centuries for precedents. No precedent involving bribery has reference to any charge that is now before this House. All these things are common law offences, and whatever Parliament did in connection with them, Parliament acted in a different way from what we are called upon to act here: and if hundreds of years ago Parliament would have tried out the question of a crime, it is notorious that Parliament does not so act now with reference to charges of crime. It is very unfair and unjust to attack individual members of the House in their capacity as members, and to fling these charges of crime across the floor when hon. members have no charge of crime to make, and are not making any charges of crime. All this quotation of precedents having relation to crimes, is mere dirt throwing at members of this House. Now, supposing the tables were reversed. The cases of Mr. Jones, formerly a member for Halifax, and of Mr. Anglin, at the same time a Speaker of this House, have been referred to. Suppose, for example, these two gentlemen were sitting now on the other side of the House, having been returned in the elections that took place last winter. Suppose that some hon. member should get up on this side of the House and make the same charges against those two members for which they resigned at that time, and say there were moral offences committed, and that they were not worthy to be members of the House on account of what they had done then. Suppose these two gentlemen were members of the Government of the day, and that it should be claimed that they ought not to be members of the Government because of those offences, would not such charges be laughed at? Would not hon. gentlemen opposite themselves say that the thing was absurd? Would they not say that the charges were made merely for political effect? And yet that is just what the hon. member for Lambton is now doing in asking for a committee of investigation into certain insinuations he has made against the Postmaster General. Surely those hon. gentlemen are not sincere in the position they take. The hon. gentleman said the charge is one of the nature of a high crime and misdemeanour. Any one answers that argument by reading the charge. All the charge, if it be a charge, mentions is that the member infringed the Independence of Parliament Act. It has been shown that that is not a crime at common law, but an offence created by virtue of a statute. If an hon. gentleman rose in his place and declared that at an election ten years or five years ago the hon. gentleman in question had committed an offence against the Independence of Parliament Act, under which he would be punished by forfeiting his seat, would he be justified in asking for a committee to try the charge? Under that Act it is specially provided that disqualification is punishment for such an offence. After the lapse of one year, however, the operation of that Act lapses as regards any particular case. I will not undertake to argue that point, but I only mention it, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has omitted to reply to that and other arguments. The hon. gentleman spoke of appealing to the people, and at the same time he dodged the arguments brought forward, and in effect he said: I know my position is unsound, that these charges cannot be substantiated, that a committee should not be struck; but I will appeal from Parliament to the people, who will not examine the question in the same manner as will be done by hon. members in this House. The hon. gentleman comes down to refer to the position which the Postmaster General occupies towards the Government of the day. Let me read that portion of the charge, as I wish to make the reply as close as needs be. It is in these words:

"That during the progress of the said works, and while the said the Honourable John G. Haggart was so interested therein, members of the said firm were called upon by members of the Government of Canada for large contributions for political purposes, and such contributions were paid out of the moneys of the said firm, and with the knowledge and assent of the said Honourable John G. Haggart were charged against the profits of the firm."

Does the hon. gentleman or any other hon. member think for a moment that the offence of a gentleman sitting here contrary to law is increased because he contributed to election expenses? I hold that it would not affect the case one way or the other; it would not as a moral offence, and certainly it would not as a statutory one, if it was such an offence. It

is not alleged that the hon. gentleman, or the firm with which it is alleged he was connected, took any money out of the public treasury, or that the Government contributed one cent more than it should pay. We find that the firm obtained money to which they were properly entitled, and they had a perfect right to contribute of their own money, if they pleased. It could not seriously be argued that they had not a right to contribute to elections if they thought fit to do so. There is a great deal of false virtue exhibited in this Parliament and before its committees and in the country about contributing to elections. We all know there is a very large legitimate expenditure in connection with elections.

Mr. GILLMOR. No, not very large.

Mr. SKINNER. I say there is. Take the elections which occurred last March. Hon. gentlemen opposite made an attempt—I will not, for the purpose of this argument, say they acted wrongly—to turn the legitimate course of this country into an entirely new stream, and they endeavoured to bring about a state of things in that regard that was almost revolutionary.

Mr. LISTER. How was it four years before?

Mr. SKINNER. Perhaps the same. I am not saying that hon. gentlemen opposite at the last election acted improperly, but they attempted to do something which in the nature of the case would have been of a revolutionary character, and in carrying forward that propaganda they of necessity went to very large expenditure. We know that the press cannot work for nothing. A large amount of money was required for advertising and publication purposes. We know that a large number of speakers were employed, that men travelled up and down the country as probably they had never travelled before on an election campaign. I do not wish to introduce anything of a controversial character; but, giving hon. gentlemen opposite credit for working according to their belief, it is commonly known that they went to a vast expense for the purpose of carrying forward the movement which they thought would benefit the country. How was that movement to be met? Was it to be met by hon. gentlemen abrogating their principles and by allowing matters to go their own way, and stating that they would meekly submit to this propaganda? No; expenditure had to be met with expenditure; and it had to be so.

Mr. LISTER. You got it from your contractors, and we from our supporters.

Mr. SKINNER. It does not affect my argument from whom the money came. I am giving hon. gentlemen opposite credit for getting the money honestly; and outside of all this question of contractors, within my knowledge I know that plenty of money was correctly and honestly spent in the elections on our side, and no contractors ever contributed anything.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Which side is that?

Mr. SKINNER. It scarcely becomes us to be eternally talking about the expenditure of money on elections, and at the same time shutting our eyes to the common history of our country, as we are doing. Let us apply these arguments to this portion of the charge:

"That during the progress of the said works, and while the said Hon. John G. Haggart was so interested therein, members of the said firm were called upon by members of the Government of Canada for large contributions for political purposes."

If that were true, it is not a matter for enquiry here. Even according to this charge the money belongs to this firm, and even if they paid it out for political purposes, that was their own business; and if it was expended for political purposes, it is not for us to ascertain whether it was so or not. It is not for us to enquire here——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear hear.

Mr. SKINNER. You will make yourself hoarse.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Go to the courts.

Mr. SKINNER. I am going to finish this sentence as I started it, notwithstanding the interruption. It is not for us to enquire here, after the manner of an election court, as to expenditures made years and years ago. It would be the most supreme folly for us, if charges were made respecting expenditure of money as this charge is made here, to have a committee of enquiry appointed on each case. I could understand the hon. gentleman, if he made a charge that in 1879 the Government received money from contractors and so forth; and hon. gentlemen opposite might make that the subject of a motion of want of confidence in the Government, and have it turned out. But it will not do by inserting the thin end of the wedge to turn our parliamentary committees into committees of enquiry on election cases, and thereby rob the election courts of their jurisdiction so far as they may take it up. Examining that portion of the charge, it does not allege that any money was dishonestly taken from the Government. It is going rather too far to say, as the hon. member for Bothwell argued, that the moment a member violates the Independence of Parliament Act, it becomes an offence such as he has attempted to describe, and becomes immoral. The taking of that money because you are a member of Parliament is not to rob the country of anything. It is only to say that you being in that position, notwithstanding the services you may have rendered, you are not entitled to the money. That is all the law says on that point. When it was alleged that the Hon. Mr. Jones and the Hon. Mr. Anglin of the Parliament between 1873 and 1878, took money, I do not understand that because they took money that they were not entitled to by law, they did anything immoral because they had not rendered services to the country. I suppose Mr. Anglin gave value for the money; I never heard it contended that he did not. But if the hon. gentlemen opposite were correct in their argument, notwithstanding that he gave full value for the money, still because he got the money in violation of the Act, he became immoral and became tainted forever, and could never again sit in the House without having the shadow of an immoral offence upon him, and at all events would never have been in a position to become a member of the Government in Canada. That is the length to which the hon. gentleman wants us to go. I think he must know on reflection that he can not only produce no precedent for an idea like that, but he must know that it is absurd, that it is against all sound reasoning, and that it is an argument which on reflection he would not put to this House again, nor even to the electors on the hustings, if he wanted to guard his reputation and to keep it as high as it now

stands before the House and before the country as well. Therefore I think that the hon. gentleman stands now in a double position. Not only did he fail to meet the unanswerable arguments of the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), but he has also put forword arguments which are unsound in themselves and which cannot be for a single moment maintained in this House. The hon. gentleman's concluding argument was, that the firm referred to in the charge may have taken larger sums of money than they were entitled to. That is a very easy thing to say; but does the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) charge it? Is it going to be said that an hon. member can get up in this House and say that he will have an investigation because it was possible that under certain circumstances a certain thing could have been done. I say such a thing cannot be allowed, and I think the hon. gentleman would not again have advanced that argument to the House if he considered the proposition it contained. I say the argument is unworthy of him, and, therefore, I come back to the fact that the arguments of hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this side have not only not been met, but that hon. gentlemen on the other side have put forward the weakest case that it is almost possible for a person to imagine, when it is seriously demanded that a Committee of Parliament should be asked to enquire into such a matter. I maintain in the first place, as has been stated, that there really is no charge at all. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) does not say he makes the charge. He only claims the privilege to see whether or not he can prove it, and when his supporters speak in this Parliament in favour of that proposition they carry it no further, and only ask that a committee be appointed upon a grave charge which can neither be sustained in fact nor in law. I believe that the proposition to appoint a committee should be rejected by the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I listened with extreme regret, Sir, to the speech delivered this afternoon by the hon. Minister of Justice, and for my own part I desire to record my conviction that no more immoral speech was ever delivered in Parliament. Sir, we had hoped, as we had some right to hope, that the hon. gentleman who is a comparatively new member of this Cabinet, who may have been supposed not to be acquainted with all that we have known as to the ways and means by which his predecessors got into office and were kept in office; was to some extent at any rate sincere in the declaration which he and his chief have made over and over again, that they desire to screen no man, that they desire to make honest enquiry and honest investigation into every reasonable charge that can be preferred against any member of their Cabinet or against any member of this House. Now, Sir, we know what that hon. gentleman's professions are worth. We know, Sir, what we have to expect from this hon. gentleman. Sir, the hon. gentleman perhaps has heard, as I have heard and as others have heard, that there are certain casuists who are willing to prove that there is no conceivable crime in the calendar that cannot be committed *ad majorem dei gloriam*. Substitute party for Providence, and we have a tolerable idea of the morals and principles which the hon. gentleman, to my regret, and I hope to his own regret when his conscience wakes up, proves to have advocated to-day. Why, Sir, what has this hon. gentleman got to tell us? That it is no crime for a member of this House to have taken, it may be, $100,000 or $200,000 of the public money under false pretenses as a contractor, and in conjunction with other members of that same firm of which he was a member in disguise, to have paid large sums to the Government for political purposes. That is the charge. We are told that it was no crime for him to have expended large portions of that money for the purpose of debauching the electors in connivance with the Government of the day, and that, in the opinion of the Minister of Justice, is no offence, it is not a statutory offence, it is not a moral offence, it is not a thing that requires the investigation of Parliament. I never heard such a doctrine proclaimed before, and I trust, for the honour of Canada, that we will never hear it advanced again. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, besides that, was disingenuous as mortal man can be in dealing with the statements of my hon. friend. What was his argument from first to last? These things he says took place twelve years ago. Why, Sir, he knows, if he knows anything of the history of section B, and if he had listened to the statement of his friend the Postmaster General, he would have known, that whether it commenced in 1879 or 1880 it did not matter, because it extended over six or seven years, and probably the end of this affair was not attained until 1887, a matter of barely four years ago. Yet he and his friend who has just spoken have made the House ring with their denunciation of stale charges dating back half-a-score of years. Why, Sir, this charge is not nearly so stale as the charge which I made from my place here twelve months ago against the then hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). That matter had all been disposed of, that matter had all been closed years before the charge was made, but we did not find that an objection to going into the question: we did not find that a reason why we should not examine it. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it would have been better on the whole if the hon. gentleman who spoke last had confined himself—for, after all, perhaps that would be his best defence—to an argument which I heard advanced not very long ago in respect to a somewhat similar case. The hon. member, the Postmaster General, may not be clean, but he is probably quite as clean as is necessary for the company he keeps. Let us consider the desperate position which the Ministers have assumed on this question. If this charge be false, if my hon. friend has been misinformed, if he be unable to establish it, the political advantage to the Ministers of proving that charge false, would be immense. If this charge could be shown and proved to be false, it would go very far indeed to relieve them from the cloud which hangs over the hon. gentleman and his colleagues with respect to the doings of other members of that Cabinet than the late Minister of Public Works. They would have everything to gain, in a political point of view, if this charge be false, by causing it to be investigated. Sir, I say that these hon. gentlemen have committed, or rather are committing, a political mistake of the very first magnitude, because even if this charge is proved it will do them less evil, it will do them less harm in the public mind, and in the minds of all honest men the world over, than

if they refuse, as they now propose to do, to allow it to be investigated. Mr. Speaker, these things are not done in a corner. Every word my hon. friend stated in his place yesterday has long ere this been placed in the hands of all the electors of the Dominion of Canada; it has appeared this morning in all the leading journals of the adjacent republic; it has appeared in the principal journals of the mother country——

Mr. FOSTER. The party machine.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—and after what we have known and seen during the last few weeks, but one conclusion will be drawn from the conduct of the hon. gentlemen—that they know that the Postmaster General is guilty of everything that has been alleged, and dread and fear the result of the investigation, and therefore they call upon their majority to vote it down. Sir, I have no doubt myself, and never had, that the Railway Department was a worthy sister of the Department of Public Works. I have no doubt and never had, that just as we have found that for the last eight years hundreds of thousands of dollars of the public money have been stolen from the public chest, by the aid of the officers of the Department of Public Works, and have been divided up for political purposes with the co-conspirators, who aided in that steal, in the same way, I have no doubt, if my hon. friend were permitted to have his committee to go into the matter, that we should find that the sister department has been keeping up its end of the stick in precisely the same fashion. Sir, this is not a matter, even if it occurred twelve years ago, which we should be justified in allowing the lapse of time to prevent us dealing with. Sir, I have always contended, as hon. gentlemen know, and my contention is the only possible principle on which the conduct of members of Parliament can be regulated, that every member of Parliament is *ex officio* a trustee, and every member of the Government is doubly and trebly a trustee by virtue of his office; and if it can be shown that lapse of time does not prevent us dealing with the trustees in their management of the affairs of their wards, and if it can be shown that one of the colleagues of hon. gentlemen opposite, five or six or eight years ago, forgot his duties as a trustee so far as to put large sums of money into his pocket, whether it be $100,000, or $150,000, or $200,000, by a deliberate violation of the Act of Parliament in such cases made and provided, that act alone would condemn the Postmaster General. If he were found thus guilty of being a false and fraudulent trustee to the people of Canada, he would be utterly and wholly unfit to continue one hour an adviser of His Excellency; and, Sir, although we do not often introduce His Excellency's name here, I would like to know whether His Excellency is acquainted with the course his Ministers are preparing to take on this occasion. The hon. gentleman will not undertake to say that he has communicated this charge to His Excellency, I venture to say, and received any intimation from His Excellency as to how he would like it to be dealt with. But, behind all this, there is a very large question of policy. It is inexpedient to the last degree to the good government of this country, that we should offer a premium to concealment. Every man who knows anything of the mode in which these contracts were let and carried on, and the way in which the political machine on the other side has been run, knows that it is and always has been a matter of extreme difficulty, except, indeed, in cases of a quarrel occurring among the parties, to ascertain what has been going on. Remember that my hon. friend has made statements which involve the honour and implicate the good government of an Administration of which a portion at any rate of the hon. gentleman's colleagues were members as long as his contract continued, which I believe was up to 1885 or 1886 or 1887 at any rate, until it was finally finished. Now, Sir, is there any man here who will dare to rise up and tell me that the contractors on section B came down here times without number and subscribed large sums over and over again for political purposes, out of pure good will towards hon. gentlemen opposite? We know this: never a dollar is subscribed by contractors without being repaid ten-fold out of the treasury. We know that contractors, being keen business men, will make no contribution to party funds unless they have a perfect certainty that the bread they cast upon the waters will be returned to them buttered on both sides before many days. Now, Sir, there is no use in telling us that it need add materially to the length of the session. Why, Sir, the men chiefly concerned are within two hours rail of this place; a telegram would reach the remainder. One or two of them are either members of the other branch of the Legislature or colleagues of the hon. gentleman. I would venture to say that a very few hours of investigation, properly conducted, would enable the hon. gentleman to establish the facts of his case, and would, if he has been misinformed, enable the hon. gentlemen opposite to clear themselves of the accusation which has been brought against them. Sir, I desire to say a word or two as to the duties of this House; and I think my knowledge of constitutional law on this subject is as good as that of either my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Mc Carthy) or the hon. Minister of Justice. As I understand it, we sit here, the representatives of the people of Canada, for the especial purpose of watching, checking, investigating and ascertaining how the moneys which we, in our capacity as members of Parliament, vote to the Government are expended; and everything connected with them is a proper subject of investigation by this House or by any committee which this House may choose to appoint. That, Sir, I contend, is the true constitutional doctrine; and when my hon. friend rises in his place and declares: You have seen from day to day and from hour to hour how your confidence has been abused, you have seen how the people of Canada have been plundered, you have seen what an organized system of corruption has existed in one important department of the Government; I should like to ask: Is he not justified under these circumstances in saying, information has come into my hands which shows that another great department of the Government has been honeycombed with corruption, and has been the means of providing equally large sums to those which have been scattered in connection with the Esquimalt dock, the Quebec dock and the Lévis harbour works, for the purpose of debauching the electors of Canada. My hon. friend is in his right in every way. I may tell the hon. gentlemen that they need not delude themselves with the idea that this matter is going to

rest here. They need not delude themselves with the idea that, though their majority will vote down the proposition of my hon. friend, this matter will rest or that they will escape. In the present temper of the people of Canada, their refusal will be interpreted, as it ought to be, as a deliberate confession of guilt.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Their refusal will be interpreted as a proof of what I have again and again declared on the hustings and from my place in this House and over my signature, and to which I have challenged proof in rebuttal, which proof was never given, that from first to last, from the time their precious policy of legalized robbery, otherwise called the National Policy, was inaugurated, down to these latest developments, when we find the pettiest offices put up to sale to provide funds for political purposes, the Government of which the hon. gentleman is a member, the Government which he and his predecessors have pretended has the confidence of the people, owe their position to this and to nothing else, that they have succeeded, just by such means as these, in providing funds to influence the ignorant portion of the electorate, by whose votes alone they have succeeded in keeping the places they hold.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CASEY. I confess that, looking at this matter merely as a party man, I think the whole party to which I belong should be extremely well satisfied with the turn this affair has taken. If anything could be conceived more calculated to injure the Government than their refusal to grant an enquiry which is demanded by constitutional practice, into the conduct of one of its own members, such a thing has, at least, not yet been imagined by any preceding government. At the same time, while this course is so favourable to us and so hurtful to the Government, it has a bearing upon constitutional government and the dignity of this House which does not allow us to regard it with unmixed satisfaction, and therefore it is necessary that we should criticise it further. The principal subject of criticism must, no doubt, be the speech of the Minister of Justice. A couple of his supporters came to his aid, but I cannot see that their observations had much to do with the question. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) expressed the whole pith of his speech in the first few sentences he uttered, when he said it was about time for the House to consider when these investigations were going to stop. That is the whole point of the hon. gentleman's speech. I do not wonder that he came to that conclusion; I do not wonder that he thought it high time for these investigations to stop. The result of the investigations which have been held have not been of a nature to reassure hon. gentlemen on that side as to the propriety of going on with any more; and the whole drift of his speech was to produce reasons why no more investigations into the alleged misconduct of members of the Government and their supporters should be permitted. From a personal and party point of view, it would be better for some members on that side that the investigations should not proceed. The hon. gentleman's argument strongly reminded me of the expression used by a little darkey boy who was in a crowd of other boys. The question arose as to the whereabouts of a missing jack-knife, and it was proposed to search the pockets of Sambo to find it. Sambo had not learned his lesson in casuistry from the Minister of Justice, and agreed in the first instance to have his pockets searched, and said nothing until they came to a particular pocket. When they came to look through that he said: "You can't put your hand in dar." "Why not?" they asked. "Because," he said, "that is where the knife is." Probably this is one of the reasons why the investigation into this particular pocket is not granted on the other side. This may be where the jack-knife is. I am afraid that the hon. Minister implicated in this matter must have had a chance to whisper to the jury. He must have copied the expression of the betting men who when on trial for having swindled somebody out of a bet, was given the opportunity to whisper into the ear of the foreman of the jury: It is time for us betting men to stand by one another—and won his case. The hon. Minister must have had the opportunity to whisper into the ear of the hon. member for Simcoe: It is time for us boodling men to stand by one another, and see where this process of investigation is going to stop. The hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Skinner) also chimed in to support boodling, or, to put it more exactly, against investigation into boodling. It was of course necessary for that hon. gentleman, who has so lately become a recruit to the Conservative party, to prove that he is thoroughly in sympathy with the methods and aims of his colleagues. His remarks on this case, as well as another matter on which he spoke, the East Northumberland matter, a few days ago, are sufficient evidence of his intention to be a thorough-going colleague of hon. gentlemen opposite for the future. He has paid his footing as a member of that party by these two speeches. He is thoroughly entitled now to be enrolled on the books of the party; but, apart from this circumstance his speech has little to do with the question at issue. The Minister of Justice, on the other hand, being not only the representative of the Government in this House, but the representative of justice in the whole Dominion, is entitled to have his remarks carefully studied and their import thoroughly understood. He has gone further than any of his predecessors ever went when he denied the right of this House to enquire into matters affecting its own privileges and the standing of its members. His predecessor, as leader of this House, the late Premier, never ventured to go so far. Why, when the late Mr. Huntington made his charges in regard to the Pacific scandal, in 1873, it is true that Sir John Macdonald gave the word to call in the members without a word of debate on the question and voted down the motion for a committee of enquiry. But he was careful, a few days afterwards, to come down to this House to explain his action on that occasion, to say that he did not think it was right that the House should be asked, on the first blush of the charge, to appoint a committee of enquiry, and he then himself proposed the appointment of a committee of enquiry into those charges. The Government, which at first refused to allow a committee to be appointed on the motion of Mr. Huntington, had a committee of enquiry appointed on its own motion. It appeared afterwards that that

committee had not the requisite powers to examine witnesses under oath and to get at the facts of the case. The Government proposed to get over that difficulty by appointing a commission, and, though that was objected to by some of the members on this side of the House, they did appoint such commission. It may have been a partisan commission, but it was a means of enquiry, and, as a matter of fact, that enquiry led to the downfall of the Government. We find that the late Sir John—the great Sir John—had so much regard for constitutional practice and for the privileges of this House that, after he had administered a rebuke to the members of the Opposition, he went on to get an enquiry made. Has the present Sir John the intention of following a similar course? On the contrary, he flouts the right of the members of this House to get an enquiry, and moves that the House, having heard the charges and the denial, shall proceed to the Orders of the Day. He offers nothing whatever to take the place of a committee, to which he objects on the ground of the lateness of the session, and he simply ignores the charges. I ask the House to contrast the course taken by the two knights who have had the honour to lead this House on these different occasions. The one, though carried away by his feelings for the moment, finally did what was necessary to support the dignity of the House. The other proposes to pass the matter by because the charges have been denied by the party accused. What has our late experience taught us in regard to the denials which have been made across the floor of the House by members who are accused? Was not the denial of Mr. Rykert, whom the Minister of Justice practically assisted in expelling from the House, as full and complete across the floor as that which has been made to-day? Was not the denial of the member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) as complete a denial as could be made across the floor of the House? Was not the denial of the late Minister of Public Works as to irregularities in his department as complete a denial as possibly could be made across the floor of the House? The result is that each of these denials has been found to be contrary to the facts of the case. So we cannot be asked to accept a denial made by a Minister as a conclusive answer to an accusation made on the responsibility of a member of the House. Then the objections of the hon. Minister of Justice may be condensed into these—first, that he thinks the privileges of the House are not involved in this matter; secondly, that the action complained of took place too long ago; thirdly, that it does not matter anyhow whether the Postmaster General was guilty of this conduct or not; and fourthly, that it is too late in the session to enquire into it, no matter what might be the consequences of the lack of action. As to the question bearing on the privileges of the House, I do not think there can be two opinions. It is certainly a question of privilege whether a member has been guilty of a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act, but here again the hon. Minister has had the—what shall I call it?—I can call it, at all events, within parliamentary language—the audacity, to say that it makes no difference to the present standing of the Postmaster General whether these charges are proved or not, that no stigma would rest on his character for having broken the Independence of Parliament Act for a series of years. If the Minister of Justice thinks it would reflect no discredit upon him to sit in the same Cabinet with a man guilty of the offences charged against the Postmaster General, I am sorry for his taste and for his opinion of his own dignity and honour. But whatever degradation of sentiment the hon. gentleman may have undergone in regard to this matter, no matter how much he may feel that it is proper to sit in the same Cabinet with a man convicted of this crime, I believe the country and the other members of this House will regard it in another light. The hon. Minister has tried to get around that by saying that other members who had erred in this way have come back from the people afterwards and occupied their seats in this House without a stigma resting upon them. The hon. Minister deliberately misrepresented the facts in regard to those gentlemen. The actions in consequence of which they forfeited their seats were not of the same character as that alleged against the Postmaster General, and which the Minister of Justice would not allow made any difference in his standing in Parliament. He instanced the case of the former Speaker of this House, Mr. Anglin, and of Messrs. Vail and Jones, successively Ministers of Militia. Let me recall to those who were members of the House at that time, and let me inform those who were not, that these cases differed entirely from this one. In the case of Mr. Anglin, there was not a contract with the Government, as has been incorrectly stated by the Minister of Justice. That was charged by the present Minister of Customs, but it was proved that there had been none. In the case of Messrs. Jones and Vail it was also shown that there had been no contract. Their offence was simply what is going on to-day, without exciting any disgust on that side of the House and apparently without being sufficient to void the seat of any member. It was just that the Government of that day gave certain printing to the newspapers in which these gentlemen were interested. That was the offence of Mr. Anglin, that was the offence of Mr. Vail and of Mr. Jones, who were interested in newspaper offices to which printing had been given. It was a transaction exactly of the same kind as the one that is going on now with the Montreal *Gazette*, a paper with which the late Minister of the Interior and the present member for Cardwell (Mr. White) was and is respectively connected as much as Mr. Vail or Mr. Jones was with the newspapers in consequence of their connection with which they had to give up their seats in this House. Their case was by no means as clear in either of those instances as the case of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who practically owns the whole of the Regina *Leader*, a newspaper to which a large amount of Government printing is given every year, entirely out of proportion to the amounts given in those other cases. And yet, Sir, these facts are not held to void the seat of the gentlemen named, because the management of these papers is nominally vested in joint stock companies. But at the time when these occurrences took place to which reference has been made, it was the rule enforced by many precedents in the past, that the Government might give printing to such of its supporters as controlled newspapers, or rather to the newspapers under their control, without voiding their seats in the House.

Precedents had been made to that effect, and I am going to give you in some detail an account of how the precedents came to be reversed in the case of Mr. Anglin and in the cases of Mr. Vail and Mr. Jones, to show you how differently the Government of that day dealt with allegations of this kind, from the manner in which the present Government propose to deal with them, or rather refuse to deal with them. Now, let us take the case of Mr. Anglin. In view of the exordium of the Minister of Justice, in which he stated that notice ought to be given of this motion in the ordinary way, and that it should have been taken up as a notice of motion in its due course, I will call attention to the manner in which the attack was made upon Mr. Anglin. The attack was made by the gentleman who is now Minister of Customs; and how was it brought up? On notice of motion? No, Sir. As a matter of privilege, even? No, Sir. It was brought up as an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply. We find that on that occasion Mr. Bowell "moved that the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved," and so on, quoting the facts and reciting from the Independence of Parliament Act, and concluded by moving that such practices are calculated to detract from the independence of members of this House.

Mr. BOWELL. That was an attack upon the Government, not upon the Speaker.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman says now, as he pretended then, that this was an attack upon the Government and not upon the Speaker, whereas we all know perfectly well that he and his leader both made it an attack upon the Speaker, and I think Sir John A. Macdonald himself told the Speaker that he had no more right to sit in his chair than one of the pages who ran about the floor.

Mr. BOWELL. That is quite true.

Mr. CASEY. It may have been quite true, but it was an attack upon the Speaker, and the present Minister of Customs and his leader, and all who backed them up on that side, attacked the Speaker and attempted to belittle him personally. The only possible outcome of the motion, if it had carried, would have been that the Speaker's seat would have been declared vacant; consequently, this motion was an attack upon the Speaker as well as upon the Government. Sir, the motion involved a question of fact and a question of law. It was an admitted fact that certain payments had been made to Mr. Anglin by the Government on account of printing. That resolution alleged that this money had been paid under an agreement or contract with Mr. Anglin. There was a question of fact and of law both, whether the order to do certain printing and the subsequent performance of the printing constituted a contract. The discussion went on for some time in this unfair method of argument, because it was markedly unfair to attack a member's seat on a motion moved as an amendment to go into Committee of Supply. The discussion continued for some time, and finally the motion was defeated. Amongst those who voted on the motion to condemn the Speaker and to declare his seat vacant, without even a reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, without notice given in the ordinary manner, and on the unheard of and unfair proceeding of moving on going into Committee of Supply—amongst those who voted to condemn the Speaker in that matter were several gentlemen who are now members of this House, and who now object to any enquiry at all into the acts of the Postmaster General. I will read a few of the names: Bowell, Caron, Costigan, Desjardins, Dewdney, Ferguson, Haggart—above all others the gentleman who is now Postmaster General, who now is not willing that his conduct should be investigated by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, who shirks any enquiry into the allegations made against him; on that occasion he voted to condemn the Speaker, who sought the privilege of justifying himself before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, while the then member for Lanark, the present Postmaster General, voted to refuse him that privilege and to condemn him unheard. I see also the names of Kirkpatrick, Langevin, Macdonald (Kingston), McCarthy, Ouimet, White (North Renfrew). Those gentlemen, of the opinions of one of whom, at all events, you, Mr. Speaker, may have some recollection, voted to condemn the then Speaker without giving him the privilege of having his conduct reviewed before the Committee of Privileges and Elections. Now, Sir, the rest of the gentlemen whom I have named, not including yourself, will have an opportunity of voting to prevent the investigation of the charges against the present Postmaster General. They who were so eager to condemn a man unheard then, are now unwilling to let the charges against another man be heard. After that motion had been defeated, I want to call your attention to the manner in which the Government treated this matter. After that motion was defeated it fell to myself, then acting as the Government whip, to move a reference of the whole matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It was felt that a case for enquiry had been made out against the Speaker. I moved:

"That attention having been called to the matter, all the said papers be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and they be directed to enquire into the facts, to search for precedents, and report the result of their enquiries; and whether the said Hon. T. W. Anglin has vacated his seat."

The case went to that committee, composed then, as now, of members of both parties. And what was the result? Did the Government of the day try to burke the enquiry before that committee? Far from it. However, we find that the Committee on Privileges and Elections made a unanimous report, as follows:—After hearing Mr. Anglin, Hon. A. Macdonald, late Postmaster General, and other witnesses, and after papers had been examined, the committee came to the conclusion:

"That it appears from the evidence before the Committee that the Hon. T. W. Anglin, since he has been elected a member of this House, has fulfilled various orders given by public officers for the insertion in his newspaper, the St. John *Freeman*, of advertisements in connection with the public service, and various orders given by the post office inspector, under the instructions of the Postmaster General, for the printing of forms required for the Post Office Department, and has received public moneys for such advertisements and printing; that it appears from Mr. Anglin's evidence that his action was taken under the *bonâ fide* belief, founded on the precedent and practice hereinafter stated, that he was not thereby holding, engaging, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement within the second section of the Act 31 Victoria, chapter 35, for securing the Independence of Parliament.

"That in the year 1864, an Election Committee of the Legislative Assembly of the late Province of Canada, found that the publication by the member for Russell of advertisements for the public service, paid for with the

public moneys, did not create a contract within the meaning of the Provincial Act, the provisions of which are, so far as is material, as follows:—

"No person whosoever holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing, any contract or agreement with Her Majesty, or with any public officer or department with respect to the public services of the Province, or under which any public money of the Province is to be paid for any service, work, matter or thing, shall be eligible as a member, &c."

In giving their decision the Committee used the following language:—

"It is to be remembered, however, that the statute is a disabling and penal one, and must be strictly interpreted. The word 'contract' is accordingly to be taken in its most restricted meaning. There must be, in our opinion, a distinct covenant, or a subsisting and continuous agreement, assented to by the parties, and having the character of mutuality. The words themselves may be said in some sense to bear out this view, for it is required to be held or enjoyed, undertaken or executed.

"That it appears from the evidence taken by the Committee and from the Public Accounts of the Dominion, and returns laid before Parliament, that between 1867 and 1873, numerous orders given by public officers for the insertion of advertisements connected with the public service were fulfilled, and various sums of public money were in respect thereof received, by several persons then being members of Parliament: and that, under the practices were notorious, it was never alleged in Parliament, that the members concerned therein, had entered into disqualifying contracts, but they held their seats unchallenged through two Parliaments. The Committee are of opinion that, in point of law, the same principle must govern the case referred to them, and the cases of the Russell election and the said other members."

Thus it appeared from the precedents of Parliament of Canada that up to that time the seat of a member of Parliament was not necessarily vacated by the fact that he had done printing of any kind on the order of the Crown or any officer thereof. What conclusion did the Government arrive at? Did the Committee say that Mr. Anglin was cleared, although he had innocently and in good faith and in the presence of many precedents done Government printing, as it was then understood he had a right to do? No; that Committee, on which the friends of the Government of the day were in a majority, reported as follows:—

"The Committee are, however, of opinion that the said precedent and practice are erroneous, and that, according to the true construction of the Act for securing the independence of Parliament, the transactions in question did constitute disqualifying contracts."

The Committee held that there was no contract, and therefore Mr. Anglin's seat was not vacated according to the law as interpreted up to that time. The Committee reported:

"And therefore find: That the Hon. Timothy Warren Anglin, member for the electoral district of the County of Gloucester, after his election for the said electoral district, became a party to a contract or agreement with the Postmaster General of Canada, with respect to the Public Service of Canada, and under which public money of Canada has been paid for certain service and work, and that this election thereby became void."

And therefore the seat of Mr. Anglin was vacated. The Minister of Justice has said that if the charges against the Postmaster General were all proved, no stigma would rest on his character. He quoted the case to which I have been referring in some detail in illustration, because no stigma rested on the character of Mr. Anglin. The cases are quite different, and the difference is clear. Mr. Anglin had acted in accordance with all precedents up to that time. He was unseated because the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which the matter had been referred by the action of the Government of the day, and in spite of the fact that a majority of his own friends were on the Committee, reported that although Mr. Anglin was technically within his rights, yet, taking a broad view of the independence of Parliament, he had gone beyond it, and must vacate his seat. He went back to his constituents and was re-elected, and, as the Minister of Justice has said, he came back without the slightest stigma on his character. Why? Not because he was re-elected, but because he had not been guilty of any crime. It was because he had acted in good faith and in accordance with parliamentary usage up to that time, that there had never been any stigma on his character. The Minister of Justice contends that re-election would remove a stigma, and quotes this case as proof. The cases of Messrs. Jones and Vail were similar. Their disqualification arose in the same casual manner from some printing matters. In consequence of this new interpretation of the law they went back to their constituents, and they also came back without any stigma on their character, for the same reason, viz., that no stigma had ever rested there. They went back to their constituents to remove a technical disability, newly created by the decision of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. These cases, so far from assisting the Minister of Justice in his contention, show in the broadest and clearest light the difference in the methods of dealing between the Liberal Government of that day and the Conservative Government now. In that case enquiry was courted; in that case the Government's friends on the Committee on Privileges and Elections, went far beyond existing precedents in pressing the carrying out of the law both in the letter and spirit against one of their own friends. In this case, the Conservative Government refuse enquiry altogether. If re-election would remove a stigma, if it was only necessary that a man should be re-elected to wipe out such a blot, why did the Government consent to an investigation in the case of the hon. member for East Northumberland? He had been re-elected since the time he was charged with committing petty acts of corruption, not to be compared in amount and importance to these now charged against the Postmaster General. The Government had not then reached the sublime point of audacity to which they have now attained. They did not feel that they dare refuse an enquiry into the Cochrane case, and although that hon. gentleman has been re-elected since the time of committing the irregularities, the Government granted the committee enquiry was made, and a report laid before the House. It may have been in consequence of their experience in that case that they came to the conclusion that enquiry must be stopped; but, at all events, the granting of their consent to the enquiry in that case has estopped them from objecting to enquiry in the present case, on the ground that the Postmaster General has been re-elected since those events happened. Only four or five years have elapsed since this contract in question came to a termination, although it was entered into twelve years ago. It went on during two Parliaments at all events, and although there has been an election since, that fact certainly does not estop enquiry in this case any more than in the case of the hon. member for East Northumberland. The argument as to the lateness of the session requires to be mentioned more by way of ridicule than by way of serious argument. What does it matter how long the ses-

sion has been, what does it matter whether members are put to inconvenience or not, compared with the question of either proving or disproving the charges that now rest on a Minister of the Crown. Is it to be supposed the Postmaster General can hold up his head among his colleagues and hon. members and before the electors with these charges hanging over him, and with the fact that his colleagues, no doubt with his consent, and perhaps at his urgent request, decided to refuse to him and his accusers the chance, respectively, of clearing or condemning him? Can he pose as a member of the Government in good standing while these charges hang over him? He cannot. The Minister of Justice is doing an injustice to his own colleagues by keeping him in that position. If the Postmaster General can be proved innocent, our party will have received a more crushing blow than it has received for many years, in view of the manner in which these charges are being pushed forward and pressed. While hon. gentlemen opposite declare these charges are false, they refuse us the opportunity of proceeding to their proof, and they refuse the opportunity to their colleague of proving his innocence. The country must and will draw the conclusion that his innocence could not be proved, and that the Government and he himself are afraid to have the case go to trial. While that state of things exists, I say that the Postmaster General cannot be recognized as a member of Parliament in good standing, and as one free from all suspicion of having sinned against the privileges of this House, and neither he nor his colleagues nor those who vote to prevent enquiry in this case can hold themselves free from suspicion of connivance at a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act. But, Sir, still worse than the effect upon the character of the Postmaster General and of those who vote to prevent enquiry in this instance is the effect that this will have upon the reputation of the Minister of Justice himself. That hon. gentleman had begun to earn a reputation for impartiality from his remarks in the earlier part of this session, and it had begun to be believed that he really wished to see an investigation into all matters where wrong-doing was alleged, and the punishment of everybody who was proven to be guilty, no matter how high the guilty person might be placed. We began to think that the Minister of Justice preferred righteousness and purity to guilt and corruption, and that he intended to induce the Government of which he was a member to set out on new principles, punishing corruption wherever it was found and keeping their skirts clear from the sins which had defiled the garments of their predecessors, and going ahead with a clean sheet as that re-constructed Government might have done. If that policy had been adhered to the Minister and his Government would have obtained credit for the desire to do well and for the acts which they did do well. But, Sir, what a fall is there when we find the Minister of Justice, the first who has ever dared to lay down the dictum in this House that it is not wrong that a member of Parliament and a Minister, for a number of years, should have systematically violated the Act securing the independence of this House. It was bad enough when a few days ago the House voted that it was no offence against Parliament to sell petty offices for cash for elections or personal purposes, but when we find the highest authority on jurisprudence in the Government and in the country declaring that such conduct as is charged against the Postmaster General is no stigma on a member of this House, we have reached a depth of degradation still lower. The manner in which the Minister of Justice argued has done everything to ruin the reputation which he was gradually building up. We had begun to have an idea that the mind of that hon. Minister was as transparent to the rays of truth as glass is to the rays of the sun, and that he transmitted to the House the full truth that flowed upon him from the contemplation of any subject. We had begun to think that the pure white light of truth penetrated his intellect and was transmitted to the House, but now we are forced, on account of his casuistry, and by his twisting and turning of truth, to recall some of the qualities which appear in very transparent glass or crystal, to which I have likened his intellect. There are many crystals as bright and lustrous as glass which have a peculiar property; for when a gleam of white light passes through these crystals in a certain direction it comes out on the other side apparently as pure as ever, but, that light has undergone a change in the body of that crystal. It has come out of the crystal polarized. It has had to twist around the axis of the crystal in its passage through, and that light, pure as it looks coming out of the crystal, is still not true white light because it has been twisted around the axis of that crystal, as the truth in this case has been twisted. Now, Sir, taking all these things into account, the injustice that has been done to the maker of these charges, the injustice that has been done to the man against whom they are brought, the damage that has been done to that pride of the Government, the Minister of Justice, the insult that has been offered to the dignity and privileges of this House, and the general degradation of public feeling that must arise: I say that although from a party sense we might rejoice in the course the Government has pursued to-day, yet from the point of view of patriots and honest citizens of this country we must deeply deplore it and protest against it to the best of our ability.

Mr. GIROUARD. When the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) closed his speech at six o'clock I intended to offer to the House a few remarks upon this matter, but as I had hoped we would reach a vote then I did not do so. However, seeing that my expectations and the expectations of many members of the House were not realized, I will venture to offer one or two remarks now. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) closed his speech by saying that we were afraid of the investigation, and, in his eloquent and at the same time violent language, he asked: What will the mother country say to-morrow when the people there will hear that the grave charges which have been published in the London press this morning did not meet with a proper answer from this side of the House; what will the people of England say when a serious charge is made against a Minister of the Crown and against the whole Administration; when an investigation is demanded, and when that investigation is refused? Mr. Speaker, if we judge by the communications which have been sent from this side of the Atlantic to the mother land respecting all these scandals and so-called scandals, I think I may say that the object of hon. gentlemen opposite in bringing this charge was

to bring infamy upon this country in the mother land. I am going to read from the news sent by—I would not say by hon. gentlemen opposite—but by a gentleman who is very well known for his zeal for their cause, a gentleman whom I see now in the press gallery, a gentleman who is very well known as the correspondent of the Dalziel News Agency. There was a charge made on the 7th September, in the shape of a query, by the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Forbes) against the Secretary of State. It appears hon. gentlemen opposite were not satisfied with the revelations made in the Public Accounts Committee and in the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I admit that these revelations were too much for the good name of Canada; but why were hon. gentlemen opposite not satisfied with the facts, instead of concocting imaginary scandals? The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes), acting under their instructions, knew that the charge which he brought was brought only for the purpose of bringing scandals before the people of this country. He would not dare to make a charge against the hon. Secretary of State; but he put it in the shape of a query, and it was telegraphed to the London press on the following morning. Now, for the edification of the House, to show how these charges are telegraphed across the Atlantic, I will read a despatch which was sent to the London *Times* of the 8th September, signed "Dalziel:"

"OTTAWA, September 7.—Mr. Forbes, one of the members for Nova Scotia, has given notice in the House of Commons of his intention to call the attention of the Government to statements contained in a letter written by Mr. William McDougall, a former Cabinet Minister and Privy Councillor, which is widely published in the press here. The letter contains serious reflections on the Hon. J. A. Chapleau. Mr. McDougall intimates that he now believes that Mr. Chapleau, or somebody on his behalf, was paid 10 per cent. on $83,000 which the Government awarded to Messrs. Smith & Ripley, a New York firm of railway contractors, in settlement of a claim for damages. Mr. McDougall, who is counsel for Messrs. Smith & Ripley, has been questioned."

Here is quoted the letter on which the query was made:

"Mr. Forbes will ask the Government what action they propose to take in the matter."

Now, there are almost as many falsehoods, wicked falsehoods, and libels upon members of this House in this communication as there are lines. Do you want me to name a few of these falsehoods? First, the year is not mentioned, and the communication as sent gives the impression that this so-called scandal has just arisen out of facts happening at the present time, whereas it is very well known that this quarrel between the Hon. Mr. McDougall and the hon. Secretary of State happened in 1882, at a time when I believe the hon. Secretary of State was not a member of the Government or a member of this House, but when he was acting as counsel for Smith & Ripley. That is a very important fact to ignore. This was done in order to malign, in order to slander, in order to libel the Conservative party and the Government of the day. But that is not the only falsehood. In order to give more colour to the statement that these charges referred to events just happening or having just happened, it was said in the same communication that Mr. William McDougall has written a letter which is going through the press. That letter did not go through the press for the last ten years. It was put on the Order Paper, and it was very likely reproduced in the press after that. But the impression given by this correspondent was that this communication came from the Hon. Mr. McDougall at the present time, which was just as false as any statement could be. Another falsehood in that communication is that Mr. McDougall is the counsel for Smith & Ripley, whereas the fact is that he has not been counsel for them for ten years, because this case was settled in 1882. Yet this slander and libel is sent abroad to vilify this country. That is not enough. It is said that 10 per cent. of the $83,000 was paid to the Secretary of State or to some one on his behalf. The correspondent, whom I see now, in the press gallery, was just as careful about this point as about the others, to leave the impression that the money was paid when the Secretary of State was on the Treasury benches, whereas this whole transaction happened in 1882. Another false statement is that Mr. McDougall has been questioned, the inference being that he has just been questioned or interviewed, and that the answer has been given to-day; whereas the reference was to the letter written by Mr. McDougall in 1882. That fact is not disclosed; it will not serve the purpose of the correspondent; and the letter of Mr. McDougall is published in the London *Times* as a communication which has just been written by him. Now, I hope that this correspondent of the Dalziel Agency will take very good care—he ought to do it now if he has not done it yet—to send to the London press the answer of the Hon. Mr. McDougall to the charge of the hon. member for Queen's. It is moreover very important that proceedings should be taken to put an end to these libels upon the House of Commons. In no other country of the world would such scandalous conduct be permitted; and the correspondent should be brought to the Bar of the House to answer for it. The hon. member for South Oxford referred to the communication sent with regard to this charge against the hon. Postmaster General, and it was undoubtedly published in the London press of this morning. Judging from the past, I have no doubt how that communication was sent last evening to the London press. In ten days, when that communication reaches this country, it will be too late for us to take notice of it; but when it reaches us, we shall find that falsehoods have been communicated to the people of England in regard to this charge. We shall find that the date of the supposed interest of the hon. Postmaster General in the firm of Manning, Macdonald & Co. will not be mentioned. The correspondent will merely state that the Postmaster General had an interest in an important railway contract with the Government, and was sharing in the profit, and very great care will be taken not to name the year. Now, the last speaker does not suppose that we are going to take him seriously when he asks us to compare the case of Mr. Anglin with that of the Postmaster General. The cases of Mr. Anglin, Mr. Jones and Mr. Vail, had reference to violations of the Independence of Parliament Act, not even in the preceding Parliament, but in the very Parliament then sitting. The hon. member for South Oxford concluded this afternoon by saying that we must not only look to the year of the contract, 1879. If the mover of this motion intended us to look to any other year, he should have mentioned it in his reference. He did not state that this contract was entered into in 1879 and completed in

1886 or 1887; but he only mentioned 1879. He does not suppose that all the transactions happened in the year 1879. What are the facts of the case? Was this contract completed in 1885, 1886 or 1887, as the hon. member for South Oxford has said? He was very careful to say it was not completed until 1885, 1886 or 1887. When an argument is based upon a statement of that importance, the statement ought to be precise. In the Sessional Papers of 1879, some explanations concerning this contract are given. It is said that the contract was let in February, 1879, and that the time stipulated for its completion was the 1st of July, 1883. Was it completed on the 1st of July, 1883? I know it was personally, and a great many members know it was, and if they will look at the blue-book for that year they will find it was. In 1882, when I happened to be at Thunder Bay, the road was open to a certain extent, but not to the public, and I believe that some of the Ministers of the Crown went over the whole road during that season. But, Sir, it is a well known fact that in 1883 the road was in full operation and open to the public. The transactions of these railway contractors closed somewhere about the 1st of July, 1883, when a final estimate was made and a closing settlement arrived at. The contract was at last completed and settled in 1883. This is established by the blue-books and by those who are aware of the facts. In 1883, and this will make at least eight years, this transaction was closed. There was an election in 1887, and another one in 1891, and we are now asked, in the face of the Independence of Parliament Act, to enquire whether the hon. member for North Lanark has violated the Independence of Parliament Act. There are in that Act three or four sections bearing on this point. Any contractor or anyone having an interest in a contract under the Government is disqualified from being elected; and if elected, is disqualified from sitting or voting, and the punishment is first, the forfeiture of his seat, and secondly, a penalty of $200 a day for every day he sits as member of this House. But there is an express provision of the law which says that any proceeding thereunder for the forfeiture or the penalty must be commenced within twelve months. Now, not twelve months but eight years have elapsed, and we are asked seriously to grant an enquiry, when the law says positively such enquiry shall not be had unless the proceedings have been commenced within twelve months. But the hon. gentleman says that the offence committed by the Postmaster General is an immoral one. If it was an immoral one, why should we require a statute to declare it illegal? There are many offences which may be committed against the privileges and dignity of Parliament, although not defined by statute. Why? Because they are immoral. And why was this transaction declared illegal? Because it was not immoral. The necessity of the statute became apparent because the offence was not an immoral one. It was not immoral for a contractor to sit in this House, or for a sheriff to sit in this House until that statute was passed. I can give another striking illustration of the correctness of this principle. The qualifications of members of this House are not the same as those of the Senate Chamber. No sheriff has a right to sit in this House, and he is exposed to having his seat declared vacant and to be subjected to a penalty of $200 per day if he should violate that law. The same statute which creates a prohibition with regard to contractors creates it also with regard to sheriffs and other public officers. But hon. gentlemen are aware that Sheriff Thibaudeau, who is a senator, does not by reason of his holding the office of sheriff render himself incapable of sitting and voting in the Senate. If his so doing were an immoral act, he would forfeit his seat. The disqualification, as regards this House, of a sheriff or other public officer is a legal one established by the statute in the same way as the disqualification of a contractor, and both stand on the same footing. They are mere legal disabilities, and where there is no legal disability and no immoral offence, this House cannot create one except by statute. The hon. member for South Oxford has given us a lecture on constitutional law. He does not pretend to know parliamentary law better than anyone else, but he knows it just as well; and he asks: Is it not an elementary principle that this House has a right to enquire how public moneys have been expended? Is it not the duty of this House to enquire whether money has been spent especially, to use his expression, to debauch the people of the country? I will only say to the hon. gentleman that it is not necessary to know much parliamentary law to know that principle; but I will say this, that if the charge made by the hon. member for Lambton contained the statements which the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford did contain, the case would be in my opinion a very different one. But look at the charge made. There is no misapplication of public money mentioned in it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GIROUARD. There is nothing of the kind in it. The only charge is that this firm have taken some of their money, not the public money, for political purposes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD. I would like to know if contractors are prohibited by statute from spending their money as they please. If the hon. gentleman wanted to reach the Administration and make it a crime, he should have said that the Administration acted corruptly or knew of some misapplication, but he merely charged them, to use the expression of the reference.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would that rule apply to Armstrong in appropriating his money?

Mr. GIROUARD. I am not dealing with the case of Armstrong, but the present case.

Mr. McCARTHY. We are going to ask you that.

Mr. GIROUARD. I take the case as you make it. You cannot go beyond the terms of your own reference, and you say in your own reference—which is not an inference but a paper submitted to the consideration of the House:

"That during the progress of the said works, and while the Hon. John G. Haggart was so interested therein, members of the said firm were called upon by members of the Government of Canada for large contributions for political purposes."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD. Where is the wrong there? Where is the law which prohibits a Minister of the Crown from asking anyone for subscriptions for political purposes? If the order of reference had contained the other words which the hon. member

for South Oxford used, if it had said for political purposes to debauch the electorate, there would have been something in the charge. The order further says:

"And such contributions were paid out of the moneys of the said firm."

I find nothing in the charge, and really I think that many hon. members on the other side are too familiar with parliamentary practice and our statutes to make me believe for one moment that they are serious in making this charge. It is made only for the purpose for which the one against the Secretary of State was made, and for no other purpose. It was made with the view of vilifying the country before our people and before the mother land, and for no other purpose.

Mr. EDGAR. I am very much surprised at the tone and manner and language of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who has been for more than a hundred days, as he tells us, presiding as the Chief Justice of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. He has worked himself up to a great state of excitement over this matter. He began by telling us that the charge made by my hon. friend would bring everlasting infamy upon this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this charge be true, why should it not be published in this country or in any other country?

Mr. GIROUARD. Correctly.

Mr. EDGAR. Correctly, yes; but the hon. gentleman asserted that it would bring everlasting infamy upon this country, and he insults an hon. member of this House by saying that he brings this charge in order to vilify hon. members on the other side. That is an imputation of motives which I think should not be allowed. Surely the hon. gentleman had not listened to the hon. the Minister of Justice, who said these charges meant nothing at all, that these charges, if true, would be no stigma at all on his colleague, the hon. the Postmaster General. If that is the case, why did the hon. gentleman fly into a sudden passion because these charges were made? He not only attacked the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), but he attacked gentlemen in the gallery. He attacked gentlemen of the press who, as I dare say he will find out, are well able to take care of themselves. He blames them for publishing a letter from Mr. McDougall. If Mr. McDougall chose to write a letter to the press over his own signature—and I think it was in 1886 and not in 1882, as the hon. gentleman said—he should be too experienced a politician to complain of his letter being used at another time. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the Dalziel reports sent to England as not being correct. I will let them take care of themselves. I wonder if the hon. gentleman has looked at Reuter's reports sent to the English press. That agency has been subsidized by this Government for many years, and there has not been for many years a truthful statement published in the English press in regard to Canadian matters owing to that fact. Does he not know that the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) had to get up in his place in this House and denounce a falsehood cabled over by Reuter's Agency? I think he should have taken some of his judicial mind to that agency as well as to the Dalziel Agency. The hon. gentleman has compared, as others have done, the position of Mr. Anglin and Mr. Jones, of Halifax, in former Parliaments, with the Postmaster General to-day. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that those gentlemen were found guilty, by a Committee of their own friends, of having unwittingly transgressed the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act, in a way in which it had never been interpreted before, and others on both sides of the House were the victims of that strict interpretation; but, when this charge is made against the Postmaster General of having been interested in the profits of a public contract, there was no doubt at all about the law on the subject. Was it not settled and beyond a peradventure then as to what the law was, so that if the hon. the Postmaster General was guilty of violating that Act he did so with his eyes open, with the full knowledge of the condition of the law which had been discussed when he was in Parliament in the cases of Anglin, and Jones and Vail. They may have done this in ignorance of the law, but he cannot plead that he has done this in ignorance of the law, if he did it at all. I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman say that there is no allegation in this charge of the misapplications of the public moneys. I could scarcely believe that I heard the Chairman of the Tarte-McGreevy-Langevin Committee say that. Has he not learnt enough, in that long, tedious investigation, to know what was meant by misapplication of public moneys when contractors gave subscriptions to members of the Government for political purposes? He knows that contractors never do that for nothing. He knows that was the case in reference to these contracts, and in this motion it is alleged:

"That the members of that firm were called upon by members of the Government of Canada."

Not by Thomas McGreevy or other private individuals, but by members of the Government of Canada, for these subscriptions, and that these contributions—

"Were paid out of the moneys of the said firm, and with the knowledge and assent of the said Hon. John G. Haggart were charged against the profits of the firm."

And more than that: that while all this was going on—

"The said firm of contractors were in various ways dependent upon the Government by reason of many matters being unsettled and in dispute in relation to the said contract, which were at the time of such contributions, or subsequently, settled not unfavourably to the contractors."

That is all right. There is nothing wrong about that. My hon. friend, in the beautiful innocence of his heart, thinks there is no possible misapplication of public moneys to be apprehended under that charge. I am sorry I cannot agree with him. In the opening remarks of the Minister of Justice he contended that this, if it were a crime at all, was a statutory crime, a crime by a statute alone relating to the independence of Parliament, and that the Postmaster General, if guilty of it, was whitewashed by elections he has subsequently gone through. I wonder why the Minister of Justice did not think of that before. Why did he, after careful consideration, allow the member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) to bring his charge against the member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) this session in regard to the steamer *Admiral*, charging him with having received public moneys, when that was not during the present Parliament.

Mr. GIROUARD. Yes; up to February, 1891.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. member cannot remember, but if he looks at the report signed by himself he will find that none of these payments to Mr. McGreevy were shown to have been made since his last election.

Mr. GIROUARD. The contract was in force in February, 1891.

Mr. EDGAR. There was no payment made after the 24th February. The sale to Mick or Nick—I do not know which—or to Bancroft, or some one, took place before the election, and I am sorry the hon. gentleman should have signed the report without having known that; but the Minister of Justice knew it, and he also signed the report, and to-day he says it is improper for Parliament to investigate a charge that a member has received public money when he has since gone through an election. He not only allowed that investigation in the Tarte-McGreevy case, but he took part in that investigation and signed a report to the House on that very subject. Then the Minister of Justice complained very strongly and warmly to the House that it was too late in this session for the investigation to take place. Now, Sir, we have got, through past experience, very expert in the making of these investigations, and we have learned that we can hold sittings of the Committee during the session of the House. We could have had three sittings of this Committee every day—at morning, noon and night, and closed it up without detaining the House, perhaps, more than three or four more days longer than they will be under any circumstances: and the public will not understand that after we have been here five months we cannot sit here five days more to investigate a charge like this. Then we come to the defence of the position of the Minister of Justice made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). He stated to the House, I think, very emphatically, his opinion that the House, or a committee, should not try a member for a crime. That was one point which he made. Then the next point was that the House should not try a member for anything less than a crime, or, at any rate, anything that does not involve expulsion from the House or punishment by the House. I really think that the hon. gentleman will not say that I misinterpret his position in that respect. Now, Sir, I am very sorry, if it is so improper and very wrong for this House to try a fellow member for a criminal act, that the hon. member for Simcoe did not think of that when he was here in the early part of the session and assented to the charges of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) being brought before this House. There he charged a fellow member of this House with criminal conspiracy, and the hon. member for Simcoe did not find fault; but now at last, in the same session of this House, he raises an objection to another motion of the same kind. But, perhaps, it is not a crime, perhaps it is whitewash, perhaps the statute of limitations shuts him out. Well, then, he says that if this case does not involve expulsion we should not take it up. Now, I think I can show a precedent that will satisfy even the hon. member for Simcoe that he is wrong, entirely wrong, in that contention. He calls for precedents from England or from Canada; the Minister of Justice calls for precedents from England or from Canada, for the action that we propose. I will give them a precedent now from Canada, one which they will both remember well; and the Minister of Customs I think will also remember it, and will corroborate what I say. In 1886 a charge was made in this House by myself against the hon. member for East Hastings, that he had promoted the interests of a colonization company and had received blind shares for his services. I also charged that a Minister of the Crown was cognizant of this, and had been consulted during the course of the negotiations. That Minister of the Crown was the Minister of Customs. Now, I think I have fairly stated those charges. Many members of this House remember them. They have been discussed a good many times in the House and out of it, and members know what happened then. Those charges were nothing like as serious as these. They involved no criminal charge. They involved no question of unseating a member if they were proved to be true. What was the position taken in the House when that matter came up? Why, Sir, the Minister of Customs got up in his place, the day after notice was given, and called upon me to bring those charges and to have them investigated before a Committee; and very properly he did so. The member for East Hastings also got up subsequently in his place and stated that he wanted an investigation too. They took no technical objection to that proceeding, but perhaps it will be said that the attention of the House was not called to that objection, and therefore it would not be a good precedent, even if it were acted upon. But, Sir, the attention of the House was called to this very objection which was taken to-day by the member for Simcoe, and it was called by the present Postmaster General. The present Postmaster General took that exception himself in 1886, I think with a fine prophetic view of what might happen to himself, because if these matters occurred that are alleged by the member for West Lambton, they had occurred before 1886. Now, that there may be no doubt on this point, I will read to the House the exact terms of the objection taken by the Postmaster General. He said then, in *Hansard*, page 491, 1886:

"Let me draw attention to the fact that there is no charge against the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White) in this statement of Mr. Edgar. Suppose that everything proved true before the Committee which the hon. gentleman charges, what action is the House going to take?"

I think these were almost the words used by the member for Simcoe to-night.—

"There is no charge of corrupt practices or anything. I think that before a committee is appointed the charges should be such that if they are found to be true some punishment should be visited upon the member, either unseated or something else. There is not the slightest charge of a corrupt practice in all this statement."

That was the position taken on that occasion by the Postmaster General. Perhaps you will say that the hon. member for Simcoe was away. He was not; he was in the House at the time. The Postmaster General insisted upon having a vote on the motion made by Sir Hector Langevin to refer this charge to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and, like a man, he voted according to his argument. But the hon. member for Simcoe voted against him; the hon. the Minister of Justice voted against it and voted down his contention of to-day that such a charge as that was not a matter of privilege, and should not be referred to the Privileges and Elections Committee. They both voted to refer

it to that Committee. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) was here he voted that way too, because Mr. Haggart's is the only name recorded on the other side. Now, Sir Hector Langevin moved this reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; I had moved its reference to a Select Committee. Sir Hector Langevin, in moving that reference, used these words:

"The charge is one which affects the standing of two hon. members of this House, one of whom is a Minister of the Crown; and as it is not a mere matter of curiosity, but is a charge or an insinuation against those hon. gentlemen, I think, under the circumstances, the House will see that it is a matter of privilege, as the hon. gentleman stated just now, and should therefore be investigated by the Committee on Privileges and Elections."

And whom do you think seconded that motion? Why, Mr. Thompson, of Antigonish, the Minister of Justice. He seconded the motion and voted for it, and so did the member for Simcoe. Now, I think they have got a precedent. Therefore, it is not for want of precedents they are going to vote this motion down; it is because they do not want the investigation held. I want to draw the attention of the House to one point. It has been stated that the Postmaster General has given his denial to this charge under oath. That is not the case. I listened attentively to what he said. He said that in 1880—remember the contract was entered into in September, 1879—he had sworn that he was not interested in any contract. The charge here was that he became interested in the profits under that contract accruing on the interest or share standing in the name of Mr. McLaren, and certainly no profits would have accrued in 1880 when he made that statement, and therefore it is no defence to these charges. It was very satisfactory, of course, to hear the hon. gentleman make his statement in this House and deny the charges after they were made. But it was also very satisfactory early in the session to hear Mr. McGreevy make a similar statement. I do not know whether this is done as a matter of course in these cases or not; but such is the case. We have heard the statement made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) making the charge. We are now in this curious position: We have to accept the statements of both these hon. members, which we do, and the only way we have to enable us to decide is to refer the charges to a Committee for investigation, which would take the evidence and we would thus be enabled to settle the point. If the Ministry are satisfied there is nothing in these charges that cast a stigma on a colleague, very well, and perhaps we ought to be satisfied in a political sense, too. If they are satisfied of that, I think the matter will be thoroughly and distinctly understood by the country. We want this investigation. We are pressing for it here to-night. We are ready on this side of the House to sit till it is finished, and the other side are not willing. They will not have an investigation; they say there is nothing wrong and they will not have it. Let them accept and occupy that position, and we will occupy the position of having to vote down the amendment.

Mr. LISTER. I will ask the privilege of trespassing on the attention of the House for a very few moments while I address myself to the subject that has been under discussion for three or four hours. I desire, so far as I am concerned, that nothing shall pass my lips that in any way can be construed as prejudging or reflecting in any way on the hon. gentleman against whom I have preferred the charges laid before the House to-day. In preferring those charges I have been actuated and animated not by any unfriendly feeling to that hon. gentleman. I have never had such a feeling; I have not it now. I believe I am safe in stating that so far as I am concerned no such feeling will be found with me. In preferring those charges I have discharged, and am discharging, what I conceive to be a public duty, regardless altogether of the feelings and relations which have existed between the hon. gentleman and myself, and in any remarks I have to make to this honourable House I will be guided by the feelings which have animated me in making the charges against that hon. gentleman. The Minister of Justice in his speech on this subject has thought proper to say, and other hon. gentlemen have done so as well, that in making this charge it was my bounden duty to have made it positively, upon the strength of my position here as a member of this House, that I should not have made the charge on information and belief, but I should have made a positive charge against the hon. gentleman, and, not having made the charge in that way, it should not be entertained by this House. I will call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that all charges that have been presented by members of this House, for at all events nine years, have been worded and couched in exactly the words which are found in the motion I have presented to the House. In the case which the hon. member for Montmorency presented the words used were as follows:—

"That John Israël Tarte, the member representing the electoral district of Montmorency, having declared from his seat in this House that he is credibly informed and believes he is able to establish by satisfactory evidence," and so forth.

The motion I have presented to the House is in precisely the language used in this motion which was adopted by the House. And not only so, but in other instances I could mention the wording was exactly as I have it here. In the Cochrane case and in the case referred to by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar), the wording is precisely as it is in the motion now before the House. Sir, what is that charge? The charge is that an hon. member of this House, who was in 1879 a member of this House, who from that date down to the present has been a member of this House, and to-day is a member of the Government, was a secret partner in fact in a contract made between the Government and certain individuals. That is the substance of the charge. It is further declared that in addition to being a secret partner in a contract, he, as such partner, contributed from that date up to the present large sums of money for the advantage of the Government. I heard to-day for the first time with some little amazement from members supporting the Government in this House that it is no offence against the law of Parliament, it is no offence against political morality, that men holding contracts with this Government involving millions of money should turn round and take from their pockets thousands and tens of thousands of dollars and hand them back to the Administration for the purpose of sustaining them and their party in office. Sir, if that is not political immorality, if that is not an offence against Parliament, if it is not a

crime against the people of this country, then I concede at once, without further discussion, that the charge I have made against the hon. gentleman must fall to the ground. We have had it stated in this House by the leader of the Government here that he would purge the public service from all immorality and impurity. We have had it stated in the Senate by the leader of the Government himself that be the man high or low against whom a charge is made it will be investigated, and regardless of his position he will suffer. We have had before us during the past five months subordinates in the public service who have been proved to have been guilty of receiving trifling sums, and instantly their official lives have been destroyed. But while it is a crime in an official to receive money from contractors, it appears that members of the Government, the Government as a whole, may do it with impunity, and they are to be supported and sustained by the majority of the House in refusing to have the matter investigated. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier waxed eloquent to-day. He looked up to the gallery at a man not able to defend himself: but I will venture to say he is able to defend himself against any accusation the hon. gentleman may think proper to bring outside of this House. Was the hon. gentleman fair and honest? Did he tell the members of the House and the country that for long years the Reuter Company has been sending from this House, through a paid servant of Parliament, the most infamous lies concerning their political opponents? If all that has been telegraphed through Dalziel's Agency is not exactly true, we are giving hon. gentlemen a little dose of the medicine they have been administering to the Opposition for so many years past. As I stated a moment ago, the charges are as they appear in my motion. These charges are in the phraseology adopted in introducing similar motions in this House. And these charges, if they are not a crime, if they do not amount to an offence against the law of Parliament, must fall to the ground. But does my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Mc Carthy) pretend to argue that because a statute has been passed creating an offence, which gives an individual a right to prosecute, that Parliament has divested itself of its right to investigate the question as to whether a man has been properly sitting in Parliament or not, and does he pretend to say that owing to the lapse of time during which Parliament and the public have been ignorant of the fact, still, when they became aware of the facts, that they have not the right to deal with the men against whom the charge is made? I contend, Sir, that in passing that Act Parliament retained the right that it possessed before to deal with a man who violates the law of Parliament in such a way as Parliament thinks proper, and that the right which is given under the statute is an additional penalty which any person and every person has a right to enforce if they think proper. But in addition to all that, the charge here is that the hon. gentleman while a member of this company, while beneficially interested in these profits, while deriving large sums from this Government—because, remember, the contract involves over $4,000,000—that while beneficially interested in this work the co-partners were from time to time contributing enormous sums of money for the purpose of maintaining in place and power the gentlemen who now hold the Treasury benches. I ask hon. gentlemen and I ask the country

is that a politically immoral act, or is it one that can be justified in this House and before the people? No member of the Government has dared to justify it; they have left it to their followers. Let their utterances go abroad, let the people of this country draw their own inferences, let them be told by hon. gentlemen supporting the Government that the Government were justified in taxing the contractors of this country, that they were justified in drawing by force from their pockets enormous sums of money which come from the public treasury of this country in order that the people themselves might be bribed by the taxes they paid into the treasury of Canada. If, Sir, that is the law of this country, if this has been the view of hon. gentlemen opposite during all these years past, God only knows that we are to-day just what we ought to be, a politically demoralized country. I say to-day to every hon. gentleman here, and to the country at large, that we are worse than any South American or Central American republic. Sir, when we try to investigate these matters, when we ask to have them enquired into, when we ask to lay the facts before the people of the country, we are refused the committee, and the Government say: You shall not enquire, because, forsooth, we want to get home within the next four or five days. Sir, the charges made here against an hon. member of this House are connected with the section B contract, which has become famous in the history of Canada. Sir, the Government of the country is a sink of iniquity to-day. All of us who remember anything about the politics of thirteen years ago remember well poor old Whitehead and those connected with him. The contract was passed on from one to another, until it came down to Manning, Macdonald & Co., and while it was under these people things were done that I believe will not bear the light of day. I state to this House again that hon. gentlemen have denied charges on the floor of this House which have been brought against them. The member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) denied all the charges that were made against him: Thomas McGreevy denied the charges that were made against him: but, Sir, the investigations afterwards proved that every statement that was made to the country was true; and I say further, after all that has been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, that I believe from information I have received, if the committee is granted I will be able to establish that the Postmaster General was beneficially interested in these profits; I believe I shall be able to establish that members of the then Government received large sums of money which were charged to the profits of that contract. I believe I will be able to prove that a lawyer, eminent in his profession and otherwise, advised these contractors to keep their books clean, and that their books were kept in such a way that it would be impossible for an outsider to get at the charges. They were more skilful than some others; they acted under legal advice and "Mick and Nick" did not. These gentlemen were well advised, and it would be almost impossible to get at the true condition of affairs, so far as their books are concerned. I believe, Sir, that I can show that after their contract was ended they had a friendly arbitration. I believe that I can show that the arbitrators were told the exact state of affairs, and that upon the basis of that the award was made giving to each of the contractors the sums to which they were entitled. This is the

information which I have received. I believe it to be true, and I believe if I were granted a committee that I shall be able to establish the charge which I have made to this House.

Mr. BOWELL. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that a member of the Government advised these parties to keep their books clean ?

Mr. LISTER. No, Sir; I did not. I said that they were kept well advised always, and that a gentleman eminent in the profession advised them to keep their books clean ; that they expected session after session to be brought to Ottawa for the purpose of parliamentary investigation, and that they took every precaution that clever, cautious business men could take for the purpose of thwarting, so far as they could, any investigation that Parliament might think fit to order. That is the position. If the Government says it is no crime, that this Parliament has nothing whatever to do with the fact that a member of this House is beneficially interested in a contract, then, so far as that portion of the case is concerned, it must fail. If the Government says it is legitimate and right and proper for public contractors of this Dominion to pay back to the Government thousands, nay, tens of thousands of dollars, for the purpose of debauching and corrupting the electorate of this country, then I say this charge must fail. But, if it is an offence ; if the charge states as an offence that it is wrong for a member of Parliament to be interested in a contract ; if it is wrong for public contractors to contribute vast sums of money to political heads who give them their contracts, and who ask for the money : if that is an offence, then I say, Sir, that the charge which has been made here ought to be investigated. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that in this matter I am proceeding on information which I have received and which I believe to be true, and I believe if a committee is granted to me that I shall be able to establish the charges which I have prepared and formulated and presented to this House.

House divided on amendment of Sir John Thompson :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Adams,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Baker,	LaRivière,
Bergeron,	Léger,
Bergin,	Lippé,
Bowell,	Macdonald (King's),
Burnham,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Burns,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Cameron (Inverness),	Mackintosh,
Carignan,	McAllister,
Carpenter,	McCarthy,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDonald (Victoria),
Chapleau,	McDougald (Pictou),
Cleveland,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Coatsworth,	McKay,
Cochrane,	McLean,
Cockburn,	McLennan,
Corby,	McLeod,
Costigan,	McNeill,
Craig,	Madill,
Curran,	Marshall,
Daly,	Masson,
Daoust,	Miller,
Davin,	Mills (Annapolis),
Davis,	Montague,
Denison,	O'Brien,
Desaulniers,	Ouimet,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Patterson (Colchester),
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Pelletier,
Dewdney,	Prior,
Dickey,	Putnam,
Dugas,	Reid,
Dupont,	Robillard,
Dyer,	Roome,
Fairbairn,	Ross (Dundas),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Ross (Lisgar),
Foster,	Ryckman,
Fréchette,	Skinner,
Gillies,	Sproule,
Girouard,	Stairs,
Gordon,	Stevenson,
Grandbois,	Taylor,
Hazen,	Temple,
Henderson,	Thompson (Sir John),
Hodgins,	Tupper,
Hutchins,	Tyrwhitt,
Ingram,	Wallace,
Ives,	Weldon,
Jamieson,	White (Cardwell),
Kaulbach,	Wilmot,
Kenny,	Wood (Brockville),
Kirkpatrick,	Wood (Westmoreland).—102.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Allan,	Harwood,
Allison,	Hyman,
Armstrong,	Innes,
Bain,	King,
Barron,	Landerkin,
Beausoleil,	Langelier,
Béchard,	Laurier,
Beith,	Lavergne,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Bowers,	Legris,
Bowman,	Livingston,
Brodeur,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brown (Chateauguay),	McGregor,
Brown (Monck),	McMillan,
Cameron (Huron),	McMullen,
Campbell,	Mignault,
Carroll,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Monet,
Casey,	Mousseau,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Christie,	Murray,
Colter,	Paterson (Brant),
Davidson,	Perry,
Davies,	Proulx,
Dawson,	Rider,
Delisle,	Rinfret,
Edgar,	Rowand,
Edwards,	Sanborn,
Flint,	Savard,
Fraser,	Semple,
Gauthier,	Simard,
Geoffrion,	Somerville,
German,	Spohn,
Gibson,	Sutherland,
Gillmor,	Trow,
Godbout,	Truax,
Grieve,	Vaillancourt,
Guay,	Watson,
Hargraft,	Yeo.—78.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Barnard,	Mr. Welsh,
Mr. Earl,	Mr. Fauvel,
Mr. White (Shelburne),	Mr. Forbes,
Mr. McKeen,	Mr. Borden,
Mr. Moncrieff,	Mr. Lister,
Mr. Pope.	Mr. Préfontaine.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. TROW. I notice that the hon. member for West Lambton has not voted.

Mr. LISTER. I am paired with the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Girouard : " That the seventh report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections be adopted ; " and the motion of Mr. Davies, in amendment thereto.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, I intend, as briefly as I can under the circumstances, to present my humble views upon this case which has occupied the attention of a great many members of this House and the country at large during the last four or five months. I suppose you remember perfectly under what circumstances that enquiry took place. During the last session of Parliament a series of charges were published and inserted in the papers of this House, and received a denial from the hon. member who then represented Quebec West. It was too late to proceed with the enquiry that session. This session, however, over a year afterwards, the charges were reiterated, but by an hon. member of this House from his seat: and then we received the same answer from the hon. member from Quebec West, and we also received an answer from the hon. Minister of Public Works, both denying emphatically all the charges. So far nothing was proved: we were completely in the dark, we had often to find out by mere guessing what we suspected. At all events, we went before the Committee. The amount of trouble we had to procure the documents, even the books of the department and the books of the firm concerned, was something extraordinary, when we consider that this Committee was the first tribunal of this country. At all events, we proceeded and the further we went the more astonished we were at the revelations. What the principal witness, Mr. Murphy, stated was so wonderful, that many would not believe a word of what he said. We will see later on whether he was right or not; we will see whether or not the indications he gave us as to all the facts were correct. For the moment I intend to speak of some of the contracts, more especially as they relate to the hon. Minister of Public Works. The two reports of the Committee agree as to the culpability of the member for Quebec West, but they do not agree as to the extent of his culpability, and they disagree entirely so far as the hon. Minister of Public Works is concerned. I will take first the contract for the Esquimalt graving dock, in which I think the hon. Minister is more directly concerned. The first matter to which I will draw the attention of this honourable House is the plant. Let me first remind you of the letter wherein one of the partners writes:

"The Government are asking for tenders for British Columbia again. You had best see one of your uncles about it."

The uncles were then already known to the partners. We will see later on that these uncles had been utilized very largely, nor for the benefit of the country, but for the benefit of the contractors. On the 15th of March, 1884, Mr. Perley writes to the secretary of the Department of Public Works, which means the hon. Minister himself, about the plant, saying:

"There is no doubt but the Dominion has come into the possession of the plant, quite a large amount, which it is proposed shall be taken and paid for by the contractors who undertake to complete the dock in accordance with the tenders lately received therefor."

I quote this now to show that the hon. Minister of Public Works was fully informed about that plant, which had been received from the Local Government of British Columbia, and which was intended to be paid for by the contractors of the dock. A letter from Mr. Ennis, the secretary of the department, dated 24th March, 1884, says:

"Ask Mr. Trutch to prepare and transmit to the department a statement in detail of such plant."

I will now treat more fully the first tenders asked for by the department. There were two series of tenders asked for; one series in the month of April, 1884, and the other in the fall of the same year. Messrs. Starrs & O'Hanly had been tenderers with Mr. Baskerville in the first series. They had committed an error, and on the 24th of April, 1884, they asked leave to amend their tender in order to correct the mistake they had made. That request was refused: I would like to know why? We will see that in the case of the Quebec cross-wall, the department themselves, under the direction of the hon. Minister, not only allowed an amendment, but suggested an amendment. In this instance, Mr. Starrs is refused permission to amend in any way. In the first tender, the Government, upon the report of Mr. Perley, finds that the tender of Starrs & O'Hanly is too low and that of Mr. Baskerville too high; and they decide not to accept either. As to this point, I do not throw any blame either upon the Minister or the department, except that it seems strange they should have refused an amendment which would have been to the advantage of the country in this case, whilst in other cases they suggested amendments which were not to our advantage. But a few days after that Mr. Perley, who was looked upon by this House as an eminent engineer, had an interview with Mr. Baskerville, and the result of that interview was that Mr. Baskerville made the following offer to the Minister of Public Works, dated 8th May, 1884:—

"DEAR SIR,—We have some time since submitted a tender for the completion of a graving dock at Esquimalt, British Columbia. If you will agree to the substitution of solid masonry and dispense with the use of concrete and brick backing, we will consent to build the same for $16 per square yard, which will reduce the bulk sum about $53,000. Hoping that this will meet with your approval.

"BASKERVILLE & CO."

On the 9th of May, Mr. Perley reported in favour of that. He said that Mr. Stewart, of Baskerville, Cassidy & Stewart, had gone to British Columbia and made special examination, that concrete is expensive, and that rubble is much better and less expensive, and he added:

"Having submitted to Messrs. Baskerville & Co. a proposition to amend their offer by the substitution of rubble backing in lieu of concrete backing, brick work, &c., they now offer to build the masonry for the sum of $16 per yard." * * *

And he adds:

"As Messrs. Baskerville & Co. have executed for the Department of Railways and Canals the new works on the Ottawa at St. Ann's, and as contractors possess experience and means for carrying out large works, I beg leave to submit for consideration by the hon. the Minister the desirability of arranging with that firm for the works at Esquimalt, under the terms of their tender as amended by them, and the alteration of the plans whereby rubble backing shall be used instead of concrete backing, and that such other changes be made as will dispense with the use of brick-work in connection with the walls."

Had this proposition been accepted it would have put Mr. Baskerville's tender at $362,000, which would have been a saving of $41,000, as compared with the next series of tenders, that of the Messrs. Connoliy, which was accepted later on. About the same time Mr. Baskerville wrote to Sir Hector Langevin a letter with reference to this report of Mr. Perley, a very interesting letter all through, but of which I will only read this portion:

"As your honour remarked to me to have this matter kept quiet, my brother and I did so. He still holds the cheques in his possession, as he expected he would get the work and would require to return them to you."

And he strongly urges his friends and chief in politics, Sir Hector Langevin, to consider the fairness and justice of the tender as amended at Mr. Perley's request. As I have said, his tender, as amended, would have been a great benefit to the country. What follows? The answer to that letter was written by Sir Hector Langevin, informing Mr. Baskerville that new plans and specifications had been prepared and that new tenders would be called for. Hon. gentlemen who defend the ex-Minister of Public Works are requested to take note of this point, which will be considered a most important one in the country at large. The defence we have heard up to now is that the engineer is the man who must be looked upon in the department to guide the Minister. Sir Hector Langevin himself, under oath, said:

"I am a layman in matters of this kind, and Mr. Perley was the scientific man."

He says later on:

"It is always on the report of the chief engineer or the chief architect, as the case may be, that my report is made to Council, because I know nothing of these matters personally."

Mr. Perley reported to the Government, advising them to accept Mr. Baskerville's tender as amended. He also insisted on the solvency and the capacity of the firm of Baskerville & Co. to carry out the contract. Yet, without any report to Council, without basing his action upon the opinion of any engineer whatever, the Minister ordered new tenders to be called for. Why? Because he had gone to Quebec and had seen parties there; and, after seeing those parties, he, a layman, in spite of his chief engineer, decided to call for new tenders. Where is the man in this country who will say that in this instance it is not the Minister himself personally who must be held responsible? He did not act on the report of his engineer, but directly contrary to that report; and are we to be told that his engineer is responsible? There is no possible defence on that ground. In this instance the money which has been lost to the country was lost entirely through the personal action of the Minister of Public Works. We will see, when I come to conclude my remarks, what influence it was which moved the Minister in this instance. It must be remarked here that Mr. Perley declared in favour of rubble, and wrote on the 26th of May, 1884, agreeing to have rubble masonry substituted for concrete, and he says in his letter to Mr. Trutch, page 153:

"Our Canadian contractors have had many years experience in the construction on the canal system of Canada of heavier works than are to be executed at Esquimalt, and the experience gained in the use of concrete backing as specified by Kinipple & Morris for the harbour works at Quebec has proved that it would be cheaper and more satisfactory to use rubble backing."

This was Perley's idea then. On the next page of my scrap book are to be found five celebrated promissory notes. There is a letter which will be found on page 196, which is most extraordinary, dated 3rd of June, 1884, addressed to Mr. Noad of Montreal, and signed by the secretary of the department:

"SIR,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 28th inst., making enquiries about Portland cement for the Esquimalt graving dock, and to say that no information can be given as to the quantity which will be required."

This information we will see later on was furnished to Mr. Thomas McGreevy though it was refused here to an honest contractor. On the 23rd June, 1884, the report of the Executive Council of British Columbia is sent to the department, and it is stated there that:

"Any modification in the direction of cheapening and lowering the character of the dock would relieve the Imperial Government from any obligation to pay the otherwise promised subsidy, and will be regarded by the province as a deliberate breach of contract and violation of the settlement arrangement on the part of the Dominion Government."

And then it goes on to say:

"The Minister recommends that a strong protest against any modification of the plan and specifications of the dock, and against any further delay in the commencement of work, be presented to the Federal Government; and that they be requested to carry out the terms of settlement promptly, honourably and equitably."

The answer to that is sent. The Order in Council is referred to Mr. Perley, and he reports:

"I have no hesitation in stating that the substitution of rubble masonry for concrete backing will be a benefit to the work, and in this I am borne out by Mr. Bennett, the residing engineer, who is of opinion that rubble backing will cost more than concrete. Personally I would not permit such an indiscriminate use of concrete as specified for the graving dock, B.C."

In this report it is stated that rubble backing will be more expensive than concrete. On the 27th July, Mr. Bennett writes:

"I have the honour to send you herewith three tracings showing proposed alterations in the construction of the caisson recess, and a copy of the specifications and form of tender altered so that rubble masonry be substituted generally throughout the work for concrete backing or hearting to side walls, quay walls and floor of dock."

He goes on:

"The change will not, however, ensure a better or more water-tight job, nor will the proposed alterations of materials to be used in construction in any way, in my opinion, tend to decrease the ultimate cost of the dock."

In spite of that the specifications were altered; they were altered in spite of the danger of losing the £50,000 promised by the British Government, in spite of the report of Perley, of the report of Trutch and the one of Bennett; the changes were ordered without any Order in Council. But when the time came to send in the notices the Government ordered that in the tenders the amount for both rubble backing and concrete should be inserted. On the 11th September, when the tenders were not yet received, information was sent to Mr. McGreevy which had been refused to Mr. Low. Even a photograph of the place was sent to him. The tenders were received, and the tender of Messrs. Starrs & O'Hanly was the lowest. The request that they should strengthen themselves financially has already been explained. It is a most extraordinary procedure and one perfectly unknown before that. By the notice to the public it was asked that the tender should be accompanied by a deposit of $7,500 which was supposed to be a sufficient guarantee. But, if Starrs & O'Hanly had got the contract the object of the trip of Sir Hector Langevin to Quebec would not have been attained. They answered that they were financially strong enough and they refused to take any partner. The Minister did not know what to do. We have seen these promissory notes. Doubtless consideration had to be given for them. There was some delay, but we find that Robert McGreevy says in his evidence that he

wanted to know for Larkin, Connolly & Co. what was doing with the tenders, and that Sir Hector told him he had telegraphed to Thomas McGreevy to look after the matter. I want to know what Thomas McGreevy, who was then in Quebec, had to do with the contract, which was to be executed in British Columbia. Messrs. Starrs & O'Hanly having deposited their accepted cheque for $7,500, the Minister could not go beyond that, and had to report to Council, because I suppose then as natural Council would not have overlooked that tender which was accompanied by a sufficient guarantee. The report was made, and Messrs. Starrs & O'Hanly's tender was accepted by the Council. Then comes the letter of the 21st October to Michael Starrs signed by Mr. Ennis :

"Will you be good enough to call to this department at once, *re* Esquimalt graving dock."

Then comes that famous conversation which was so well exposed by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) that I will not again go into it, but it shows that Messrs. Starrs & O'Hanly by threats, by false representations, by inducements to lie, and so on, withdrew their tender, and Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s tender was finally accepted, due to the actual interference of the Minister, and by that the country lost heavily. Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s tender was $28,000 above that of Starrs & O'Hanly as far as rubble was concerned, and the country lost to that extent, if we take the concrete the country lost $35,000. It is remarkable that wherever Larkin, Connolly & Co. got a contract, there has been a loss to the country ? Is that due to any action of Perley's ? No ; it is due entirely and exclusively to the wrong-doing of the Minister, and in vain can we say to-day that the Minister relied upon his officers, when the documents which are before the House establish the contrary. In this case I have tried to form an opinion not based upon the oral evidence but nearly exclusively upon the documentary evidence, and it is extraordinary enough that we should be able to decide the greater part of this matter without requiring the oral evidence. I remark that this contract, in spite of the tenders, in spite of the habit of the department, was not signed by all the members of the firm but by only one member. But the question of the plant came in with that tender, and Mr. Robert McGreevy wrote to Mr. Murphy on that subject as follows :—

"My Dear Sir,—The memo. of yesterday in *re* B. C. dock is with the Minister."

With the Minister, mind you. It is not with Mr. Perley, it is with the Minister. In 1884 did Robert McGreevy foresee there would be any difficulty seven years afterwards, and did he prepare documents that would injure the Minister upon whom he relied for so many hundred thousand dollars ? Well, he wrote this letter, and I prefer it to any oath, because unfortunately in the year in which we live, I have heard so many oaths which I could not believe, that I prefer a letter written seven years ago as evidence.—

"The memo. of yesterday in *re* British Columbia dock is with the Minister. He says that those conditions cannot be embodied in the contract, as it will be the same one as sumitted to O'Hanly & Starrs, and it would not do to make it different."

Here is the affirmation of that conversation I referred to a moment ago. "It would not do to make it different." Why would it not do ? Because the fraud would be detected at once. Here is a condition which it was distinctly stated could not be put in, and if you put it a few days afterwards in another contract, then anybody can see at once that Starrs & O'Hanly are deceived at the public expense.—

"But he says that all what's asked is so fair that there will be no trouble in obtaining them, especially the $50,000 material one, however you are to urge them just as if nothing had transpired."

Can there be more direct evidence that the whole thing concerning the plan is the exclusive action o the Minister ?

"Of course it's for you and partners to say if you will sign without them being embodied. Politics changes : so does Ministers."

We will see that the Minister was kept in his office long enough that it was not necessary for the contractors to insert that clause in the contract so that they could benefit by it. It was also said in the conversation with the Minister above referred to, that the contract would be rigidly followed, and no extras would be granted. However, a precaution was taken so as to make Starrs & O'Hanly afraid of taking the contract. We will see how these threatenings were executed. There is another letter of the 29th of October (page 1113) of Nicholas Connolly to Mr. Larkin. This one is not sent to Murphy, but to Larkin :

"You will see by the enclosed message——"

This letter is from Point Lévis, and is sent to St. Catharines. I attach importance to that, because Sir Hector had gone down.—

"You will see by the enclosed message that we are offered the Esquimalt graving dock. I cared nothing about tendering for the dock, and scarcely expected to get it, but now that we are offered it——"

They are offered the dock. By whom ? It is not by Mr. Perley. We have seen that this contract was signed by Mr. Murphy alone. Larkin seems to have known all about the contract:

"I cared nothing about tendering for the dock and scarcely expected to get it, but now that we are offered it, and under the circumstances I think it would be best to accept it, with the proviso that the changes we suggest are made, and have been partially agreed between parties. They say there will be no security (cash) required by us. Our friends propose to arrange this ; moreover, there is no money paid for securing the contract."

The other contracts, I suppose, were secured through money : this one Nicholas Connolly says there is no money needed to secure it, but we will see later on that money has been paid abundantly. On the 5th of November Larkin, Connolly & Co. are told to go and deposit a further sum of $11,200 with their cheque of $7,500. Starrs had been refused under a pretext that it was too low. He had his cheque of $9,400 ready, his cheque of $7,500 deposited, and he was to leave 10 per cent. on every monthly estimate of work done as a guarantee to the public. On the 24th November, 1884, Mr. Perley writes (page 699) :

"In determining the several amounts of the tenders received for this work, they were prepared so as to show the cost of completion using concrete (items 11, 12, 13), and using rubble backing (item 13½), and, as in all cases, it was found that the use of rubble backing would increase the cost of completion, it has been decided to adhere to the original plan, and to use concrete backing."

It will be observed, in reference to this Esquimalt dock, that the opinion of the engineers residing at Esquimalt, Mr. Trutch and Mr. Bennett, has never been looked upon as of any importance by Mr. Perley. We see that the Government decides to

use concrete in spite of the refusal of the first tender:

"The contracters claim that, seeing they have to take men and materials from this side of the Dominion, the time allowed for completion—viz., eighteen months—is too short; but, as they have signed the contract, no change can now be made; but you might arrange to defer as long as possible the giving your order to commence.'

I beg to draw the attention of the Government to that point. Here is the chief engineer of the department who writes to the resident engineer representing the Government at Esquimalt: "To defer as much as possible to give the order." Why? Is it in order that the contractors may be able to ask for extras? What can be the possible reason for that? I suppose the members of the Government look upon the trust with which the country has charged them as something serious. Well, here is one of their officers who writes to another officer of the Government to delay, unduly and improperly, the execution of the work so as to prepare for extras, at a large expense to the country. If the Ministers have not remarked this letter, they will find it at page 699. I hope they will find some explanation for that letter. I have been inclined all along to look upon Mr. Perley as an honest man, as a man desirous of doing his duty to the country, without displeasing the Minister. Then comes the partnership of 20 per cent. only this time, but the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. had promised to make the difference good, and so they did. We have seen regarding the two tenders, and we have seen the contract awarded. We have the interference of the Minister direct on these two points. We will now proceed to examine the question of the substitution of granite for sandstone, and I call the attention of Ministers and hon. members to this point, because it is one, which according to my view, in which the late Minister of Public Works is most directly interested. The history of this matter begins on 12th December, 1884. Nicholas Connolly addresses his dear friend Murphy as follows:—

"I think that Mr. T. would like to have the dock builte of grannet and hee said that it would not cost much over sixty thousand in adishin to our prise for sandstone and I also think that the folkes heer would lik to mak it a hundred feet longer. If corse thoes thinges are for our frend two work on But for the substitutin of grannet would be worth one hundred thousane moeur and the lengthing preporson if corse Mr. T. would have two bee seen in the avent of aney chaing as hee is the Dominion agent heer and all pourfull as well as our folkes there. We will want changes mad in the sise of the stone and paid for all the stone we put in that is we wnt to increase the thickens and the weth of bed and be alouded for it at our prise and in that way we will make a good thing. The best way would be to have them order hever corses as by that it would give us a chance of an extra as well as giving us our prise. Your can tell our frend But I will write you more fully in a day or two."

The contractors begin by saying that the people there desire granite substituted for sandstone. They themselves wish the lock lengthened, and recourses of stone. On 19th December, 1884, Nicholas Connolly refers to plant, and he says:

"I hope friend Sir H. will not punish us thus.

"ther is a verey strong feeling heer that the dock must bee built of grannet and a hundred feet longer or a hundred and fiftey which you want two adeviсat for you now that whem the C. P. R. is compleeted and they get the line to China and Japan you now it would bee a verey onfortunate thing two have the dock two short or built of perishable materil lik sandstone when good grannet can bee had at verey littel more expence, of corse wee donat want aneything more than the adishional expence of cutting a and other things.

"Mr. Trutch semt for mee twoday and asked mee in a verey frendley maner about the stuf that I was objecting two and after a long conversatin and at which I made some good pointes hee Mr. Trutch said hee would bee glad if the Dominion Government would take my vew of it and he said that hee would lay the case befour Sir Hector and that hee would not inger us on the contrary would help us all he could I told him if that was the case ther would bee now truble. But wee would sueseed Sow you want two prepair the folkes ther for thees thinges wee want thim all wee want the corses of stone incrased in sise and alowed for sade incrase. If now more at last the seedule of rait, if corse wee can get a long with the sand stone and build verey well with it but ther is maney cole vainis in it and hard laires of iron that is verey bad and it scales off with the wether and the other kind that is heer is hard and full of iron and discolors verey much this is the kind the mint is built of in Sanfrancisco But if wee have two use sandstone wee will get it about 40 miles from heer and softer than what the used for the mint the quarry that the got the stone for the mint out of is about a hundred miles from heer ther is not aney offes for us on the work and wel have two build and at onse and all the dericks are now good."

Nicholas Connolly mentioned in a postscriptum that the sandstone is bad and that the post office built there of that stone had to be pulled down, and a new one built. On 2nd January, 1885, Larkin writes:

"My Dear Sir,—* * * I hope that Uncle Thomas will succeed in getting the percentage."

We see there Uncle Thomas helping Larkin, Connolly & Co., regarding the graving dock at Esquimalt where he was not a Harbour Commissioner. On 16th January:

"Besides this, Mr. Trutch started nearly a week ago for Ottawa, to (I think) press the matter on the attention of the proper officials in Ottawa. The people here are also very anxious to have granite substituted for sandstone in the dock, and I think Mr. Trutch will also bring this matter to the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works."

On 14th January, Larkin writes to Murphy:

"Should you have an interview with Sir H. and talk over B.C. affairs make no definite arrangements until Nick's arrival, as he may have things to suggest that we at present know nothing about."

On 16th January Michael Connolly writes to friend Murphy:

"The people here are very anxious to have granite substituted for sandstone in the dock, and I think Mr. Trutch will also bring this matter to the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works. If there is a change made we cannot afford to make the substitution for less than $75,000, in addition to the present sum, and if it was a hundred thousand it would be all the better, and we can then afford to devote more to charitable purposes."

On 27th January, 1885, Murphy writes to Larkin:

"I have heard nothing from Perley as yet in reference to the B. C. dock or Trutch, but McGreevy leaves here tomorrow and he will look after the matter."

We see by other letters that the Minister of Public Works had decided beforehand. Of course, he had to wait for Mr. Trutch in order to cover himself, but he had determined to grant the request of the contractors. On 18th January a letter from Michael Connolly is sent as follows:—

"We found a very good quarry, and left Gallagher and a few men there to get the buildings ready for the men and intend sending the balance of the men up Wednesday next. As soon as this reaches you make no delay in seeing the proper parties and get the double entrance at the head of this dock changed to a circular head, the same as the dock at Lévis. You can use as an argument the fact that there is quite a large hill behind this one and to build a dock in the rear of this one will cost more than to put in another coffer dam and build an entirely new dock alongside of this one. This is very important and should be attended to at once. Mr. Perley will see the absurdity of this double entrance business."

I will say *en passant* that it is very extraordinary that the plans for the Esquimalt dock contained

absurdities that had absolutely to be changed a short time afterwards. Perley, without asking the engineers of British Columbia, wrote on 21st January :

"As before stated, the works for a second entrance at the head of the dock are and will remain useless; and if the dock bottom were carried out, and these works abolished, a further length of 50 feet would be obtained within the limits of the present contract, at an additional expense of, say, $35,000, or a total of $410,000."

A layman, an ordinary man, finds out and writes to Ottawa, that a second entrance is an absurdity, and Mr. Perley a few days afterwards decides that it is an absurdity and suggests that $35,000 in extras will be granted to have that absurdity disappear. It reminds me of another contract we know about, where a proposal to diminish the work entailed an increase of cost. In this instance also the extent of the work was cut down, yet the country had to pay $35,000 more because the contractors had less work to do. Immediately upon that report of Mr. Perley, which is not based upon the report of the engineers at Esquimalt, Sir Hector sanctions the change suggested. On the 27th January, 1885, Mr. Murphy writes to Mr. Larkin :

"I have heard nothing from Mr. Perley as yet in reference to the B. C. dock, or Trutch, but Mr. McGreevy leaves here to-morrow and he will look after the matter."

On the 1st February, Michael Connolly writes to friend Owen :

"I don't think $100,000 would any more than pay for the difference of cost of substituting granite for sandstone, as it is a very costly and tedious job to cut and prepare granite for this work"

On the 2nd February, Michael Connolly writes to friend Owen :

"Sir Hector has telegraphed instructions to Trutch to measure all the stone in the dock full as built, but there has not been anything done about the old plant yet."

I leave aside for a moment the question of the granite stone. Will the hon. gentlemen opposite tell me upon what authority Sir Hector Langevin had been telegraphing to Esquimalt to measure all the stone? Is there any report of the engineer to justify it? This, in the mind of the Minister, must have been nothing else but a preparation for extras for the contractors. You see by a letter I quoted, of the 1st February, that the contractors find out that the granite is very expensive and they say that $100,000 would not pay them. Then, on the 8th February, Michael Connolly writes to "friend Owen" :

"Nick at first was very anxious to have the stone changed to granite, but I hope no such change will be made, for the granite here is terribly hard and the quarry about 180 miles distant. If possible get them to extend the dock 150 feet and do away with the double entrance but put in a circular head, the same as at Lévis, and let sandstone go in as it is. Be sure and do what you can for this matter. Dispensing with the double entrance head is very important, as it is very difficult work."

On the 12th February, Michael Connolly writes again to "friend Owen" :

"I am delighted to hear that they have determined to extend the dock, as you say, 100 feet. If it was 150 feet it would be all the better. I didn't care so much about the change of sandstone for granite, as the granite here is terribly hard, and will take a tremendous time to cut it. Nick thought at first if we got it changed to granite it would be a good idea, and there would be money in it. Now we have the sandstone quarries open and communication established with them, so that it is no trouble to run up or down to them, and besides, if we have to put in granite we will have to go about forty miles further off where no boats call, and if we have anything to send there it will have to go by special conveyance. On the whole, I would rather put in the granite, as we would be able to finish in a shorter time, and I think there is fully as much money in it."

Now we have got the letter of the 16th February, 1885, of Mr. Trutch to Mr. Perley, and I draw the attention of the Minister to that letter in which it is stated as follows :—

"I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of an Order in Council, conveyed to me under covering letter of the 14th instant from the chief engineer, authorizing the omission of the works for a second entrance at the head of the Esquimalt dock and the extension of the dock, bottom and side walls to obtain a further length of 50 feet in the body of the dock, and to state that the necessary instructions will be at once sent to the resident engineer and to the contractors, for carrying these alterations into effect.

"In connection with this subject, I take this opportunity of calling your attention to the fact that the sandstone intended to be used in this work, though the best obtainable after a careful search, and selection, is of a soft character, and will, I fear not wear well in positions in the work where it is liable to crushing strain, heavy blows or much friction, as, for instance, in positions such as the altars, the ladders, the dock bottom under the keel blocks, the culverts, &c.

"It would undoubtedly add very materially to the value of the dock by rendering it a more permanent work, and thus diminishing the liability to after expenditure for the removal of these portions of the work (which would certainly be a contingency to be provided for if they were built of sandstone) should they be constructed at once of granite instead, an abundant supply of which material of excellent quality is available to the contractor. (Sgd.) JOSEPH TRUTCH."

But, Sir, on the 18th February, 1885, Larkin writes to Murphy as follows :—

"ST. CATHARINES, 18th February, 1885.

"O. E. MURPHY, Esq., Quebec.

"MY DEAR SIR,—After posting my letter to you yesterday I received a letter from Mike dated the 8th. You may have one of same date and to the same purport. In case you have not I will give you the main points. The first is that they are working the sandstone quarry. It has turned out first rate. A steamer calls there alternate days, making communication with the dock easy, and that the substitution of granite, even at a dollar a foot, will not pay as well as the present contract for sandstone, and Mike does not want the change. The granite is good but hard to cut : and the quarries are 180 miles from the dock and no regular steam communication to them as there is to the sandstone quarries. The latter is only 45 miles from the dock. Of course Nick is anxious for the lengthening but nothing more. Better see our friends on this matter." * * * *

"Yours truly,

"P. LARKIN."

Not only Mr. Trutch, not only the contractors at first, not only the people of British Columbia by sending petitions, but even Mr. Perley under date of the 21st February, 1885, considered that the stone should be granite, and Mr. Perley says :

"I have carefully read Mr. Trutch's letter of the 16th (No. 56915) calling attention to the desirability of substituting granite for sandstone in certain portions of the graving dock at Esquimalt, and recommending that such substitution be authorized.

"Having had occasion last summer to examine a large number of graving docks in England and Scotland, I particularly noticed that the bottom of the docks, the altars, filling and emptying culverts, steps, timber slides and copings were the points where the greatest wear and tear took place—in fact that they were the working points of the docks, and, therefore, were built accordingly.

"The sandstone specified for the Esquimalt dock is of a very soft and friable nature, and liable to fracture under a heavy blow or strain, and may be classed as unfitted for use at points where it would be subject to the constant wear it would sustain if placed in the parts of the dock above referred to.

"By substituting granite for sandstone, at these points, not only would a greater degree of solidity be given to the work, but the amount of ordinary wear and tear would be reduced to a minimum—in fact, it might be assumed that

once built a necessity for repair would be almost *nil*, whilst, if built of sandstone, I believe a yearly expenditure would have to be made for restoration of damaged work.

"I have also looked into the matter of cost and find that by substituting granite for sandstone at the salient points, there would be added about $45,000 to the cost of the dock, and I am of the opinion that the benefit to be derived by the use of granite would justify the expenditure required to place it in the work, and I therefore join with Mr. Trutch in recommending its use."

We find at the bottom of this letter:

"Approved and recommended.

"H. L. LANGEVIN."

Mr. Speaker, we all admit; Mr. Perley admits, Mr. Trutch admits, and Mr. Bennett acting for Mr. Trutch admits, and the people of British Columbia admit, and the contractors admit, and common sense and experience were also there to prove that sandstone was not good, that the interest of the country required that granite should be supplied, and the Minister himself recommends the change to granite; but notwithstanding all this we find that the Council refuses to accept the recommendation, and why? They refused it against the report of Mr. Perley, and did they do it of their own act? If they did, they must take the responsibility of having refused the change against the advice of everybody, and of having refused to do what was in the public interest in this matter. I do not charge that the Council was at fault in this, because I understand that they must have acted upon the advice of the Minister at the head of the department. But surely they will be more manly than to throw the responsibility of that on Mr. Perley, when they have got the report of Mr. Perley that he was in favour of granite. When Sir Hector accepted that change, did he do so in the interest of the public? We will see. On the 24th of February Mr. Robert McGreevy writes:

"DEAR MURPHY,—The second entrance has been done away with, and circular head substituted at an increase of $35,000. The granite substitution was just about being sent to Council, but happily my letter came in time to put it back to sandstone, where it is now; high courses and bed will be put—the additional length will be hereafter settled. I think this is what you want, but it was a close shave."

Here is abundant proof that the Minister has been sacrificing the public interest for the benefit of the contractors. I do not care for the oral evidence on that point; I have got the documentary evidence all through, and we will see how it confirms that fact. On the same day that Mr. McGreevy wrote to Murphy Mr. Perley wrote to Mr. Trutch, telling him that a decision adverse to his recommendation had been given by the Privy Council. On the 24th of February, 1885, Nick writes also:

"As to the sandstone, if they can make as much out of it as they can out of granite it would be as well to stick to the former if we can, as it is far more covenient. No doubt Nick, on investigating the matter, has come to this conclusion, and since writing you first about substituting granite, and he is on the right track now."

He was not aware that Mike had written on the 18th February. On the 26th of February Murphy writes to Larkin:

"DEAR SIR,—You letter just arrived, and in reply would say that our friends here are greatly disappointed in the way we have treated them both here and at Ottawa, after everything was done to suit us, then it has to be undone again."

Do we see there what was done before the Council? Do we see the action of the Minister, deciding first in the interest of the country, but when he received word from the contractors that if it was in the interest of the country it was not in their interest, going before the Council and asking for the withdrawal of his signature? There was the report before the Executive Council: there was Sir Hector Langevin's signature approving of it, and he had to say to the Council that he begged to withdraw that report; and of course he must have complained to his friend Thomas McGreevy of the position in which his friends had put him. Murphy writes to Larkin:

"I cannot understand Nicholas, as you know, Mr. Trutch stated, there would be a letter in Quebec, giving a detailed statement of what we wanted in the way of changes and proposed costs of the same. However, there came none, of course, when Michael's letter came to me, I had our friend send dispatch to Ottawa, stopping the substitution of granite, you see the position this places our friends in there before the Council."

What a humiliating position it is for this Dominion to see the hands of the contractors surreptitiously at work in the sacred room where the Council sits, taking away a document before them so that their interests would prevail upon public interest. Here are men under oath to protect the interests of this country, and that oath is laughed at and sneered at by contractors, whose influence reaches into that chamber; and to-day we are told that Mr. Perley is the responsible man. Will not the fourteen men of that Council be brave enough to say that they decided, and will they not be able to give us reasons why they did it? I say that nobody except Sir Hector Langevin, or the whole Ministry if they prefer it, is responsible for that change, which was made against the interests of the country. But Owen Murphy is not the only one to give us corroboration of that. On the 28th of February, 1885, Larkin writes from St. Catharines:

"MY DEAR SIR,—Your letter of the 26th instant received, and contents carefully noted. I cannot see why our friends should be disappointed or that they have cause to think that we have treated them in any way discourteously, either at Quebec or at Ottawa: in fact, this is a matter in which all are interested, and the more made out of it the better for them as well as us. It was first thought that substituting granite for sandstone at $1.00 per foot additional would be a big thing; afterwards, it was ascertained that the sandstone at contract prices would pay as well, owing to the quarries being working well and the facilities of getting the stone to the dock would expedite the building and shorten the time materially. I am not prepared to say that the granite would not pay, but I am satisfied to leave the whole matter with Nicholas, Mike and Hume: they are on the spot and have fully investigated the whole affair, and are better judges of what will pay best than we are or could possibly be at this distance from the scene of action."

On the 23rd of March, 1885, Michael Connolly writes again to "friend Owen":

"FRIEND OWEN.—Yours of the 10th received to-day.**

"I agree with you, things were badly mixed up and too much confused, in reference to the granite. This was owing to not getting proper data on which to base figures when writing or tendering to the Department of Public Works. Nick at first thought, and indeed so did I, that we could substitute granite for sandstone at a very moderate advance on the price of sandstone. I should be very sorry to have our friends think that that matter was done intentionally or with any view to placing them in a false position. The first letters were written without giving the matter due consideration, which I am ready to admit was our fault, but after due examination we came to the conclusion that it could not be done for the price; therefore we are grateful to our friends for having our proposition rejected. I am sorry to hear that our friends are annoyed over the matter, for surely it's better not to get the substitution than to have it at losing figures. There are many ways, however, in which they can make up for this matter, by increasing the beds of the stone, &c., and by adding to the length of the dock will more than com-

pensate for the loss in the granite substitution. I was not aware and I do not think that any one here knew that our friends had been ignored or that there had been any overtures made except through you to them. If there were I certainly had no hand in it, and I do not think Nick had either."

Then he says that he had some difficulty with a young gentleman, a nephew of the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, who used to talk too much about his uncle's influence with the Minister of Public Works. That influence was well known to the contractors, and they knew well what they had to pay for it. This ends the matter of the sandstone, and I will be glad if there can be any possible answer made concerning it. I will sum it up in a few words. It was found out by experience at Esquimalt that the sandstone was bad; the post office there had been built of sandstone and had to be pulled down and rebuilt of other stone. It was asked by Mr. Trutch, assented to by Mr. Perley and by Sir Hector Langevin, that granite be substituted, and the thing was to have been done when word came from the contractors that it would not be financially beneficial to them, and Sir Hector Langevin, to please the contractors, withdrew his report from the Council and placed himself in the humiliating condition which was depicted by the contractors among themselves. If anyone will pretend that the Minister himself did not join the contractors in their conspiracy against the public interests, I must say that I did not understand the meaning of the words I have been reading. The Minister, and not Mr. Perley, was responsible in this instance, just as the Minister, and not Mr. Perley, was responsible for the loss suffered by the country on the first and second tenders. Now, I will come to the re-coursing; but before doing so let me read a letter from Michael Connolly to his friend Owen, page 209, in which he says:

"I think Bennett will object to us putting large stone in the concrete. We put some large stone in yesterday to test the matter, but Bennett did not come here. He will be down to-morrow, and if he objects I will write you at once and let you know. He is exacting every petty foolish thing the specifications speak of, all of which we will of course comply with until we get orders from headquarters."

Here we see that the contractors always looked to Ottawa for protection against the officers of the department at Esquimalt, the government engineer, Mr. Trutch, and Mr. Bennett, the resident engineer. They do not care what is done by these men, but they write to friend Owen to get the department to comply with their wishes. On the 16th of April, 1885, Mr. Perley wrote to Mr. Trutch:

"Contractors' engineer submitted his design for re-coursing graving dock, and also for alteration in the course for inclination or drip in bottom, and informs me that he furnished Bennett with copies of changes proposed. You are authorized to permit contractors to make these changes; plan circular head will be forwarded."

It is very extraordinary that the officers at Esquimalt were not consulted, but that instead there was direct communication between the contractors, engineer at Esquimalt and the department at Ottawa. Why had we a resident engineer at Esquimalt? Why had we another officer there representing the Government, when the contractors did not deign to consult them and communicate through them, but wrote direct to Ottawa to obtain orders for extras and changes? That was a very extraordinary state of things. Now, we have seen that the contractors complained of Mr. Trutch, and on their complaint Mr. Perley interfered, by his letter of 16th of April, 1885, page 122:

"There would appear to be an intention on the part of Mr. Bennett to adhere literally to the plans for this dock, even where it has been shown to him that a change is necessary for the benefit of the dock. This ought not to be so, for there is no doubt that before the dock is finished many occasions will arise when departures must be made from the plans, and Mr. Bennett should exercise judgment in such cases."

Judgment he could not exercise, because he was always being checked by Ottawa. By following the dates of the letters we come on one referring to the plant, Mr. Trutch, according to Mr. Bennett, the resident engineer, found out that all the plant had been handed over to the contractors, except $10.45 worth, and the contractors objected to the amount of $12,403. Mr. Trutch writes as follows:—

"I represented to Mr. Connolly that I understood it to be clearly one of the terms of the contract that the whole of the plant mentioned in the schedule should be taken over by them, and be charged against them at the prices stated, and that this material and plant had accordingly been handed over to them, and was now in their possession and would accordingly be charged against them, except as to the missing articles to the value of $10.45, and that, as provided in the specification attached to the contract, a deduction of one-twelfth of the aggregate price of the material and plant so handed over to them would be made from the amount of the payments to be made to them on each of the twelve first monthly progress estimates, certified to by the resident engineer."

This will be found on page 99 of the report. On the 18th of April, 1885, Mr. Trutch wrote to Mr. Perley, *see* page 123:

"Design furnished Bennett by contractors for re-coursing will be carried out as authorized by your telegram of 16th inst.; alterations appear unobjectionable, but their adoption will increase cost of work by additional price of dressed stone resulting from necessarily increased width of bed proportionate to increased depth of courses."

On the 20th of April, 1885, Mr. Perley wrote to Mr. Trutch:

"As the alteration in depth of courses was requested by the contractors for their own convenience, and not ordered by the department, there will not be any extra amount of dressed stone allowed beyond the schedule quantities which will be adhered to in making estimates. * * * What I wish to convey in the above is that as the contractors suggested the change in the dimensions of the stone, and were not ordered by the department to make the change, they have no right to be paid for any extra stone supplied."

It was well decided then by Mr. Trutch and Mr. Perley that they would not allow anything for the re-coursing. In another letter of the 29th of April, 1885, page 141, Mr. Perley writes:

"It now appears from Mr. Trutch's letter that the contractors desire to accept plant, &c., to the value of $38,000 only and do not wish to pay for the balance, amounting to $12,400, because they say they have no use for it. The specification is very clear on this point, and there is no option on the part of the contractors to take what they please and refuse what they do not want."

On the 2nd of May, 1885, page 18, Mr. Thomas McGreevy wrote to his brother:

"If this arrangement does not suit Mr. Murphy, telegraph me what he wants done and I will have it done for him."

By whom?

"It is now understood that Bennett, the engineer at British Colombia, will not suit, so the Minister and Perley are prepared to change him. He asked if I could recommend one. 'Could you think of one that would suit, and I would have the Minister appoint him?'"

On the 2nd May, 1885, another letter was written by Mr. Trutch as follows:—

"A month ago I apprised Mr. Connolly that substitution of larger courses would not be objected to, and that on his written application to be allowed to substitute any larger courses without increased cost of work to Government I would return him written sanction. No such written application has, however, been received, and consequently no written sanction has been given by me. Contractors submitted to Bennett, twentieth March, plans of proposed changes in mode of construction which he referred to me on my return: these changes appeared both to Bennett and myself unobjectionable, except as regards question of cost as I wired you eighteenth ult., and I understand work is proceeding in accordance therewith, but without letter from contractors to above effect. I hesitate to give written sanction or to formally approve plans as specifications request least complication as to cost should result. Of course, however, I will do so if Minister so directs. Please answer."

On the same date Perley writes:

"Minister directs that no deduction for plant be made from first progress estimate, but shall begin with second and so continue monthly. You can allow ninety per cent. on materials delivered subject to the deduction of ten per cent. Wire on Monday morning amount which can be paid to contractors, as they are pressing for payment."

On the 4th May, 1885, Perley telegraphed:

"Minister authorizes you to permit contractors to build work with stone of increased sizes, as proposed by themselves; they to be made aware that this permission is merely acceding to their request and not ordering them to make the change."

On the same day he writes in confirmation of his telegram and adds that the permission to do so has been granted to them at their own request, "and I would inform them here of this decision of the Minister and that no extra payment will be made to them on account of this change." On the 4th May Thomas writes to his brother:

"As I telegraphed you this morning, no estimate has been telegraphed. Everything and every order has been sent to them that was possible to make them understand. But still there was a despatch from them to-day which cost $15, which they had in writing for over a month out there. Perley went to see Page this morning to try and get another engineer to send out at once and dismiss Bennett. He that goes out will get his instructions before going out."

The contractors wanted the re-coursing and plant paid for, they wanted the new stones paid for on the same basis as the outside masonry. They could not obtain the consent of Trutch or Bennett, but you see that Mr. Perley himself was supporting them. Then Mr. Thomas McGreevy sees that somebody must be removed, and he sees Perley and they decide to get rid of Bennett and to have another engineer who will have his instructions before starting. Mr. Trutch, on the 11th May, 1885, protests against what has been insinuated against Mr. Bennett, and says that there is no intention on his part of doing anything of which he is accused. On the 12th May, 1885, the Minister cannot do otherwise than to follow the advice of Mr. Perley and Mr. Trutch, and to say that the plant must be paid for as specified in the contract and the specification. But every hope is not lost for the contractors. Mr. Trutch, on the 18th May, 1885, writes to Larkin, Connolly & Co.:

"I have also been apprised by Mr. Perley that you have applied to the Minister ——"

You see they have applied to the Minister and not to Mr. Trutch.—

"to the Minister and to him for permission to be allowed to carry out the works in accordance with these plans; and that the Minister had decided that such permission should be given on the distinct condition that no extra payment will be made to you on account of the changes to be effected by the adoption of these plans, and especially that no extra payment shall be made to you on account of the increased sizes of stone proposed by you to be used in the work, as this is to be done at your own request and for your own proper advantage, as you think, and not by order of the department, and I am authorized and requested to convey to you such permission.

"I have, accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the conditions of the specifications on which your contract is based, signed the plans under reference, and hereby convey to you my consent to the work being carried out in conformity therewith on the conditions above stated as prescribed by the same."

Mr. Trutch wanted at first a written bond by the contractors that they would not ask any extra payment. They have received direct from the Minister at Ottawa permission to measure all the stone, then they have permission to employ these new stones without the consent and against the will of the engineers at Esquimalt. On the 28th May Michael Connolly writes:

"Yours of the 17th instant is just to hand. I wrote a letter to Mr. McGreevy a few days ago, telling him about Trutch. I don't think much of him; he was terribly put out when he found the Government had ignored him, and approved the changes we suggested without consulting him; hence his letter about not allowing us anything for the additional sizes of stone. I treat him with great consideration when he calls, but don't intend to trouble him much in future."

No, he need not trouble him much. He will simply write to Ottawa, to friend Murphy or friend McGreevy, and every one of his wishes will be complied with. He goes on:

"While I was away, under telegraphic instruction from Ottawa, Bennett prepared the estimate, but I knew we did not get all we were entitled to, as, for example, our engineer tells me he did not allow us for any headers in the first and second altars, when I know there is the regulation number in, and if not, how can we face the chief engineer, after allowing the work to be built so much at variance with the specifications."

I think Mr. Trutch was quite correct in feeling that he was not consulted. What was his use there, and what was the use of the money we paid for him? I think we might as well decide, looking at the small number of members actually present in the House, that the minority's report should be adopted and that the Government should be upset at once. Judging from the small number who want information on this subject, we might stop the debate and vote at once. On the 9th of September, 1885, Larkin and Connolly write to the Hon. Mr. Trutch and want to be paid for the re-coursing of the stones under the head of masonry. They have obtained the permission they asked for. They did not consent to sign a document by which, as requested from them, they would have agreed not to ask for changes. They have received permission from the engineer and orders from the Minister, and now they begin to fyle their claims. On the 11th September Michael Connolly writes to his brother and complains again of Messrs. Trutch and Bennett, and says they think they know more than the Minister of Public Works or the chief engineer:

"Instead of Mr. Trutch complying with the request of Sir Hector, that we should receive every possible indulgence and encouragement, he is doing everything he can in an underhand way to embarrass us, and Bennett is his tool all through."

"Received all possible indulgence and encouragement." When Sir Hector told Starrs & O'Hanly that it would be a strict contract, that there would be no extras and no change he was telling Trutch at the same time to use every possible indulgence towards Larkin, Connolly & Co. He goes on:

"If the Department of Public Works is going to allow Trutch and Bennett to dictate to it in this manner, we might

as well, and better, stop at once, for we cannot stand this sort of humbugging any longer."

He concluded by saying :

"I wish, as soon as this letter comes to you, you would go to Ottawa and see Sir Hector and explain the matter to him, who, I believe, when the situation is explained to him, will apply the necessary remedy."

On the 7th December, 1885, Michael Connolly writes to friend Owen, and says :

"I judge from the tone of his remarks——"

That is of Perley.—

—"that he is in favour of lengthening the dock, but as he has not yet seen it reported to the Minister, of course he cannot say what will be done. We did not ask him anything about Bennett, but from the drift of the conversation we concluded that Bennett would be allowed to finish the dock."

Mr. Perley had just come back from British Columbia. We have seen that the contractors could not be paid for their plant, and they could not be paid for the re-coursing of the stone? What do they decide in Ottawa? They sent that useful Perley to British Columbia, and when he gets back then he finds that, as the sandstone is not very good, it was well to employ larger stone than stipulated by the contract. Now, it has become fair to pay for the sandstone fully and completely, in spite of the contract, in spite of the engineers' report, in spite of the previous decisions. His trip to British Columbia was for what purpose? Was it to show that he knew nothing about it beforehand? Was it to go there and prove that these previous reports were based upon erroneous information? It would appear to be so. At all events he comes back and he suggests that the plant should be paid, and that the engineers should be fully paid for their re-coursing. I might refer this honourable House to his letter of the 18th January. There are two letters of that date. One is Exhibit "86," which is to be found in the report of the majority. I have heard complaints that in the Lévis dock the documents were only put in at the end of the enquête. But Mr. Henry and Mr. Osler were there, and the officers of the department were there, but this letter quoted in the majority report has never been fyled as an exhibit, and is not to be found in the list of exhibits. We do not complain of it, but I wish only to remind them that when they complain about the exhibit fyled in the Lévis dock matter, their complaints are not based upon equal justice and fairness. Those two exhibits, which I will not read in order to save time, are dated the 18th of January, 1886, and are the confirmation of what I say, that Perley's trip was with the only object of putting him in a position to recommend the payment of the plant and the re-coursing. It was to accomplish the promise made by Sir Hector which is related to us in the letter of Robert McGreevy. It was to accomplish the promise to which Larkin has referred in his letter. All through we see that Perley is simply a cover and a sham to take away the responsibility of the direct action of the Minister. We see also by telegrams of 15th November and other dates, what means the Minister took that no delay should occur concerning the contractors. He acts towards them as a very good father, and I presume that the contractors felt obliged under these circumstances to show practical gratitude. On the 15th of February, 1886, Mr. Trutch writes to Mr. Perley, and says :

"To-day I have received from Mr. Bennett the progress estimate to the end of January under Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s contract for the completion of the dock, with a covering letter from Mr. Bennett, in which he states that the measurements for this estimate have been made by him in accordance with the Minister's said directions, and that the sum of $23,844.13 has consequently been added to this estimate.

It is good to have friends at court. In one month the amount due is increased by $23,844. Is this Mr. Perley's fault? No; this is the order given specially by the Minister to measure the whole of the inside stone. The permission was given at the start to the contractors to re-course the stone with a special understanding and agreement that nothing will be allowed extra for that. Afterwards Mr. Perley goes to British Columbia and finds, against the views entertained by the resident engineer, that the contractors must be fully paid. He did not know it before leaving here. Here I see the direct intervention and action of the Minister himself. Then there was a question of lengthening the dock further, and Michael Connolly writes on the 15th of February, 1886 :

"Friend Owen,"—

We are happy to have those letters. If we had them not we would never have found out anything. If Murphy had come before the Committee, that man who was a defaulter in New York, and sworn to these things without there being abundant letters and documents to corroborate his statements, he would be in gaol for the rest of his life. But we have letters. Everything he said in his evidence was astounding. We all looked at them as if it was impossible. But there were letters and documents discovered everywhere, and now the history is made pretty complete. Here is one of these documents about the dock (page 191) :

"Now about the dock here. If the two hundred and fifty thousand pass in the Budget, we, of course, will have some work to tear down, &c., but if you can get a lump contract for extending at $250,000 we can give fifty thousand dollars. If we don't get it of course we will finish up as soon as possible. If you can prevent the appointment of Muir, whom Bennett appointed inspector of machinery on the dock here, do so by all means."

Is it possible that these contractors are obtaining from the Government a contract for $250,000 which will place then in a position to give $50,000? What is the state of the country in which we live? These contractors were planning for a contract at such extravagant prices that they would be able to give $50,000 out of their profits. On 19th February, 1886, the following letter was addressed to Murphy :—

"My Dear Sir,—I have just got your letter of the 17th inst. Our friends' call for another $5,000, on account of B. C., is not in accordance with the agreement we had when the $50,000 was divided—that was, that there was to be no more calls or divisions to be made until the indebtedness of the B. C. dock and Q. H. I. works to the Quebec dock was paid, that was distinctly stated by me and agreed to by R. H.; otherwise, I would not have agreed to the division of the $50,000. You did quite right to refuse—stick to it; should we get an order to lengthen the dock 100 feet or even 75 feet I would be quite willing that $5,000 should be given at once. Bear in mind, my dear fellow, that there is a large amount due you, Connolly and myself, and that if we continue donating as we have been doing there will be nothing left to pay us, except old plant. Keep the eleventh commandment in view—that is, look out for yourself."

Further down the letter reads :

"We can apply for the percentage any time. I do not think, however, that it would be advisable to do so for some time, as we are getting paid for the increased masonry, and it would be asking too much at one time. If Trutch was removed we could get along with Bennett all

right, but as long as he is under Trutch's influence we cannot. I have just received a letter from Mike; he says that Trutch is very much annoyed because he was not consulted before the order was given to measure the increased masonry."

Michael Connolly writes to Owen:

"I told you in a letter lately, that if $250,000 were granted for extending the dock we would give fifty of it for some charitable purpose. I think it will be quite possible to get that amount, and as we will have to pull down a considerable quantity of work it will be worth that amount to pull the work down and extend it 100 feet. We have not incurred any expense in connection with the agitation about extending the dock, but I suppose we will have to give something to the *Colonist*, whose proprietor is a pretty decent man. * * *

"P.S.—I don't see why our friends should ask for another $5,000. I know and heard a distinct understanding and agreement in presence of Capt. Larkin that after the division of the $50,000 there should be no further calls until all the debts were paid. I think our friends should have a little patience with us, and wait a little. We have not acted badly by them, for I see by the statement you sent out they have received out of this work alone $14,000, all before we were charged one dollar on it; I would advise you to be careful. There may not be so much saved or made on this work as we expected; for we have had to advance the men's wages here lately, as we could not otherwise get labourers, most of them having started out to the gold mines on Granite Creek.

"I think perhaps Nick and Hume will start about the 15th inst., or thereabouts.

"Be careful and don't pay out too much."

On 26th February, 1886, Thomas McGreevy writes to Robert from the House of Commons:

"I wrote you yesterday about Halifax graving dock. Sir Hector would be glad to recommend Murphy. The way for them to do would be to apply to the company in England, offering to build the dock for them, stating that they built the one in Quebec and were finishing the one in B.C. and referring to the Minister of Public Works of Canada as to their ability to do the work."

On 1st March, 1886, Thomas McGreevy wrote Robert from the Department of Public Works:

"I have had a long interview with Perley on harbour works and graving dock at B.C. Fleming was to have signed his report to-day on harbour works. It will be shown to me as soon as signed. I will see it to-morrow, and Sir Hector and myself will decide what is to be done for future. He will adopt my views. I will see you and Murphy about it before doing anything. It is a big thing for the future."

On 11th March, Thomas McGreevy wrote to his brother again from the Department of Public Works:

"My dear Robert,—I enclose you the amount of estimates for December and January. The January one includes the new system of measurement. The advance $20,000 on drawback has been passed and will be sent at once to B.C. The amount of estimate for February has not been telegraphed yet. I will let you know when it comes."

On 16th March, 1886, Michael Connolly wrote to Owen:

"Friend Owen,—I thought you said some time ago that the Government only intended to charge us thirty-seven thousand dollars for the plant they had on the ground here. Mr. Perley sent out a request and a list to mark and note what quantity of the plant we used or could use in connection with the work here, so we marked the different items we accepted, and their value, which in the aggregate amounted to thirty-one thousand dollars. Yet these people here, Trutch and Bennett, keep deducting the amount monthly prescribed by the specifications, viz., $4,000 a month, so that we have already paid on the old stuff forty-two thousand dollars. If Mr. Perley recommends that we be not charged with this worthless stuff and Sir Hector acts on his recommendation, Trutch and Bennett ought to be instructed in reference to the matter."

On 15th March, 1886, Thomas McGreevy wrote to Robert:

"My Dear Robert,—Larkin and Murphy are here. Larkin has learned a good deal of what has been done. The estimate for February is through and amounts to over $25,000, that makes nearly seventy-five thousand gone out within a month. They ought to be flush out there now."

On the 21st March, 1886, Michael writes to Owen Murphy:

"Yours of the 8th inst. came duly to hand. I hope you will soon hear definitely about the extension of the dock, as we have some men whom we would like to retain. Of course, if the estimate passes, we will give everything we can afford. We haven't heard anything from the 20,000 drawback yet, but perhaps we will in a day or two."

On the 13th May, 1886, Thomas writes to his brother Robert, from the House of Commons:

"House of Commons, Ottawa, 13th May, 1886.

"My Dear Robert,—Your letter received. Will be home on Saturday morning. The tenders for Cape Tormentine work were opened to-day by Sir Hector. The lowest is an Ottawa man. He is $134,000. His name is Perkins. The next after him is another Ottawa man. Perley says the estimate of the work is $170,000. You know what the tenders were that you were interested in. It is a great pity that a fine job like that should go so low. Give enclosed to Mr. Chaloner.

"Yours truly,

"THOMAS McGREEVY.

"I have seen Ferguson. He is going to push on the suit. Government won't ask any delay.

"Yours,

"T. M."

We see here that Thomas McGreevy knows it as soon as Sir Hector does anything. Mr. McGreevy knows all that Mr. Perley does, and there is no secret for him there. On the 13th September, 1886, Perley writes to Mr. Trutch:

"Ottawa, 13th September, 1886.

"Sir,—I am directed to inform you that the Honourable the Minister wishes to be furnished with a final estimate of the work done, &c., by Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co., on the graving dock at Esquimalt, B.C."

On the 20th September, 1886, Sir Hector himself writes to Mr. McGreevy:

"Office of the Minister of Public Works, Canada,

"Ottawa, 20th September, 1886.

"My dear Mr. McGreevy,—The contractors for the Lévis graving dock should ask a settlement of their account from the Harbour Commissioners, who then will most likely consult with their engineer. For the Esquimalt dock it is different, because the work there is altogether under my control.

"Yours very truly,

"HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

"Hon. Thomas McGreevy, M.P., Quebec."

On the 11th December, 1886, Larkin, Connolly & Co. receive a letter from Mr. Gobeil, as follows:—

"Department of Public Works,

"Ottawa, 11th December, 1886.

"Gentlemen,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 7th instant, transmitting statements of claims on your part on account of your contract for the completion of the graving dock at Esquimalt, B.C., and to inform you that the matter has been referred, for report, to the chief engineer of department.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"A. GOBEIL,

"*Secretary.*

"Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co.,

"Contractors, Quebec."

We see here a most extraordinary request from Sir Hector Langevin who writes to them to send the account, and his request is complied with by the contractors immediately. The contractors not only succeeded in obtaining the changes I speak of, but they get another account for extras, and then comes the celebrated memo., corresponding in date with

a letter of Sir Hector Langevin, advising them to send in their account. The memo. is as follows :—

"If contract is entered into with Harbour Commissioners, and approved of by the Minister of Public Works, for eight hundred thousand yards of dredging at thirty-five cents, to be dumped in river, or if in more difficult place, to be paid extra, we give 25,000. All over 200,000 at Lévis dock. Extras B. C. about 73,000, of which we give 23,000.

"LARKIN, CONNOLLY & CO."

They wanted something to make things smooth. Sir Hector writes to them to send in their account and the memo. was signed. This memo. was corroborated a few days afterwards by Larkin, because the first memo. they wrote was signed by Larkin, Connolly & Co. On the 1st February the contractors met at Nicholas Connolly's in Quebec, and another memo. was written by Larkin as follows :—

"QUEBEC, 1st February, 1887.

"Memo. of meeting this afternoon at the residence of N. K. Connolly, between N. K. C., O. E. Murphy, R. H. McGreevy and P. Larkin, and agreed that 'twenty-five,' (it does not go any further, but I know what that 'twenty-five' means $25,000. The memo. goes on) "and agreed that 'twenty-five' should be given and charged to dredging contract if obtained. If not obtained, to be charged to B. C. and Q. H. I., and that a former proposal, a memo. of which was taken by M. Connolly, should be cancelled."

On the 1st May, 1887, Michael Connolly writes to "friend Owen" as follows :—

"LARKIN, CONNOLLY & CO.,
"CONTRACTORS ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK,
"ESQUIMALT, B.C., 4th May, 1887.

"FRIEND OWEN,— * * * * I am trying to keep up the agitation of the dock extension as well as I can. I send you a paper to-day with a very good letter written by the engineer we had here, Mr. Aylen.

"I am glad to hear that yourself and Nick are making money in the stock business, but I think it is scarcely a prudent thing to do to give Clews a *carte blanche* to buy and sell as his opinion dictates, but of course he and you should know best. If you give these B.C. M.P.'s too much money you will spoil them ; I did a good deal for both of them here during their recent contest ; I helped them with votes and my personal influence on their platforms at their meeting, and besides subscribed about two hundred dollars to defray their incidental expenses.

* * * * * * * *

"Yours,
"M. CONNOLLY."

Whilst we were paying very largely here out of the public money, they were working the electors in British Columbia with our money to induce them to return members to support the Government. The power of these contractors was felt very heavily everywhere. It has been said that Mr. Perley is responsible for the remission of the money for the plant, and although Mr. Perley now assumes the responsibility for it, yet if the Minister after having known for such a long time the history of the plant, having known the conditions imposed, having known the objections of the engineers here and at British Columbia to paying that amount of $50,000 to the contractors ; if after that, Perley paid the money without his consent and knowledge, Sir Hector was not fit to be a Minister. Of course I am bound to accept Mr. Perley's evidence on that, but even accepting Mr. Perley's evidence, I say that it is gross negligence, and culpable and *quasi* criminal negligence on the part of the Minister, for which there is no possible excuse. The House remembers the conversation which took place in presence of Mr. Perley in reference to this matter, and which will be found related on page 102 of the evidence. Mr. Perley got into a passion because the contractors wanted a clause inserted about that, and he would not consent. Hon. gentlemen will also remember Mr. McGreevy's letter, which says that further on they will succeed, and so they did succeed. But who wanted to get rid of Mr. Bennett on account of the extras which were asked? On the 21st September, 1887, Mr. Perley reports to Sir Hector Langevin that Mr. Bennett will not be required after the 1st September, and Mr. Bennett is consequently dismissed. We have seen the great effort on the part of the Minister to have the dock lengthened. An Order in Council was passed to that effect, and they wanted the consent of England to the proposal, but England refused to agree to the lengthening of the dock, and that scheme, which would have put the contractors in a position to get $50,000 cash out of the public money, was spoiled by the honesty of the English Government, who would not lend a hand to that theft. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with the Esquimalt affairs so far as it concerns Sir Hector Langevin directly. I do not see how, in justice and fairness, we can seriously say that anyone else is nearly as guilty as the Minister himself. Anybody who will look, I will not say at the verbal evidence, but at the documentary evidence, will come to the same conclusion as I have arrived at myself, that in this contract, in which the contractors made the enormous profit of $240,000, besides donations, this terrible result for the country has been achieved through the direct, I might say the criminal conduct of the Minister of Public Works himself. I will not take up the time of the House to speak of the share of Mr. McGreevy in that, as both reports agree to make him responsible to a certain extent, though they differ as to the extent. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, to take up so much of the time of the House, but I think it fair to put these facts, as I understand them, for reference in the *Hansard*, so that it will be possible for our friends in the country to have my humble view of this case. The other contracts I will deal with in shorter terms, trying always to limit myself to the share that Sir Hector Langevin had in the matter. I come now to the dredging contract. On the 17th of June, 1882, the following letter was written by Sir Hector Langevin :—

"MY DEAR MR. PETERS,—You promised to send me something about the elections. Will you kindly do so?"

Where is the harm? If Mr. Murphy took $10,000 of his money and gave it as a subscription to Sir Hector Langevin, what harm can hon. gentlemen opposite find in that, when their late chief himself asked a contractor for a subscription? Another Minister of the Crown lately said before a committee of this House that he had asked for a subscription from a party furnishing goods to his department. The principle laid down on that side of the House is that it is fair and proper to ask for such subscriptions. Mr. Murphy thought so, and he said he had paid $10,000 ; and here we have the proof that Sir Hector himself asked for a subscription from Mr. Peters. We must remember that the dredging contract was subject to the approval of the hon. Minister of Public Works. It appears in all the official documents fyled before this House. Then, here is the letter of Sir Hector Langevin to the commissioners, asking if there was any collusion :

"I desire to know whether the commissioners have reasons to believe that the tenders received which are lower than the one they prefer, have been made in good faith, and that there has not been any collusion with respect to the withdrawal of these tenders."

Was the commission the proper party for him to apply to? Should he not rather have applied to the engineers? I do not object to the precaution he takes: it would have been all right if the results had been good; but he would have been better informed perhaps if he had asked Mr. McGreevy at once all about it. It is very strange that this man slept in the same house with Sir Hector, that he was then in Ottawa plotting, and sending to his brother the necessary advice. That most intimate friend, Sir Hector, writes to the commissioners: "Are you sure there is no collusion?" On the 25th of August, 1882, Michael Connolly writes to "friend Owen":

"I am glad to hear that you have ousted Peters, Moore & Wright out of the harbour works. Stick to Tom, and I think he will work matters all right; anyway, I have great confidence in him. If Larkin won't get out I would give him the whole thing, for he is a drag chain to carry with the present Administration; so, if he don't get out I would have it with him at a valuation."

That first contract obliged the contractors to dump into the embankment at a given price. Another letter of the 4th of October, from Michael Connolly says:

"You do right to keep in with Tom, as he is the main guy."

Another letter of the 12th of October from Michael Connolly says:

"You do right in keeping in with Hon. Thos., as just at present he has the whole thing in the hollow of his hand. You tell me you have the contract signed for the harbour work, but I think you have given Bob more than he is entitled so, especialy as he is not furnishing any capital. But of course you, who are on the ground, ought to know best, and it would be better to make a hundred thousand dollars with him in, than fifty thousand dollars with him out; so I suppose you have done the best you could under the circumstances."

You will remember on this point that Mr. Boswell informed Mr. Perley uselessly about the dredging being done deeper than the specifications provided for. It has been said that Mr. McGreevy knew that his brother was a partner, but that his object was to be paid his debts. How can hon. gentlemen dare to say such a thing, when Mr. McGreevy himself swore that he received directly from the contractors, from $50,000 to $60,000, though his brother says $117,000. Nicholas Connolly, in a letter, says:

"About the prise for throwing the materil back and leveling I think you are about right, and I think that Mr. Perley or Mr. Boyd would recomend it with very litel perswasan, if our friend would lay it before them in the proper *light*."

His letter is very compromising for the parties concerned. I want to draw your attention to an extract from the Minutes of the Quebec Harbour Commission of 4th July, 1885, according to which it appears that the contractors were still going on, in spite of their contract, with that dredging, and they were going on at the same price as before:

"The secretary is also directed to instruct the engineer in charge to notify the contractors that the commissioners will have to stop the dredging if they do not succeed in making arrangements that will allow them to proceed with the extra dredging the contractors are now executing, and to notify them also that it must be understood, however, that all works performed by them, or that may be performed out of their contract, not especially agreed upon, are and will be considered as forming part of the contract, it being established by certificate No. 13, read at the meeting, that the moneys already paid on account of dredging have exceeded the total amount of the contract."

We will see that through the intervention of the Minister they succeeded in going on, for larger quantities, with their contract of 1882 at the price stipulated therein. This is an important point, and I doubt not that the Minister who at this moment represents the Government in this House will remember it. In 1885, the ex-Minister of Public Works was informed that the contractors were going on with their contract at the same price as was stipulated in 1882, and it was he who allowed them to go on to the extent of $50,000 more at that price. Mr. Gobeil writes as follows:

"I am directed by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to inform you that the understanding in the matter was as stated by the Hon. Mr. McGreevy, and to authorize your board to act accordingly."

On the 29th of July, 1885, Mr. Verret wrote to Sir Hector Langevin himself:

"As this dredging cannot be resumed without the consent of the Government, the commissioners most respectfully urge you to come to their relief."

You see there that Mr. Verret states the commissioners cannot do anything without the consent of the Minister. On the 29th of June, 1886, Mr. Boyd, in a letter to Mr. Verret, said:

"If Larkin, Connolly & Co. are willing to go on at their present prices, a good deal of valuable time will be saved by allowing them to do so."

On the 5th of July, 1886, the commissioners themselves inspected the work, and then Mr. Murphy, on behalf of the contracting firm, undertook to perform the work at contract prices, that is to say, as work executed under their contract for dredging, dated 25th of September, and on the 8th of July Mr. Verret wrote to Mr. Boyd as follows:

"They (the contractors) have undertaken to dredge to a uniform depth of at least 25 feet at low water mark, all the lumps designated on your plan. The work to be performed at contract prices, that is to say, as work excavated under the contract for dredging dated the 25th of September, 1882, with the proviso that the handling and levelling of the dredged material, after its dumping on the Louise embankment, shall be paid extra."

But the putting in of the dredged material on the embankment forms part of this extension of the contract. On the 23rd of December, Mr. Boswell was appointed resident engineer at $2,500. He is the man who later on signed the false report spread all over the world, as to the depth of the dock. Mr. C. McGreevy, a son of Robert McGreevy, was appointed assistant engineer at $1,800 a year, and Mr. Laforce Langevin was appointed another assistant engineer at $1,800 a year. After they were appointed, a letter came from Larkin, Connolly & Co. to the Harbour Commissioners claiming that they were entitled to over $13,000 more than was allowed them. Mr. Perley answered that on the 22nd of February, 1887:

"I may tell you that when going over this matter I found that Boyd had made an error whereby you were overpaid $13,000 and this may account for the smallness of the amount found to be due to you."

But there were two very able assistant engineers, Mr. McGreevy and Mr. Langevin. Where they had made their studies to become engineers nobody knows, but they were very competent. One was the son of the Minister of Public Works, and the other was the son of Mr. Robert McGreevy, one of the contractors and a brother to Thomas McGreevy. What was the result? It was that the claim for $13,000, which was refused on the 14th of March, 1887, was granted, not to the extent of $13,000, but

of $17,000. That is, the contractors asked for $13,000 and got $17,000. It is under those circumstances that I refer to the correspondence to prove that the dredging contract was entirely under the control of Sir Hector Langevin. He knew that the contractors had been going on at the price of their contract, 27 cents, ten times beyond the quantities specified by their contract, and he knew that they were satisfied to keep going on at that price. That is proved by all the written evidence I have quoted, and we find further the following:—

"If contract is entered into with the Harbour Commissioners and approved of by the Minister of Public Works for 800,000 yards of dredging at 35 cents, to be dumped in river, or if in more difficult places to be paid extra, we give $25,000."

That is signed by Larkin, Connolly & Co. They had been ready to go on at 27 cents, and at that price were making a profit, but we find suddenly this offer signed. On the 26th April Mr. Thomas McGreevy wrote to his brother as follows:—

"I have just seen Perley on dredging. I think he will report on 35 cents, and put some conditions which will amount to nothing. He will report when I will be there."

Remember that Perley had nothing to do with granting or refusing contracts. That belonged exclusively to the Minister. The work had been going on very smoothly before, large quantities had been dredged at the 27 cents, and suddenly, on the 27th April, Mr. Perley, when nobody asked him, wanted to know from the contractors what they would charge at a uniform price for further dredging. The next day the contractors replied they would take 35 cents. On the 6th May Mr. Perley wrote to the commissioners and recommended that the 35 cents be granted, as it was a fair and reasonable price. And the commissioners, of course, seeing the recommendation of Mr. Perley, accept. Mr. Forsyth tells us it was the first time he ever heard about it, and they all say they only acted upon Mr. Perley's advice. It was proved before the Committee that 17 cents was paying the previous contractor. The answer to that, and I was rather astounded to hear it, was that the commissioners were responsible and Mr. Dobell's name was given, and I think it was the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) who asked what kind of men are the citizens of Quebec? I will tell him that unfortunately a great many of the active, intelligent citizens of Quebec are no longer in Quebec. They are gone, they have had to go away. The division represented by Mr. McGreevy has been diminished by 3,400 souls during the last decade. And who are those commissioners after all? Who are those who are given to us as representing the citizens of Quebec, and as being persons who should be looked to in defending the interests of the city? There was Mr. Valin. The friends of Mr. McGreevy have taken the trouble of bringing one of Mr. Valin's confrères here to state that he was not fit to be chairman of that commission. They testified against his intelligence, but they did not dare to speak against his honesty. Then we had Mr. McGreevy himself. We also had Mr. Julien Chabot, a most respectable man, but one who was entirely in the hands of Mr. McGreevy. Then we had Mr. Edmond Giroux, one of the directors of the Union Bank, who was appointed through the intervention of Mr. McGreevy. And we had Mr. G. B. Forsythe, who has since been recompensed for all the troubles he suffered in that office by being appointed in the Custom house at Quebec. His name is also to be found on one of the notes given by Mr. Murphy. There were two others, Mr. Dobell and Mr. Rae, but have not they been protesting against that amount of 35 cents? I say this to the hon. the Minister of Militia, who pretends to command in the district of Quebec, let him dare to charge the Harbour Commissioners there or anywhere else that they are responsible for the payment of the 35 cents, and he will find the result. Here, away from the City of Quebec, here where they are not present to defend themselves, he may attempt to throw the responsibility upon them, but they have sworn that, if they accepted that exorbitant price, it was because Mr. Perley, their engineer, recommended it. The hon. gentleman may laugh at this statement here, but we may have the opportunity of meeting him in the presence of these commissioners and then we will see as to the responsibility of this commission for this large price. It is ungrateful for the hon. gentleman to refer in such a manner to those gentlemen, in view of the help the Government have received from them. If Sir Hector Langevin knew nothing about that 35-cent contract, his proper place was not at the head of the department; he would not be worthy to be the tail of a department. What is the policy which has been pursued under the Quebec Harbour Commissioners if it was not a plan and a plot and an effort to rob the City of Quebec, and finally to throw it in the Dominion's hand? Let the hon. gentleman tell us if they ever asked the citizens of Quebec to go into that commission? When did they ask the mayor of Quebec to go into that commission?

Mr. IVES. He is a boodler.

Mr. AMYOT. Does the hon. gentleman say that the mayor of Quebec is a boodler?

Mr. IVES. The ex-mayor.

Mr. AMYOT. The ex-mayor? You say the Hon. Mr. Langelier is a boodler? You say that from your seat in Parliament? The hon. member is here and will be able to defend himself. If he were not here I would do that for him.

Mr. LANGELIER. Is the hon. member speaking of me?

Mr. IVES. Yes.

Mr. LANGELIER. That is a lie.

Mr. AMYOT. Let the hon. gentleman take that direct, and take it between his lips and swallow it, and not take it back. That hon. gentleman's family has ruined Quebec, that family has deprived us of a railway, that family has provided us with a short line railway which takes away so many of our people. That family wants to take away to Texas a great many citizens of Canada.

Mr. IVES. That is Pacaud's partner who spoke last.

Mr. GUAY. Where is Seneeal?

Mr. AMYOT. Who is the partner of Pacaud? What does the hon. gentleman mean? If nothing but dirty things can come from his lips, I would like to know to whom he dares to address them. Whom does he mean by Pacaud's partner? Does he know what he says? Is it not too late in the night for him to know when he is addressing a man who is worthy of his position in this House? What does he mean? If he has nothing to base his

accusations on and they are thrown into the air, he should stop.

Mr. LAURIER. I move the adjournment of the debate. I think we have reached a point when it is better to adjourn.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I hope the hon. gentleman will not insist upon it.

Mr. LAURIER. I do insist.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Well, if the hon. gentleman will insist upon interrupting me, I do not see the necessity for the hon. gentleman striking his desk with his fist when I am repeating to him, in the most civil way possible, my suggestion that the hon. gentleman should not insist upon the discussion being interrupted now. It has been going on for a long time, and I hope that we can finish it without any more interruption. It is getting a little late, or rather a little early, and I think the hon. gentleman himself should feel that it would be better to continue the discussion now than have it interrupted.

Mr. LAURIER. Not at all. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives), when the House is almost empty, insulted my hon. friend in a most wanton manner. It was a most cowardly act which he would not dare to do in a full House. When such things are being done, no man on the other side of the House has the courage to bring the hon. gentleman to his senses. To-morrow, when the House is full, the hon. gentleman will repeat his words if he dares.

Mr. LANGELIER. He was encouraged by the Minister of Militia.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What does the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. LANGELIER. He is encouraged by his neighbour.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I say that the hon. gentleman, as usual, is quite incorrect in the statement he is making. I say that the hon. gentleman was quite unwarranted in stating that I was encouraging the hon. gentleman from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) or any other hon. gentleman here. I was taking notes. I did not open my lips, I did not say a word, good, bad or indifferent; and I think that the hon. gentleman is quite unwarranted in making the statement which he has made. I am quite certain that when he feels that he has made a mistake, he will take back his statement. I was encouraging nobody, I did not attempt to encourage anybody.

House divided on motion of Mr. Laurier to adjourn the debate:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Landerkin,
Bain,	Langelier,
Brown (Monck),	Laurier,
Campbell,	Lavergne,
Casey,	Legris,
Choquette,	Livingston,
Dawson,	Perry,
Delisle,	Rinfret,
Featherston,	Savard,
Geoffrion,	Semple,
German,	Sutherland,
Godbout,	Tarte,
Guay,	Trow,
Hargraft,	Watson.—29.
Hyman,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bergeron,	Henderson,
Burns,	Ingram,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Ives,
Cochrane,	Kirkpatrick,
Corby,	LaRivière,
Costigan,	Lépine,
Curran,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Daly,	Mackintosh,
Davis,	McDonald (Victoria),
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	McDougald (Pictou),
Desjardins (L'Islet),	McKay,
Dugas,	Masson,
Dupont,	Miller,
Fréchette,	Ouimet,
Girouard,	Pelletier,
Gordon,	Sproule,
Grandbois,	Taylor,
Haggart,	Tyrwhitt.—36.

Motion negatived.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker——

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I beg to remind the hon. gentleman from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) that he has given up the floor, and he can no longer continue this interesting discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot resume the debate; he has given up the floor.

Mr. LAURIER. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. AMYOT. I wish to say that I do not think it would be proper to adjourn the House now, because I desire to lay before this honourable House certain facts that require the immediate attention of Parliament, facts that are important for the present and future of this country. It has been established that the Government were informed of all that took place concerning the dredging in the Quebec harbour. We know that through Mr. Perley's interference a new contract was given at 35 cents a yard. We say that two new engineers were appointed, Mr. Laforce Langevin and Mr. McGreevy. The former was never an engineer in his life, but Mr. McGreevy had some experience. When these new engineers went on we find that the inspectors were paid by the Harbour Commissioners and were also paid by the contractors, to make false reports. We see men paid by the contractors to give false certificates as to the amount of dredging, and we see any amount of work reported as done which was not done, and the contractors are paid $13,000 extra when they had only asked for $7,000. I believe I have demonstrated that in the dredging contract, the first as well as the second, and in the Esquimalt work, Sir Hector Langevin knew personally and exactly all that was going on, and was responsible for everything. Now, we have been told that the commissioners knew all about it and were responsible. I will refer to the evidence of Mr. Dobell, who was called by the Government themselves as a witness. I will read it at page 768, and I wish the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) was here so that he might hear it:

Q. And is there any special tax on the shipping at Quebec—when the ships arrive loaded with merchandise? A. They pay the equivalent of that one-tenth of one per cent. on the merchandise they bring into the country. It is both in and out a tax of one-tenth of one per cent.

Q. This tax does not exist in Montreal? A. No.

Q. So the ships that go to Quebec, either to bring in goods or to carry away goods, have got an additional tax to pay now on account of these works? A. Certainly.

Q. And those works and those improvements, since the law has been changed, I think from 1873, have been

decided by the majority of the commission appointed by the Government? A. Certainly.

Q. And the majority of either the city or the corporation have never had control as to alterations to be made or decisions about the works? A. Certainly.

Q. They have been entirely in the hands of the Government?—A. Certainly.

Q. And those very large works which have been carried out there have not, properly speaking, been yet used by the Quebec commerce or shipping? A. No; we did not expect they would be used.

Q. But, as a matter of fact, they have not been? A. Not yet. They are being used now to a small extent; they are beginning to use them.

Q. Of course, you are in a position to say that, as far as you are concerned, you never found anything incorrect in your share, or in any share of the commissioners in the decisions about contracts, and so on? A. None.

Q. They have generally decided at Ottawa and you carried out the decisions from Ottawa? A. Well, the first contract that was given out from Ottawa direct was the cross-wall. Previous to that we shared in the responsibility in the awarding of contracts.

Q. But the cross-wall, that was in 1883? A. In 1883. Then the tenders were all sent up to Ottawa and they were there dealt with, and an Order in Council passed authorizing us to accept such-and-such a contract. It was taken out of our hands.

Mr. OUIMET. I rise to a question of order. It is as to whether this motion is regularly before the Chair. The motion for the adjournment of the debate was moved by the hon. member for Quebec East, and I understand he has since moved the adjournment of the House. Having moved the adjournment of the debate, I understand the hon. gentleman has no right to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LISTER. I now move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I withdraw my motion.

Mr. GIROUARD. The leader of the Opposition should not be allowed to withdraw his motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point raised by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) is well taken. The hon. member for Quebec East, having moved the adjournment of the debate, cannot move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LISTER. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. AMYOT. With respect to the dredging at Quebec, to which I was referring when I was interrupted by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives), I believe it is fully proved that the Minister of Public Works was cognizant of all that occurred and is personally responsible. Notwithstanding any interruptions that have been made I intend to continue my remarks. I have studied this case from the beginning to the end, and I believe I know something about it. I think it my duty to express my views, and I intend to express them. It has been argued before this House that the Minister of Public Works was not personally responsible. I am endeavouring to prove that he is personally responsible. The story of this public work was well told by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). I will only add this, that the Minister, after having written to the contractors to send in their accounts to the engineer, must be presumed to know exactly the account they would send in. What is that account? These contractors asked $110,000 more. For what purpose? We have the history of the matter stated in a communication, 14th September, 1887. Here is the account:

Our claim is made up as follows:—	
To salary of Mr. N. K. Connolly, one year	$ 2,000 00
To salary of Mr. O. E. Murphy, one year	1,200 00
To salary of Mr. M. Connolly, one year	1,200 00
To salary of Mr. P. Hume, one year	1,800 00
To salary of Book-keeper, one year	800 00
To salary of Mr. J. H. Gallagher, one year	1,200 00
To salary of Time-keeper	350 00
To salary of Stable boys	600 00
To salary of Watchmen (2)	700 00
Interest on $90,000 at 7 per cent	6,300 00
Cost of maintenance of organization at Lévis and at the quarries, consisting of machinery, derricks, horses, waggons, carts, sleighs, &c., and for loss sustained in not being able to realize from the plant	11,350 00
One year	$ 27,500 00
Or four years	110,000 00

Who was asking for this amount for salaries? Michael Connolly, Murphy, Nicholas Connolly, and the rest of them. During the time they were plundering the public treasury with respect to the Quebec dredging work, which they had at 25 cents and 35 cents per cubic yard; during the time they were plundering the treasury with regard to the British Columbia dock, where they were making extraordinary profits which reached nearly to a quarter of a million—they came to the Minister and asked him to pay them salaries of $2,000, $1,800 or $1,200. They multiplied that amount by the four years, and asked for a total sum of $110,000. We are told that the Minister in granting $35,000 on that account, is justified in throwing the responsibility on Mr. Perley. The commerce at Quebec had to be taxed for that payment. The Government never, however, consulted Quebec interests. The Government imposed a Harbour Commission on Quebec. On that commission they imposed loans of over $3,000,000. They constituted a commission of their own friends, of those men who came here and swore that Sir Hector Langevin was the man most devoted to Quebec interest. They decided they would build an artificial harbour, when in Quebec we have the finest harbour in the world. They decided to tax the commerce of Quebec in order to meet the amount they would spend in paying the chairman and the members of the Board of Harbour Commissioners. And the contractors will receive large sums of money, and will buy *Le Monde* and will buy the electors, and subscribe here and there to sustain the party in power. They conspired to ruin Quebec, but to remain in power, and when all that was done they said: We will say it is Perley's fault. The country will not accept that answer. From the beginning, these works in Quebec have been absurd. Mr. Rae and other commissioners not appointed by the Government, have been protesting against them, and the citizens of Quebec have for a long time protested against them, but the Government was stronger than they were. If a member objected to the system his credit was ruined and he was slandered in the ministerial press, and every attempt was made to destroy his influence. We have been kept in Quebec for years under a reign of tyranny, but the Ministry are beginning to receive their chastisement. They have lost their hold on the district of Quebec, they drove their friends one by one from the ranks of the party, and whenever there was a member who showed any independence

he was hounded down. These men who try to ruin Quebec and its members, bought for $26,000 a paper called *La Minerve*, and through the columns of that paper they hurled accusations and slanders at some of the members of this House, which they dare not utter on the floor of Parliament. They had plenty of money from the contractors, and they thought they could rely on it to carry on their tyranny. The Quebec Harbour Commissioners were appointed by the Government and were not responsible to the people. They acted on the orders of the Government, but to-day when we ask the Government to render us an account, they say that the commissioners are responsible for that. The Government got their tools, the commissioners, to do all the harm they could to the City of Quebec, to destroy our commerce, to drive away our people, and to make of Quebec a poor city, to demoralize and to ruin her, but when we call them to account for it they say: Perley is responsible. That is not the answer of men. I hear it said in some places in Ontario: Oh, this is French boodling. Yes, I admit, but I say that the Government sitting opposite, with the money of the country, and by schemes skilfully arranged, carried out all the corruption and boodling. Let me tell the House and the country that they were not all Frenchmen engaged in this boodling. The McGreevys are not Frenchmen, Larkin is not a Frenchman, the Connollys are not Frenchmen, Murphy is not a Frenchman. It is true that there has been boodling in Quebec, but gentlemen on the other side of the House have no right to throw that in the face of our people, because it is they and the Government who have systematically tried to demoralize Quebec during the last twelve years. Who has tried to-day to bring that boodling to a stop, if it is not a Conservative member and a French Canadian, and who is helping him now if not another Conservative member who was driven from the ranks of the Conservative party, when that party was leading us to ruin and demoralization? We do not refuse an enquiry into French boodling, but the Government opposite refuse an enquiry into the English boodling. When it is a Frenchman you think you have a right to strike at him and to condemn French boodling, but you give English boodling protection. There are some Ministers, some high citizens who came into politics very poor and who are millionaires to-day, but that is English boodling, and you do not think of it. If there is French boodling, it has been due to the Government which has fostered it for years and years, and it has ruined and demoralized Quebec, but we want to stop it now and the Government want to protect it. When they bring a Bill before this House to prevent boodling and corruption they are careful to exempt members of Parliament and members of the Government from its operation. We say now on this side of the House that it is time we put a stop to this boodle. The population of Quebec is diminishing, and the population of the rest of the Dominion was at the eve of diminishing, while large sums of money were expended at Esquimalt and at Kingston, and would have been expended in Montreal and all through the Dominion, corrupting the people, had we not been able to make these revelations and to make an effort to put a stop to it. We propose to you that the Minister himself is the author of this, and we prove to you that he is the author, but yet you hold there is no connivance on his part and no responsibility. Just look at this account of Connolly & Co. for $110,000 damages, consisting of salaries and so on, whilst they were making hundreds of thousands of dollars at the same time at Quebec and Esquimalt. If in any other civilized country of the world that account had been approved of by a Minister of the Crown, that Minister would have been looked upon as unworthy of confidence and would have been driven from office. Now, Mr. Speaker, as it is a very late hour I will draw my remarks to a close shortly. I would have gone on to speak about the cross-wall and the other contracts, but I will not. In conclusion, I humbly submit that in the Esquimalt work the first tender was refused by Sir Hector Langevin at considerable loss to the country in spite of Perley's report and that the second contract was granted to Larkin, Connolly & Co., and refused to Starrs, on account of the false representations of Sir Hector and the false conditions which he wanted to impose upon the contractors, all that involving a loss to the country of a considerable amount. The tender of Starrs & O'Hanly was for $338,000; adding the cost of the change, $55,000, you obtain $392,000. If you take what Larkin, Connolly & Co. got, $581,000, and deduct their profits, $240,000, you obtain $340,000. Deduct that from $392,000, which the contract would have cost Starrs, and you find that the profits which Starrs would have obtained are $52,000. So that Starrs & O'Hanly would have got amply sufficient profits from that contract. I contend, in the third place, that the change from granite to sandstone decided by Sir Hector Langevin against Perley's report, against the wishes of the people of British Columbia, and against the reports of the two engineers of the Government there, was to the detriment of the work and at the country's expense. I submit, in the fourth place, that the re-coursing was allowed against the reports of the British Columbia officers, on condition that no extras would be allowed; but Mr. Perley was sent to British Columbia so that he might report against his previous report in favour of the payment to them; for that, too, I find Sir Hector Langevin personally responsible. In the fifth place, I say that the $19,000 were paid as promised by Robert McGreevy and as he had been led to understand by Sir Hector, and that payment indicates either connivance or gross neglect on the part of Sir Hector. In the sixth place, the attempt to extend the dock 100 feet was checked by England, and it amounted to a conspiracy by Sir Hector with the contractors to obtain the money promised by the contractors, if that lengthening could have been obtained. I say, in the seventh place, that the $6,000 per mile in connection with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, offered by Sir Hector Langevin to Mr. McGreevy, as stated by McGreevy in his letter and sworn to by him, constitutes a direct offer to bribe and boodle by the Minister of Public Works. I say, in the eighth place, that Sir Hector granting a contract to Vandry, as appears by one of the letters of Thomas McGreevy, was a gross injustice and unfairness. I say, in the ninth place, that the payment of $65,900 to the contractors on the Lévis dock as damages was a wilful plunder and conspiracy, or scandalous negligence. I say, in the tenth place, that in the cross-wall contract there was gross negligence, direct responsibility, and

great unfairness on the part of Sir Hector towards Mr. Peters, who was one of his best friends. In the eleventh place, I say that in the south-wall the wrong principle of granting contracts under false names was assented to. In the twelfth place, in the dredging, there was gross negligence all through on the part of Sir Hector. In the thirteenth place, I say that the purchase of *Le Monde*, by Sir Hector paying $39,000 and Mr. McGreevy paying $35,000, makes of this paper nothing but the product of boodle. I say, in the fourteenth place, that if Mr. Valin is the imbecile they try now to make him, his appointment by Sir Hector and his friends as chairman of the Harbour Commission was a conspiracy to defraud Quebec and the public at large. In the fifteenth place, I say that the works at Quebec were perfectly useless, imposed on the City of Quebec directly by Sir Hector, that they have brought ruin to Quebec, either financial or moral, and that the Government are responsible for the results which we see to-day. In concluding, I regret that the Government have taken the responsibility of the acts of Sir Hector. As they do not want to disavow them I presume that they believe that by admitting ministerial responsibility of Sir Hector, they will maintain the ministerial solidarity, which they are afraid to break. I cannot conclude without joining with other members of this House in congratulating the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) upon the courage he has shown in bringing this matter before the House. I know the trouble to which he has been subjected; I had as Crown attorney to protect him before the courts against powerful influences. He next came to this Parliament, and I trust that now that the public at large know something of the facts of this case, we shall receive some help and support. I apologize for having spoken so long. It is painful for me to have to condemn two citizens of Quebec, but there is something stronger than their interests, and that is the public interest. It is the duty of all citizens to promote public purity and to strive to make it possible for an honest citizen to live in this country.

Mr. OUIMET. Before the motion for the adjournment of the House is disposed of, I wish to raise a question of order. I did not interrupt my hon. friend; but now that he has finished his speech, to prevent a bad precedent being established, I raise this question of order: that under the cover of a motion of adjournment an hon. member is not allowed to speak on a question which is on the Order Paper. I admit that an hon. member may take that opportunity to give personal explanations or perhaps reply, but it would surely be extending the rule rather far to permit an hon. member, on a motion to adjourn the debate, to resume the discussion on the question before the House. I will read for your Honour from May, page 352:

"Again on the 24th of November, 1882, the Speaker explained that it was an established and fundamental rule of debate that, on a motion for adjournment, a motion standing on the Order book should not be discussed, and that this rule was in no way affected by the new standing order regulating motions for adjournment, and this rule applies even when no day has been fixed for a motion."

I read from Bourinot, page 352:

"But even this practice, which is liable to abuse, has its limitations. No member will be permitted, on such a motion, to discuss an Order of the Day, or a Notice of Motion on the paper, or a motion which was dropped owing to a count out."

I know very well that it is previously mentioned by Bourinot that:

"Motions for the adjournment of the House or the debate are generally made in the Canadian Houses in the course of a discussion, in order to give an opportunity to members who have already spoken, to speak again or to make certain explanations, which otherwise they might not be able to make,"

I can find no precedent for this doctrine, and I must say that even this will not justify a member in resuming his speech or the discussion of a question after he has lost the privilege of addressing the House on that question. I raise this point, not to be disagreeable to my hon. friend, but in order that we may arrive at a decision, so that, if the thing is irregular, it should not be made a precedent.

Mr. SPEAKER. With reference to the question raised by my hon. friend from Laval, I understand the statements both in May and Bourinot to mean that on a motion to adjourn the House, a member cannot anticipate an Order which is upon the paper, but I do not understand that a member is prevented from discussing the question which was before the House at the time the motion is made. Where there is an Order or a Notice of Motion on the paper, a member cannot, under cover of a motion to adjourn the House, anticipate discussion upon such Order or Notice of Motion, but I cannot go so far as to agree with my hon. friend that a member cannot discuss the question which was before the House when the adjournment is moved.

Motion to adjourn the House negatived.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.55 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 24th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to-morrow, to consider the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:—

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for a subsidy from a point at or near New Glasgow or St. Lin to or near to Montcalm, in the Province of Quebec, eighteen miles, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act forty-ninth Victoria, chapter ten, not exceeding in the whole $28,100.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for the railway bridge over the St. Charles River to give access to the City of Quebec, the difference between the amount already paid to the company, and the limit fixed by the

Act fifty-third Victoria, chapter two, a subsidy not exceeding $5,250.

To the Oshawa Railway and Navigation Company, for seven miles of their railway from Port Oshawa towards Raglan, in lieu of the subsidy for a like amount granted by the Act passed in the session held in the fiftieth and fifty-first years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter twenty-four, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $22,400.

To the St. Lawrence, Lower Laurentian and Saguenay Railway Company, for the section of their railway from Grand Piles, on the St. Maurice River, to its junction with the Quebec and Laks St. John Railway, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act passed in the session held in the fiftieth and fifty-first years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter twenty-four, not exceeding in the whole $92,784.

To the Great Eastern Railway Company, for thirty miles of their railway from the River St. Francis to the Arthabaska Railway, at St. Grégoire station, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act passed in the session held in the fiftieth and fifty-first years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter twenty-four, not exceeding in the whole $79,700.

To the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company, for forty-nine and one-half miles of their railway from Woodstock to Hamilton, in the Province of Ontario, in lieu of the subsidy for a like amount granted by the Act fifty-second Victoria, chapter three, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $158,400.

To the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company (formerly the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Company), for thirty miles of their railway from Vaudreuil towards Hawkesbury, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act passed in the session held in the fiftieth and fifty-first years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter twenty-four, not exceeding in the whole $46,040.

To the Tobique Valley Railway Company, for fourteen miles of their railway from Perth Centre station towards Plaister Rock Island, in lieu of the subsidy for a like amount granted by the Act passed in the session held in the fiftieth and fifty-first years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter twenty-four, a subsidy not exceeding $6,400 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $89,600.

To the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company, for fifty-six miles of their railway from the city of Kingston to Smith's Falls, in lieu of the subsidies, not to exceed $179,200, granted by the Acts fifty-second Victoria, chapter three, and fifty-third Victoria, chapter two, a subsidy not exceeding $12,534 per annum, to be paid in semi-annual instalments of $6,267 each, for twenty years, which represents a grant in cash of $179,200.

Provided, that upon the completion of twenty-eight miles of the said railway a semi-annual subsidy may be paid proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole fifty-six miles: Provided also, that the company shall deposit with the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, a sum not exceeding $1,170,000, in consideration whereof there shall be paid to the company, for twenty years, a semi-annual annuity, calculated on a basis of three and one-half per cent, on the amount so deposited: Provided further, that the Governor General in Council may permit the company to assign the said subsidy and annuity to trustees by way of security for any bonds or securities which may be issued by the company in respect of their undertaking.

To the Quebec Central Railway Company, for ninety miles of their railway from St. Francis station, on the Quebec Central Railway, to a point on the Atlantic and North-Western Railway, near Moose River, or from a point on the Quebec Central Railway between the Chaudière River and Tring station, to a point on the International Railway at or near Megantic, in lieu of the subsidy for a like amount granted by the Act fifty-third Victoria, chapter two, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $288,000.

2. *Resolved*, That the subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose shall be granted to such companies respectively; all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the 1st day of August next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council; and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, and which the Government is hereby empowered to make; the location, also, of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; and all the said subsidies respectively shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister, or upon completion of the work subsidized,—except as to the subsidy granted to the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company, the first semi-annual payment upon which shall be made at the end of six months from the date of the chief engineer's certificate of the completion of twenty-eight miles of the railway, and each subsequent payment at the end of each six months thereafter, for the term of twenty years.

3. *Resolved*, That the granting of such subsidies respectively shall be subject to such conditions for securing such running powers or traffic arrangements and other rights as will afford all reasonable facilities and equal mileage rates to all railways connecting with those so subsidized, as the Governor in Council determines.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Girouard: "That the Seventh Report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections be adopted;" and the motion of Mr. Davies in amendment thereto.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, almost ever since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, it has been my privilege to be a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. This year, however, I do not belong to that Committee, and not being in attendance at the very important investigation which has been going on there, and which is now the subject-matter of the protracted debate which has been occupying the attention of Parliament during so many days, I have not had the advantage of following, day by day, the various phases of the case as presented to the Committee and the evidence as given before its members. Owing to other duties, I have not had the time to take up critically every incident of that very important case and to examine fully into the evidence, which would require many days to comprehend as it should be comprehended; I have not looked into the testimony adduced sufficiently closely to be able to discuss it in the few remarks which I consider it my duty to address the House, but I will address myself more particularly to certain remarks and attacks made by hon. gentlemen opposite who have taken part in this discussion. I may say at the outset that ever since I have occupied a seat in this Parliament no investigation or enquiry has been more important or more painful than the investigation now occupying our attention. I look upon it as important from the far-reaching consequences that acts such as the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) has brought before the attention of Parliament can exercise on the political life of a people like the Canadian people. I look upon it as painful because the first result of such an investigation is, to a certain extent, to tarnish the reputation of one of Canada's most prominent public men. From the importance of the far-reaching consequences of such an investigation I consider it is the duty of every member of Parliament, whether he considers politics from one side or the other, to bring to the consideration of a matter like the present one a judicial and not a party spirit. I hope the discussion that has taken place has displayed as little party spirit as possible, and I will endeavour during my remarks to avoid anything that may be looked upon as party spirit. The reputa-

tion of public men is national property. The reputation of public men forms one of the most important pages that can be written in the history of a people. They are the men who control the destiny of a country, and their names, handed down to posterity, will be names which will be used as examples to those who may follow to guide and govern the people in the right or in the evil direction. It is because of that that it is the sacred duty of every man to protect the reputation of our public men to the fullest possible extent, and whether they be attacked on one side or whether they be attacked on the other, it is the duty of every patriotic heart to protect them to the fullest extent. If it is a duty to give them that protection, it is a greater duty still, when they are being tried before the highest tribunal of the country, to give to the consideration of their case that judicial mind without which it is impossible to treat questions of such importance. Sir, it is for that, that with the knowledge which I have acquired of the evidence, imperfect as I admit it is, it seems to me that I should require much stronger proof than the evidence produced and contained in the voluminous report now before us: I would require stronger evidence by a great deal than that which I have been able to find, to arrive at a conclusion different from that which the majority of the Committee have arrived, and to declare that Sir Hector Langevin personally has been guilty of conduct which would necessitate the censure and condemnation of the House. Mr. Speaker, in dealing with a matter of this kind it is of importance to look back into the antecedents of the man who comes before us for judgment. For upwards of thirty years previous to Confederation and since Confederation, Sir Hector Langevin has been one of the most prominent figures in the political history of Canada. Before Confederation, almost the moment which saw him enter public life saw him also taking a prominent position in the official life of his country. Almost from the moment that he became a member of Parliament the confidence of the people of his native province indicated him, without any hesitation, as one of the leaders of public opinion and entrusted to him the most important positions that can be entrusted to a public man. Before Confederation he had been Solicitor General, and subsequently Secretary of State. He became Postmaster General, Minister of Railways and Canals, and Minister of Public Works, subsequent to Confederation. Any of us who have read our political history know well that he was one of the most trusted colleagues of the late Sir John A. Macdonald, and that he was the right-hand man and trusted lieutenant of that great patriot Sir George Etienne Cartier, who governed, and governed so well during so many years, the destinies of the race to which I belong in the old Province of Quebec. Under Sir Hector Langevin, when he was occupying a prominent position in the counsels of his country, Canada from disjointed provinces became the great Confederation which we are so proud of to-day. He was one of those who, consulting with men who up to that time had not viewed politics from the same standpoint, put aside their differences for the patriotic object of saving the country from the dissensions of the past; and looking to the brilliancy of the future they united their efforts to make Canada what Canada subsequently became; a Con-

federation which I am proud to say has made the name of Canadians abroad more respected than ever before among the old nations of Europe, and Sir, it has opened up to us Canadians who have benefited by the energy of these patriotic men, new destinies which, from the standpoint of the development of our country, must make us more eager and more determined to work to the utmost of our ability to secure for Canada the advantages of that destiny which Providence seems to have carved out for her. Under him as one of the public men of Canada, not only Confederation became an accomplished fact, but the North-West, Manitoba and British Columbia, following in the wake of the older provinces, came across the continent to shake hands with old Canada and to make of Canada one united nation under the one flag which we are all proud of. Not only that, Sir, but after achieving these peaceful revolutions—because they are nothing else but revolutions which in other countries have cost blood and treasure—he went to work in earnest, and he contributed his great influence towards building up the Canadian Pacific Railway which to-day is the great military and commercial highway of the Empire through Canadian territory, and which has extended Canadian trade and the Canadian flag across the Pacific Ocean to Japan and to China. Now, Sir, we know Sir Hector Langevin's loyalty to his country, his loyalty to the Empire, and his loyalty to the nationality to which he belongs. When it was my privilege and my pleasure to have accompanied him during political meetings in the different sections of the country, on every occasion he laid aside the question of sectionalism, whether he was speaking in the fair Province of Ontario or whether he was addressing in a tongue different from that which is spoken in Ontario the people of his own race in the Province of Quebec. The same expressions of loyalty to the Empire, and the same expressions of loyalty to Canada, was always heard to be echoed by the man who to-day is no longer occupying the high position which he once occupied on the Treasury benches. He was over and above everything—and that is a point which I consider important in the present discussion, although possibly he made a mistake in carrying it to the extent which he did—over and above everything he was devoted to his department. He was devoted to his department to the extent that every moment of his time was given up to work, and to hard work indeed, to administer this great department and in trying to deal with details in every portion of the Dominion of Canada, and to control numberless employés, some in technical branches of the department, but still requiring the supervision of the Minister. Let me ask even his most bitter enemies—if he has bitter enemies—if it is not the fact that, unselfishly, he gave every moment of his time to the administration of his department? Sir, if to-day he retires from public life and from official life, shattered in health, almost broken down, I attribute it altogether to the energy which he has displayed in fulfilling, according to his lights and his best abilities, the duties which he considered to be in the interest of the department over which he presided. I know very well that in the matter which is now the subject of discussion he may have attempted to grasp more than he could possibly control. But be that as it may, he comes before us

as one of our colleagues, who has been subjected during three months to one of the most searching investigations—not upon positive charges, but in an attempt to connect him with charges which were preferred against other individuals. Therefore it is important for us to consider the intention which controlled him in the discharge of his duties. He may have attempted to grasp more than he could control. That was his mistake, which may have been due to his belief in his ability to control a large amount of work ; but it was no mistake so far as his intention to patriotically do his duty towards his department was concerned. Now, Sir, in speaking of his responsibility, I claim, from what I have been able to ascertain, after looking into the evidence which has been adduced, that no direct charges were made against Sir Hector Langevin by the hon. member for Montmorency ; but the attempt has been made during the investigation to connect him with the different charges upon which the conspirators, as they are called to-day, were being tried. I claim, as I have stated, that it is impossible for any Minister to control in all its details a department as extensive as the Department of Public Works. In that department, or in any other equally technical in its nature, it is the bounden duty of the Minister, it is a necessity for him to rely almost implicitly upon the technical officers who are there to advise him, and upon the other officials who happen to be in his department. Not only Sir Hector Langevin, but his predecessors have been obliged to do this, and his successors will have to adopt exactly the same system. It will be their duty in every matter affecting public works of a technical nature, to consult the engineers. Those officers are given prominent positions in the large departments of the Government, and they are paid large salaries, for the reason that they are looked upon as reliable men, as men who from their scientific training are able to give to the man who presides over the department that advice necessary to enable him to carry on the public works of the country. I remember during the time that the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie led the Government, when it was my privilege to sit in the House with him, when he was questioned on the floor of Parliament as to a certain policy adopted in regard to public works, that hon. gentleman, like Sir Hector, said on many occasions that he had consulted his engineers, and that the policy which he was carrying out was a policy which had been advocated by his officers ; and I think it would be wrong, for one who does not possess any technical qualifications, to set up his judgment in opposition to the judgment of a trained engineer, a scientific man, and say : I will conduct this great public work, involving hundreds of thousands and sometimes millions of dollars of expenditure, according to my own judgment, and I will overrule the judgment and recommendation of the technical adviser who is in the department. Now, Sir, as I understand the case, an attempt has been made to connect Sir Hector Langevin with charges in connection with the following contracts, though no positive charge is brought against him by the hon. member for Montmorency : with the contract of 1882 for dredging in the harbour of Quebec ; with the contract of 1883 for building the cross-wall and locks or gates in the said harbour ; with the contract of 1884 in connection with the Lévis graving dock ; with the contract of 1887 for the dredging of the wet basin ; and with the contract of 1886 for the building of the south wall in the same harbour. I take it that, according to the sworn evidence of Sir Hector Langevin—evidence which has remained unchallenged, and the credibility of which has not been attacked in any way —these works were carried out by the Quebec Harbour Commission, a body incorporated by a statute of Canada, having its rights and its franchises, and that if any mistake has taken place in connection with these works, it must be laid at the door of the harbour commission and the technical officers of that commission, and not at the door of the ex-Minister of Public Works. I claim that the evidence of the ex-Minister of Public Works has proved clearly and conclusively that these contracts were carried out by the Quebec Harbour Commission, and that is the view which was taken when the votes for these different works were passed in this House. Now comes another charge, that concerning the Esquimalt graving dock. I admit, and nobody can deny it, that this charge must be viewed from a standpoint quite different from the five other charges I have referred to, and the reason of the difference is simply this. The harbour works were conducted by the commissioners, and I hold them responsible for their mistakes ; but the Esquimalt graving dock was carried on by the Department of Public Works under the immediate control of the Minister of Public Works, and as such I consider he would be responsible, if anything could be established against him personally. I would consider that this charge should be treated in a different manner from that made in the case of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners. Let us see how this work was carried on. The charge is made that certain changes were operated in the construction of that work, and without going critically into the nature of the changes, it is an important factor in the charge made by those who contend that the responsibility of the Minister is paramount in those works whether they were made in the public interest. As I view it, every change which was made, was made in the interest of the public, and for the money which has been expended the public has received full value. But admitting, for the sake of argument, that these changes were wrong, I fall back upon the rule I have already stated, as being that which, in my honest belief, should prevail in every department of that kind and govern the conduct of the advisers of the Ministry. No change of any importance, not the slightest possible change, can have been made, and I find no evidence whatever in the record to show that it is intimated even, that any change has been operated, except on the advice of the engineer. If that be so, whether each change was in the interest of the public, as I claim it was, or not, it was made on the advice of the engineer ; the Minister was powerless in the hands of his adviser, and, consequently, if anybody is to be blamed, it is not the Minister. I know the official responsibility which attaches to a Minister, but we are not discussing that point, it is not for that official responsibility he is being tried, but it is for having done things which should have been left undone in the interest of the public. In every change he consulted his advisers and could not possibly be held responsible unless he had gone in direct opposition to the advice he received. The

most serious portion of the charge is that concerning the payment of extras, which, it is supposed, the contractors had abandoned. Well, there is one thing to be said on that subject, and that is that no extras were paid by the Minister of Public Works, except upon the twice repeated report of Mr. Perley who had gone out for the purpose of inspecting the works, who came back, after personal inspection, and recommended these amounts to be paid. There is another accusation, leaving those which I have referred to, which was more painful to me still than any other which has been brought forward, and, if it had been established, I admit that that alone would have been sufficient to have placed Sir Hector in the position described by the hon. member for Queen's the other night, of going back to private life a dishonoured man, and not carrying away that respect which a man, ending his political career, hopes to retain when he gives up his arduous labours. That is, the charge made against the Minister of personal corruption. It was attempted to be shown that Sir Hector Langevin had received large amounts of money from Larkin, Connolly & Co. Now, we have to follow, in the present instance, as in any other case submitted to any tribunal, the ordinary laws of evidence. That charge is based upon the testimony of Mr. Murphy. I do not want to go into the details which have come out during the investigation; but I say we have Sir Hector Langevin, upon his oath, stating positively that he never received, directly or indirectly, from Mr Murphy, or the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., or anybody else belonging to that firm, any sum of money. We must accaccept his evidence, which has not been attacked as to credibility; and I believe it was the opinion of the Committee that, as between the two witnesses, the positive evidence of Sir Hector Langevin had to be taken and that of Mr. Murphy had to be rejected. Another attempt made, and it was made during the investigation, was the attempt to establish that Sir Hector Langevin had an interest in the Baie des Chaleurs subsidy. There, again, I state, in so far as Sir Hector's explanation is concerned, and from my own personal knowledge of the locality and the people connected with the enterprise, I am perfectly willing to accept his explanation of the matter. He says that two old friends, men who during years had been intimate, had fallen out, and he used his best efforts to reconcile them, to get them to shake hands over their difficulties, and renew their old friendly ties. In a portion of the evidence, it is stated that he used Mr. McGreevy to effect this reconciliation, but still he said positively and absolutely that he had at no time any interest, direct or indirect, in the Baie des Chaleurs contract, and I am bound to believe his testimony. His credibility is not attacked, and I am bound to take that evidence as being what it pretends to be, the explanation of the relations which existed between him and those parties connected with the railway. Now, we had last night the advantage of listening to a very long speech from the hon. gentleman from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). The hon. gentleman from Bellechasse seemed to view the matter in quite a new light, a light that I had no possible idea could be the light according to which the different phases of that important state trial could be considered. The hon. gentleman seems to lay all the blame on Sir Hector Langevin.

I am not going to follow the hon. gentleman in examining *seriatim* the different charges and the different portions of the evidence which he submitted to the House last night, but after submitting each portion of evidence he invariably said that the responsibility was on the Minister and that it could be seen he was guilty and responsible. He invariably defends Mr. Perley and condemns the Minister. As I read the evidence, I think the view of the Committee was that Mr. Perley was guilty and that no guilt attached to Sir Hector Langevin. The hon. gentleman spoke of the different changes which took place at Esquimalt and all that, but the matter has been discussed in every detail and every point of that evidence has been handled by members of the Committee who have been sitting day after day and have heard the witnesses giving their evidence, and it is an important feature in appreciating evidence to have the opportunity of judging of the manner in which every witness gives his testimony. I will, therefore, not go into that question, but I was rather surprised to hear the hon. gentleman, in a burst of eloquence, state that fourteen men under oath as members of the Privy Council had permitted contractors to surreptitiously put their hands into the public chest and get papers which they altered in the interest of the contractors. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, because it is impossible to find anything in the whole of the evidence to justify his statement. The hon. gentleman should be careful in dealing with men under oath. It has happened before that men may stretch their conscience to a great extent when money is at stake, but I cannot see that anything which has been established can possibly warrant the hon. gentleman in making the statement he has made.

Mr. AMYOT. I did not mean that the hand of the contractors was physically there. It was invisibly there. The effect was the same as if the hand was there. I never contended that the hand of any of the Connollys would be as strong as the hand of the fourteen Ministers.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I never supposed that the hon. gentleman meant that burglary had been committed, but last night the hon. gentleman laid the responsibility almost entirely upon Sir Hector Langevin. Of course, he spoke of the conspirators, of McGreevy and all that, but, as far as the Public Works Department was concerned, he put the whole responsibility upon the Minister and defended the engineer. I think that is wrong, and, knowing as I do, that for years and years the hon. gentleman has been kindly treated by Sir Hector Langevin and has been very friendly with him and kindly treated by him, although he is of course bound to fulfil the duty he is called upon to fulfil as a member of Parliament in this disagreeable matter, he should avoid anything which would lead anyone to suppose that there is any feeling of hostility between him and the Minister he is now accusing. Yesterday, in scanning the *Hansard* of 1883, I stumbled over what seemed to me to be the expression of opinion of a man who knew well the situation and who knew well the merits of the contending parties at that period of time. I found these remarks:

"Well, I say to the recognized leader of the Conservative party in the Province of Quebec (that is Sir Hector) that he can continue without apprehension to discharge the duties of his department with the same success which he has achieved in the past, without bothering himself with the nonsense and reproaches of the Opposition; let

him continue as in the past, and all parts of the Dominion will be willing to recognize him as a useful man who consecrates every moment of his life to the service of his country, who pushes rapidly to completion the great undertakings of Canada, and who is always found at his post in the House ever ready to meet any accusation of his adversaries. General accusations are indulged in without giving any details. Why? Because they know that there is not one of the works now commenced or under construction by the present hon. Minister which is not for the well-being of the country where it has been undertaken. They know very well that, if any particular work was attacked, there would be immediately a complete refutation of the charge."

Mr. AMYOT. What year is that?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1883. Again, speaking of Sir Hugh Allan, he says:

"There are in countries enjoying the blessing of that system of government of the people, by the people, moments when the people become tired of those who govern them. The reason is that for a long time they have lent an ear to the incessant, excited and disloyal accusations of a political party whose sole programme is accusation, and during the fifteen, twenty or twenty-five years that the same party is in power the same accusations are repeated. The people, alarmed at the numerous accusations, each succeeding one more vile than the other, says to itself: Perhaps there is some truth in these accusations on the part of the Opposition. Let us try them. And that is what occurred, when what is called the Pacific scandal happened."

He goes on, and referring to Sir Hugh, he says:

"He made a mistake—a mistake which many people often make; he thought that with lots of money he could succeed. This was a mistake. But let those who never said 'come down handsomely,' the disciples of the 'big push,' and of certain other maxims which have now become historic, come forward and cast the stone at him."

Now, I have known of instances where doctors differed among themselves, but I never knew of an instance where a doctor differed with himself. The expression of opinion of last year, and the extracts I have read from the *Hansard* of 1883, are the expressions of opinion of the hon. gentleman who represents in this Parliament the County of Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). Now, Sir, it is not my intention, as I stated before, to address the House at any great length, and I think that in being brief I shall show a determination to please my colleagues to the fullest extent in my power. We have had such long speeches upon this important question that I believe I shall deserve the gratitude of the House if I cut my remarks very short. I desire simply to express this opinion, that from the evidence I have read it is extremely difficult, I look upon it, indeed, as impossible, for any hon. gentleman on either side of the Speaker to stand up here and declare Sir Hector Langevin guilty of any personal malfeasance. I think it would be assuming a very grave responsibility indeed, if, considering his past services and considering the evidence which has been adduced, any hon. gentleman should allow himself to be carried away so far as to condemn Sir Hector Langevin unjustly; I will not say carried away by prejudice, because I give credit to every hon. gentleman, whether sitting on our side or on the other side, for that impartiality and spirit of fair-play which, in a matter of this importance, would hesitate before blasting a long and useful career; I say I give to every hon. gentleman on the floor of Parliament credit for that spirit of fair-play which would prevent me from imagining for a moment that any hon. gentleman will be influenced in his decision by anything else than his honest and conscientious opinion. When the excitement is over, when, calmly and dispassionately, that report of the evidence will be considered, I hope that inside and outside the House, and throughout the extent of this vast Dominion, wherever the name of Sir Hector Langevin is known, his reputation will be as clear from taint as it is to-day, and as it was before this investigation was commenced. Sir, I think I have shown on more than one occasion that I am not in favour of sectionalism, I am not in favour of parish politics; but I cannot forget that Sir Hector Langevin and myself belong to a race who are a minority in this Dominion, we belong to a race whose history is glorious, and I am proud to say it; a race that has given to the political records of Canada names as eminent and reputations as stainless as any other nationality of which the people of Canada are composed; a nation that can find upon its records the names of a Lafontaine, a Papineau, a Taché, a Morin, a Dorion, a Cartier, a Langevin, and others; that nation need not be ashamed of walking side by side with the other races, proud as those races may be, who compose the people of Canada. Sir, I would ask, and, as I say, without a particle of sectionalism, without any idea of appealing to prejudice—I would ask this House, in dealing with this case, to hesitate before casting a shadow on the pages of that history which we all love. I say that if the evidence is convincing we have a duty to perform, and we must perform it like men. But unless that evidence be convincing, let us pause, let us hesitate, before we brand the reputation of a man who has been useful to his country, who has exercised a beneficial influence in uniting the various nationalities which make up the people of Canada, and which may have been, at times, antagonistic. The names of the leading statesmen of to-day are just as dear to us as those whom I have named were dear to their admirers of a past generation. Sir, let me here also say, for I consider it my duty as a public man to say so, that we are at this time traversing a crisis in our history. We have had for the last few years, several so-called scandals in a province dear to us all. We have had investigations going on in the Parliament of United Canada; we have had investigations going on in other provinces. Well, Sir, abroad, where the public ignore the bitterness of our political contests, and the manner in which these attacks may be organized and led for political purposes more than for any other reason—I say that abroad, the notoriety and the history of these scandals, magnified, as they are, ten-fold, injure our credit and injure our reputation. I was very sorry to hear the other day an hon. member of this House compare Canada to the South American Republics. Well, Sir, so far as my weak efforts can avail, I want to keep Canada above the level of the South American Republics; and it is the bounden duty of every Canadian who is proud of the land, and proud of the flag, to avoid, as much as possible, anything that may, at the very beginning of our existence as a people, prevent our growth, prevent us from extending our influence, that may injure our credit where our influence and our credit ought to be extended and strengthened. Sir, there is only one word more which I desire to address to the House before I take my seat. It is said that Sir Hector Langevin was influenced, to a great extent, by Mr. McGreevy, that Mr. McGreevy exercised an extraordinary influence over Sir Hector Langevin. Now, I do not know to what extent that influence went,

but I am quite free to admit that the influence did exist, and the reverse would surprise me. In the dark days of Opposition, when Sir Hector Langevin was hounded down by charges that for a time drove him out of public life, Mr. McGreevy stood by him, and stood by him right loyally. When the bright days came back and Sir Hector Langevin returned to power, the friendship which had taken root in adversity was strengthened and developed in prosperity. I would be ashamed of the man who in the days of his prosperity would forget the friends he possessed in the dark days of adversity, and I admire him for having done so. Whether this is the fact or not, we have to decide this, not upon supposition, not upon the theory as to whether the influence of Mr. McGreevy was great or small, but upon the sworn evidence of the witnesses, and the unchallenged testimony of Sir Hector Langevin. In dealing with the question the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron), I thought, was rather severe in the terms he used in regard to Sir Hector. It struck me more forcibly from the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite, when Sir Hector Langevin was administrating his department, considered he acted invariably in the most courteous manner to them, and was frequently the subject of congratulations at their hands. In this respect I think he established for himself a position in which he placed his colleagues at a disadvantage so far as courtesy was concerned. I mention this because Sir Hector is most painstaking, and is a man ready, even at his own inconvenience, to answer any questions put to him and do everything to officially fulfil the arduous duties of his position. I am not ashamed to say that I differed with Sir Hector, as the hon. member for Montmorency knows, and he referred to the fact the other day, on very important questions. I differed from him in matters not affecting the responsibility which Ministers assume together, because, if we differed on important matters so far as that is concerned one Minister would have to give way, but I differed with him on important subjects, and the opinions I held on those several questions I hold to-day. Nevertheless I am bound to say that during the ten years I sat side by side with him in Council, I never met a man who was more industrious, hardworking and really devoted to his department and to his work. I must apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, and more particularly to my colleagues, for having spoken longer than I intended to speak. I have only one excuse, and it is that I do not trouble the House very frequently. I am always so much interested in listening to other hon. gentlemen who address us occasionally that I am satisfied with that role without intruding myself on the House. I regret the fact that I have not had time to go into every portion of the evidence which forms the small library, which will considerably increase our collection of books, and have been unable to treat, as well as I would have wished, a matter which I consider one of the greatest possible importance to Canada from every standpoint. However, I have touched merely certain points, and I have done it imperfectly; but I have addressed myself to those points which struck me as being more important than others and more prominent as factors in the discussion that has taken place.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, after the feeling remarks with which the hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat, opened his address to the House, upon the painful character of the debate in which we are now engaged, it may not be out of place that I should refer, for a few moments, to the motives which have guided and inspired the Liberal party, from the time the charges were first brought to the House, down to the time now reached when we have come to the critical period when a verdict is to be pronounced, a verdict warranted upon the facts disclosed before the Committee. The assertion has been made, on more than one occasion since the debate commenced, by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, that the hon. members who drew the report now before you, Mr. Speaker, in the form of an amendment, could not have done it in good faith. The insinuation has been made persistently in the press, and sometimes also the assertion that the Liberal party, in insisting that all the charges, formulated by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte), are proved against all the parties implicated, are simply trying to throw dust in the eyes of the people, to the detriment of the Conservative party, by ruining the reputation of one of its leaders, with the hope thereby of enhancing their own chances of obtaining power. As to the first part of this charge, I have nothing to say. I do not impugn any man's motives and I will not defend my own. As to the latter part of the charge, it is, to say the least, a very singular one. To charge against a party that it is striving to obtain power, is to reproach that party with its very existence. Under our system of Government all parties are striving to obtain power. That aim in its higher form, is the advancement, the promotion, of those political principles which the members of a party hold together; that aim in its lower form, yet a form implying nothing ignoble, if kept subordinate to the first, is to enjoy the legitimate advantages which power gives. But speaking here in behalf of the Liberal party, neither from one consideration nor the other consideration, I have this to say, that I would prefer a thousand times to fight the battle with hon. gentlemen opposite solely on the ground of political questions, solely upon the merits of their policy and our policy, solely upon the merits of unrestricted trade and of restricted trade, solely upon the merits of unrestricted reciprocity on the one side and the National Policy on the other side, rather than to have to accuse them either collectively or individually of malfeasance in office. Let me tell this to hon. gentlemen: The Opposition during the session has been engaged in a kind of work, which, whatever may be insinuated to the contrary, was not a labour of love but a labour of necessity, which had to be followed to the fullest consequences however painful they might be. At the opening of the session the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) brought accusations of the gravest character against the administration of the Public Works Department, implicating personally the Minister of Public Works, and implicating as well another member of this House. As to the latter member, the member for Quebec West, all the charges brought against him have been proved as fully as they were charged. He has confessed his guilt by his own act, and he is practically expelled from this House. And now that the scapegoat has been sent into the desert burthened with the sins of Israel, it is suggested that justice ought to be satisfied, that we should rest there and that we should go no further. But I shall be sorry

to hear any such language here. It cannot be a question here of revenge or of mercy. This is a question on which justice has to pronounce. justice alone, as the ancients represented her, with bandage on her eyes, blind to the rank or condition of those whom she is called on to absolve or condemn. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has brought in a report which asserts that the Minister of Public Works is guilty of the charges brought against him. Now, let me say this at once, Mr. Speaker. I assert that on this side of the House there is not the slightest animosity against the late Minister of Public Works. There is no one on this side of the House who would do him the smallest wrong. But is this the first time in a British Parliament that it has been found to be the duty of men to accuse their fellow men? Is this the first time in a British Parliament that fellow members have been constrained by the facts to bring charges against a member, and to follow them to the bitter end? When Edmund Burke, a man distinguished by the noblest attributes of mind and heart, distinguished perhaps beyond anything else by his high sense of justice, by his unswerving notion of right, stood at the bar of the House of Lords to impeach Warren Hastings of high crimes and misdemeanours committed, or alleged to have been committed by him in the discharge of official duties, history attests, Sir, that the motive which impelled him was not an ignoble one; history attests that the motive which impelled him was the highest sentiment of patriotism and humanity; history attests, Sir, that his object was not to ruin, or to degrade, or to humiliate a man who had done important services for his country, but that his motive was to destroy the system of corruption and evil which had marred the course and impaired the value of these services. And when, Sir, we likewise here accuse the late Minister of Public Works, I protest that our aim is not to degrade a reputation hitherto honourable, but our aim is, if possible, to destroy that system of corruption and evil which has too long prevailed in this country. And if, in order to reach that object, a reputation hitherto honourable is shattered to the winds, the blame does not lie with those who make the exposure, but the blame rests with him who committed the faults which have to be exposed. I repeat again, Sir, we would much prefer to fight the battle with our opponents solely upon political ground, but if we on this occasion depart from that ground, it is because on no occasion yet would the Government of this country meet us upon the ground of purely political questions. It is because up to this day they never would meet the people face to face on political questions, but they relied in every instance upon that system of corruption which we want to destroy now if possible. I see signs of dissent upon some faces on the other side of the House. Do I understand that the statement which I now make is denied? Then, Sir, what is the meaning, I want to know, of these scandals which day after day and week after week for the last three months have been exploding like craters bursting out in a volcanic region? What is the meaning but that there is underneath a mass of corruption, seething and fermenting, and which can no longer be repressed by the crust of deceit which has too long concealed it from view? Is my statement denied? If so, it is easy of proof. There is one thing which gentlemen on the other side will not deny. They will not deny that year after year, we on this side of the House have charged them with governing by corruption and bribery. The charges were indeed so persistent that their late leader, Sir John Macdonald, one day thought it his duty to refer to them. The occasion was one which the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House remembers very well. It was on the occasion of a banquet in the City of Quebec tendered to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia. Sir John Macdonald upon that occasion referred to the charges made against his Administration, and now, Sir, listen to his language:

"Our opponents say that we bribed the constituencies."

There is the charge; did he deny it? Did he attempt to explain it, did he extenuate it? Nothing of the kind; he rather gloried in it, and what was his answer?

"Our opponents say that we bribed the constituencies, but we bribed them with their own money."

This is the painful truth. Such were the ethics which were taught to his party by the late leader of the Conservatives. I have always said that I am an admirer of Sir John Macdonald. I will not deny the great services which he rendered to the country, but nevertheless history records that his fondness for power led him to speak such language as he spoke on that occasion. If his party was to be kept in power, and if to attain that end the constituencies had to be bribed, bribed they would be. I say, Sir, before history he stands answerable, not only for the fact, but for all the consequences which have to follow, and have followed, and of which we are to-day the humiliated witnesses. That was his doctrine, and what was the practice? We remember on the eve of a general election that Sir John called together the manufacturers of the City of Toronto; the invitation had been public but the meeting was secret. What was discussed there? Affairs of state? No. If affairs of state had to be discussed Parliament was the place to discuss them; and why of all men should he call the manufacturers together, but in order to have the funds necessary to bribe the constituencies with their own money.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. LAURIER. Order! is this not history?

Mr. FOSTER. It may be history, but it is not the question.

Mr. LAURIER. The language which I use, Sir, is history, and it is within the question, and if to-day we charge the Minister of Public Works as we do, it is because the system proclaimed upon that occasion has been followed too long. Is it anything extraordinary, Sir, that when such were the ethics and practice of the leader, the man who held the second rank in command should have also done his best, in his own way, to provide for the raising of a fund in order to bribe constituencies with their own money? Is it not to be expected that since that was the example in upper quarters, the practice had to be followed, and that it continued radiating all around, until it has reached the point we have now seen. I repeat, Sir, that it is a painful duty for me to speak as I now do upon this occasion; but, Sir, the duty is one which not only concerns the late Minister now accused before us, but it is one which concerns every man in Canada; because, I submit, that no nation can live in which such a system has been tolerated as

has been tolerated in this country. I see men on the other side of the House to-day, who when these words of Sir John Macdonald were uttered, protested in their hearts that such a policy as this could not be tolerated in any country; but such was the prestige of the man, such was the great authority which he exercised, that the protest remained unuttered. But at last the system had to be investigated publicly before this House, and it is the duty of everyone now to deal with the facts, and to deal with them, as has been stated by the hon. gentleman who spoke last, according to his conscience and in the light which his conscience gives him. The hon. gentleman stated a moment ago, and the remark was made by an hon. gentleman before him also, that it was not fair for my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) or my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) to have put his name to such a report as this, because Sir Hector Langevin, the late Minister of Public Works, had denied under oath the charges brought against him. Sir, I have no desire to be offensive, but this is a painful subject, and if it is to be treated as it ought to be treated, it is not possible to treat it without giving pain. I would not give pain, if it were possible for me to avoid it. I do not want to make any reproach against Sir Hector Langevin, but I simply say this: that the testimony which he gave, in my humble judgment, cannot form the basis of an opinion to be rendered upon this charge, because, in my judgment, in the testimony which he gave, he laid himself open to the charge that, after all, his memory is a very confused one. I take the very opening sentence of his testimony and this is what I read in it:

"I regret that in consequence of the manner in which, as respects myself, this enquiry originated, I have been obliged to appear to be passive, while charges of the gravest character have been gradually accumulated against me by the slow and unusual process of adducing evidence upon them, before they had been formulated or communicated to me.

"If Mr. Tarte, when he brought his accusations in the House of Commons on the 11th of May, 1891, had made his charges directly against me, I would have at once, pending the enquiry, put my resignation as Minister of Public Works in the hands of the Prime Minister, in accordance with the custom followed in such cases in England."

We are to understand, Sir, from the words of the late Minister of Public Works, that when the hon. member for Montmorency brought his charges against him in the House, he, the Minister of Public Works, did not understand that he was accused, and that if he had so understood, he would have at once placed his resignation in the hands of the Prime Minister. Well, everyone will agree with me that if the hon. Minister of Public Works did not on that occasion understand that he was accused, he was the only man in this House on either side who did not so understand. Everyone understood that he was accused; and more, Sir, if there could be any doubt in his own mind as to that, not a week elapsed before he was called upon from this side of the House to resign because he was accused. On the 19th May, when the House was in Committee of Supply, and when the estimates for the Department of Public Works came up for discussion, my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar) suggested that the Minister ought to resign because he was charged. He said:

"If the Minister of Public Works had looked a little further into British precedents he would have found out that whenever a Minister of the Crown is charged as he is charged to-day, with a gross offence, which if it is proved would have the most serious consequences to himself and his colleagues, I say that if he looks at British precedents he will find that in no case has a Minister who has charges like that hanging over his head continue in office until a decision on the accusations was arrived at."

So also spoke my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies); so spoke my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). An hon. member on the other side of the House, the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives), also took part in the debate, and this is what he said:

"I do not think that the course proposed by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) or the hon. member who has just addressed the House, would be practicable. I do not think it would be practicable to carry on the business of Government, if, every time an accusation is brought against a Minister, he should take the course suggested."

On all sides, therefore, it was understood that the hon. gentleman was accused, and if he did not so understand on the 11th of May, surely he should have understood it on the 19th of May and taken the course which he says he would have taken if he had so understood. But there is more. Let us look at the language used by the hon. gentleman himself on the 11th of May, and let us see, let us ask ourselves how in the face of that language he could say on the 11th of August, three months afterwards, that he had not understood that he was accused. As soon as the hon. member for Montmorency took his seat after making the charges, the late Minister of Public Works rose and said:

"This matter being a matter of privilege, we have a standing committee appointed by the House—the Committee on Privileges and Elections—which has to deal with matters of privilege, and this matter should be sent to that committee. My intention from the beginning had been to make the motion myself, but I understood that the hon. the mover of this motion had other matters to bring before the House than those which were published in the press, and I thought it therefore but fair to leave the hon. gentleman to take his own course."

The charges had already been made in the press. The Minister had seen them, and he stated that even if the hon. member for Montmorency had not moved, he himself would have moved in the House for an investigation. Moreover, if I remember rightly, these charges were commonly repeated in the last election contest, and Ministers of the Crown stated that they should be investigated. How, therefore, can it be possibly held that the hon. gentleman did not understand on the 11th of May that he was accused by the hon. member for Montmorency? So clearly was he accused that he ventured to explain:

"As my name is connected with this question by the hon. gentleman,"——

Nothing could be plainer——

——"I think it my duty to make a statement to the House. That statement I now make as follows:—I never communicated in any way to anyone tenders or prices of tenders, or relative position of tenders,"——

This was a charge——

——"or names of tenderers at any time before the contract was allotted and signed and the work in progress;"——

This was another charge——

——"the only persons having the same information being the members of the Privy Council and such of the officers of my department as were entrusted with the opening of tenders after the period fixed for their reception."

Mr. Speaker, in the face of this the hon. gentleman stated under oath on the 11th of August that he had not understood that he had been accused on the 11th of May, three months previous, although

on that occasion he ventured to explain the charges which were brought against him. Now, as I have said, I do not want to be offensive to the hon. gentleman, who is not here. I do not want to make any charges except such as I am bound to make in support of the position which has been taken by my hon. friends, and which I believe to be the correct position. But without at all impugning the honesty of the hon. gentleman when he made that statement under oath, I say that if his memory is so defective that on the 11th of August he forgot the words he had uttered only three months before in the full publicity of this House—words uttered in the hearing of hundreds of people, and recorded in the Official Debates of this House—can it be expected that the slightest impression has been left upon his mind of events which took place years before in the dark recesses of the Department of Public Works? Sir, I am sorry to come to that conclusion, but if that conclusion is not perfectly warranted by every word that I have uttered, then let the friends of the late Minister of Public Works rise up and defend him. But, Sir, if we cannot take the version of the facts which was given by the hon. gentleman before the Committee, in order to come to a proper conclusion on this matter, there are two facts, at all events, within the knowledge of every man in this House which ought to be remembered, and which, if kept in view, may illuminate the way, as we proceed through the corners, paths and by-ways of the evidence, in the search after truth. These two facts are, the well-known character of the hon. gentleman, and the condition of his department. Sir, the late hon. Minister of Public Works has been for many years a prominent man in this country. In fact, for the last twenty years his position has been only second to that of Sir John Macdonald. Since the death of Sir George Cartier, as the hon. Minister of Militia has stated, he has been the head of his party in the Province of Quebec. Before him all other ambitions had to take a back seat. He has been for years the all-powerful sun before whose luminous rays the brightest stars were extinguished. Now, what was the peculiar quality which gave the hon. gentleman his eminence in the country? He was, as all will admit, quite dissimilar from the two great leaders with whom he was so long associated: yet the variety of the human mind is so immense that no single mind can compass all its qualities: but in every mind there is an attribute which marks the man above others. What was the attribute of the mind of the hon. Minister of Public Works? It has been stated over and over again; it was one in which he prided and which gave delight to all his friends: it was his great ability as an administrator; and indeed all who have sat in the three last Parliaments, and who have seen the hon. gentleman in this House—who saw the skilful manner in which he could present all questions concerning the great public works which were constantly going on, who saw the knowledge he displayed of the details, not only of his own department, but of every other department in the Government—must have come to the conclusion that as an administrator he was endowed as few men in this country were endowed. Now, what was the condition of his department? I venture to say that four or five months ago, at the opening of this session, the impression was general, not only in the country, but more especially among the members of this House, that the department of the hon. gentleman was not only unimpeachable but a model department in every particular. And yet how erroneous an impression, how fallacious a view. It has been proved by incontrovertible testimony, not an iota of which can be impugned, that the department of the hon. gentleman which was thought a model department in every particular, is a mass of irregularities, jobberies and corruption. The evidence has proved that every contract given by the hon. Minister cost the country just double the amount he set upon it, that every plan, every specification which he signed himself, was altered, once and more than once, before the contract was completed. The evidence has proved that tenders and specifications in his department were, through some mysterious manner, communicated to a friend of his, and altered so as to favour particular contractors. The evidence has proved that his chief engineer was bribed, that his inspectors of masonry were bribed, that his overseers of crib-work and dredging were bribed, and that in the contracts investigated by the Committee the country has been robbed and cheated out of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Now, I ask this question of friend and foe: Are these things consistent with the character of the hon. gentleman as an administrator? Is it possible that these frauds and jobberies and peculations can have gone on for years before the eyes of such an able administrator without his having perceived them? The fact is not possible. Then, what is the explanation? It is that given by the gentlemen who have placed in your hands, Sir, the minority report—knowledge, participation, connivance. This is hard language undoubtedly, but the choice has to be made between two alternatives. Either the explanation is knowledge, participation and connivance on the part of the Minister, or the Minister was utterly incompetent. Is there a man here, who has been in Parliament for the last fifteen years, and who has seen that Minister leading the House in Committee of Supply, who will say that he was incompetent to discharge the duties of his department? But I will be told that after all there was a conspiracy of which the Minister was the victim, among Perley, the two brothers McGreevy, the brothers Connolly, and Murphy, that of course these conspirators did not give up their secrets, and that but for the quarrel betwen the two brothers McGreevy, nothing would ever have been known. There might be plausibility in that assertion, if it could be said that the Minister had never before this year heard of these charges; but I affirm this, that although the facts had not leaked out to the general public, still every fact, now proved to be true, as to the condition of the department, was known by a small circle of men, at all events. Let me quote here an article published in a newspaper published in the City of Montreal:

"Unfortunately all questions relating to public works are determined at Ottawa, by the worst of all bad reasons, by bribery.

"To keep aside the contractors who ask a fair price, and who desire to perform their work honestly, recourse is had to those tricks which are common to all Administrations guilty of malversation. Underhand some favourite contractor is told to tender at the lowest price. The contract is awarded him, and immediately he makes the share of the Minister under the form of a subscription to the electoral fund. But he must be recouped. The engineers, the inspectors, the overseers are chosen so as to help him. After the contractor has tendered for no matter what price, a most important omission is discov-

ered by accident in the specifications. A protest and an investigation follow. The end is that the Minister has a report addressed to him, which concludes that there must be a modification of the specification, the effect of which is an alteration, to the advantage of the contractor, of all the conditions agreed to in the contract. After having tendered at a lower figure than the real price of the work, for no other object than to keep aside all serious competitors, the minion of the Government gets double the price of his tender, and everybody is delighted.

"We could defy the Department of Public Works to show us a single contract which, for several years past, has been executed literally according to the specifications. It is all profit for the reptile fund; and those who supply it also find therein an ample compensation to their apparent sacrifices. But the public works cost from twenty to thirty per cent. above their real value."

When was this written? Is this a piece of writing indited since the facts disclosed before the Committee were published? You would imagine that this was a comment on the report of the Committee. No, Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, this is almost ancient history. This was written in the year 1886, and published not in a Liberal paper, but in a Conservative paper, *La Presse*. I had occasion, some time ago, to mention that paper to the Secretary of State, and he replied that it was not a Conservative paper. Sir, it never was a Liberal paper; it always was Conservative, though not always a ministerial organ. It was at times independent, and it was in a fit of independence that the editor gave to the world the knowledge he had acquired while in the secrets of the gods. But it matters not whether this paper was Liberal or Conservative; the important fact to which I want to call attention is this, that the condition of the Public Works Department, such as has been disclosed before the Committee, was known outside, was known to the editor of a newspaper, who published it to the world five years ago. The assertion was then made that favourite contractors always got the preference, and the assertion has been proved true. The assertion was made that tenders and specifications were altered to benefit the favoured contractors, and the assertion has been proved true. The assertion was made that overseers and inspectors were chosen, who would help the contractors, and the assertion is true. Now, can it be possible that these facts should have leaked out of the Department of Public Works, and that the Minister did not know a word about them? Can it be possible that such a vigilant administrator could have been so blind to what was going on in his own department as not to know what was known outside. The thing is not probable or reasonable. But there is more than that. It was asserted also, and it has been proved to be true, that these fradulent contracts were entered into and these fraudulent manipulations of specifications committed, with an object, and that object was to create a fund in order to bribe the constituencies with their own money. We have that fact proved, and the further fact also that the manipulator of those frauds, the collector of that fund, and the bosom friend of the Minister of Public Works, was Thomas McGreevy, the member for Quebec West. It may be said that I speak warmly on this subject. Sir, I do not desire to pose as laying pretensions to any puritanical sensitiveness; I do not claim to be better than my fellow men; but there is not a man for whom patriotism is not a vain and empty word, who can see, without shame on his brow, the finger of scorn pointed to this country from all parts of the civilized world. There is not a man who has a spark of patriotism in his heart, who can see, without feeling humiliated, the degraded condition to which the country has been sunk by this infamous system of bribery and plunder of public money. And on this occasion I may be pardoned if I remember that the city which I have the honour to represent has been the victim selected to be preyed upon. It was a crime, but it was a double crime, when the trade of that city was declining and when every effort should have been made by the Minister, who was a native of that city, to assist it in the endeavour to retain its ancient control of business, it was a double crime to load it with a debt, of which hundreds of thousands of dollars were engulfed in remorseless peculations and malversations. Sir, the report which has been made by the accountants employed by the department has shown that the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. has derived out of the public treasury the amount of $3,138,234 for the works in the harbour of Quebec and the harbour of Esquimault. Out of this the members of the firm have divided among themselves as profits what follows:—Patrick Larkin, $106,161; Nicholas Connolly, $148,172; Michael Connolly, $125,422; O. E. Murphy, $167,000, and R. H. McGreevy, $187,000. Besides that, the firm has paid $170,000 as gratification, as donations for charitable purposes, because those were some of the euphonic terms used by the firm to disguise their contributions, for the purpose of bribing the constituencies with their own money. The contracts were the following:—The first contract was for the graving dock at Lévis, the second was for dredging the wet basin at Quebec, the next was for building what is known as the cross-wall in Quebec harbour, then there was one for the completion of the graving dock at Lévis, another for the graving dock at Esquimalt, one for the south wall at Quebec, and one for dredging the basin at Quebec. It is to be remarked that all these contracts but one were made under the name of the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec, but all these contracts without exception were carried out under the authority of the Department of Public Works. The hon. gentleman who addressed the House last stated that the Minister was not responsible for these contracts because they were carried out by the Quebec Harbour Commission. I deny that altogether. I will not go into the question, because my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has dealt with it thoroughly and has shown that the moneys expended were moneys belonging to the people of Canada, and that they were expended under the direct authority of the Minister of Public Works. The Harbour Commission consists of nine members, five of whom are selected by the Government. When this Government came into power in 1878, one of the first things they did was to cancel the appointments made by their predecessors and to appoint other members of that commission, one of whom was Mr. Thomas McGreevy, who was then member for Quebec West. From that time on, all the moneys which were expended in the harbour of Quebec were expended under the authority of the Minister of Public Works. When Mr. McGreevy became a member of the commission, Larkin, Connolly & Co. had a contract which had been given to them in August, 1878, under the former Administration, to carry out the construction of a graving dock at Lévis. The next contract given to them was in 1882, to dredge the harbour of Quebec, that

is to say the wet basin. In that contract, Mr. Robert H. McGreevy was taken into partnership and was given an interest of 30 per cent., and in every subsequent contract he was given an interest of not less than 20 per cent., except one, the contract to complete the graving dock at Lévis. On all the other contracts he received an amount varying from 30 to 20 per cent. It is in evidence that Mr. Robert McGreevy never put a dollar in money or labour into the business of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and yet he got 30 per cent. of their profits. It is in evidence that they never received an hour of his time or a dollar of his money, and yet they agreed to give him 30 per cent. of their earnings, and he received in all more than $187,000. What is the reason that Larkin, Connolly & Co. gave him that large amount of money without any consideration for it? It is not in human nature to give anything without consideration, and it is certainly not in the nature of the Connollys, who have proved themselves to be remarkably human in that respect. The only reason for this course is that Robert McGreevy was the brother of Thomas McGreevy, who was a member of this House, a member of the Harbour Commission, and an intimate friend of the Minister of Public Works, and the object as stated by Murphy himself—and his evidence on this point cannot be challenged—was that they wanted to make money. To make money—how? By having the influence of Mr. Thomas McGreevy on their behalf, and through him the influence of the Minister of Public Works. You can imagine how deep that firm expected to dip their hands in the public chest when they consented to pay to the brother of Thomas McGreevy 30 per cent., which proved to realize an amount of $187,000. But I will be asked: Can you say that Mr. Thomas McGreevy really influenced the Minister of Public Works? I will put the question in another way. Was Mr. Thomas McGreevy in a position to influence the Minister of Public Works? I say yes. I say he was in a position to unduly influence the Minister of Public Works. But let me say this before I proceed with that question. It is proved that Mr. Thomas McGreevy continually exerted himself in behalf of the contractors to secure them favours, to secure reductions in the conditions, to secure increases in the prices, favours which swelled their profits to an enormous degree, and for these services, in addition to the interest they gave to his brother, they gave him also, as is proved in evidence, different and various sums of money amounting to a very considerable total. As to what amount of money he received directly or indirectly, there is a confusion of testimony. Robert McGreevy says he himself gave him over $57,000, and that Larkin, Connolly & Co. gave him $117,000. Thomas McGreevy admits only receiving $55,000 from Larkin, Connolly & Co., out of which he says he gave $35,000 to *Le Monde*, a paper notoriously published in the interest of the Minister of Public Works and to which the Minister was a heavy subscriber. As to the rest, he would not say how he expended it, but we know that he expended it with a view of bribing the constituencies with their own money. We have, then, the evidence of the constant interference of Thomas McGreevy with the department in the interests of the contractors, we have the direct evidence that the contractors received favours from the department. We have the evidence of the benefits which he received for himself and for his party, and now I again ask: Was Mr. Thomas McGreevy in a position to unduly influence the Minister of Public Works? Was he in a position to unduly influence the Minister of Public Works? Sir, the investigation has revealed this fact, the investigation has revealed that from about the year 1877, the Minister of Public Works borrowed money from the banks to the extent of $10,300, and that Mr. Thomas McGreevy became his endorser, and that from that time to the present day, these notes have been constantly renewed every four months, the interest being paid all the time by Mr. Thomas McGreevy. What is the meaning of this? Let us see what the Minister of Public Works himself has to say upon that point:

"In the account books of Mr. Thomas McGreevy, laid before the Committee, mention is made of certain promissory notes on which my name is. I wish to state in connection with this, that in 1876 and 1877, not being then a member of the Government, I ran twice for parliamentary elections in the County of Charlevoix."

Then the Minister goes on to say that he had no money, and that he had incurred some debts; and he continues:

"Mr. Thomas McGreevy, knowing the circumstances, endorsed my notes, paid out of his own money the interest or discount when due, and told me then that later on he would see the notes redeemed. I have considered, therefore, that he assumed the notes, and I have been confirmed in that idea by his having met regularly the interest or discount since then, and I have never troubled my mind about the matter."

Now, Sir, this, to say the least of it, was an extraordinary explanation, extraordinary from its brevity, extraordinary from its tenor. The Minister speaks of all this as quite natural, as if Thomas McGreevy had been his debtor and had told him: "Don't concern yourself about these notes, I will redeem them, and you will place the amount to my credit." But Mr. McGreevy was not the debtor of the Minister, and therefore when the Minister says that he understood from Mr. McGreevy that he would redeem these notes, after paying interest on them all the time, what was it if not a gift of $10,300? Was it anything else? I call upon every friend of the late Minister of Public Works in this House to say if it is not evident that when Sir Hector Langevin was told by Mr. McGreevy that he would redeem these notes for him, he was accepting a gift of $10,300? Now, it is true that the Minister in the first part of his declaration had made this general statement. He had stated generally:

"That, in truth, Mr. Thomas McGreevy and I have been, for a long time, on friendly terms, and that he has been my guest at Ottawa in the period from 1878 to 1890, whilst I resided here as a Minister, and during which I did not receive from him, and he never offered me, any sum of money, gift or loan."

Well, Mr. Speaker, much as I regret—because I assert again that I have no animosity against the Minister of Public Works, I would rather fight him upon political grounds than any other—but much as I regret it, in face of that testimony I must ask: Is there a man here who can say that the Minister of Public Works has not received a gift of $10,300 from Mr. McGreevy? That is the charge. Sir, will any man tell me—and I put this question not out of animosity to the late Minister—will any one tell me that when he accepted from one of his supporters a gift of $10,300 he was a free agent in so far as his relations with that supporter were concerned? And remember, remark the cunning of Mc-

Greevy. It would have been easy for him to have paid these notes, it would have been just as easy for him to pay these notes as to subscribe to a newspaper: yet he kept the sword suspended over the head of the Minister for ten long years and more. And every time the Minister came to him and asked him to renew these notes, Mr. McGreevy told him he was paying the interest and would redeem the capital—I say that on every such occasion the Minister of Public Works was signing the instrument of his own bondage into the hands of Thomas McGreevy. Now, Sir, I put the question as a plain man to men of common sense: When Thomas McGreevy, like Mephistopheles, was whispering in the ear of the Minister that it would be advisable to change the specifications of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and to give them increased prices for certain works and to give them certain reductions in the conditions of the contracts, was the Minister in a position to deny a favour to so generous a friend who had undertaken to free him and to relieve him from a debt of $10,300? Sir, the logic of facts is too strong in this matter to allow us to come to any other conclusion than that the Minister of Public Works had surrendered his freedom into the hands of Thomas McGreevy. I do not say it with any pleasure at all. If we accuse the Minister of Public Works we do it in sorrow, and not in anger. But before such facts as these, whatever may be the opinion on either side of the House, I will say there is no man who will listen to the voice of reason and to the voice of conscience but must come to the conclusion that the Minister of Public Works has placed himself in a position that he could not say nay to any request of Thomas McGreevy. But I will be told, perhaps, that Thomas McGreevy never approached the Minister to obtain favours; that the Minister never gave favours to Larkin, Connolly & Co. at the instance of Thomas McGreevy. Now, I say this, and I intend to prove it, I will show from the public records, that Thomas McGreevy approached the Minister of Public Works to obtain favours for the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and that at his solicitation the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. received favours from the Minister of Public Works. Now, I will not review the whole evidence, I will review it only in so far as necessary to prove the points I have just stated. Let me take the first contract, the contract for the Lévis dock. This was a contract entered into under the late Government, and my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has shown the other day that under that contract the contractors assumed all responsibility for the foundation, whether it was of clay or of sand. It was stated in the specifications that borings had been made to test the matter of the soil, that the conditions revealed were satisfactory, and the agreement was imperative that if the soil was not ultimately found to be as the borings seemed to indicate, the contractors would be responsible. It appears that the contractors found sand instead of clay, and they made a protest accordingly. It matters not whether it was sand or clay; at all events, according to my construction of the contract, it seems to me that no one can gainsay that the firm had taken all risks; but instead of being forced to execute their contract, they were allowed to make more favorable conditions, under which they expended $180,000 by day's labour, which they charged to the department. In 1884, as stated by Murphy, they were making a profit on that kind of work, but they thought that by having a lump sum they would make still greater profits, and they would be able to give donations to their friends who had assisted them. They entered into a contract of $74,000 to complete the works of the graving dock, and it was understood between them and Thomas McGreevy that he was to receive out of this sum $24,000, and it is now proved that he received $22,000. Now, so far, the hand of the Minister is not shown, but the hand of the Minister is shown later on when, on the 20th September, 1886, he writes thus to Thomas McGreevy:

"MY DEAR MR. MCGREEVY,—The contractors for the Lévis graving dock should ask a settlement of their account from the Harbour Commissioners, who then will most likely consult with their engineer. For the Esquimalt dock it is different, because the work there is altogether under my control."

What does this letter prove? It proves that the contractors, Larkin, Connolly & Co. had a claim—whether good, bad or indifferent, I will not discuss at this moment—against the commissioners for their works at Lévis and in British Columbia. This letter proves that the Minister of Public Works had been approached by McGreevy asking him to have this claim recognized and paid. The Minister answered in substance that as to the works in British Columbia he could attend to that himself, but as to the works in Lévis the contractors would do better to present their claim to the commissioners, who would refer it to their engineer; and the engineer of the commission was the engineer of the Minister of Public Works. Such was proposed, and such was done. Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co. produced a claim later on, in which they pretended that the total indebtedness to them for the Lévis graving dock work was $814,241. On 24th January, 1887, the engineer reported on that claim. He reduced it to $640,000. He reduced the claim on several items, and an item of $110,000 he rejected completely. That item was, as stated by Larkin, Connolly & Co., for "detention, salaries, maintenance of organization at Lévis and at the quarries." That was simply an outrageous claim, and it is sufficient to read it to show its character. The claim was put forward in these terms:

"Our claim is made up as follows:—Four years' detention on account of the engineers, Messrs. Kinipple & Morris, having assured the existence of clay in the foundations of the wing walls and the coffer dam, and so distinctly shown and stated on both plan and specification furnished by them, whereas a fine sand existed, and we were misled. Had the foundation been as described, there is no reasonable doubt but we would have completed the works within the time specified, or in other words, we were four years longer constructing the work owing to their error and stubbornness in not adapting themselves to the circumstances when made acquainted by personal observation and our written protest. Our claim is made up as follows:—

To salary of Mr.	N. K. Connolly, one year	$ 2,000 00
do	O. E. Murphy do	1,200 00
do	M. Connolly do	1,200 00
do	P. Hume do	1,800 00
do	Book-keeper do	800 00
do	T. H. Gallagher	1,200 00
do	Time-keeper	350 00
do	Stable boys	600 00
do	Watchmen (2)	700 00
Interest on $90,000 at 7 per cent		6,300 00
Cost of maintenance of organization at Lévis and at the quarries, consisting of machinery, derricks, horses, waggons, carts, sleighs, &c., and for loss sustained in not being able to realize from the plant.		11,350 00
One year		27,500 00
Or four years		$110,000 00

Upon this item, what was the opinion of Mr. Perley at that time? It was as follows:—

"With reference to this claim I desire to state that when I took charge of the dock in September, 1883, it was not presented to me, although I had asked that every claim the contractors might have be submitted, so that I could investigate them and see to what extent the commissioners were indebted. Only *one* claim to my knowledge, that of the *extra foot* in depth in the dock was withheld, because there was not at the time any certainty as to the correctness of the bend marks and tide-gauge on which the matter depended, and its investigation was therefore deferred: and at the time of preparing the supplementary contract of June, 1884, I was under the impression that the clause inserted therein, admitted the right of the contractors to submit further claims for the *extra foot*; and I desire to have this statement made on record."

So when this supplementary contract was entered into in 1884, it had been understood between Mr. Perley and the contractors that the contract was to cover every claim. Not only so, but the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) showed yesterday that a condition of the Order in Council that granted the contract was that no claims for extras should be admitted in the future. Yet, although this was the written condition of the contract, Mr. Perley on that occasion had the weakness to admit the claim, not *in toto*, not for $110,000, but for $30,900. Well, the wily contractors then had the advantage. The principle of their claim, which should have been denied, was admitted, and they asked for an arbitration. The arbitration was granted, but did not go on. Why? Because we find that on 1st May, 1888, Mr. Perley wrote as follows to the Harbour Commissioners:—

"In reply to yours of the 25th April, asking for an opinion on an offer by Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co. to accept the sum of $35,000 with interest in addition to the sum of $30,900 offered by the board in full settlement of their claim in connection with the graving dock at Lévis, I have to state that, in view of the assumption of the dock by the Dominion Government, and the relief thus to be afforded to the Board from all future liability and responsibility in connection therewith, I am of the opinion that it is desirable the dock should be handed over free and unencumbered, and to do so it is advisable that the contractors be offered the sum of thirty-five thousand dollars ($35,000) without interest in addition to the amount, viz., $30,900, in settlement in full of all claims and demands."

The further sum of $35,000 was paid for that bogus claim, which should have been denied under the very terms of the contract itself. What is the reason? How silly and how absurd it is. The reason given is that because there was an Act just passed by Parliament assuming the proprietorship of the graving dock at Lévis it was desirable to pay this money to relieve the Harbour Commission from the responsibility, when it was known that the commission never contributed a cent of its own money, but every cent was paid by the Dominion Government; and whether the works remained in the hands of the commission or passed into the hands of the Government, so far as money was concerned it did not matter, because every expenditure had been paid and would be paid by the Dominion Government. We are told: What had the Minister of Public Works to do with this? In the first place, he is responsible for every act done by his engineer. I will not, however, put the matter on that broad ground. There is a letter written by Mr. Perley to the Harbour Commissioners dated 28th March, 1888, when an application was made by Larkin, Connolly & Co. to change their arbitrator from J. J. Macdonald to Mr. Aylen. Mr. Perley says that the Minister objected to that. It thereby appears that he kept the matter in his own hands, and therefore it was with his consent that $65,900 was paid to Larkin, Connolly & Co., who had no more claim to it than I had or any other member of this House. How was it done? I have shown by letter written by the Minister of Public Works to Thomas McGreevy that it was done at the solicitation of Thomas McGreevy, who appealed to the good offices of the Minister to have that claim allowed. I pass now to the contracts in British Columbia. Hon. members will find there at every step the hand of Thomas McGreevy on the Minister, and the yielding of the Minister to Thomas McGreevy. It is well known that works in that province had been undertaken and commenced by the Provincial Government, and afterwards turned over to the Government of Canada. Tenders were asked for the Esquimalt dock in 1884. Two tenders were sent in; one, the tender of Starrs & O'Hanly, for $315,240; and the other, the tender of Baskerville & Co. for $465,309. These two tenders were rejected under Order in Council, on the advice of the Minister of Public Works, because one was too low and the other was too high. The tender of Starrs & O'Hanly was too low and the tender of Baskerville was too high, it being $465,000. It is in evidence that a short time afterwards Baskerville & Co. were approached by Mr. Perley, who told them that if they were ready to reduce their tender by $50,000, the contract would be given them, and he had the authority of the Minister to make that statement. Then there was a letter sent by Baskerville & Co., wherein they expressed the desire, on the suggestion of the engineer, to amend their tender and reduce it by $53,000. A report was made, accordingly, by Mr. Perley, recommending that the tender so amended be accepted. Nothing was done on it. Now, what had taken place? The Minister of Public Works had gone to Quebec and had met Murphy. Murphy says he made a proposition on that occasion, which I am almost ashamed to believe. I can hardly believe that a Minister of the Crown would have listened to such language as that; but, at all events, the language is there. The Minister said to Murphy that he would readvertise the tenders, and he did readvertise subsequently. In the meantime Mr. Baskerville, who had written to the Minister to have his tender amended, asked for a reply; and upon that we have this answer made by the Minister: Tell Mr. Baskerville that the specifications have been altered, and new tenders will be asked for. Now, Sir, I charge this, that when the Minister said that the specifications had been altered and tenders would be asked on the altered specifications, that was a deceit on Mr. Baskerville and the country. It is true that new tenders were asked for; but I say this also, and I challenge contradiction on this point, that the new tenders were not made on the specifications as amended or altered, but were made on the old specifications. We have the evidence of it in the blue-book which was laid on the Table of the House last year by the Minister himself. You have it in evidence, in the following language of Mr. Perley to be found at page 38, that the works had been commenced by the Government of British Columbia and handed over to the Government of Canada. He then continues:

"As soon after the transfer as possible tenders were asked for the completion of this work. Two only were

received, both of which were objected to and cancelled. A second set of tenders was called for, on exactly the same plans, &c., which were those prepared by Kinipple & Co., and fresh tenders were received."

Now, that is not all. There is also another letter of Mr. Perley to Mr. Trutch in which he states the same thing. So, Sir, we have in the evidence of Mr. Perley that the second tenders were asked for upon exactly the same plans and specifications as the first tenders, and it was to deceive Baskerville & Co. and the country that the specifications were said to have been altered with a view to asking for new tenders. New tenders were asked for, and there were several tenders received, and Starrs & O'Hanly were the lowest, and the contract was awarded to them. Starrs & O'Hanly were the lowest, but they were told by the Minister of Public Works that they need not expect any favour, that they would have no extras and that they would be bound to pay every cent of the $50,000 for the old plant, which was a condition of the tender. On account of the stern language of the Minister, Starrs & O'Hanly thought that the best plan after all would be to recede and to tender another time. They withdrew their tender, and the contract was awarded to Larkin, Connolly & Co.; and, Sir, it was awarded at a time and under conditions which were not given in the contract, but by which they had already secured alterations in the tenders upon which they had based their contract. Here is a letter written by Nicholas Connolly to Patrick Larkin on the 29th October, 1884:

"You will see by the enclosed message that we are offered the Esquimalt graving dock. I cared nothing about tendering for the dock and scarcely expected to get it, but now that we are offered it, and under the circumstances I think it would be best to accept it, with the proviso that the changes we suggest are made and have been partially agreed between parties."

Although Starrs & O'Hanly were told that they would be held rigidly to the letter of the contract, Larkin, Connolly & Co. were told that they would have the contract upon conditions which were not written in the tender. Now, Sir, let us see what were the changes which they expected in the contract. You find these changes enumerated in a letter of Nicholas Connolly to Murphy on the 20th December, 1884. He had proceeded to Victoria, and he wrote from Victoria as follows, with his quaint orthograph:

"I think that Mr. T. would like to have the dock builte of grannet and hee said that it would not cost much over sixty thousand in adishin to our prise for sandstone and I also think that the folkes heer would lik to mak it a hundred feet longer. If corse thoes thinges are for our frend two work on But for the substutin of grannet would bee worth one hundred thousand moeur and the lengthing preporson if corse Mr. T. would have two bee seen in the avent of aney chaing as hee is the Dominion agent heer and all pourfull as well as our folkes there. We will want changes mad in the sise of the stone and paid for all the stone we put in that is we wnt to incrase the thickens and the weth of bed and bee alouded for it at our prise and in that way we will make a good thing. The best way would be to have them order hever corses as by that it would give us a chance of an extra as well as giving us our prise. Your can tell our frend But I will write you more fully in a day or two."

Then there is another letter from him written on the 19th February, in which he says that they also wanted a reduction in the price of the plant which is old and useless, and he concludes:

"Sow you want two prepair the folkes ther for thess thinges, wee want thim all, we want the corses of stone incrased in sise and alowed for sade incrase."

What was it they wanted? They wanted first a change in the length of the dock, they wanted the substitution of granite for sandstone, they wanted heavier coursing of stone, and they wanted a diminution in the price of the plant. Now let us see how far they were successful. Michael Connolly also proceeded to British Columbia, and he is not so diplomatic as Nicholas Connolly, who said that all the folks out there wanted the lengthening of the dock. He writes in this business way:

"The Hon. Mr. Trutch has gone to Ottawa—started this morning—to back up a petition got up by the people here to have granite substituted for sandstone throughout the works, and asking that the dock be lengthened 100 feet. If you have a chance see Mr. McGreevy and have him arrange to have the second entrance at head done away with and a circular head, same as at Point Lévis, substituted."

And so desired, so done. Mr. McGreevy saw Mr. Perley, the Minister had a report from Mr. Perley, the report was brought to Council, and it was ordered by Council as follows:—

"The Minister further represents that the plans show and the contract provides for the construction at the head of the dock of inverts and a caisson recess, in anticipation of the construction, at a future date, of another dock beyond the present one; and the chief engineer reports that these inverts, &c., which occupy a length of 50 feet 6 inches, are and will remain practically useless for any purpose in connection with the dock—merely adding to the cost of its construction, without adding anything to its usefulness—and that if the dock bottom were carried out and these works abolished a further length of 50 feet would be obtained within the limits of the present contract, at an additional expense of, say, $35,000, or a total of $410,000.

"The Minister recommends that authority be granted that the inverts and caisson recess provided for in the plans, &c., and herein referred to, be not constructed, and that the dock bottom be carried out at the additional cost of thirty-five thousand dollars ($35,000), as estimated."

Now, you see how it was done; but, Sir, the change with regard to the substitution of granite for sandstone is still more marvellous. Michael Connolly wrote to Murphy to have granite substituted for sandstone, and he gave very good reasons for it, and the Order in Council was prepared accordingly, but the change was not carried out, and why? The thing is so instructive that I had better, perhaps, read the whole of the correspondence upon this subject. Michael Connolly and Nicholas had been very anxious to have granite substituted for sandstone, but they changed their mind, and then Michael wrote to Murphy:

"But I hope no such change will be made because the granite is terrible hard and the quarry 180 miles distant."

The order had been prepared and taken to Council, but meantime the contractors discovered a quarry, and then, Sir, the order which had been prepared and which was at the very door of the Council, was stopped by McGreevy, and, after all, the contract was made for sandstone and not for granite. It was the same all the way through this transaction. Now another change was made in the coursing of the stone. It was provided that the course of masonry should be one foot in thickness, but they demanded that the course should be three feet and at the same price. This was denied at first but it was afterwards granted, and it was granted at the instance of the Minister. On the 24th February Mr. Perley writes to Mr. Trutch:

"I am also to say that the Minister approves of the suggestion that the masonry in this dock be built in heavier courses than called for by the specification, and you are authorized to permit the contractors to re-course the work, provided it will not entail any extra expense on the Crown."

Later on he also writes to Mr. Trutch :

"I am of the opinion that the contractors should have preferred their request in writing before being permitted to change the courses, but as they have not done so, but have informally applied here for permission to do so it has been granted to them, and I will inform them here of this decision of the Minister and that no extra payment will be made to them on account of this change."

Sir, no extra price was to be entailed on the country, but would you believe it? Later, on the 25th January, 1886, there was a telegram from Mr. Perley to Mr. Trutch, as follows :—

"Minister directs that contractors shall be paid for full quantity of stone in dock and caisson recess, and full measurement on all stones. Letter by mail."

And then comes the letter :

"I have to inform you that the Minister has directed that the contractors, Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co., shall be paid full measurement for all stone they have placed in the dock at Esquimalt, these directions specially applying to the increase in the sizes of the stones needed by the contractors and rendered necessary by the change made in re-coursing the work, and they will also apply to the full size of altar coping as it exists in the work. All special stones are to be measured fairly and liberally, and their sizes are not to be affected by an arris, a nosing, a check or groove, &c."

And the increased cost to the country was just $41,000, according to the evidence of the Minister, though it had been understood that while a change would be made, it would be made at no cost to the country. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) stated here the other day that though there had been a conspiracy, it could not be shown that the hon. Minister of Public Works was in it, because it was sufficient for Mr. McGreevy's object to have the services of Mr. Perley, the chief engineer. But there are two instances in connection with this contract in which the opinion of the chief engineer was set aside by the opinion of the Minister. The first one was in the case of the re-coursing, and the last was when the engineer advised substituting granite for sandstone, and the Minister persisted in keeping sandstone. So it cannot be said that the Minister was not in the conspiracy. Now, I have only to repeat what I stated a moment ago, that there is no animosity against the late Minister of Public Works on this side of the House. It is no pleasure to anyone to become the accuser of his fellowman. It was no pleasure to my hon. friend from Montmorency to become the accuser of a man with whom he had been for so many years on terms of intimacy. I remember very well, not later than last year, when there was an election contest in Montmorency between the present member for L'Islet and another gentleman, a meeting was held there which was addressed by the hon. Minister of Militia and the hon. member for Montmorency. At that meeting the hon. member for Montmorency repeated every charge which he has since made against the Minister of Public Works, and on that occasion we did not hear from the hon. Minister of Militia the eloquent defence of the late Minister of Public Works which we heard this afternoon. Sir, it was no pleasure to the hon. member for Montmorency to repeat those charges on the floor of this House. It is no pleasure to anyone of us to have to pronounce on them if we believe them to have been proved. But, as I said before, the question before us is not simply a question of the guilt or innocence of one man. The question is much broader than that ; it involves the existence of a system which has to be put down, or which will put down the country. Some few weeks ago the Prime Minister in another House introduced a measure for the punishment of minor offenders. On that occasion, speaking of the scandals which had disgraced this country, he consoled himself by remarking that after all human nature would always be the same, and that there would be dishonest men in every community. Sir, this is not a question of individual offences. Individual offences may always take place : frauds may be perpetrated in the most honest communities, but in this case, we have to grapple with a system which permeates the whole public service from the top to the bottom. We have often boasted of our political morality in this country, especially in contrast with that of our neighbours to the south. But the American people have given us an example which should help us on this occasion. Twenty years ago, comparing ourselves with our neighbours, with our eyes turned up to Heaven, we thanked the Lord that we were not like other nations. I admit that our neighbours had much to be ashamed of in those days. They had the Crédit Mobilier frauds, the whiskey frauds, the Tweed frauds. But though they had much to be ashamed of in the way of corruption in official and public life, still there were causes to explain it and circumstances to excuse it. The American nation had just passed through four years of the convulsions of civil war, and during those four years every energy of the nation had been directed to the one object of crushing out the rebellion. Enormous sums of money were spent without any supervision, enormous contracts were granted, fabulous prices were paid ; and all with eyes closed to everything, except the one thing, the crushing out of the rebellion. Thus the door was opened wide for peculation. But if the American people had excuses, what excuse have we in Canada? Excuses there are none, and although you may on this occasion excuse the man who is charged, yet with the tinge of shame on your brow you cannot take off your eyes from that mass of corruption now in heaps before you. But there was life and energy in the American people, and the whiskey frauds, the Tweed frauds and the Star route frauds were exposed, and every offender was brought to justice and punished. But I almost despair of my country when I see the Government willing to punish the minor offenders, but receding before the mighty—when I see them willing enough to punish clerks in offices, but refusing to censure the men who are the most blameable of all. How can this nation expect to live, if such offences are condoned? No nation can live in which public moneys are not applied exclusively to public purposes. In discussing this case, the other day, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was only too happy to have a fling at the Liberal party, and to point out that there are accusations pending against it in the Province of Quebec. Sir, I will not prejudge the case ; I have only this to say, that that measure of justice which we call for in this Parliament we want applied also in the Province of Quebec. Wherever, after investigation, blame and censure are found to be deserved, blame and censure should be pronounced. Upon this occasion I appeal especially to my fellow countrymen of French origin, to stand up to the duty of the hour, painful as that duty is. I do not appeal to them in any words of my own ;

but I appeal to them from the teaching of their history. The old City of Quebec has been the victim on this occasion of most of the malversations which have been unearthed. Let them remember that this is not the first time in her history that she has thus suffered, and let them remember at what cost to the country. In the last days of the great struggle between England and France for the possession of this continent, when England and the American colonies were preparing to invade Canada from all points—from the west by the route of the great lakes, from the south by the valley of Lake Champlain, from the east by the St. Lawrence—the King of France had neither men nor money to send for the defence of this colony. The general of the army, Montcalm, had to depend on the resources of the colony, small as those resources were. Montcalm, Lévis and Bougainville and all the principal officers of the army made the sacrifice of their emoluments for the defence of the colony, and they returned to the almost empty treasury every franc paid to them in salaries. But at the moment that these great men were giving this example of their devotion—crime exceeding all crimes ! shame exceeding all shame !—the resources of the colony, insufficient as they were for the most pressing wants were the prey of the malversation of the Administration of that day. Sir, the system which has been revealed in this investigation was not invented in the Department of Public Works. This system of manipulating contracts for the profit of the contractor, this system of substituting private for public interest, this system of plundering the treasury to enrich individuals, was not invented by the Department of Public Works, but was practised in those days by the Administration, by Bigot the Intendant and his creatures Pean, Vergor and others. In the month of August, 1757, M. de Doreil, one of the commissioners of the army, thus wrote to the Minister of War, concerning Pean, one of Bigot's creatures:

"Pean has made so rapid a fortune in eight years that he is now supposed to be worth two millions * * * The English will have this country next year * * We are as sick persons in the pangs of death whose lives Providence and medical skill may prolong for a few moments * * * Look on him (Pean) as one of the chief causes of the maladministration and loss of this unfortunate country."

Then, two years afterwards, General Montcalm himself, as brave a man as ever lived, felt compelled to denounce that system to the French Government, and wrote thus to the Minister of War:

"Mr. Bigot seems occupied only with the care of making a large fortune for himself, his followers and sycophants. * * * Cupidity has taken hold of the officers, storekeepers, clerks. * * * They make astonishing fortunes. * * * Everywhere false certificates are admitted. * * * It appears that all are hastening to realize a fortune before the loss of the colony, which many perhaps desire, as an impenetrable veil over their conduct. * * They make immense accumulation of all kinds of commodities, which they afterwards sell at a profit of 150 per cent. for Bigot and his followers."

In another letter, written the same day to the Minister of Colonies, General Montcalm pointed out the immense robberies of the local engineers in the works of fortifications and on the labour of the workingmen, and he adds:

"There is robbery in all contracts concerning artillery, iron works, transports, tools, &c."

Sir, these stern denunciations brought a strong remonstrance from the French Government to Intendant Bigot, who, of course, denied everything.

But now, my fellow countrymen, let me quote here the language of the historian, commenting upon those pages of infamy and shame:

"Canada (says Parkman) was the prey of official jackals—true lion providers, since they helped to prepare a way for the Imperial beast, who, roused at last from his lethargy, was gathering his strength to seize her for his own."

How humiliating the language, but how true—how painfully true ! The resources of the colony were exhausted in shameful peculations, the way was prepared for the invader, and after her first defeat Canada had not the strength to retrieve the loss. Sir, a hundred and thirty years have rolled over since those unfortunate days, and time and freedom have obliterated the grief, but the shame is always there, and there is not to-day a cottage in Lower Canada where the names of Bigot and Pean, and the other official jackals who sucked the life-blood of their country in the hour of danger, are not remembered with abhorrence. Sir, Canada is to-day again the prey of official jackals—the jackals of this Government. Again there is robbery everywhere; if again cupidity has taken hold of clerks and store-keepers and officers, again everywhere false certificates are admitted. Montcalm is not here, but if he were, and if he were a member of this Parliament, with the right to speak and vote, is there anyone who doubts that he would denounce the conduct and the infamy of the Bigots and the Peans of to-day, as vigorously as he denounced Bigot, Pean and Vergor in his own day. But, if Montcalm is not here, we have his example; and, if his stern patriotism still lives in the hearts of his countrymen, to them I appeal and as he would now do, so now let us do.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McCARTHY. In taking part in this discussion, I can assure you, Sir, that I do so sharing in common with the other members of this House a full sense of the responsibility which rests upon us all in arriving at a decision upon this momentous question. It is a question that is important, involving, as it does, the political life of an hon. gentleman who has been for many years, long before I took any part in public proceedings, a member of this House, and who has been for many years a servant of the Crown. It is important, not merely because it involves the political life of that hon. gentleman, but because it involves what is dearer to us all than mere political life, his reputation, his character and his honour as a man. No matter what our views on political matters may be, I trust we all share in the feeling that before we decide adversely to that hon. gentleman, we should be satisfied, beyond all reasonable doubt, of his guilt and of the righteousness of the conclusion at which we should arrive in pronouncing upon it. On the other hand, looking at it from another point of view, the question presents features perhaps still more important to the country of which we are here the representatives. I agree, not to the full extent of the exaggerated language which has been used, but in the substance of what has been said by the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, as to the unfortunate position Canada has presented to the eyes of the civilized world since this investigation commenced. We had hitherto, whatever our other

faults may have been, as compared with our neighbours to the south, the conviction that our public men bore a character for honesty and respectability which would compare favourably with that of those with whom we are naturally brought in comparison. But I had the misfortune, or good fortune, as it may have been, to be absent in the mother land while these investigations were being held; and I can assure you, Sir, that no man could feel pride in his country as a Canadian, reading, morning after morning, the disclosures made with reference to one of the great public departments of the Government of this country. Therefore, while we have to deal here, under a full sense of responsibility, with regard to the condemnation or acquittal of one of our fellow-members—one whom, so far as I am concerned, I have hitherto had to look up to as a leader, one with whom I have been brought, if not into intimacy, into certainly frequent relationship—while we have to look to that relationship on the one hand, we must not forget, on the other hand, that we are the representatives of the people, who, I believe, are not willing to condone transactions such as have been revealed during the progress of this investigation. Whatever else may be said, we who sit here as representatives of the people have no right to stigmatize them as being a dishonest or dishonourable race. I had the honour of being a member of the Committee to which this matter was referred, but for reasons I was unable to control I did not take part in its proceedings. And I felt that, with regard to the conclusion that should be arrived at by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, not having heard the witnesses, not having been able to judge of their manner or their demeanour in giving evidence, not being able to form an opinion as to their credibility, I should not take part in the final conclusions of that Committee, the other members having had opportunities which were denied to me in those respects. I would very gladly have escaped from the responsibility of taking part in this discussion, but I cannot see why I should refuse to participate in a discussion on which every member of the House, whether belonging to the Committee or not, is called upon to take a part and to decide whether the report of the majority or the report of the minority of the Committee shall be accepted and placed on our proceedings. I must add this, however, as I think all those members of the House who are not members of the Committee ought to do. We must accept the conclusions of that Committee as to the credibility of witnesses where we find it expressed in the report. We are not to take up these three volumes of evidence, running over so many pages, and whatever the impression conveyed by the dead page or the dead type might be, to overrule the judgment of those members of this House who took part in the proceedings and had the opportunity of seeing the manner and demeanour of the witnesses, and forming an opinion at the time as to the credibility to be attached to their statements. In all other respects, we stand upon an equality with the members of the Committee, and we ought to be, and I believe we are—at least those who have taken the trouble to go over the voluminous evidence—in a position to form an opinion on the question submitted to us. It is very unfortunate that, on a question so grave as this, the decision is to be left to a popular assembly of this kind. It may be that, under our system of government, it is impossible that any other or any better way could be found, but I think that, if the same course that was followed in the Parnell investigation had been pursued here, if the matter had been referred to three independent members of the bench, where we know we could find judicial impartiality, while this House and the country would have been saved the enormous expense of this enquiry, a more satisfactory conclusion would have been arrived at. We have, however, to deal with the questions presented to us, and to do the best we can under the circumstances. I regretted that the hon. the leader of the Opposition who last addressed you should have determined this matter, not as I think it ought to be determined as a judicial enquiry, as a question only to be decided upon a close and minute review of the evidence, but that the hon. member made what might be termed—and I say it without any disrespect to the hon. gentleman—a stump speech, in which he invoked party considerations and denounced the hon. gentleman who is under the trial because he was connected with the political party to which the hon. the leader of the Opposition is opposed. I think I shall be able to point out that in the references he made to the evidence, he was strikingly inaccurate. I think I shall be able to show, even to the hon. gentleman's own satisfaction that he had not only not read the evidence but that he had not even read the reports, and certainly not the report of the majority. But the hon. gentleman was able to satisfy his conscience and to arrive at a conclusion that he ought to drive—no doubt unwillingly, but on political grounds—his opponent from public life by appeals to passion, by invoking statements which were not always accurate, by charging, for instance in one example, that the leader who is no longer in this House had openly boasted that he carried and bribed constituencies with their own money, and the hon. gentleman said, what should we expect from the follower of that hon. gentleman, from the second in command, than that he should have followed that doctrine and should have carried out the practice which the late Sir John Macdonald, according to the hon. gentleman, publicly stated was his rule of conduct and practice. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the dead might have been spared in this enquiry. I think the hon. gentleman must have been hard pressed in making his attack upon the late Minister of Public Works, when he found it necessary to quote statements which he said had fallen from the lips of him who has recently left us and of whom, in my hearing, the hon. gentleman himself spoke in the very highest terms on an occasion which will be memorable to us all. But, if the hon. gentleman had not the magnanimity to abstain from attacking the memory of him who has gone, we might have expected at least that he would not have garbled his statements in the speech to which he referred. I had some recollection of that speech, not very accurate I admit, but the hon. gentleman's statement did not bring to my mind the utterances of the late Sir John Macdonald on that occasion, and by great good fortune I have obtained the words of the hon. gentleman, and I ask, and I feel certain that I will not be denied, an apology from the leader of the Opposition for the garbled statement he made. As the leader of the Opposition stated the words of Sir John Macdonald, they were:

"The Opposition charge us with having bribed the constituencies. Well, we have bribed them with their own money."

There the hon. gentleman stopped. Will it be believed that he stopped not merely in the middle of a paragraph, but in the middle of a sentence? Will it be believed that the hon. gentleman, in uttering these words, which, if they were as he gave them, could only have been made in joke, did so without giving the context? Here are the words which our late leader used:

"The Opposition charge us with having bribed the constituencies. Well, we have bribed them with their own money, and the charge amounts to this, that we have so wisely and equitably distributed the revenues in the different parts of the Dominion as to gain the approbation of the country as a whole."

Surely the hon. gentleman can see the difference.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. They do not appear to see the difference now.

Mr. MULOCK. We are just complaining of the distribution.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, I do not know what the difference is between the conduct which the hon. gentlemen support and the conduct which the hon. gentlemen denounce. They denounce the late Sir John Macdonald because he distributed the revenues of the country in a way the people approved of.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what is stated, but they back up and support their own leader who bargained with the Premier of the Province of Quebec by promising better terms. If it is wrong to buy a county by the erection of a post office or public building——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Mr. McCARTHY--I should like to ask whether it is right for the leader of the Opposition to bargain with the leader of the Province of Quebec that he will——

Mr. LAURIER. When was this?

Mr. FOSTER. And boasted of it in this House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, he did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. LAURIER. I wish to state this to the House——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has no right to add anything unless the House chose to let him.

Mr. LAURIER. Will I be denied the right—

Mr. McCARTHY. Ask anything you like.

Mr. LAURIER. Do you deny me the right?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not deny you the right.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well; I stated in this House that I had been in favour of the resolutions of the Quebec Conference asking for an increased subsidy. I stated that in answer to a question put to me by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) who, in 1884, was a member of the Quebec Legislature, when Mr. Mousseau, if I remember right, was in the Government, and who at that time was a member of the Legislature which passed unanimously such a resolution for increased subsidy.

Mr. FOSTER. All right.

Mr. LAURIER. What is my fault, then?

Mr. McCARTHY. What is his fault, asks the hon. gentleman. Why, Sir, if it was a fault in the late Government to distribute money in public works throughout the provinces of this Dominion, is it not equally a fault for the hon. gentleman on the hustings—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hon. gentlemen will not listen. Mr. Speaker, I can understand their desire to drown my voice, I can understand their desire to suppress free discussion. They are accustomed to assail continually, as if they themselves were free from stain and corruption, every statement of members on this side. Let them understand there are two sides to this question, and in this free Parliament we must hear both sides, their side as well as ours. Now, Sir, in my judgment there is no distinction between the leader of the Opposition, upon the hustings, bargaining that if he got power here he would hand over to the Province of Quebec the $400,000 which the Premier of that province demanded—there can be no difference between that crime, if it is a crime, and the act of this Government spending money in a county for the erection of public buildings here, or the construction of a public work there. Why, Sir, there was a demand by telegram made to that hon. gentleman: "My support depends on your answer to this question;" and if ever an hon. member was bought and sold, it was the hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition. My friend by me hands me this telegram sent by the Premier of the Province of Quebec, and not denied by that hon. gentleman, giving Mr. Mercier's reason why the Province of Quebec and the Government of that province, should support the leader of the Opposition and his party in the late election. Every hon. gentleman knows that perfectly well, and therefore it is idle to talk--I was going to use a word for which I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, you would have called me to order—I say it was unfair, at all events, to bring as an accusation against the late Minister of Public Works, that the Government of which he was a member had been guilty of conduct certainly not more heinous and not more reprehensible than that of which the hon. member himself had been guilty:

"Mr. Laurier has accepted the resolution of the Interprovincial Conference of 1887, and he has promised to give effect to that when he comes into power."

Mr. AMYOT. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. And there was good consideration for it, too. The hon. gentleman made a pretty good bargain, and the recent disclosures have shown that there was cash down in the bargain. Not merely was there the moral support of the Government of the Province of Quebec at the last election, which has given the hon. gentleman his right to make the proud boast of having a larger following from his own province than have the Government on this side; but that majority was obtained, as the disclosures which have recently been made public have shown, by means which I would have expected the hon. member for South Oxford to denounce as being corrupt and scandalous in the extreme.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When you prove any, they will be denounced.

Mr. AMYOT. Prove them first.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In a judicial way.

Mr. SPEAKER. Hon. members have no right to interrupt an hon. gentleman in the midst of his speech.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman from Bellechasse had better keep perfectly quiet. He knows why, perfectly well, and I think he had better observe the rules of order, at all events, or else, perhaps, we will be sitting in judgment upon him before he is very much older.

Mr. LAURIER. I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Simcoe has no right to use threats to another member on the floor of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is threatening the hon. member for Bellechasse, I think he is not quite parliamentary. It is a parliamentary rule that an hon. member shall not threaten the House, and I presume that rule applies to threats made against individual members.

Mr. McCARTHY. I bow to your ruling. If I threatened the member for Bellechasse, I withdraw the threat, and I trust the hon. gentleman's sleep and dreams will not be disturbed in the least by anything which, in a hasty moment, escaped me in reference to this particular case.

Mr. AMYOT. I rise to a question of order. If the hon. member has any personal charge to make against me, I beg of him to state it clearly, instead of indulging in insinuations.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has not stated any question of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, I think, has not stated any point of order, so far as I understand him.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Take your medicine quietly.

Mr. McCARTHY. I rose, Sir, desiring to discuss this question quietly.

Mr. MULOCK. And judicially.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thought it well, before we commenced the discussion of the question proper, that I should point out that the language and the manner in which the leader of the Opposition had invoked the support of his followers, were not such as ought to characterize the discussion of this great question.

Mr. MULOCK. You have got us into a judicial frame of mind now.

Mr. McCARTHY. The last appeal which the hon. gentleman made was especially directed to his own fellow countrymen, and although, perhaps, I am not the best exponent of the views of the fellow countrymen of my hon. friend—and I hardly think they will call upon me or like me to stand as their defender—but, Sir, I do not think that any more insulting reference could have been made to a race or nationality than that which was made by the hon. gentleman himself. Why, Sir, he made an appeal to them to look over the pages of history and to observe that men of their race had, from the earliest times, and long before they passed under the flag of England, been guilty of boodling and corruption which, he said, was perpetrated and exemplified by his fellow countrymen and his fellow citizen, as I understood him to say, of the City of Quebec. Sir, I trust that the members of that race in that province, even from me—and perhaps I am not the best one to say it—even from me would repel and reject an appeal of that kind, and I trust they will not condemn the hon. gentleman who sat upon these benches so long as one of their honoured representatives, because 100 or more years ago, the members of that race had been guilty of corruption in the administration of affairs of the French Province of Quebec. In dealing with this matter it is well to see what charges we have to consider to-night, because when we compare the two reports—and for convenience sake I propose to follow the report which is before the House as the substantive motion—I think it will be found that with respect to many matters, differing as they may as to phraseology, the conclusions arrived at are practically the same. There is no one here left to say a good word for the member for Quebec West. Whatever the charges made against him were, those charges have apparently been established, so that neither the majority nor the minority who have reported to us here have a word to say in his behalf. Every charge practically, I think almost every charge, has been answered in the affirmative against him. We are asked, therefore, not asked merely to consider the position of the late Minister of Public Works, for I frankly say, at the outset, that if this was a question dealing merely with the late Minister of Public Works as a responsible Minister of the Crown and head of the department, I have no word to say in his defence. I think his conduct cannot be defended; I think on the ground of ministerial responsibility, which, under our system of government, we must exact from the heads of the department, it would be impossible to offer here in defence of the late Minister any valid excuse or any defence which this House or any portion of it would entertain. I think so far as that goes there will also be practical unanimity. But we must remember that the hon. gentleman is no longer a member of the Cabinet. We must bear in mind that the hon. gentleman resigned as Minister, though late in the day, and I agree it was late in the day; I agree it would have been better if the hon. gentleman had at once recognized the charges made against him and placed his resignation in the hands of the Premier, for, coming at the stage it did, it only intensified the feeling that the hon. gentleman's case was hopeless and his action was calculated to do him a great deal of damage. But we are asked to go much beyond that. We are asked to find that the hon. gentleman, lately a Minister of the Crown, was personally guilty of corruption, that he was privy to the conspiracy which both reports find to have existed, and by means of which large sums of money have been stolen from the public treasury of this country, whether through Harbour Commissioners or direct from the treasury here is a matter, in my judgment, of but very little moment or difference. It would be mere hair-splitting to draw any distinction as to whether this money came from Harbour Commissioners or direct from the Public Works Department; it was taken from the people, and taken from them in a manner which none of us are prepared to endorse, approve or condone. The important matter which we have to deal with now is, was the late Minister of Public Works a party to that conspiracy; was he privy to it; was he, in other words, the dupe of the conspirators or a participant in the

conspiracy? I propose to deal with this matter in the fairest manner I know how, with a full sense of the responsibility which rests upon me as one of the representatives of the Canadian people, however unworthy, upon the evidence, and not upon mere rhetorical statements, and to ask that the conclusion I arrive at may be adopted by a majority in this House. The matters which invite our consideration are: (1) The dredging contract of 1882; (2) the cross-wall contract of 1883; (3) the supplementary contract with respect to Lévis dock in 1884; (4) the contracts with respect to Esquimalt dock also in 1884; and lastly, the contract for dredging the basin in 1887, being the second dredging contract which the facts show was entered into between the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. and either the Harbour Commissioners or the Public Works Department. The first of these matters may be passed by without much notice. It is not pretended that the late Minister of Public Works had anything to do with the awarding of the first dredging contract by the Harbour Commissioners in 1882. I listened, and I listened with admiration, to the very able speech made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) the other night, and no hon. gentleman on the floor of this House is as capable, or, certainly, more capable of dealing with this question as that hon. gentleman, and he did not pretend, and I do not suppose it will be pretended, that the late Minister had anything at all to do with the dredging contract of 1882. I am not at all justifying the manner in which that contract was awarded; but, as the conduct of the member for Quebec West is no longer a matter of discussion between us, we may pass that by, and, as I am aware the House is already satiated with this debate, I will deal with matters that are really of more consequence in this discussion. Coming, then, to the next matter, the cross-wall contract of the following year, 1883, it is well that I should state what I understand to be the law regulating this question. We have had the law stated by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth); we have had that law ridiculed in a rather severe strain by the hon. member for Queen's, and, although I may be made a subject of criticism, I venture to differ from both hon. gentlemen. Undoubtedly the first Quebec Harbour Commissioners were entrusted with the task of constructing various public works. The Dominion Government agreed, under the authority of Parliament, to advance money to them from time to time, leaving, speaking generally, to them the management and control of that money, for which they became responsible, and which it was hoped—I do not know whether the Minister of Finance entertains any longer a reasonable expectation of receiving it—would be repaid. But there are two exceptions to that general rule. The first exception is to be found in the Act of 1875. By the Act of 1875 the Governor in Council was authorized to raise $500,000 for the completion of a graving dock at Quebec harbour, the size, dimensions, plans, specifications and draft contract to be approved by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Public Works. Stopping here for a moment, let me state to the House what I understand that to mean. The construction of the work was not taken out of the hands of the Harbour Commissioners, but the plans and specifications, the size and dimensions and the draft contract were to be approved by the Governor in Council. But the contract, nevertheless, regarding the graving dock, was to be let and the control of that contract was to rest in the hands of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners. There was a clause, however, inserted in that Act, found there for the first time and repeated in a subsequent enactment, which I find has been misquoted in the report of the minority.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is correct in most of the copies. The word "hereunder" should be inserted instead of the word "hereafter."

Mr. McCARTHY. I took it for granted it was a clerical error. The report says:

"Any money hereafter paid from time to time as the works proceeded, upon the report of the Minister of Public Works as such progress is satisfactory."

The true reading is that any moneys to be "hereunder" paid under this particular Act were to be expended on the report of the Public Works Department that such progress was satisfactory. We pass from 1875 to 1887, or a period of 12 years, and during those years the moneys that had been voted by Parliament prior to 1875, and the money that was voted by Parliament between 1875 and 1887, was not subject to this control, such as it might have been, with the exception of the particular sum that was voted in the Act of 1875 itself. In 1887, however, the money then voted was placed upon the same terms and conditions, and was, I take it—though the language perhaps is not very felicitous—subject to the same control as that imposed by the Act of 1875. When we come to apply the application of money, in the view that I take of the matter, I do not think this will make any very substantial difference. But, Sir, it must never be lost sight of, in fairness to the late Minister of Public Works, that there is a distinction between that money which he controlled himself, the money that was expended by the Public Works Department, and the money which was controlled by the Harbour Commissioners of the City of Quebec which he had only an indirect supervision over, and as far as I can see, to be worked out somewhat in the following way. Take, for instance, the Act of 1875. The plans and specifications, the sizes and the dimensions in this particular work were subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. But the letting of the contract and all that was done under the contract, was controlled by the Harbour Commissioners, although the Minister of Public Works, before this money was put in the hands of the contractors—it is only fair to bear it in mind—and before he paid this money out to the Harbour Commissioners, was bound to see that satisfactory progress was being made with the work. The language of the Act says:

"Upon the report of the Minister of Public Works that such progress is satisfactory."

Now, Sir, there is a manifest distinction between the Minister being responsible to see how the money was paid to Larkin, Connolly & Co, and what would justify the Minister in saying that the money was properly paid over to the Harbour Commissioners because the progress of the work was satisfactory. I think every hon. gentleman will see that distinctly. It may be, and I am afraid it will be found, that the manner in which the Minister executed this authority has involved him in very serious consequences. First and foremost, what was the

unfortunate step that was first taken? On his recommendation the chief engineer of the Public Works Department became engineer of the Harbour Commissioners, so that the man who ought to have exercised the supervision over the Harbour Commissioners was the very man who was performing the duty for the Harbour Commissioners, occupying a dual and somewhat antagonistic position; and on the recommendation of Mr. Perley, the chief engineer, Mr. Boyd, another engineer of the department under him, was employed for the Harbour Commissioners and was also retained as a servant of the Public Works Department, occupying thus unfortunately the same dual and inconsistent position. So that the late Minister of Public Works, if these circumstances have involved him in trouble and difficulties, has only himself to blame, because of the manner in which he sought to carry out the intention of this Act of Parliament. Now, first as to this cross-wall contract of 1883, and I am not going to weary the House; it would be unpardonable that I should do so after the full explanation this matter has undergone from the hon. members who on either side of the House have dealt with it. I do not mean to say that they have all been perfectly correct according to my reading of the evidence, but I think the House is seized of the salient features in relation to the letting of this contract, and I will only repeat them sufficiently for the purpose of the argument which I intend to found upon them. There is no doubt whatever that this contract was obtained by corrupt means. There is no doubt in my mind, and I regret very much to have to say it, that the tender of the firm of Peters & Moore, which was the lowest *bonâ fide* tender, was by means, disreputable and disgraceful to the Public Works Department, made to appear a higher tender than that of Larkin, Connolly & Co. I do not think there is any one can doubt that. I regret it very much, and it was long before I could come to a conclusion, in the absence of an explanation from the late Mr. Boyd who is not here to speak for himself; and it was only after examination of the statement in his own handwriting as proved before the Committee that I arrived at the conclusion reluctantly, that undoubtedly quantities had been filled in in the tenders, quantities which were not honest, which were not the result of his own calculations, but which brought about the result that this tender of Larkin, Connolly & Co. appeared to be $6,000 or thereabouts lower than the tender of Peters & Moore. I do not think any person can defend this. I do hope that when this commission which is to be appointed investigates the work of this department, they will be able to arrive at some scheme by which such a thing as that will be rendered impossible to occur again. I quite understand that lump sum contracts cannot in the public interest be always awarded; but, Sir, if it is in the power of an engineer, by filling in false quantities of the materials, and by moneying out these quantities, to make a *bonâ fide* lower tender appear to be the higher, surely there can be some means devised by which such rascality as that can be prevented in the future. But, Sir, when we come to ask to what extent the Minister is to be responsible for this, I find that the report of the minority only goes this length. At page 27 of the report of the minority we have this finding:

"We find there must have been a conspiracy between McGreevy and some one, or more, of the engineers of the Department of Public Works to procure the contract for Larkin, Connolly & Co., and we find it difficult to absolve the Minister from a knowledge of the existence of that conspiracy."

That is the greatest length to which the minority were able to go. Well, that is a negative finding, and I do not think we can found upon a negative finding, an affirmative verdict of guilty. They cannot see how it is that the hon. gentleman could be free from the knowledge of this conspiracy, and they are unable to give him a certificate of good character with regard to it But, if they start with the presumption of innocence at all, there would not be much difficulty in saying, if that stood alone, that the Minister ought to be absolved. Yet, what was it, Sir? Mr. Boyd having these tenders in his hand moneyed them out upon a schedule, and that schedule was brought to Mr. Perley the chief engineer. Presuming good faith on the part of the Minister, did you expect him or did any person else expect him to sit down and tot up these columns, or to ask about these quantities, or how did you expect that the Minister, thus imposed upon—I am assuming innocence—by his engineers, could discover this fraud? It may be said that the permission to withdraw Gallagher's tender and the suspicious dealings with Beaucage's tender were sufficient to awaken suspicion in the mind of the Minister. While I cannot too strongly condemn a principle which I am afraid has prevailed, not only under the administration of this Minister, but under the administration of other Ministers, that is, permitting tenders to be amended after they are in, and, still worse, permitting tenders to be withdrawn, one significant thing at all events might have aroused the suspicion of Sir Hector Langevin - that is, the audacity of these contractors; for Larkin, Connolly & Co., tendering in their own name, had actually put up Mr. Patrick Larkin's cheque as security for Gallagher's tender. Whether as a matter of fact that was brought to the notice of the Minister, does not appear in the evidence, so far as I am able to discover. If it stood there, however, I do not think any fair-minded man, however much he might, on the principle of ministerial responsibility, condemn Sir Hector Langevin, would say that on that ground he ought to be treated as a criminal and driven with dishonour from public life. Now, let me pass on to the next contract, that is, the one for the completion of the Lévis graving dock, of the 23rd of June, 1884. It must be borne in mind, dealing now merely with the criminal accusation against the late Minister, that there is no charge preferred against him with regard to this Lévis graving dock. If you are going to condemn a man on the report of a Committee which dealt with subjects which were not referred to that Committee, not merely in a parliamentary sense but in a criminal sense, you will be doing a great injustice—an injustice which, I think, when we come to realize it, none of us will be willing to perpetrate. This charge was to this effect, that Mc Greevy had, for a corrupt purpose, induced the Harbour Commissioners—and remember it was the Harbour Commissioners upon whom the responsibility lay—to give a lump sum of $74,000 for the completion of the Lévis graving dock—without consideration, as the hon. member for Queen's puts it,

which I suppose means with reference to the country; but certainly for a very substantial consideration—the difference between $50,000 and the $74,000 so far as Mr. McGreevy is concerned. That is the way that charge was presented, and it was presented near the end of the enquiry after the Minister had made his final explanation. A lot of evidence was put in which throws a great deal of suspicion upon the hon. Minister in connection with the Lévis graving dock from beginning to end; but when we are dealing with this matter in the sense in which we ought to deal with it, are we going to condemn the Minister on a charge which was not brought forward until after the Minister's mouth was closed, so to speak, and condemn him as a criminal on that ground? The hon. member for Bothwell says: No, I do not mean that technically his mouth was closed, for he could have come forward if he had wished to. But I mean that this was not in the formal charges, and he was not summoned by the Committee to answer it. He could have come forward and answered it if he had seen it; but there was not an opportunity given to him to come forward and defend himself from it. But this charge in reference to the Lévis graving dock is not so bad as it is made to appear, even on the scanty evidence which we have before us. What is it? As it may be stated on the stump, it has a very horrid look—that a contract was let in 1887 to complete this work at $380,000, and that nearly $800,000 was paid. But it is not fair to leave the charge there. There is a patent explanation of this transaction which ought to be given before we decide that the Minister should be treated as a criminal. It appeared from the report which my hon. friend from East Toronto read the other night, that a mistake had been made on the part of the engineers. They assumed that where this dock was to be constructed there was a substratum of clay, and made the plans accordingly. Now, it is perfectly clear that the contractors were not to rely upon that—that they were bound to bore for themselves. The specification in substance said to the contractors: The surface on which you are to build the dock is sawdust and sand and clay, but we invite you to inspect it for yourselves; if this is a mistake, remember you are not to hold the Public Works Department responsible, but the consequence will be upon your own head. What is the legal consequence of that? I am not going to give the House my own opinion; but there is a case so exactly in point that I will trouble the House with a short extract from the judgment of the Lord Chancellor of England with regard to it. Exactly the same thing happened with regard to the construction of the Blackfriars Bridge, in London. The engineers supposed that certain works which they designed would be of sufficient strength to enable the contractor to erect the bridge, and the contractor took the contract relying upon the engineers' statement. After commencing the work, he found that it could not be performed without the expenditure of a great deal of money, and that a great deal of money which he had spent was wasted. Therefore he sued the City of London for damages. What were the principles of law to determine that case? First, that there was no warranty on the part of those letting the contract that the work could be performed according to the specifications, and the contractor took that risk upon his own shoulders. But it was also held that where a mistake of that kind was discovered—a mistake as to the character of the soil in this case, and as to the strength of the tide in the other case—the contractor was not compelled to perform an impossibility, but had a right to decline to perform the work; and I do not think he would have been held responsible or bound to perform the work or mulcted in damages for breach of contract, if he had failed to perform it. In other words, the contract was entered into on a mutual mistake, and it would have been unjust and inequitable to enforce it. Then what were his rights? Here is how Lord Cairns dealt with them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman to imply that there is a charge made in the minority report against the Department of Public Works or Sir Hector Langevin with reference to that?

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On the contrary, the minority report says distinctly that there is no evidence of it and they do not pass judgment.

Mr. McCARTHY. It has been commented on in the debate, and the whole story should be told fairly, because it is certainly calculated to create a very bad impression. The rule of law is stated by the Lord Chancellor as follows:—

"It appears to me that, under those circumstances, the appellant must necessarily be in this dilemma, either the additional and varied work which was thus occasioned is the kind of additional work contemplated by the contract, or it is not. If it is the kind of additional or varied work contemplated by the contract, he must be paid for it, and will be paid for it, according to the price regulated by the contract. If, on the other hand, it was additional or varied work, so peculiar, so unexpected and so different from any person reckoned or calculated upon, that it is not within the contract at all; then, it appears to me, one of two courses might have been open to him; he might have said: I entirely refuse to go on with the contract—*Non hæc in fœdera veni:* I never intended to construct this work upon this new and unexpected footing. Or he might have said: I will go on with this, but this is not the kind of work contemplated by the contract, and if I do it, I must be paid a *quantum meruit* for it. Or, for ought I know, for I wish to express no opinion upon the subject, having gone on with it, he might now, if this is not extra work within the contract, have maintained a proceeding for remuneration upon a *quantum meruit* for the extra work he so did."

That is a clear statement of the law and of the position in which Larkin, Connolly & Co. and the commissioners found themselves. Larkin, Connolly & Co. had a right to say: We will not go on; it is impossible for us to go on; the works you designed, the wing walls you designed with reference to a certain supposed substratum, which does not exist, cannot be constructed upon these specifications; but we will go on with it by day work, or go on and leave you to pay us what is fair and reasonable. No person knows, so far as this evidence discloses, on what terms and under what conditions this work was proceeded with up to 1884 when the supplementary contract was let. All we know is that $140,000 beyond the contract price was paid, whether rightly or wrongly we do not know; but as there is no charge concerning it we have no right to assume it was wrongly paid. When we come to 1884, what do we find? We find the contractors doing the work by day and being paid a certain percentage on the amount expended by them as their profit—I think 15 per cent.; we find that they were approached by Mr. McGreevy or that

they approached him, and that they said to him: If you can procure us a lump sum for the additional work, we will give you all over $50,000. The result was he got them $74,000, and another new contract was entered into for the surplus work on that basis. In what respect does the responsibility attach itself to the Minister of Public Works there? If he had pursued his ordinary course, if he had not desired to monopolize authority which did not belong to him, he ought to have had nothing to do with this contract which did not come within the purview and control of the department at all. All the department had to do with regard to the graving dock was to make the plans and specifications and define the site, and then it remained with the Harbour Commissioners to carry out the work. But the Minister was not satisfied with that; and the unfortunate position he took in appointing Mr. Perley as chief engineer for both works was found then, for the first time, to work mischief. What do we find? We find that, on the advice of Mr. Perley, the Minister of Public Works agreed to this contract. He got the Council to agree to it upon the understanding that there was to be no claim for extras in the future, that the $74,000 was to be in full, and that one portion of the work was to be done by the close of the season of 1884 and the balance was to be finished, I forget at what time, and that all the difficulties and perils were to be at the risk of the contractors. I am sorry to differ from my hon. friends on this side, but, so far as I can judge, I think the statement of this contract given by the hon. member for Queen's the other night was correct. The supplemental contract carried on the original contract and was founded upon the original contract; and the contractors agreed for a bulk sum, making in the aggregate $577,020.43, to do the whole work and complete it, and they acknowledge in that amount is comprised the first sum of $330,973.89, the $40,659.74 already paid, the $141,326 already paid, and the $64,080 agreed to be paid, and the $10,000 for caisson. The whole sum is $577,020.43, and deducting therefrom $407,911.33, left to be paid $169,109.10. No doubt the Minister of Public Works made himself responsible for that contract, and it is impossible for him to escape the responsibility. Whether that was a good contract, whether it was too much or too little it merely depended on what may or may not have been known to the Minister. The only evidence we have is that the contractors were told the work could be completed for $43,000. They said to Mr. McGreevy: We will give you everything beyond $50,000. That is the evidence. Mr. Perley recommended it. The Harbour Commissioners relied in the first place on Mr. Perley, the Minister relied on the Harbour Commissioners. Was Mr. Perley honest in that recommendation? Was that a fraudulent misrepresentation of his, and if it was did the Minister know it? It does not follow that because there were some underhand dealings among the contractors—and they seem never to have done anything in an honest way from beginning to end—that Mr. Perley is to be condemned or that the Minister is to be condemned. But I confess I am unable to understand on what principle the further payments were made. I find, figuring out the money, that there was $169,000 to go to the contractor when all the work was done, and I take it that was to cover every claim for extras in connection with that work. Of course, if there were claims for extras outside of that work, they would have to be dealt with on their own merits.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The minute of Council says in express terms that there was to be no claims for extras.

Mr. McCARTHY. It says extras "for the future;" and there was paid before the final account was presented the sum of $154,000, leaving only $14,504 due. Nevertheless the engineer certified for $74,000; and after that this preposterous claim, the most preposterous claim that in all my experience I have heard of—the claim for $110,000 as damages while their plant was lying idle and they were doing this work—was presented, and that claim was entertained by Mr. Perley; and I would like to know what his excuse or pretense was for entertaining it. First he said I advised $30,000 to be paid for that. Then being pressed, he offered $35,000 more, and in the end $65,000 was paid. I certainly have no desire whatever to say a word against Mr. Perley, who unfortunately was not able to finish his examination, or to hound down the late Minister of Public Works, but I am unable to find any explanation with regard to that, and all I can say in regard to it is that I think we ought to suspend our judgment until the late Minister can say what he has to say in reference to it. For my part I am not satisfied, but, according to British fair-play, I do not think we should condemn the Minister on a charge of this kind without giving him an opportunity of making a defence. Now I come to the contract with regard to the Esquimalt dock, and, if there is any subject with which this House is familiar, I think it is the Esquimalt dock, and I think that those gentlemen who have not been in the House or in the Committee will find it all recorded in the *Hansard*. I have read the speeches of the hon. members for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) and Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) and the speech of my hon. friend on the other side, and I think the whole matter is in possession of the House. Briefly it is this: The Minister declined to give this contract to Baskerville & Co. in the early part of 1884. He declined to give that contract after he had authorized Mr. Perley to give the contract, provided Baskerville & Co. would reduce the amount they had tendered for, and they agreed to that, reducing it by some $50,000, as far as I remember.

Mr. MULOCK. They did do that.

Mr. McCARTHY. I say they agreed to do it, and, so far as their side of the matter was concerned, they were willing to enter upon it on those terms. That made their contract price less than the amount of the contract which was afterwards let in the fall of the same year. It is said that the Minister went to Quebec the following morning, and there is evidence given by a discredited witness. It is true—I admit that his testimony has generally something to support him, that as a general thing it is corroborated, and it is only where it has not been corroborated that it has been rejected. It is not corroborated here, but it is not expressly denied, and Mr. Murphy says, that he saw the Minister in Quebec and that he said: "Cannot we get the contract between Starrs & O'Hanly and Baskerville & Co.? I hear one has tendered too high and the other too low," and he intimated that he was willing to give a quarter of

the profits he did not say to the Minister, but to somebody. It is clear that we cannot exclude the fact, that the contract was not let to Baskerville & Co., and that no satisfactory explanation has been made in regard to that, and that a new calculation was made, for my hon. friend who leads the Opposition was entirely inaccurate in regard to that, though perhaps he was justified in his statement by Perley's report. Mr. Perley said that, in response to complaints made by the British Columbia Government, who complained that the Government here were delaying the work Sir Alexander Campbell had agreed to enter upon, Mr. Perley was called on and made a report and new specifications were made by Mr. Bennett. The difference was that Mr. Perley asked for masonry instead of concrete.

Mr. MULOCK. But the Baskervilles substituted rubble for concrete.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said so.

Mr. LAURIER. It was an alternative matter.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was referring to Perley's report as written for the British Columbia Government or for the Minister, in order that he might give an answer to the British Columbia Government.

Mr. LAURIER. I quoted from the report made for this House last year.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend is quite wrong in that. That was only a summary of what took place years before, but I am referring to the report which was made at the time to enable this Government to answer the British Columbia Government. It appeared to me that, in judging a fellow member, the hon. gentleman might have been a little more particular in enquiring into the evidence, but I am quite sure that he made his statement in good faith, and that it was only a slip. When we come to the letting of the contracts, the Minister's conduct becomes still more extraordinary. I need not read it and I am willing to deal fairly by it, I need not read this report to Council recommending that Starrs & O'Hanly should have the contract. Everyone who reads it will see that every line of it is intended to induce Council to reject that contract, and probably the last clause was altered because Council did not agree to do that. At all events, it was altered so as to recommend that Starrs & O'Hanly's tender should be accepted. But every clause of the report, stating that they were not contractors that the Government should deal with, that they had offered to put up another sum, that they had offered to strengthen themselves, and so on, tends to the conclusion that the Minister's mind went in the direction of rejecting that tender. In the end, and by the means the House is aware of, the contract was awarded to Larkin & Connolly, and Starrs & O'Hanly were, so to speak, crowded out. From that time, the most serious case against the Minister is presented. It is impossible for me to disregard the letter written by Mr. R. H McGreevy on the Sunday before the cotract was let. I will read it:

"QUEBEC, SUNDAY, 2 p.m.

"(*Private.*)

"MY DEAR SIR,—The memo. of yesterday *re* British Columbia dock is with the Minister. He says that those conditions cannot be embodied in the contract, as it will be the same one as submitted to O'Hanly & Starrs, and it would not do to make it different; but he says that all what's asked is so fair that there will be no trouble in obtaining them, especially the $50,000 material one—however, you are to urge them just as if nothing had transpired; of course, it's for you and partners to say if you will sign without them being embodied. Politics changes; so does Ministers. I will be back Tuesday. My address will be St. Lawrence Hall, Montreal.

"I remain yours,

"R. H. McGREEVY."

Now it is impossible to suppose that that letter is relating a fiction. There must have been a memorandum and that memorandum must have been brought to the Minister by somebody. By whom was it brought? It could only have been brought by Mr. Thomas McGreevy, and that memorandum, relating to the plant, was to the effect that the Minister, notwithstanding the tender, notwithstanding the language he had used a day or two before to Starrs & O'Hanly, that the full $50,000 would have to be paid, would only call upon them to pay for so much of that as they would be required to use. And we find that from the very day that these gentlemen go to British Columbia, they act as if nothing had transpired, and they at once object to taking over this material. They object to take it. Mr. Trutch says, you must take it. He hands them over the whole $50,000 worth. I am not saying it was worth $50,000; I do not think it makes the slightest difference if it was not worth $5. He hands it all over with the exception of $10.50. They at once commence to remonstrate, but they only object to take $12,000 worth. So they keep on harping throughout the summer, and the correspondence is all here, about this $50,000 worth of plant. In the end, what happens? Mr. Perley reports that they have no choice about it, that it is an absolute condition of the contract, that they must take it at $50,000: they have got to take it for better or for worse, it is the contract, it is the condition upon which the tenders were let, that they had a right to enquire into its value before they made their tender, but now they are bound to take it. Let me follow up the history of this $50,000. This having been certified to and approved by Mr. Trutch, and communicated by him to the contractors, Mr. Perley visits British Columbia in the fall of 1885; he returns in the month of December of the same year; he is at once seen by one of the Connollys, who reports that Mr. Perley, from his conversation, talks as if everything was to be made right, and on the 18th January Mr. Perley makes a report to this effect: That he has seen this plant, that it was comparatively worthless, that it was not such as ought to have been forced upon the contractors originally, and that for his part he does not think this matters much, he is satisfied it will come into consideration at the making of the final estimate. At least you will find in the letters produced from Mr. Perley's own book, that he sends to the engineers in the month of January, 1886, a list of articles, and he asks them to write down on this list what they are willing to pay for what they take, and return it to him; and based upon that, he says, upon his own responsibility, he makes up his report, and he allows for that nearly $20,000 off, which certainly they had no more right to than I have, or any other member of this House. Now, that is so far as Mr. Perley goes. Then, what is the position of the Minister with regard to that? The Minister has Mr. Perley's report; but the Minister also has in addition, or he ought to have before him, the early statements, the early correspondence that took place, in which

they had refused to allow to these contractors any deduction or abatement whatever on account of that. But the Minister, we are to believe, did not know anything about that. Now, upon that, I confess, I have some doubt. Looking at Mr. Perley's evidence, what does he say? Mr. Perley says it is true that he accepts the full responsibility for it. What does that mean? He does not accept full responsibility with regard to the re-coursing with stone, but his report for the re-coursing of stone is just as strong as the report for the allowance of stone. What does he mean by that expression? The point is, did the Minister know of it? Now, let me see what the Minister says about that, because I think something ought to turn upon the Minister's own statement about it. The Minister makes a deliberate statement with regard to that, and his statement will be found in the evidence which is before the House, and which I need not detain the House by quoting with exactness. The result of it is this: That the Minister does not, in the first place, specifically deny, though he does after cross-examination, but the Minister assumes and argues in his statement that his chief engineer has accepted that responsibility, and he points to the page in his evidence where it is to be found, and arguing upon that he says the engineer did wrong, or ought to have brought it to his notice, and that he ought to have been consulted about it. It is true that subsequently, upon cross-examination, and the matter being put squarely to him, he does say that he did not know anything about it. Mr. Perley is careful to refuse to swear that the Minister did not know it. He accepts the full responsibility, he says he accepts all the responsibility, but he is careful to say that the Minister had not knowledge of it at the time at which Mr. Perley permitted this to be made. I think I have stated that charge correctly. Now, with regard to the re-coursing of stone. That re-coursing of stone, we all know, was permitted upon the distinct understanding that it should not be dealt with as an extra. That was the distinct bargain with regard to the re-coursing of stone. It was certified to by Mr. Trutch and Mr. Bennett as being a change which, in their opinion, was unobjectionable. But until this enquiry was made, until Perley was put on the stand before the Committee, no engineer certified it was an improvement; and I have very grave doubts whether it was an improvement. I do not mean to say it was not a stronger wall, but I do mean to say it is very doubtful in my mind whether the specification that the English engineers, Kinipple & Morris, had provided in the first place was not amply sufficient for the purpose. However, that may be, giving Mr. Perley the benefit of that doubt, giving the Minister the benefit of that doubt, I am unable to see upon what pretense they allowed the $27 a yard for it. It is quite plain that the work, if called for as done, would not have been charged for at anything like $27 a yard. Mr. Perley has pointed out in his report that, for three stones, as he put it, more should be paid than for two, and, therefore, if they put in a third stone they should be entitled to charge more. We can all understand, taking a stone of a cubic foot, it will take 27 of these to fill up the space of a cubic yard. If each stone is to be dressed upon five sides, it will be found that the dressing would be equivalent, in the one case, to 45 feet, and with the 27 stones, to 135 feet, besides the additional handling and the additional cement. Now, I am not able to understand how the engineer, according to his own argument, and approving of it as being a better job for which the country should pay, having evidence before him of Baskerville's tender that that work could be done for $16 a yard, and having the report of Kinipple & Morris—that the work was not worth more than $14 or $16 a yard. Here is the report of Kinipple & Morris:

"As to substitution of solid stone in deck walls in lieu of stone and concrete, my firm were the first to introduce into Canada Portland cement concrete as backing of quay walls behind stone face, in lieu of solid stone walls which cost from $12 to $16 per cubic yard, while a stone and concrete wall of equal durability and strength only costs from $6 to $8 per cubic yard. The latter class of work has been most successful in the harbour and graving dock works at Quebec. It was at first supposed that the severe climate of the Province of Quebec would be very injurious to a stone and concrete wall, but it is not found to be the case. Should Canada take advantage of this experience, she may in the future save some millions of dollars in the carrying out of her public works."

Mr. Perley writes on the 20th April, 1885:

"What I wish to convey in the above is that as the contractors suggested a change in the dimensions of the stone they have no right to be paid for any extra stone supplied. If they are permitted to place two courses of stone instead of three it follows that they save the dressing of two beds, the setting of one course and the saving of the cement, besides the saving in handling a fewer number of stones."

So we know perfectly well that this price of $27 per yard should not have been allowed, and we find Mr. Perley, without remonstrance or suggestion, asking the Minister to allow that price, and the Minister agreeing to that request. These are two grave charges in connection with the Esquimalt dock, and I can only say, to my mind, there has been no very satisfactory explanation about them, and no one which it can be pretended is any justification or defence. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) thought this interview with Mr. McGreevy was the same one Larkin spoke about, because it must not be forgotten that Larkin spoke to Sir Hector Langevin in the presence of Perley about the plant, and that he and Perley had words about it, in the presence of the Minister, and Larkin left with the understanding that the Minister was to look into it, whatever that implied. So the whole thing was in the mind of the Minister, and he has not very satisfactorily accounted for his granting his permission to pay this sum to the contractors. Undoubtedly in that respect, to the extent of $41,000, which the Minister himself states was the difference between the re-coursing of stone and the stone contracted for, the Minister is responsible. There remains the charge of dredging and the charge of dredging is one for which the Minister at all events should not be deemed in the first place responsible. The charge is that Larkin, Connolly & Co. agreed to take 32 cents and allow 3 cents out of 35 cents a yard for political purposes. This charge is proved. They were awarded the contract at 35 cents. It is said the Harbour Commissioners were responsible, and a good deal of controversy raged across the House with respect to the responsibility of the Minister on that account. In my opinion I do not think the Harbour Commissioners are so much to blame. It was provided that they were to get 35 cents a cubic yard for dredging and placing the material dredged on the embankment, or wherever else the Harbour Commissioners de-

sired it, not dumping it into the river. Mr. Perley in one report says it is alternative. Read the contract, and you will see it is not so. The work was to be continued during the summer, the cost was not to exceed $100,000 and the material dredged was to be placed on the embankment or at such other place as the Harbour Commissioners required. Instead of that, and in spite of it, the Harbour Commissioners, whether Mr. McGreevy was the instrument of the Minister or not, no matter how the department and the chairman of the Commission may differ as to their evidence, there is no dispute of the fact that against the protest of the Harbour Commissioners these contractors continued to dredge in 1888 and 1889, not merely to dredge at those rates, but to take and dump the material in the river, earning 20 cents or 22 cents per cubic yard while the Harbour Commissioners were paying 35 cents. There is no question about that fact. The value of the work is not seriously in dispute. If they had received 27 cents, the price they had before, it must be remembered that Boyd deducted 5 cents per cubic yard for the quantity of material they put in the river. Peters swore that 7 or 8 cents would be a fair sum.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Nicholas Connolly said 4 or 5 cents.

Mr. McCARTHY. No doubt 22 cents per cubic yard would have been the very outside price; yet for the bulk of the material dredged and dumped into the river there were paid 35 cents, and the balance put on the embankment was paid at the higher rate of 45 cents in addition. Who is responsible? I utterly repudiate the doctrine that the Minister of Public Works is responsible in the first instance. This was money to be paid over by the Minister to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners and by them to be expended, and unless you can go further than charging the Minister with his responsibility under the Act of Parliament, unless you are able to bring home to the Minister the fact that he was in complicity with the engineer who permitted this nefarious job to be carried out, you cannot convict the Minister of any impropriety on that ground. These are the simple facts; I have not misstated them, certainly not intentionally; I have not favoured the Minister on the one hand, or stated the case too strongly on the other. It is perfectly true there is not one tittle of positive evidence against Sir Hector Langevin. The only direct charge of corruption has been ignored by both reports. It is not for us to sit in judgment on the reports, and no one proposes to reverse the reports. But we have to deal with the conclusions to be drawn from the evidence taken. We have thus been dealing with the Minister in regard to the Esquimalt dock, for which he was responsible; we have also been dealing with him in regard to the Quebec dock, for which he is more or less responsible according as the evidence indicates to the mind of the members that degree of responsibility which would fasten criminality on him.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What motive does the hon. gentleman find in regard to that expenditure?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not quite follow the hon. gentleman. I find a motive as regards Larkin, Connolly and Mr. McGreevy, and as regards them it is plain sailing. How the Harbour Commissioners permitted themselves to be made use of in 1888 and 1889, I do not understand. Mr. Dobell tells us he protested; he produced the minutes to show that his statement was true; but beyond a mere protest, they seemed to have been powerless. As the hon. gentleman for Queen's (Mr. Davies) argued, some over-powering influence, some controlling power seemed to have been determining this matter, and the Harbour Commissioners had no recourse. I cannot help saying that this has been a most unfortunate division of authority. The Act of 1875, which placed the Harbour Commissioners under the authority of the Dominion Government, seems to have deprived them of the substantial reality of power. Five of them were nominated by the Minister of Public Works; they became, in a certain sense, his creatures; they did not realize they had the full sense of responsibility resting on them, and they were looking to the Minister, and so long as he was satisfied, they did not seem to think much was to be done by them. I have arrived at this conclusion, and it is the only safe one to be reached, that Mr. Perley is the man who can tell the truth if he is thoroughly examined. Either Mr. Perley defrauded or duped the Minister, or Mr. Perley was the tool of the Minister. There is no escape from one of these conclusions. We must all condemn Mr. Perley's acts. Mr. Perley must have succeeded, if the Minister is innocent, in hoodwinking him; and hon. gentlemen will say that he was too skilful an administrator to be hoodwinked, and that his conduct in the House and at the head of the department for many years proved it. On the other hand, it will be said that he had very rightly confidence in the officers in the department on whose characters up to that time no stain rested. But this is clear, that Mr. Perley can tell, if he makes a clean breast of it, who is the responsible man. But unfortunately at the very critical moment Mr. Perley was struck down with illness and has never been able to be recalled to the stand. At the very moment when Mr. Perley was undergoing searching questioning with respect to the Esquimalt dock, the cross-wall contract, these tenders and alterations, he was struck down, and I understand he never has been in a condition to be recalled, and at all events, never has been recalled. Is it fair to condemn Mr. Perley, whose story has never been finished? Is it fair or decent? He was there without counsel to defend him, and without an opportunity being offered to have any one to speak on his behalf; and have we the manliness left to say that this man shall be condemned until his story has been heard? Are you going to say that the Minister, upon the incomplete evidence of the most important witness, is to be treated as a criminal and driven with dishonour from his place in this House and the position he occupies in this country; or is it not fair and reasonable and proper that we should suspend our judgment until the prosecutions which these reports recommend will be carried out, and until these witness are brought into court? Then I believe, and then only, can the truth be found, and then only will it be brought home to us all whether Perley was the tool of the Minister, or whether the Minister was the dupe of Perley. I am not prepared at this stage of the enquiry to say one thing or the other, and I do not think it would be fair for us to do so. I there-

fore conclude with offering to the House the solution which I suggest is the proper one that we should reach in this matter. I move, Sir :

That all the words of the amendment be struck out and the main motion amended by adding the following words thereto: "with the exception of all the words contained in the concluding observations of the Report, on page 768 of the Votes and Proceedings, which, in the opinion of this House, should be struck out for the following reasons:—

1. That from the facts which were made to appear before the Committee and reported to the House in support of and in relation to the charges which it was its duty to investigate, the House is convinced that in many of the dealings of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. with the Public Works Department and of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, gross frauds have been perpetrated and the public have thereby been defrauded out of large sums of money.

2. That these wrongs were accomplished by means of a conspiracy on the part of the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. and Thomas McGreevy, a member of this House, and some one or more of the officers of the Public Works Department.

3. That owing to the unfortunate illness of Mr. Perley, which rendered it impossible for the Committee to finish his examination, this House does not feel that it ought, in the absence of his complete evidence, to pronounce decisively as to his complicity or otherwise in the conspiracy which the Committee finds to have existed, or to determine who among the other officials of the department participated therein.

This House, for the like reason, and because respecting some of the matters as to which evidence was given, more especially that relating to the supplemental contract for the completion of the Lévis graving dock of 1884, no charge had been made against the late Minister of Public Works, and the evidence in respect thereof is incomplete, feel unable to decide whether the conduct of the Minister in approving and sanctioning the various contracts with Larkin, Connolly & Co., the indulgences granted to them in the performance thereof, and the over-payment made in accordance therewith, is to be ascribed to a blind confidence in the integrity and efficiency of his chief engineer, even in that view scarcely to be distinguished from weakness almost criminal, or to a guilty connivance in the spoliation of the public treasury, which ought to be characterized by very different language.

4. That as no specific charge of this nature was made against the late Minister, this House, while compelled to call attention to this view of the matter, does not think that it is required to reach any more definite conclusion on the subject.

In addition to the foregoing reasons the House has no hesitation in recording its opinion that, judged by the well-known constitutional rule which makes the Minister responsible to Parliament for the administration of the department over which he presides, the late Minister of Public Works, irrespective of the considerations dealt with in the last preceding paragraph, cannot be absolved from his ministerial responsibility, and in that regard merits the censure of this House.

And the House recommends that in addition to such action as may seem to be called for under the findings hereinbefore expressed, such legal proceedings as may be available be taken against those who were concerned in the conspiracy, and for that purpose the books and papers which were before the Committee be retained or so many of them as may be necessary for such prosecution.

Finally, the House desires to record its conviction that the enquiry directed by the House has been rendered unsatisfactory, incomplete and in some respects abortive by what the House cannot help characterizing as the wilful perjury of some of the witnesses examined before it, and the House recommends that Nicholas K. Connolly and Michael Connolly and such other witnesses as the law officers may advise that there is evidence on which indictments for perjury should be preferred, be prosecuted therefor.

Now, Sir, in concluding, I only desire to make this observation. I approach this matter in no party sense. I deny any party responsibility for the action I am taking here, and I understand that, dealing with a question coming from a Committee on Privileges and Elections, it ought not to assume a party character on the floor of this Chamber. If the Committee are bound to dispose of this according to their conscience, so are the members of this House, upon whom the ultimate responsibility must rest, and I have endeavoured so far as I could—I dare say very feebly, I dare say without the thoroughness with which many other hon. members have accomplished the same object—I have endeavoured to arrive at what I believe to be a just conclusion upon this important and difficult question. But, Sir, I have this to say: that, if it indeed did involve the fate of my friends whom I am glad here to support; if indeed it did involve their fate, I should not hesitate to take the same course as I have taken here to-night, because, Sir, if this young nation is to be saved and to be preserved, it must be that this House in its might will rise and say with one united voice, that whether the man be high or low—and the greater his responsibility and the higher his position, the more we ought to say—that judgment and justice, no matter how severe that judgment may be, shall be rendered to him. No matter what the consequences might be to my friends, I shall vote as I propose to do in support of the resolution I have offered now to the House.

Mr. CURRAN. Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to offer the few remarks I have to make on this important matter, I desire to state to the House, how deeply I regret, that during the last session of Parliament I should have been made the instrument by which a false declaration was read to this House on behalf of the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy), who misled me by his statements, and convinced me at that time that there was no charge that could be sustained against him, and thus induced me to read that document which has since been proved to have been utterly without foundation. Having made this statement, that is all that I shall say in that connection. The sub-amendment now before the House has been preceded by an address which to my mind hardly leads to the conclusion which the hon. gentleman has asked this House to arrive at. I have listened with very great attention to the sub-amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and to the remarks which he has just made—not to my mind in support of it at all. I must confess that I cannot see upon what grounds he can urge us to arrive at his conclusion, in view of the observations which he himself has made. While in some respects he differed from the report of the majority, in most instances he followed very closely the reasoning in the report of the Committee; and certainly, with regard to the Lévis graving dock, he conclusively showed that there was no charge before this House which the hon. Minister of Public Works could be called upon to answer. If that be the case—because certain documents were put in the hands of the Committee at the very tail end of the investigation—documents which I, though a member of the Committee, never saw until several days after the proceedings had closed—if there was not only no charge against the Minister in connection with that matter, but if the evidence never came to his knowledge, as it certainly never came to the knowledge of the Committee who were to try him, why not let the matter drop altogether, as one which is entirely irrelevant, and not make it the subject of a motion or an amendment which merely involves further trouble and complication in a question already sufficiently complicated? The hon. gentleman has spoken not only of the Lévis graving dock, but he has given a great deal of attention to the contract in British Columbia.

It was not my intention to have said anything upon the subject of the British Columbia contract, because it appeared to me that the report of the Committee was entirely clear and conclusive, and just on that subject based as it was upon the evidence of Mr. Perley, upon his own admission, upon the letters written, upon all the instructions given in the department from beginning to end—all winding up not only with the report of Mr. Perley, but with the solemn statement that he took the full and absolute responsibility of having awarded the amount which was allowed for the plant ; and even according to the statement of the hon. member for North Simcoe, the evidence is entirely insufficient and inconclusive as regards the hon. Minister of Public Works. Why, I ask again, should there be a further investigation ? Why should there be further complication ? Why should we go still further into the matter when this admission is made, and when under the rule applicable to all criminal cases—and this is virtually a criminal charge—there is always a presumption of innocence until guilt is proved ? There being no guilt proved, even according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, the benefit of all doubt should be given to the hon. gentleman whose reputation is now at stake. We have further in this amendment a statement that Mr. Perley, the chief engineer, should not be condemned at the present time—that it would be unfair to his character, on account of his having succumbed to a sudden attack of illness before he was able to conclude his testimony, not to allow him to come forward and state fully and frankly all that took place, and establish one of two things—whether he was the tool of the Minister, or whether the Minister was his dupe. I say it is very unfortunate that an hon. gentleman should raise these difficulties where there is not the slightest necessity for them. In so far as the guilt of Mr. Perley is concerned, unfortunately for that gentleman, who stood so high in the estimation of the public at large, and in the confidence of the Government, there is ample evidence to condemn him, altogether outside of the British Columbia contract, altogether ouside of any of these contracts, in the fact that he accepted and acknowledged to have received, as mentioned in the report of the minority as well as of the majority, a present of $1,800, and that although he felt he had done wrong, he never returned the amount. Besides that, under the principles which govern in such matters, but more especially in view of the fact that in one of the contracts which we are now called upon to consider special mention is made upon this very subject, which he could not have ignored. The clause to which I refer is as follows :—Extract from the specifications for the construction of the Lévis graving dock :

"Should the contractor, at any time, offer or present any gratuity, in cash or kind or otherwise, to the engineer, the resident engineer, or their assistants, clerks of works, inspectors, or other servants of the commissioners or engineer, the commissioners shall be at full liberty, if they deem it advisable, to put an end to the contract."

Then the practice of receiving presents was not only condemned on general principles, but we have the special understanding written in the contract that such presents should not be given or accepted. Why, therefore, should we waste any more time in considering this unfortunate matter ? It is as clear as noon-day. The hon. gentleman also says that we should not only adopt the proceeding which has been suggested by the report of the majority, but that we should proceed to take measures to bring to the bar of justice for perjury, Nicholas Connolly and Larkin and Michael Connolly and such others as the law officers may advise. Well, for my part, I must say that when names were mentioned by the hon. gentleman, I cannot for the life of me conceive why he did not begin with those whom nobody believes except when their testimony is corroborated by other evidence. There is not in the speech which the hon. gentleman has delivered one suggestion as to what the particular point is upon which any of those gentlemen have perjured themselves. It has not been pointed out, as it should have been, to the satisfaction of this House, when this recommendation is made, especially as it varies the conclusion of the two reports before the House, anything upon which to base their action. Special acts of perjury, more especially with regard to those who have been mentioned, should have been indicated before we are called upon to adopt such action in contradistinction to the report of the majority, which has arrived at the conclusion, from the evidence, that a conspiracy was formed, and that the conspirators should be prosecuted according to law. Upon each then of those points, I do not think the hon. gentleman has given us good grounds for varying our action from that suggested either in the one report or the other, that we have been considering up to the present. I shall, therefore, proceed to give my view as briefly as I can upon the case generally, and state the reasons I have for arriving at the conclusion that the report of the majority of the Committee is that which should be adopted. It is unnecessary to say that I agree with the majority of those who have spoken that we cannot place any reliance on the evidence of a man like Murphy, who has admitted that he is a fugitive from justice, that he was an embezzler, that he commenced by embezzling $20,000, that he then embezzled $30,000, and then came to Canada and tried to embezzle the $10,000 remaining in the fund of which he was treasurer in the City of New York. He tells us himself that, since coming here, in the carrying out of these works, he has stopped at nothing. He swears that he corrupted the inspectors of works carried on at Quebec. He tells us that he made a present or a loan to Mr. Lightfoot, we do not know exactly what for. I am satisfied Mr. Lightfoot is perfectly innocent of any criminality whatever, but there is no doubt in my mind that in making that loan, Murphy was laying a scheme to make use of that young man on a future occasion, should necessity arise. He also swears, and everybody believes falsely, that he corrupted the Minister of Public Works by paying him on two occasions a sum of $5,000. Now, the other witness, Robert McGreevy, is a man whose evidence we cannot regard with anything but suspicion. The least we can say of him is that he is a fratricidal witness. Both those witnesses avowed that their evidence was not given in the public interest, that their action was not taken because they felt shocked at the conduct of Mr. Thomas McGreevy or because they felt shocked that any public officer should have acted contrary to his duty or oath of office, but because they felt that the day was gone by when they could get any more contracts, and they were

determined to have revenge. Therefore we have to consider with grave suspicion the evidence of these men who know too much, and unfortunately we are met on the other side by the evidence of men who know too little, who appear not to know anything at all on a great many important points with which they should be familiar. I propose to deal with the report of the hon. gentlemen opposite as regards the dredging contract and to point out where I think they are inaccurate in their finding. I would not suppose that either of those gentlemen would put his name to a document which he did not believe in every respect to be true, but I am satisfied that the magnitude of the task, with the multiplicity of work they had to attend to outside of the drawing of that report, was such as to render them unable to give it the attention it deserved, and thus on several important points they have decidedly erred. The allegation is:

"That the Honourable Thomas McGreevy, being a member of the Parliament of Canada, and a member of the Quebec Harbour Commission, entered into an agreement with Larkin, Connolly & Co., after they had tendered for the dredging contract of 1882, by which, in consideration of their taking his brother, Robert H. McGreevy, into partnership with them, and giving him an interest to the extent of 30 per cent. in the work tendered for, he agreed to give and did give them in an undue manner his help and influence in order to secure to them the said contract.

"That to this end he, the said Thomas McGreevy, undertook to secure the dismissal of Messrs. Kinipple, Morris and Pilkington from their positions, and that they were so dismissed and replaced by Henry F. Perley and John E. Boyd."

The finding by Messrs. Mills and Davies is:

"Looking at all the evidence and comparing the correspondence, written at the time, we find: That Thomas McGreevy did corruptly lend his influence as a member of Parliament and as a member of the Board of Harbour Commissioners, in order to secure the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. the contract, and to procure for them undue and improper concessions afterwards, and that he did this in consideration of the said firm having taken his brother Robert into partnership with them, and giving him an interest to the extent of 30 per cent."

Both reports agree that this interest of 30 per cent. was proven. I am satisfied that Mr. Thomas McGreevy knew that his brother had an interest, but there is no proof, that I can find, establishing that he knew he had 30 per cent. interest. On the contrary, I am satisfied that Thomas McGreevy thought, as he swore, that R. H. McGreevy, his brother, was a kind of contract-broker or peddler of contracts, and was making a certain sum of money out of these people; but he never imagined that he had accumulated the wealth he had in connection with these contracts. In fact, we have his own statement in regard to what he believed, and there is no reason to disbelieve that statement. Mr. Robert H. McGreevy was a factotum for him; he was very humble, he was lying low and keeping dark, but he felt his day would come, and he thought it had arrived in 1888, when, according to Thomas McGreevy, it dawned upon his mind that he should become one of the directors in the Richelieu Company. Mr. McGreevy says:

"It was at the end of 1888 or the commencement of 1889 before the elections took place, that in February some person told me that my brother was trying to get on the Board of the Richelieu Company. I think it was Mr. Michael Connolly, who told me. He was a director at the time, and we were on our way from one of the meetings of the board when he said to me that Robert McGreevy was trying to become a director. I said to Mr. Connolly, 'what business has he to go there; he does not own any stock or has any money to put into investments; he is too much in debt and has no right to go there.' I said further that I thought it was to create a division by putting a number of the then directors off. I stated at the time that some of the other directors would think that I was intriguing to get some of them off the board, and I was very much annoyed about it.

Q. You have just stated that the first difficulty between you and your brother, arose out of a statement which had been made to you by Michael Connolly, to the effect that your brother sought election as a director of the Richelieu Company?—A. Yes.

Q. And you thought that was impossible, as he had no means to buy stock nor was he then in possession of the stock which would give him an interest in the affairs of the company?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you then say to Michael Connolly, and what did Michael Connolly say to you on that subject? Did he give you to understand that you were in error about your brother's means?—A. He disclosed to me that Robert McGreevy was a partner in the firm, and had a large amount of money there in the company; that he was speculating with Murphy in the stock of the company.

Q. He then said you were in error as to the financial condition of your brother?—A. Yes, and that he was a partner in the firm.

Q. He then stated that fact to you for the first time?—A. For the first time.

Q. And you say that was in 1888 or the beginning of 1889?—A. Coming down from a meeting of the directors of the Richelieu Company.

Q. Did you have any conversation with your brother subsequently?—A. Yes, the next time I met him I reproached him for the whole thing, in my office at Quebec, and we quarrelled about it, and I said some very hard things to him. We never spoke since that day, or never had any conversation.

So that Robert McGreevy was interested, Thomas McGreevy knew it, but he did not know to what extent. The minority report goes on to state in reference to the dismissal of Kinipple & Morris:

"The works of the Lévis graving dock, and those of the Quebec harbour, were under the direction of a firm of London engineers, Messrs. Kinipple & Morris, whose plans had been adjudged the best after public competition. Messrs. Kinipple & Morris' resident engineer was Mr. Woodford Pilkington.

"The contractors had frequent differences with Pilkington and complained of his severity in causing them to keep to the specifications and contracts. In fact Murphy swears that the engineers were severe on them in keeping them to the letter of the contract, and that it was a question whether they would have to give up the contract or the engineers be dismissed. An organized system of denunciation was carried on against the resident engineer in the papers the contractors could control—some of the articles being written by the contractors themselves. They resolved to get rid of him. The good-will of Mr. Thomas McGreevy was secured, and Messrs. Kinipple & Morris were replaced by engineers chosen by Mr. McGreevy himself, and who were under the control of the Department of Public Works. The contractors wanted changes in the contracts, and unfortunately they appear to have been able, after the change of the engineers, to obtain anything they desired. It would seem that their principal object was to have these engineers out of the way in works to come."

It must strike anyone who has listened to the testimony given before the Committee that, when the minority report says there was an organized system of denunciation carried on against the resident engineer and that the chief engineers were dismissed through the agency of Mr. McGreevy, they are entirely at fault. There is the evidence of Mr. Dobell, there is the documentary evidence which is contained in the letter of Mr. Verret, which I may read later on, but, taking up the evidence of Mr. Dobell, it must absolutely convince anyone that these men were dismissed, and properly dismissed, and for totally different reasons. This is the evidence:

Q. You remember that Messrs. Kinipple & Morris were originally the engineers of the Quebec harbour improvements?—A. Yes.

Q. And the dock, and so on?—A. Yes.

Q. They were removed from that position?—A. Yes,

If I remember rightly, both yourself and Mr. Rae, as members of the board, objected to their removal?—A. Yes: we protested.

Q. And Mr. Rae made a formal notarial protest against that course, and you made a protest less formal?—A. The protests are those recorded in the minutes.

Q. You had objections, which were expressed at that time, to their removal?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Ouimet:

What year were they removed?—A. About 1882.

By Mr. Henry:

Q. But after your protest against their removal, some time subsequently, something occurred which induced you to change your mind on the subject?—A. At first I protested strongly against their removal, but shortly afterwards some matters came to my knowledge as to the action they had taken in the construction of the graving dock which led me to change my view. I found that the resident engineer had written or cabled to Messrs. Kinipple & Morris, telling them that it was impossible to put the dock gates where they were trying to do and that they had spent 12 months trying to do this. Instead of coming out and making a proper survey Messrs. Kinipple & Morris merely cabled out: "Move them 70 feet back;" and so further work was gone on with 70 feet back. Finding that they could not succeed there the engineers cabled out to put the gates 70 feet still further back. I thought myself that that was a sufficient reason for making a change.

Q. What was the cause of the difficulty in placing the gates where it had been originally intended to place them?—A. They sounded and found rock, and when they came to try 70 feet back, when they came to get the foundation, they discovered boulders on a bed of sand, and it was impossible to put the gates there.

Q. And as to the second attempt which was also advised by cable, they were in the same predicament?—A. Exactly the same predicament.

Q. Then you ceased to have any confidence in these engineers in respect to their attention to the work that you had previously?—A. I believed when that came to my knowledge it was sufficient to discharge any engineers.

Q. And you then agreed with the course that had been taken in discharging them?—A. Most certainly.

Q. And you are now of the same opinion that you were then?—A. Entirely.

Q. Was your loss of confidence in them attributable to want of skill or want of attention?—A. Want of attention.

Q. The resident engineer of whom you spoke, but whose name you did not give, was Mr. Pilkington, was it not?—A. Yes.

Q. You remember Mr. Pilkington leaving the work in consequence of infirmity or ill-health?—A. Yes.

Q. Were the members of the firm present when he left?—A. I really forget.

Q. Mr. Pilkington was not dismissed, any way, as far as you know. Do you remember if he remained for some time after Kinipple & Morris were dismissed in the employ of the Harbour Commissioners?—A. Some short time.

Q. Some months, as a matter of fact?—A. Yes.

Q. But the sole cause of his leaving, and his position being occupied by somebody else, was his ill-health?—A. Yes.

These men, Kinipple & Morris, would not come out from England, but they cabled those general instructions to their engineer, Pilkington, a young man whom they had left in charge of a work of such vast importance, that he was to move the gates back 70 feet, and then another 70 feet. They were properly dismissed, as I think every hon. gentleman in this House will conclude, for their negligence. The minority report makes charge 5 of the general report their second charge. It has reference to the dredging of the wet basin at 35 cents a yard. The general report gives its finding at page 15:

"The Committee therefore find that Thomas McGreevy, knowing that his brother was a partner in the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., made an arrangement with them by which he was to receive from them $25,000 to be appropriated for political purposes, out of the proceeds of a contract for 800,000 cubic yards of dredging in the wet dock of the Quebec harbour works at the price of 35 cents per yard, which it was understood he would endeavour to procure for the firm. There is no evidence that Thomas McGreevy used his influence with the Department of Public Works in connection with the making of this contract. The contract was not let by the Department of Public Works but by the Harbour Commissioners, and it appears that the department had nothing to do with the contract. Mr. Perley was connected with it only as engineer of the Harbour Commissioners.

"The only evidence of the use of influence upon Mr. Perley, as the chief engineer of the Harbour Commissioners is that constituted by the inference arising from Thomas McGreevy's letters. On account of Mr. Perley's state of health, it was found impossible to obtain evidence upon this and many other matters."

And the correspondence is here given. Now, I think that conclusion of the majority ought to be satisfactory. But the minority report endeavours to link Sir Hector Langevin with this transaction. It was admitted by the last speaker that Sir Hector Langevin had no connection at all with this contract; but they say "the question arises between what parties the blame is to be distributed and how far Sir Hector Langevin was or should have been cognizant of the facts?" Now, upon what evidence do they arrive at that conclusion? Thomas McGreevy and Perley deserve censure, and possibly the Harbour Commissioners were to blame for their want of supervision; but nothing but a desire to injure Sir Hector Langevin could have induced those hon. gentlemen to put that in their report. They try to support their statement by the evidence of Mr. Valin. Mr. Valin's evidence was shown by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) the other night to be utterly unreliable. They try to bolster up their report. The hon. member for Cumberland showed that the evidence of Mr. Dobell, which was invoked on the other side, was most conclusive in support of Sir Hector Langevin when read in full, and all its component parts taken together. Valin came before that Committee and proved himself to be a nonentity; he acknowledged himself to be a man of no understanding at all; and in my opinion if the Minister of Public Works is deserving of any censure it was because, as a member of the Government, he allowed such a man to act on that board and be its chairman. Valin's letter which was read here the other night proves that. He gives information to a gentleman of the press one day, the next day he signs a written statement taking back every word and contradicting every statement. Then he comes before the Committee, and whilst he swears to conversations which he held with Sir Hector Langevin and with Thomas McGreevy of which he took no note, and which took place years ago: at the same time he cannot swear as to the exact amount of three sums of money that were paid into his hands out of the moneys of this very plunder for which he had given his written receipts, for which he had signed his name, no, he cannot remember them. He cannot remember whether it was $1,200 or $1,500, or what amount it was. It was upon the statements of a witness like that that hon. gentlemen opposite based the finding of their report in this respect. Now, with regard to the contract for the completion of the Lévis graving dock. The minority report says:

"That in the year 1884 the said Thomas McGreevy agreed with members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., to secure for them a contract for the completion of the graving dock at Lévis, on condition that he should receive from them any excess over the sum of $50,000 of the contract price, and that, accordingly, the said Thomas McGreevy afterwards received from the said firm the sum of $22,000."

Both reports make this charge No. 3. Mr. Fitz-

patrick, Q.C., in his admirable address before the Committee, absolutely demolished this particular charge. He showed that the conflict of testimony between Robert McGreevy and Murphy was such that no person could place any reliance upon it, and that the evidence is so unsatisfactory that we must, perforce, come to the finding of the general Committee. But the minority report says :

"In order to arrive at an intelligent judgment on this charge, it is necessary to review the facts connected with the letting of the original contract, the manner in which that contract had been carried out up to the time when the supplemental contract was entered into, the entering into that supplemental contract, and the payments which have been made to the contractors from time to time.

"The original contract was entered into the 17th of August, 1878, between the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec and Larkin, Connolly & Co.

"It provided that for the consideration of $330,953.89 the contractors should build and finish a graving dock at Lévis 500 feet long and 100 feet wide, and hand the same over to the commissioners completed in accordance with drawings and specifications on or before the 1st of June, 1882.

"Most effective provisions were inserted securing the Harbour Commissioners from any claims for extras or damages, and holding the contractors responsible not only for failures and delays in the execution of the contract, but also for the stability of the work itself, and all its plant when built.

"Special clauses were inserted throwing the risks and responsibilities upon the contractors with respect to the foundations on which any of the works were to be erected, or with regard to the materials to be excavated.

"We mention these clauses in passing, because they seem afterwards to have been ignored, when entering into the supplemental contract with the contractors, and in the settlement of their claims."

Now, I want first of all to direct the attention of the House to the last paragraph of this finding. They say that we have ignored these clauses, these stern, strict clauses. Now, I pretend to say, that these clauses of the contract we do not ignore at all. On the contrary, the hon. gentlemen must have failed to read the supplementary contract carefully or they would have found :

"That nothing in this supplementary contract shall be interpreted as prejudicing, altering, or changing the rights or claims of either party under the contract for the building of the graving dock hereinbefore recited, and dated the 17th August, 1878."

Could there be anything clearer than that ? This must have escaped the attention of these hon. gentlemen when they were making their report, else they would not put in black and white that the special clauses throwing the risks and responsibilities on the contractors were entirely ignored, when there is an absolute covenant here that nothing is to alter the liabilities and responsibilities of the parties under the first contract. Again, speaking of the claims for extras, the minority report says :

"In view of the language of the contract under which they bound themselves to build the graving dock, and assume the risk of the foundation, &c., and became liable to heavy penalties for delays, this claim of Larkin, Connolly & Co. for $110,000 damages was certainly baseless, and in our opinion should have been instantly repudiated."

That is sound doctrine, no doubt. However, the hon. gentleman who spoke last has well pointed out the peculiar character of these contracts. We know what has been done in respect to contracts since long years before Confederation. These contracts are so one-sided that the position of chief engineer is one of supreme authority, almost. The fact of the matter is these contracts are so one-sided and so strict that the contractor has no rights at all. We know that it has been the habit to refer all difficulties under contracts of this kind to arbitration whenever the contractors would accept the chief engineer, even where he himself had made his final estimate. If you take one of these contracts you find that contractors are obliged to submit to all changes, alterations, &c., which, in the opinion of the engineer, may require to be made. They are to claim no extras, they are to claim no damages, the engineers are to control them in every shape and form, they can direct them as to how to carry on the business and the number of men they shall employ, in fact they can control all their operations. I desire to refer briefly to the last clause which I mentioned a few moments ago. The clause states that the engineer is to be the arbitrator of all claims of any kind whatever and is not only to be the engineer controlling the works, but in case of disagreement he is to act as arbitrator.

Mr. DICKEY. Is the hon. gentleman reading the general form of contract ?

Mr. CURRAN. Yes ; this is the form of the general Government contract, and all these clauses are in the contract to which we are referring. We all know that prior to and ever since Confederation, no Government has ever objected to submitting claims under those contracts either to the late Mr. Page or to Mr. Perley. It was looked upon as the only recourse the contractor had if he entered into a contract like this. Would hon. gentlemen propose that a Government should hold the contractors literally to their terms when it has been proved that they had attempted at two different places and at great expense to obtain foundations when no foundations could be obtained ? The Government could not act in that way. Therefore, I come to the conclusion that the hon. gentlemen were not just in that section of the report. I must say, wishing to be perfectly sincere in this matter, that where the Minister of Public Works made an error, and a very great one, was when he allowed his chief engineer to become the chief engineer of the harbour works at Quebec. It was alleged by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that the Minister had recommended Mr. Perley for the position of chief engineer of the harbour works. Is that so ?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. CURRAN. That is entirely incorrect. I was going to draw the attention of the hon. gentlemen who drafted the minority report to this error. Sir Hector Langevin did nothing of the kind. They say :

"Perley was recommended to his position by the Minister of Public Works, and Boyd was recommended as assistant engineer by Perley."

I contend that is altogether incorrect, and I will show that by documents which I will refer to in a moment. The Minister consented he should act. When the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec telegraphed up, or Mr. Perley telegraphed up that he had been appointed by them, the Minister gave his consent. That was the extent of his error ; he did not recommend his appointment. There is where the Minister of Public Works made the great mistake of his life. That permission to accept the appointment no doubt arose from the kindness of heart of the Minister. He evidently felt that the salary received by Mr. Perley was inadequate for the duties he was performing and consented, in order to swell that salary, to his

accepting that position. A debate occurred in this House on the 21st January, 1887, when the question of the payments to Mr. Perley came up. Discussing the question of extra payment to Mr. Perley, Mr. Langelier said:

"He is also chief engineer of the Quebec harbour works. I think that is for the interest of the works, because he has corrected the great blunders which were made by his predecessors. I would like, however, to know whether he is in receipt of any salary as chief engineer of the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec."

No doubt that the permission was given on account of the acknowledged ability of Mr. Perley, but at the same time to enable that officer to get paid a salary commensurate with his ability and position. Sir Richard Cartwright, speaking on the subject, said, adding up the various amounts received in all by Mr. Perley annually:

"That makes about $4,500. It may be the case that you require to pay somewhat larger salaries than you have been doing to officers of first-class grade and first-class ability if we can get them, but I think it would be better if they should receive a large salary fairly and squarely, than that we should eke it out here, there and everywhere in half a dozen ways."

That was sound doctrine. The motive of the Minister of Public Works was no doubt benevolent. His kind-heartedness has been the cause of his political shipwreck. The results of that error are manifest. Instead of being engineer-in-chief of the Department of Public Works, standing between the Government and the chief engineer of the harbour, that salutary check was removed. Mr. Perley was thus thrown into immediate contact with contractors. His dual quality placed him in a false position towards Thomas McGreevy, M.P., who was his master as a Harbour Commissioner and who was constantly using his influence on behalf of these contractors. It thus affected his position towards the contractors in many ways, not only in Quebec harbour Works, but in British Columbia matters as well. Under No. 4 charge, cross-wall contract, 26th May, 1883, the minority report, referring to this subject, says, page 23:

"Perley was recommended to his position by the Minister of Public Works, and Boyd was recommended as assistant engineer by Perley."

I may direct the House to the letter of Mr. Verret, secretary to the Quebec Harbour Commission. That letter is too long to read, but it shows what Mr. Verret, secretary of the Harbour Commissioners, reported on the subject of the appointment of other engineers. It is shown clearly and conclusively, not only from the letter of Ennis, the secretary of the department, but from the other correspondence which is given in the evidence of Sir Hector Langevin himself, that no such recommendation was ever made by him, but that he merely consented to Perley's acceptance. This I consider a very glaring error in the report of the minority. It is useless, therefore, to follow these hon. gentlemen further. Let us look at this case in its general aspect. All are agreed, except my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that Perley by the receipt of the present, and by his general conduct in this matter has, unfortunately for himself, been proved guilty. We all agreed with regard to Thomas McGreevy, on the question of the *Admiral* for instance, apart altogether from these other questions, that he was the owner of the vessel. There is no doubt but that he was the actual contractor for the carrying of the mails, although his agent, Mr. Chabot, screened him from public view. We have, therefore, these charges disposed of, and we now come face to face with the question of how much money Thomas McGreevy actually received. It was stated in the charges that he was paid something like $200,000, and the minority report thinks the amount of the donations was $170,000. Mr. McGreevy admits that he got the sum of $55,000 in ten years, and that $35,000 of that went to *Le Monde* and $20,000 to election purposes.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman does not forget that there was $15,000 to pay Cameron's judgment against him.

Mr. CURRAN. I said a moment ago that so far as Mr. McGreevy's guilt was concerned that there was hardly any use discussing that. I was merely coming to the point of his own admission as to the amount he said he had applied to political purposes for the Conservative party. He swore that he had given $35,000 to *Le Monde* newspaper and that the other $20,000 was given for elections, but he would not state where or to whom it was paid. The amount was so trifling in view of the tremendous noise made about its having been subscribed by persons carrying on these contracts for ten years, that it would be much better indeed if we had it fairly and clearly stated to us where this $20,000 had gone. In the speeches that have been made in this House a great deal has been said with regard to these political contributions, and a great deal has been added about this *Le Monde* newspaper, and Sir Hector has been attacked over and over again because he was said to have an interest in that newspaper, and the Government and the party were denounced because this money had been so advanced. The minority report mentioned *Le Monde* newspaper, but strange to say in this judicial report as they call it, they say nothing whatever about Mr. Larkin and the *Globe*. We must remember that Mr. Larkin was first introduced into the contracts of the Dominion of Canada by the gentlemen opposite. He was introduced into the contracts of this country on the Welland Canal years before he went into the contract for the Lévis graving dock, by the Liberal party, which he and his firm also obtained from the Mackenzie Administration. He is not only a Liberal, or a Reformer, or whatever you wish to call the party, but he was actually a president of the Reform Association until 1882, and what does he say himself? Look at his evidence on pages 839 and 840 of the blue-book:

Examined by Mr. Daly:

Q. What are your politics?—A. I am a Liberal—a Reformer as they used to be called. Q. Have you taken an active part in politics during your lifetime?—A. Yes. Q. Are you president of the Liberal or Reform Association of Lincoln?—A. I was at one time, but not now. I was for six years. Q. While you were president of that Association, and since, have you taken an active interest in politics?—A. Not of late years.

Q. When were you president of the Reform Association of Lincoln?—A. I think from 1876 to 1882.

Q. Did you contribute to the campaign fund of the Reform party during that time?—A. Yes; when I was asked to contribute I did so.

Q. Both while you were president of the association and since?—A. Yes; and since.

Q. Do you recollect the agitation that was going on in British Columbia for the enlargement of the Esquimalt Dock?—A. Yes; I heard of it. I was not there at the time.

Q. Do you recollect the *Globe* newspaper opposing that enlargement?—A. There was an article to that effect from the Ottawa correspondent.

Q. You recollect that?—A. Yes.

Q. It is referred to in Exhibit "17" as follows: (Reads) Do you recollect if, after this appeared in the Toronto *Globe*, the *Globe* published an editorial favouring the enlargement of the dock?—A. I do not recollect that.

Q. Are you a stockholder in the *Globe?*—A. Yes; to a small extent.

Q. Were you at the time of the agitation?—A. No.

Q. When the enlargement of the dock was asked for?—A. No.

By Mr. Edgar:

Q. Your contributions to the party to which you belong up there, were they charged to the Larkin, Connolly & Co. contracts?—A. They were charged to myself.

So that my hon. friend wishes us to understand, that Mr. Larkin who was subscribing at that time, and was subscribing all along, and whenever he was asked, to the Reform party and to their elections, did not give any of the money of the contract of Larkin, Connolly & Co., but that he gave Mr. Larkin's personal money. How innocent! How fine the distinction. I suppose the money he got from the contract he put in his pocket, but the money he intended for political donations to the immaculate Liberal party he carried around in a satchel. Let us continue still further to see what Mr. Larkin swears:

By Mr. Daly:

Q. Coming back to that question, I was asking you: Did you approach any person for the purpose of influencing the *Globe* to agitate for the enlargement of the dock?—A. No.

Q. Did you write to any person?—A. Yes; not on that subject.

Q. What subject?—A. I wrote to a director, calling his attention to the article in the Ottawa correspondence, and saying that we wanted the facts stated.

Q. Have you a copy of that letter?—A. No.

Q. To whom was it written?—A. J. D. Edgar.

By Mr. Edgar:

Q. What did you want Mr. Edgar to do about that?—All I wanted was, as mentioned in a letter I stated I had written to a friend in Toronto, to see the *Globe* people and not have things like that appear. It was doing me no good, or them either.

Here are facts that are not mentioned at all in the report of the minority. We have all about *Le Monde* newspaper, but we have not a single word about the *Globe*. We have not a single word about Mr. Larkin having no stock in the *Globe* at the time an article was written against Larkin, Connolly & Co., but that he invested in some afterwards. Nobody took the trouble to find out whether he had five or ten thousand dollars worth of stock; but it is a great pity that the thing was not further investigated, so that we should have known all about these subscriptions. It is quite clear that he did subscribe, and that whilst his partners were giving in Quebec for one object or another he was giving in his own section of the country and helping the party opposite with money subscriptions, and when this came up in evidence before the Committee not one of the hon. gentlemen held up his hands in holy horror. The leader of the Opposition this afternoon was very severe upon the late Minister of Public Works regarding these nefarious transactions. He took us back to the days of Warren Hastings, and he wound up his speech by reading from Bancroft's History reminiscences of the Intendant Bigot. Certainly that was all very interesting. It is pleasant to listen to the hon. gentleman's glowing periods even when he is denouncing us; but when we think of the fire that he threw into his denunciations, how indignant he was concerning the almost forgotten days of Bigot, and how timid were the disclaimers upon the days of Pacaud, the contrast was very striking. He told us that the time might come when Pacaud matters would be investigated by a proper tribunal, and that then he would call upon his friends to denounce the corruption in the Province of Quebec. He is perfectly willing to condemn Sir Hector Langevin as a corrupt man, a briber, a conspirator, who has joined with other conspirators to defraud this country of the people's money. He is prepared to believe that upon the evidence of Murphy and Robert McGreevy, whom we are called upon to indict as conspirators in one report, and as perjurers in the sub-amendment; but he is not at all prepared, not just yet, to denounce parties who have been proved guilty of the grossest and most unblushing corruption by the sworn evidence of respectable citizens because their testimony was given before a Committee of the Senate of Canada. My hon. friend also had a fling at the memory of Sir John A. Macdonald. He said that he was an admirer of that statesman, who, he admitted, had done a great deal for his country; and yet in the same breath he denounced him as a man who had debauched his country, who had said publicly that he had bought the constituencies with their own money. Any man who has known Sir John Macdonald and who has heard him speak, knows that you had always to judge what Sir John Macdonald said by the tone in which he said it; you had to see and hear him to understand whether he spoke jocularly or not. But as the hon. member for North Simcoe showed, the quotation was a garbled one even as it was given; and the action of my hon. friend in that matter does not, I think, reflect credit upon him. He has gone outside of the wide range of this debate in order to hurl an insult at the reputation and to blacken the name of a man whose memory is revered from one end of Canada to the other. The hon. gentleman also made an appeal to us to condemn Sir Hector Langevin, because he said he was under the control of Thomas McGreevy. He said that Sir Hector Langevin was a corrupt man, a briber and a conspirator, and he should be driven from public life—why? Because, years ago, Thomas McGreevy had lent Sir Hector $10,000; that he was still the debtor of Thomas McGreevy for that amount; that, every three months, Thomas McGreevy presented to him the notes for renewal, in order that he might hold the lash over his shoulders, or keep the sword of Damocles hanging over his head. He told us of this in his loudest tones and with his most tragic declamation, and contended that it was evidence of the guilt of Sir Hector Langevin. Now, if he wants us to believe that Sir Hector Langevin was a corrupt man, his corruption did not end with these contracts; but he was corrupt in connection with the hundreds of contracts which were let from the Atlantic to the Pacific. He was in communication with the men who had these contracts, and he could have levied enormous sums of money upon them; he might have been an enormously wealthy man instead of being a poor man to-day; and does the hon. gentleman wish this House to believe that if he was corrupt and a conspirator, instead of renewing those notes—which is an evidence that he was an honest man, and would not improperly take a dollar from any one—would not

have held out his hand and said: "Mr. McGreevy, we have all these moneys passing through our hands, and I think it is time that these notes disappeared." Why not take the common sense view of this matter, and act towards the late Minister at least as charitably as we would act towards the vilest criminal standing in the dock? Is there any reason or justice in holding up the fact that he was under $10,000 of indebtedness to Thomas McGreevy as an evidence that he was a corrupt man, who was filling his own pockets and those of his friends with the public money, and that, having control of all these contracts, he was such a fool, if he was corrupt, as not to have wiped out his own indebtedness, instead of leaving it there? Now, Sir, I do not desire to weary the patience of this House, but another statement of the hon. leader of the Opposition deserves a passing notice. He told us that the proof of these charges has been such that the name of Canada has been blackened far and wide. Who is blackening it? What did we see in this House yesterday? Who are sending charges broadcast, not only against the Minister of Public Works, but against every Minister who can be charged? Who is raking up old scandals which were exploded years and years ago? One public man after another is being defamed, and this is being done by men whose old and only policy has been to defame their country. And their agents are sending their slanders and exaggerated reports by wire and cable all over the civilized world. That is the reason we have to hang our heads in shame. The hon. gentleman does not stop there. He tells us that the United States is a country where there once was boodling, but which is now a land of purity, where everything is serene. Such a thing as a campaign fund does not exist there; payments are not made by candidates, even for a party nomination to office. I can imagine the smile that will appear upon the faces of the politicians of the other side of the boundary line when they read the speech of the hon. gentleman one of these days, and see the brilliant picture which he has painted of the purity of their politics. There are other points to which I might refer; but I think it will be sufficient to say, in conclusion, that the pledge which the hon. Minister of Justice gave in the Province of Nova Scotia during the last general election, representing the Government of this country, has been carried out to the letter. On the public hustings there, speaking of these charges, he said they would be investigated to the fullest extent, that they would be investigated in every particular, that full scope would be given to prove the charges if they could be proved, and that nothing would be done to protect the offenders, were they high or low. The prosecutor of this case gave testimony on the floor of this House, and the independent press of this country has proclaimed that the Minister of Justice has acted throughout in this matter as an honourable and upright man. He has given full scope to all parties, fuller scope in this matter than is usually given, or than would be given in any other assembly of this kind in the investigation of similar charges. His principle has been and will be to do justice to all men and purify the public service, and to see that the civil servants and all those connected with the Government departments do their duty honestly or suffer the consequences. That line of action he has never hesitated to carry out. In the words of Norman McLeod, his doctrine and practice have been:

"Perish policy and cunning;
Perish all that fear the light,
Whether winning, whether losing,
Fear the Lord and do the right."

Mr. DAVIN. The question before us is one of great importance, affecting, as it does, the character of a public man who has held a prominent position for nearly twenty-five years. We are here to-night acting as judges, and we ought to be very careful in weighing what arguments may be presented to us. Now, I will brush aside at once the arguments which have been presented to us by my hon. friend who has just sat down, because after all they are the arguments of an advocate. We have to-night to discuss the position of the Hon. Sir Hector Langevin as a judge and a jury, and I will say this, that nobody could have weighed the evidence given before the Committee fairly without coming to the conclusion that there are most suspicious circumstances connected with the position and the influence exercised by the ex-Minister. I had myself prepared an amendment, but when I saw that prepared by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) I thought it was a better one than mine. The question whether the Minister is guilty is a small one, compared with the immense issues at stake. We are a young country and is it to be tolerated for a moment that a member of the Government may enter into complicity with contractors to rob the public? Is it to be tolerated for a moment that a Minister of the Crown should do that? The verdict of this country would be decidedly not; and I may say this now: I have read all the evidence very carefully and have come to the conclusion that we cannot possibly relieve Sir Hector Langevin from this position: either one of two things—either he is corrupt or he is imbecile. We cannot get over that. The amendment of my hon. friend from Simcoe, I think, meets the case, and I intend supporting it.

Mr. EDGAR. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that we should not take a great deal of time in replying to the speech of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). There seemed to me to be one point on which he appeared to lay great stress, and with reference to which he actually ventured to criticise the report of the majority. He seemed to think that the majority of the Committee made a grave omission when they did not censure the Toronto *Globe* for something or other which was in his mind. That was really the main point on which he dwelt. He read part of the evidence of Mr. Larkin, which showed he had sent a communication to the Toronto *Globe*. He did not show there was anything wrong in that communication. He did not show whether it should have been published or not; he only said that Larkin swore he wanted to have a correction made in the *Globe*, and he blamed the Committee for not having gone into that outrageous matter further and for not having taken it up in their report. We had a much more interesting speech from the hon. member for Simcoe. I was very sorry to find that he commenced his argumentative speech with a violent and malicious attack upon the hon. leader of the Opposition. Now, I cannot understand why he went out of his way to make that attack, unless to arouse the flagging spirits upon the back benches upon

that side, and in that he no doubt succeeded. Or perhaps he thought that by so doing he was to some degree rehabilitating himself in the standing he lost in the Conservative party ever since he took a position in this House which we all remember. What was his ground of attack on the leader of the Opposition? He attacked him for two things. One was, that he had assented to the proposition for the rearrangement of the provincial subsidies which was included in the Quebec resolutions. What was that? A conference was held of representatives of all the provinces except, I think, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island. All the larger provinces of the Dominion were represented in Quebec. They considered the position of the provinces in reference to the Dominion, and they unanimously came to a conclusion that there should be some fair readjustment of the financial position, and afterwards the Legislatures of all those provinces ratified their conclusions. It was not a party question. It was not treated as such, except in some of the Legislatures, but these proposals were ratified by the Provincial Legislatures. What were they? Were they not to make equal and what were considered fair rearrangements in regard to all the provinces,—not to make a preference in favour of one province or another, not to offer a bribe to Quebec any more than to offer a bribe to Ontario, or to any province, whether it was represented there or not; and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) attacked the leader of the Opposition because he frankly said he thought that was a fair proposal. How could it place in the hands of a Government or a Parliament of the Dominion, who were satisfied to carry out those proposals, any power to bribe or improperly influence one province or another. It did not allow them to pick and choose what province they would give better terms to. It was equal rights for all in a proper sense, and that is supposed by the hon. gentleman to be buying people with their own money, that is supposed to be in the same position with the miserable policy of buying a constituency with a post office here and a public building there, a wharf in one place and a railway in another, at the choice of the member representing the constituency. That is a very different position from that taken broadly and above board by my leader at that time, and it did not become the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to try and twist that into an attempt to bribe the people with their own money. I am sorry that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) could not make his speech on this subject without the usual sneer in which he indulges against the people of Quebec and the French Canadians. And how does he do it? I was surprised that he took such a disingenuous course. Because my hon. friend referred to 150 years ago, when the best men in that province, Montcalm and his associates, frowned down corruption and stamped it out, although it was among their fellow Frenchmen, he turns that into an evidence in his own mind that Quebec has been corrupt for 150 years. That was most unfair, most ungenerous and most disingenuous. Let us follow the example set by Montcalm and the best men of Quebec of that day, when they condemned and denounced their fellow-citizens for improper conduct. I would like to know what happened in this Chamber last night—whether the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was willing to denounce a fellow-citizen of his from Ontario for improper conduct as Montcalm did in Quebec. I do not say that it is because he is an enemy of the Province of Quebec, but we find him not hesitating to condemn Sir Hector Langevin, though last night he would not condemn his Ontario colleague the Postmaster General. As to this case, I do not want to prolong the debate more than I can help. I think, at this stage of the debate, very many members of the House must have become shaken in their faith in the Committee's report. That report, while it was severe upon others, spread a very broad mantle of charity over the late Minister of Public Works, and we know that charity covers a multitude of sins. Now, on the sub-committee who prepared that report, who are responsible for its preparation in every particular, there were three gentlemen. One was the Minister of Justice, another was the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard). We know that the Minister of Justice, ever since he came into public life in the Dominion six years ago, has been the junior colleague of the Minister of Public Works, and the Minister of Public Works has in a sense been his leader in this House. We know that the member for Jacques Cartier for some twelve or thirteen years, since he has been here, has been associated as a fellow-member in this House with the late Minister of Public Works, has been his follower and friend here, and I suppose, before he came into this House at all, as long as he had anything to do with politics, he acknowledged Sir Hector Langevin as his leader. Now, who shall say that those two gentlemen were not influenced by their friendship, political and personal, for Sir Hector Langevin, in bringing in favourable findings in regard to their old friend and colleague and leader? We had also a speech to-day from another of his colleagues, from the Minister of Militia, warmly advocating the cause of his old colleague. We cannot object to that; we cannot be surprised at that, but I cannot help feeling that the Minister of Militia has almost a personal interest and a personal acquaintance with this case. He was very much in the same boat as his hon. colleague in connection with McGreevy, and in connection with the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and therefore I think we must make some allowances for his zeal in their defence. Turning to the report of the evidence, I find, when Mr. Valin, an old member of this House and president of the Harbour Commissioners, was examined, he said something about the Minister of Militia. He was asked about the contributions made to political funds, so far as he knew, by Larkin, Connolly & Co., to Thomas McGreevy, and he says, at page 495:

"I applied again to Mr. McGreevy and to Mr. Murphy. Mr. Murphy told me: 'We have placed all that is necessary in Mr. McGreevy's hands, and we have advised him to help you especially; apply to him and you will get some.'"

That is what Murphy said:

"Then having applied to Mr. McGreevy he said to me: The elections in the County of Quebec are costing heavily."

That is in the county represented then by the Minister of Militia. He says:

"The Ministers are costing us very heavily, and I have no more money to give you."

Then again he was asked:

Q. Did Mr. McGreevy mention any other counties besides those that you have named that were expensive? —A. He mentioned particularly the County of Quebec for the Local and Dominion Parliaments. He said: Caron is always after me: and he said: I cannot satisfy him with money. He said: We have Sir Hector at Three Rivers: and, besides, other counties.

Now, I think we must not place too much reliance upon the arguments of the Minister of Militia when his own friendship for Sir Hector Langevin is recollected, and when his own relations to McGreevy are also remembered. I am certain that public opinion in this country, formed from the evidence that the people have seen published day after day, has gone very much further that the report of the Committee. Public opinion in this country has already driven Sir Hector Langevin from public life; the report has not done that. Sir, individually, I am sure that I would be very glad if I could say to Sir Hector Langevin: Go in peace. During my intercourse with him in this Parliament I have met nothing but courtesy and kindness at his hands. I have had intercourse with him more than most members had on the Railway Committee, of which he was chairman, and I have the pleasantest recollection of his courtesy and his kind demeanour through all the many sittings that we had together. I can say frankly that after public opinion has driven him from public life, I have no political reasons for desiring to throw a stone at him, and I have no personal resentments to satisfy in regard to him either. I cannot, however, agree with the majority report, and one or two things I will specially mention. The report states as its conclusion, that the Minister did not know of the conspiracy which existed, and also that he did not willingly lend himself to its objects. Now, I cannot agree with that. When did that conspiracy exist, that is admitted to have existed by the report? How long did it continue? It began in 1882, at any rate, and it continued to 1889. Now, what were the relations between Sir Hector Langevin and Mr. Thomas McGreevy, one of the conspirators, during all that time? Look at their political relations first. Sir Hector Langevin was the chief of the Conservative party in Quebec; Thomas McGreevy was the treasurer of the Conservative party in Quebec during all that time. They were fellow-members of this House, sitting close together all the time. Two general elections took place during that period, in which the chief of the party and the treasurer would come into the very closest relations. During that time an important political organ was acquired jointly by them, and largely by the funds which were the results and the proceeds of this conspiracy. What were the objects of the conspiracy to which the report says the Minister did not willingly lend himself? Why, Sir, the objects of the conspiracy, on Thomas McGreevy's part, he claims now as a defence, were to obtain political funds for his party. He says it was not personal; that the object was to obtain political funds, and he did obtain enormous political funds. Yet he says that his chief did not know what those objects were. Can any man in his senses believe that the chief was ignorant of the objects of that conspiracy? Was it the habit of Sir Hector Langevin not to know anything about political funds in his province? We know that in 1872 he took, with his own hands, from Sir Hugh Allan's representative, I think the leader of the other House and of the Government, $32,000 of money for political purposes, and he did not give a receipt for it. That shows that he was not then in the habit of ignoring the existence and the use of political funds. I do not know whether he handed that to a treasurer, or spent it himself as treasurer. Then, come down ten years later, and we will see whether Sir Hector Langevin was in the habit of ignoring the existence of political funds. Why, in this very enquiry we are considering now on the evidence in this book we find that Sir Hector Langevin, in 1882, asked in his own letter, over his own signature, a political contribution from the contractor Peters, and received $1,000 himself for political purposes, when Thomas McGreevy was treasurer, and I suppose he handed it over to him. Now, Sir, these being the political relations between these two men, can any living man honestly say that Sir Hector Langevin did not understand the political objects of that conspiracy? Then look at their present relations. They were closer than brothers. The Minister of Militia to-day said he gave Sir Hector Langevin great credit for the fact that when he came into power he did not turn his back on an old friend in his adversity, Thomas McGreevy. We can be friendly with a man, owing him no grudge and showing him no ingratitude, without taking him into our house night and day, and giving him a desk in our office, which is what Sir Hector Langevin did with Thomas McGreevy from 1878 until this session. Their personal relations were very close. Is it not evidence of close personal and political relations, too, when Sir Hector Langevin got $10,000 from him for his election before 1882, and that amount was carried for Sir Hector all through the time of this conspiracy, which has been alleged, proved and admitted in the report; he paid no interest on it, and, as he very candidly said, he never expected to pay the principal of it. Surely, that was a very close relationship. How few brothers there are who would act more generously towards one another than these two gentlemen! One takes the other to his arms, to his home, he takes him to sit at the table with him, morning, noon and night, and gives him a desk in his office. The other gives his friend $10,000, pays the interest on it, and looks after it all the time. Can anyone imagine closer personal relations than these? Still Sir Hector Langevin did not know, the report says, what was going on all this time, during which a conspiracy, involving half a dozen transactions in which Thomas McGreevy was engaged every month of every year, in which the political party of which Sir Hector Langevin was the head, was decidedly interested. Sir Hector did not know anything about it, and he did not willingly lend himself to any of the objects. Was he a dupe? Was he an innocent? Was he an imbecile? Hon. gentlemen, especially those members who have met Sir Hector Langevin for many years, and who knew him as Chairman of the Railway Committee, are aware, without asking for any sworn evidence, that Sir Hector was not anybody's fool, that he was a very able man, that he was particularly acute and well-trained in matters of that kind. No one who has seen him passing the intricate accounts of the Public Works Department through Committee of Supply has failed to admire the thorough knowledge of details which he possessed. So it is impossible to persuade any member of this House to-day that he was either a dupe, an imbecile, or a simpleton. We have evidence of

a direct character in reference to what Sir Hector told people regarding his relations with Thomas McGreevy. Who can disbelieve what Mr. Valin said? Who can doubt the truth of what he said when he told the Committee that Sir Hector very often advised him to follow Mr. McGreevy and everything would be right. He said to Mr. Valin: Just follow Mr. McGreevy, you know that we meet frequently and consult together. That is what Sir Hector Langevin told Valin respecting his relations with Thomas McGreevy. I will briefly show what Thomas McGreevy told us of his relations with Sir Hector Langevin. Remember that the letters in which we find these statements were secret, private and confidential letters written to his own brother about serious and large business transactions, and there was no motive for Thomas McGreevy in those letters to tell anything but the truth. Let us see what they say. On 7th May, 1883, writing to his brother about an examining wharehouse contract, Thomas McGreevy advises his brother to get Charlebois out of the way, and all the others might be passed over. How significant that is when we possess the knowledge we have respecting some other matters. Charlebois could not be passed over. That is quite well known to us; it is known to Mr. McGreevy. "When Greek meets Greek, then comes the tug of war." When Thomas McGreevy met Charlebois there was no passing over the latter in connection with the Public Works Department: he had to be got out of the way, but the others might be passed over. Who could pass them over but Sir Hector Langevin? Then, on 2nd May, 1885, he wrote to his brother and said:

"It is now understood that Bennett, the engineer in British Columbia, will not suit; so the Minister and Mr. Perley are preparing to change him. Should you know of any one that would suit, I would have the Minister appoint him."

That was Thomas McGreevy's unbiassed and candid opinion of his relations with the Minister. In March, 1886, writing again to Robert, he said:

"Fleming was to sign his report to-day on the harbour works. It will be shown to me as soon as signed. I will see it to-morrow, and Sir Hector and myself will decide what is to be done for the future."

Rightly or wrongly that was Thomas McGreevy's understanding of the close relationship existing between them. He adds:

"He will adopt my view. I will see you and Murphy before doing anything. It is a big thing for the future."

He was right: it was a big thing for the future; it involved the 35 cents dredging contract, and other good things. That is not all. We fortunately have a little more evidence. On 13th May, 1885, Thomas McGreevy writes:

"Tell Kerrigan & Co., plumbers, that they have contract for marine hospital. They were not the lowest; Vandry was. I got the Minister to give it to them."

I do not know whether he did or not; but he had no object in telling his brother about it unless he thought he had. It gives, at all events, a beautiful picture of his confidence in his relationship with the Minister. On 25th February, 1886, in regard to Halifax graving dock, he said that Sir Hector would be glad to recommend Murphy. Murphy, of all men in the world, Sir Hector would be glad to recommend. On 13th May, 1886, writing to his brother, he says:

"The tenders for Cape Tormentine work were opened to-day by Sir Hector. The lowest is an Ottawa man. He is $134,000. His name is Perkins. The next after him is another Ottawa man. Perley says the estimate of the work is $170,000. You know what the tenders were that you were interested in. It is a great pity that a fine job like that should go so low."

There we have it clear that the very day that tenders were opened he got access to them from, we must assume, his friend and associate the Minister. We can imagine his sorrow, his touching sorrow as a member of Parliament, that "a fine job like that should go so low." We can understand, perhaps, that he and Sir Hector talked this thing over at their dinner table, and thought together that "it was a great pity that so fine a job should go so low." These guardians of the public interest, this representative of the people and trustee for the people at any rate speaks for himself when he says to his brother in confidence: "It is a great pity that a fine job like that should go so low." Then, Sir, about the Baie des Chaleurs matter we again find evidence of his close intimacy with Sir Hector Langevin, for he wrote to his brother Robert as follows:—

"They proposed (not Caron, Sir Hector) to give me control of road to Ste. Anne's with subsidy of $6,000 per mile if I would withdraw my opposition to Baie des Chaleurs Railway, and relieve you and me of our stock."

Any one of these letters, Sir, will be sufficient to show the relationship that existed between these two men, but the whole of them taken together are cumulative evidence of the conspiracy which no judge, or jury, or court in the land could dare to ignore. I shall not go into all the evidence which has been laid before the House as to the relations of these two gentlemen about the Esquimalt dock, or the Lévis graving dock, or the 35 cents dredging contract. They all show a wilful lending of himself to the object of the conspiracy. I will just say one or two words especially about the cross-wall, as there are some points I think to which attention has not been drawn yet, and to which I, for a few moments, wish to draw the attention of the House. Now, Sir, the tenders for the cross-wall were improperly and illegally called for. The Act of 1882 says in reference to this cross-wall:

"That the plans are to be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and that public tenders shall be called for and the contract awarded by the Governor in Council."

I do not think that the language of that clause can be misunderstood; I think it clearly means that the tenders shall be called for by the Governor in Council; but in case anybody should say that it does not mean that, I will refer to the testimony of Sir Hector Langevin himself, at page 1050 of the evidence, in which he says as to this statute and his duty in the premises:

"That the plans be submitted to the approval of the Governor in Council, and that tenders be called by him for their execution."

He lays that down himself as part of his duty. The tenders were, however, not called for by the Governor in Council, but by the Quebec Harbour Commissioners. That might be in itself nothing very serious, you might say, if the tenders were called for properly; but, Sir, I think I can show you why the law was departed from, and why the tenders were not called for by the Department of Public Works. We all know that in the Department of Public Works there is a long list of newspapers supporting the Government, in which advertisements for public works are inserted. The owners

of these newspapers look after this thing pretty well. They have them inserted often and long and full, and as a matter of fact it is the practice of the department to distribute their patronage of that kind well and largely, and for a sufficient time. For example, in this very enquiry in the case of the Esquimalt graving dock which was advertised for by the department, and which was little more than half as important a work as the cross-wall, they advertised that work from the 12th November, 1883, to the 29th February, 1884, a period of three and a-half months, and I do not think it was an unreasonably long time. But, Sir, when they advertised for tenders for the cross-wall, they only advertised for a period of two weeks. The advertisement is dated the 16th April and the tenders were to be put in on the 2nd May, only two weeks for this great cross-wall job, the largest of all these contracts we have under consideration. Where were the advertisements inserted? Were they spread all over the country so that contractors all over Canada would have a chance to tender? No, Sir: the advertisements were only inserted in newspapers in the City of Quebec and the City of Montreal, and for two weeks only. The result was just what might be expected. There was not a tender put in for this work outside of the City of Quebec. Gallagher, of course, dated his at Montreal, but he was Michael Connolly of Quebec. There was, therefore, a distinct object in violating the law. The Minister of Public Works has told us in his own evidence that he knew what the law was, and hon. gentlemen will see that there is a vast contrast in the kind of advertising which it would have got if it had gone through the regular machinery of the Public Works Department, and the advertising it got from the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec. The Minister saw the tender of the firm and he awarded the contract, and we know that his eagle eye could not have supposed that there had been sufficient advertising. He knew when he sent the plans to Quebec, and he knew when he awarded the contract. Another rather extraordinary and irregular thing for this able Minister to have overlooked was the fact that, when the tenders came in, the tender of Larkin, Connolly & Co. did not pretend to comply with the notice to contractors calling for tenders. That notice says most distinctly that the signatures of persons tendering must be in their respective handwriting. That is, that all the members of the firms must sign the tenders, and you find that all members of other firms did sign them, but you find that this firm did not comply with that regulation, either in the cross-wall case or in the Esquimalt case. No, Sir; the signature to the tender was "Larkin, Connolly & Co., per O. E. M.," if you please; that was all. That could not pass the eagle eye of the Minister: but no attention seems to have been drawn to it by him or anybody. Then, with reference to the cross-wall, the report says:

"The Committee are unable to conclude, with any degree of certainty, that there was a wilful application of improper quantities."

Now, Sir, the hon. member for North Simcoe to-night made a very able argument on that point, and came to the conclusion, I am sure correctly, that that portion of the report was wrong, and that there was a gross and wilful application of improper quantities—he did not say by the Minister of Public Works; he said by the department. But this report exonerates even the department. Sir, I will show in two ways that there was a wilful application of improper quantities. What was the object of figuring the quantities improperly? The object was that the tender of Peters & Moore, being in reality lower than that of Larkin, Connolly & Co., should be figured up, so that it would appear to be higher than that of Larkin, Connolly & Co., who were to get the contract. The quantities were not given to the tenderers. They only tendered on a schedule of prices, and it is perfectly apparent that if the honestly-estimated quantities were applied the tenders should come out according to their merits: but if the estimated quantities were not honestly applied, but if it were the desire to favour the one tenderer over the other, the plan would be to apply to Peters & Moore's tender a larger quantity where their prices were high, so that it would be run up above that of Larkin, Connolly & Co.; but in cases where the tender of Larkin, Connolly & Co. was higher than that of Peters & Moore the opposite course would be followed, so that the high price of Larkin, Connolly & Co. would not tell against them. That was done, and I will show you how it was done in several ways. Mr. Boyd, who is dead, seems to have been an instrument to carry this out. I allege that when Mr. Boyd first applied the quantities to the prices he showed that Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s tender was higher than that of Peters & Moore. How do we find that out from the evidence? In this way: Up to the 8th of May all the correspondence from Thomas McGreevy to his brother in connection with this matter shows that Thomas had no expectation up to that time of getting the Larkin, Connolly & Co. contract, because he knew that Peters & Moore's tender was the lower. Therefore, he had to stick to the Beaucage tender, which was lower than that of Peters & Moore. But on the 8th of May a letter was written by Thomas McGreevy, in which he said that he would get Boyd's figures that afternoon. What happened next? Having got Boyd's figures, we find him on the 13th going to Montreal and meeting his brother there and showing him Boyd's figures. There was nothing to show anything new in the arrangements up to that time. Boyd's figures still showed, as they supposed, that Peters & Moore's tender was the lower, and the talk still was to stick to Beaucage. Then, immediately after the 13th, Thomas McGreevy went to Quebec, where he met Murphy on the street and showed him Boyd's figures, and told him still to stick to Beaucage, telling him to get the $5,000 ready to get Beaucage bought up, so that they could act on his tender. But Mr. Murphy, with a Napoleonic enterprise—financing, I suppose he would call it—boldly takes the bull by the horns and says to Thomas McGreevy: "Instead of providing $5,000 to let us get into Beaucage's shoes, we will let him slide, and if you get the contract on our own tender and get Peters & Moore's out of the way somehow or other, I will give you $25,000." From that moment Thomas McGreevy works on that plan. We find him going back to Ottawa. We find no more talk of acquiring the Beaucage tender. He goes to the department. After that arrangement for the $25,000 has been made, and only after that, we find that the quantities are applied by Boyd and Perley so as to bring the tender of Peters & Moore above that of

Larkin, Connolly & Co. Murphy was asked, in this enquiry, whether when he offered the $25,000 in that off-hand way, he had any margin to enable him to do that, because that made a difference of $20,000, and he said there was lots of margin. If the members of the Committee are interested in finding out how much margin there really was, if they will turn to Schedule H of the engineers' report, they will find that what Murphy said was perfectly true, because there was a margin of $74,380 between the Beaucage tender and the tender of Larkin, Connolly & Co., which warranted him in making that offer. He knew what he was about. It suited them all round that it should be done, and it was done. I have shown that after Boyd's figures were made up they still knew that Peters & Moore's tender was lower than Larkin, Connolly & Co. Then I turn to the other proof of the case, which the hon. member for Simcoe used, and I will show, from the evidence of the engineers, not only that Boyd did bring them out lower, but he could not have done anything else, because that evidence shows, most distinctly, by all the tests that were able to apply to it, that Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s tender was $25,000 or $35,000 or more higher than that of Peters & Moore. They had to guide them the original plans which were before the tenderers when this contract was made, and which show the work to be done and the probable approximate quantities. The engineers of the Committee in this building had these original plans to work upon. The report of the Committee throws some doubt upon that. Now, I will have to trouble the House for a few minutes to show how clear and distinct the evidence is on that point, that these plans which the engineers had were the correct plans that Boyd used. We will take the evidence of Mr. Nicholas Connolly on that subject. He was the successful tenderer; he carried on the work and knew about the plans. At page 475 he gave the following evidence:—

Q. At the time of tendering for the cross-wall, had you any plans to refer to, or had you seen any plans?—A. Yes; I think these were the plans, although there were no plans signed for the cross-wall. That is my recollection.

Remember, there were no plans signed. Then he was asked:

Q. You think these were the plans you saw when you were tendering?—A. That is my recollection of it. Mr. Boswell could say.

Then we called Mr. Boswell, and he said, page 1252:

"These are the only plans I ever saw until we prepared in the office working plans."

Then we called Mr. Perley himself, who was the chief engineer at that time, and who was responsible for the plans prepared by Mr. Boyd under his direction. He said:

"I believe these to be the original plans prepared by Mr. Boyd because I often discussed points with Mr. Boyd relative to them."

Further than that, we have the evidence of Mr. Simon Peters, another tenderer at that time, who identifies these as the plans which he saw at the time of tendering. The only evidence brought to try and throw doubt upon these plans is that of Mr. Coste, who is the present engineer of the Public Works Department, and who entered the department as a junior at this time, and he says his reason for thinking these are not the plans is because they are not signed; but he could not find any others, although he made full search in the office, and he said the originals must have been tracings from these plans. Now, his reason for thinking they were not the plans is because they were not signed, but Mr. Nicholas Connolly said:

"I think these were the plans, although there were no plans signed for the cross-wall."

So that, while Mr. Coste gives as his only reason for doubting these plans that they were not signed, Mr. Connolly said there were none signed for the cross-wall at all. Therefore, they undoubtedly are the plans. These being the plans, the engineers used them and applied the quantities therein to the prices, and they found that they brought out Peters & Moore's tender $17,000 lower than Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s. The return made to the Minister was that Peters & Moore's tender was $8,000 higher than Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s, showing a difference of $25,859, showing to what extent the tenders were figured up and down by the engineers. There was another test. The Committee took the test of some original estimates to which the hon. member for Simcoe referred to to-night in Boyd's own handwriting, found in a book of his regarding those original estimates, and they found that the difference was still greater. They found that the tender of Peters, Moore & Wright, instead of being $8,000 above that of Larkin, Connolly & Co., was $28,000 below it, making a difference of $36,900 caused by the figuring up and down necessary to produce this fraudulent result. But, perhaps, the best test of all as to quantities is what work was done on that cross-wall. It has all been done and paid for. We know what Larkin, Connolly & Co. were paid according to the prices of their tender. They were paid for that work $832,000, and the engineers employed by the Committee show that the same work, under Peters & Moore's tender, would have only cost $762,000. There was, therefore, a clear loss to the country, by this transaction, of $69,860. To that extent, there was a wilful misapplication by the department of the money of the country. It may be said that perhaps the Minister was not to blame for this. But the letters are here of Peters, Moore & Co. to the Minister and to his deputy, Mr. Baillairgé, before this matter was closed, and according to these letters, in the opinion of Peters, Moore & Co., from what they knew of the other prices, their tender should have been found to be the lowest. If the Minister had cast his eyes over the quantities and the way they were applied and had searched into the matter as he should have done, whether he got that notice or not, but much more so having received a direct notice to do so, he would have found it himself. But that was only a part of the trick. I will not go into the other portion of the scheme, the swindle which was necessary in order to get rid of Beaucage without the payment of the $5,000. That emanated from the department itself. On the 17th May, letters were sent calling attention to errors in the tenders of the three tenderers for this firm, and Mr. Perley says in his letter that he writes by the direction of the Minister, and he has sworn that he showed this to the Minister, and sent these letters by the direction or with the knowledge of the Minister. I will not go into that, but that was the most flagrantly scandalous part of the transaction. That has been already discussed, and the Minister was responsible for that. He agreed to its being done and directed it

to be done. He allowed them to shift and change, and allowed the country to be defrauded in that way. Then, in this very cross-wall contract, the Minister himself releases Gallagher, one of Larkin & Co.'s tenders, the lowest tenderer, lets him go, though his money had been put up, though, by the report which was put under the Minister's nose, his tender was $80,000 less than the tender which was accepted, of Larkin, Connolly & Co. If that contract had been carried out under Gallagher's tender, which should have been accepted, instead of under the tender of Larkin and Connolly, there would have been, as was proved before the Committee, a saving to the country of $133,000—lost, absolutely given away, allowed to be stolen by the action, with his eyes open, of the Minister of Public Works in an important function of his department. We have evidence also that Gallagher was not too low a tenderer. We have sworn evidence that Larkin & Connolly had made up their minds that they could do the work on that tender, and would have made profit under it, and poor Mr. Periey, when he was examined, said Gallagher's tender was too low for the work to be done under it, but he could not give any reason for his statement except that he supposed Boyd told him so. He absolutely could not give the Committee any reason why that was considered too low, and he had made no investigation to see whether that tender was too low or not. As a matter of fact, it was not too low, and I say the Minister was directly responsible in this cross-wall matter in another very important respect. We have heard about the dredging contract which was let at 35 cents, to include the putting of the material on the embankment. That dredging was done just outside the cross-wall. This firm were paid 45 cents for filling in the cross-wall. They put a large portion of that dredging material for three years into that cross-wall, for which they were paid 35 cents, which was more than the fair price, and they were paid besides by the Harbour Commissioners and the Public Works 45 cents a yard additional for that, making a direct fraudulent payment to them of $22,412. To say that Sir Hector Langevin did not know of that, to say that he could avoid knowing it unless he shut his eyes absolutely and wilfully, is absurd. Then it has been said to-night that we should give Sir Hector Langevin the benefit of the doubt. I am sure that the report of the minority does give him the benefit of the doubt in many ways. I think it gives him the benefit of the doubt when it gives him the entire benefit of his oath in regard to that personal payment to him of $10,000 sworn to by Murphy. I am not going into details, and I am not going to show that in almost every essential particular Murphy has been corroborated by documents and witnesses, or that in many essential particulars Sir Hector Langevin has been contradicted by documents and witnesses on oath; although he waited until the last moment before he gave his testimony and knew what had been proved and what had been denied, while that poor man Murphy was called early in the investigation and was hackled and cross-examined by the most acute legal talent in the country, and willingly gave up his papers which he had not read, and yet his testimony was corroborated in the most extraordinary manner. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), in his proposed amendment, imputes perjury to Nicholas Connolly and Michael Connolly, but he does not mention the name of Mr. Murphy, who has sworn against Sir Hector Langevin in this matter, as being shown to be guilty of perjury. So I think we have given Sir Hector Langevin the benefit of the doubt, and I think the evidence shows, and public opinion now is, and this House ought to decide, that he did know of the conspiracy and that he did willingly lend himself to its objects. I think that even on this cross-wall contract, which is by no means the strongest of the cases, we are bound, I am sorry to say, to find the Minister guilty of a great deal more than merely shutting his eyes, as the report of the minority would say, and being blindfolded and misled by his dear friend, Mr. McGreevy.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I have no intention of entering upon the general subject of the present discussion as regards the evidence which has been given on one side or the other. I simply rise in reply to the hon. gentleman who has spoken last (Mr. Edgar), to call the attention of the House to this fact, not an important one, perhaps, as regards this discussion, but an important one as regards the political position of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. The hon. gentleman severely attacked the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) because, as he says, he made a malicious attack upon the Opposition. I think it is to be regretted that any question of that kind or any idea of that kind should have been brought into this discussion: but let the blame rest upon the right shoulders. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition was the first to-night to introduce any matter of that kind, and, if the leader of the Opposition had not commenced his speech by an attack upon the late Sir John A. Macdonald, I venture to say that the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would not have made the assertions he did: but, if the leader of the Opposition thinks he can pose as the embodiment of political purity, as the embodiment of everything which is refined and dignified in political life, and under the colour of that can make attacks upon gentlemen upon this side of the House, and can assume for himself and his friends the virtue which their past history does not show them to possess, he must take the responsibility of his own action. And it is simply with regard to that point that I wish to say a word with reference to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. Let there be fair-play on this question, as we all desire there should be; but when an hon. gentleman, for the sake of making an effective appeal to this House and to his followers, commences by an attack which is altogether unjustifiable, which is uncalled for, by the circumstances, then I say he cannot complain if a fair and reasonable retaliation is made. There is only one other matter which I wish to refer to in regard to this question. I think that the votes which are to be given upon this question ought to be given not from any party point of view, but from a deliberate conviction that we ought to entertain upon the evidence that has been laid before us. I repudiate altogether the idea that this is a party question, I think it is one which ought not to be, and I trust will not be, regarded by this House as affecting the political position of the parties in this House. I do not think that anything that has been said to-day in the course of this debate at all

involves the conclusion that any votes which may be given upon this question should in the slightest degree affect the position of the Government or of the Opposition. Sir, it would be a monstrous thing if it could be contended in this House that we on this side, or the hon. gentlemen opposite, upon the mere question of the validity of evidence, upon the mere question of what credence is to be given to the statements of one man or another man, are to surrender our common sense, to surrender our intelligence, to the bidding of any gentleman who may be supposed to be the leader of our party. I, for one, entirely refuse to be placed in such a position. I say this is not a question of policy, it is not a question which, in the slightest degree, affects the position of the Government, it is not one which in the slightest degree affects the position of hon. gentlemen on the other side. It is simply a question of the degree of credence that we are to give to certain evidence which has been laid before us, and upon that alone are we to determine the votes which we are to give upon this question. Sir, I altogether repudiate the idea that on this matter I am to surrender my intelligence, the best reason that I can bring to bear upon a question of this kind, at the bidding of any party leader; therefore, I repeat that I repudiate the idea that the decision of this question is, or ought, to affect the position of either the hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches, or of those hon. gentlemen opposite. In voting for the motion which I intend to support to-night, I intend to vote for it upon three distinct grounds. In the first place, I shall vote for the resolution of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) because it distinctly and clearly lays down, in terms which I think are not contained in either the report of the minority or of the majority, who are the parties to the conspiracy which all admit to have existed with reference to these contracts. It distinctly lays down, in the first place, that there was a conspiracy, that the parties to that conspiracy were the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., that Mr. Thomas McGreevy was the second party to this conspiracy, and that some officials unnamed—because it is not in our power to say who really were the officials of the Public Work Department—were the third party to this conspiracy; and all these three combined to form that conspiracy, the result of which has been the unfortunate events which I trust we all most sincerely deplore. In the second place, I support the resolution of the hon. member for North Simcoe because I think it places before this House and before the country in more just terms than either the report of the majority or the report of the minority, the responsibility which the late Minister of Public Work bears in reference to the transactions to which that report relates. I think also that it is more fair to the chief engineer of that department, for I think it would be most unfair if a majority of this House, on either one side or the other, were to come forward and say that the late Minister of Public Works was to be absolved and free to throw the blame upon his chief engineer. I think that would be as unjust as to say that the Minister is to be condemned and that his chief engineer is to be exonerated. The third reason why I support this resolution is that it lays down the doctrine which neither of the other reports lay down, and which I think has not yet been alluded to so far in the discussion, and that is that no Minister of the Crown, I care not how eminent he may be, how great his abilities may be in any direction, either as an administrator or as a debater—that no Minister of the Crown can evade, or should be allowed to evade, the responsibility which attaches to him as the head of that department, by throwing the blame of any misconduct that may arise upon any of his subordinates. Of course, that doctrine must be taken with very considerable limitations. We must clearly understand that a gentleman who is at the head of any department where great technical knowledge is required in order to carry out its details must, to a great extent, depend upon the opinions of his subordinates. At the same time it would be a fatal blow at our system of responsible government, it would strike at the very roots of our system of administration, it would really prevent anything like a certainty of honest administration, if a Minister was to be allowed to shield himself from the misdeeds of his subordinates, from the consequences of such things as we have seen happening under the the administration of the Public Works Department, by saying that he has acted upon the advice of his chief engineer. Sir, in the disclosures which are laid bare before us by the evidence given before that Committee, we have abundant evidence of the truth of that contention. If we are to accept that as a sufficient excuse for the hon. gentleman who was at the head of that department, the principle of ministerial responsibility would be entirely thrown away: and if you admit that principle, what becomes of our whole system of constitutional government? A Minister must be responsible for the department over which he presides, and if he allows improper payments to be made, if he allows his subordinates to take commissions, or to carry on the affairs of that department for their own personal benefit or advantage, he must accept responsibility for the acts of those over whom he presides, although I admit that his responsibility must be limited in some degree according to the special circumstances of the case. But he must be responsible, and if he undertakes the high position of head of a department, he must also undertake the responsibility which attaches to that position, and he must not endeavour to screen himself from that responsibility by pleading either ignorance of the transactions which have been going on, or pleading incapacity to understand the various subjects which he has undertaken to control. Sir, that principle must be adopted in all the departments, and it must be made to extend to all. It does not matter what department may be concerned; if an hon. gentleman undertakes the responsibility of taking charge of the Public Works Department, while, within certain limitations, he must be guided in purely technical matters by the advice of his chief engineer, or those who are properly qualified to judge of the technical subjects which come under his control, he must undertake, at the same time, the responsibility, and the public have a right to look to him, and the public will look to him, for a correct administration, and the public will not exonerate the Minister at the head of that department for any wrong-doing, simply because he comes forward and says that upon this question or upon that question, involving the expenditure of large sums of money, he was guided by the technical knowledge of his subordinates. When it comes to the administration of a great

spending department, the Minister will not be allowed to absolve himself in public opinion, at any rate, by saying that he did not know what his subordinates were doing. It is his business to know what his subordinates are doing, that is what he is there for, and if he fails in that duty, if he fails to keep a close check upon them, then he fails in his duty as head of the department, and this House and the country will hold him, I trust, responsible, and he must not escape either upon the plea of ignorance or incapacity. Now, Sir, I do not desire to go any further into this question for the reason I have stated. I shall give my vote for the resolution of the hon. member for North Simcoe on the three grounds that I have stated. Upon the ground that it is a more fair expression of the relative position of the parties, upon the ground that it places more fairly before the country the relative position of the Minister and his subordinates, upon the ground that it does more justice to each, leaving the country and the House to understand that, as regards these questions, the Minister must accept the responsibility, and also because in one clause of the amendment it lays down distinctly the doctrine, which this House must ever bear in mind, that a Minister must always be responsible. On these grounds, I prefer the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to the report of the Committee. I desire to repeat that the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has no right to complain of the remarks made by the hon. member for North Simcoe, for he brought them upon himself by uncalled for remarks, altogether foreign to the subject of the debate, to the late leader of the Government.

Mr. McNEILL. I had not intended to make any remark in regard to this matter, but I think it is due to myself that I should express, very shortly indeed, the reasons for the vote I feel called upon to give in reference to the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Simcoe. I would just say, in the first place, that I hope we have seen the last of such references as we are now discussing. If a matter of this kind is to be investigated again, a matter of so grave a nature, a matter of such enormous importance to the country and this House, I sincerely hope it will be left to the decision of a tribunal in which the people of this country will have confidence. The hon. member for Bothwell laughs. I think the people have not that confidence it would be desirable they should have in the decision of a committee and of a tribunal which is composed of polical partisans, in their eyes at least. I do not care how much or how carefully members of that committee may endeavour to discharge their minds of any political bias, the people will consider their minds have been affected by political bias, and no matter how just, how fair or how honourable the conclusion to which the committee arrives, the people will view that conclusion with a certain amount of doubt, and without that degree of reliance with which it is most desirable in the public interest they should view the decision of such an important question as this. I think, notwithstanding the laugh and sneer of the hon. member for Bothwell, it does not commend itself to the good sense of the people that this important question, a question of which it is hardly possible to exaggerate the importance at the present time, should be decided by a partisan committee, who are sent to consider the evidence, to decide what evidence they will admit or reject, who are to decide on that evidence which they choose to select for themselves; and they having heard the evidence, they having had a living presentation of the case before them are to come down here and make a report; and this House, the members of which have not heard the evidence (except those members who belong to the Committee), who have not had an opportunity of hearing one word or seeing any witness under examination, and being able to judge by his demeanour whether he was a credible witness or not—this other partisan body who have not heard the evidence is to pronounce judgment on the partisan body who have heard the evidence. The hon. member for Bothwell may think that a logical arrangement or proposition, and one likely to be approved by the people, but I do not think it commends itself to popular approval. Under such circumstances it is most important we should have some other tribunal to decide questions of this kind, altogether free from any suspicion of party bias. The hon. member for Bothwell may think that is not advisable; I think it is. I would add in regard to the vote I intend to give on this question that I have made up my mind to support the report of the majority of that Committee, of those who heard the evidence—a Committee containing among its members many for whom I entertain the highest respect and regard. I have here a book of 1,500 pages of printed matter, and I do not feel capable of pronouncing a reliable opinion on the evidence, at all events an opinion which I would think fit to be placed in opposition to the decision arrived at by the majority of those who heard the evidence and had an opportunity at any moment a witness was before them to ask questions to remove doubts that might exist in the minds of the Committee at any time. I wish to make this remark: I was one of three members who a short time ago took a course which was considered to be a somewhat extreme course in reference to another matter of an analogous nature to that we are discussing. I was one of three members of this side of the House who felt it to be my duty to take the somewhat strong course of voting against the motion of the Government, of the motion of the Minister of Justice, I believe, when it was moved that there should be an adjournment of the debate on the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in reference to the Rykert case. I did so because I thought it essential to make sure that the matter should be probed to the bottom. I did so because I thought it was essential in the best interests of the country that if there were corruption on the part of any member of this House, that corruption should be exposed, and that member punished. If I thought this report which has been brought in by the majority of the Committee, by the Committee in fact, was what it has been described, a "whitewashing" report, I would just as surely vote against that report now, be the consequences what they may, as I voted against that resolution of the Minister of Justice on that occasion. But when I come to consider the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in a speech which I think will be admitted by

hon. gentlemen on both sides to have been one of the clearest expositions of the case it would be possible to imagine, when I come to lay it beside the conclusions of the report, I confess that, so far as my humble judgment goes, I cannot find there is sufficient difference, so far as this main question of guilt or innocence of the late Minister of Public Works is concerned, to warrant me in voting against the report of the Committee. What does the amendment of the hon. member from Simcoe say? The amendment of my hon. friend for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says that so far as the guilt of the Minister is concerned—I am speaking now as to the conspiracy, and as to whether the Minister was a party to that conspiracy or not, the amendment of my hon. friend says that he is in unable to decide—

"Whether the conduct of the Minister is to be described as a blind confidence which can scarcely be distinguished from criminal negligence or of a guilty connivance in the spoliation of the public treasury which ought to be characterized with very different language."

That is to say, he does not find that the Minister is innocent and he does not find that he is guilty of that charge of conspiracy. What does the report of the majority say? It says:

"Your Committee, therefore, report that the evidence does not justify them in concluding that the Minister knew of the conspiracy before mentioned or that he willingly lent himself to its objects."

The report distinctly refuses to say that he is innocent of having been a party to that conspiracy, just as my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) refuses to say that he is innocent of being a party to that conspiracy. The report on the other hand says that there is no evidence to convict him of having been guilty of entering into that conspiracy, and my hon. friend says that there is no proof to convict him of being guilty of having entered into that conspiracy. So far as the substance of the two conclusions are concerned, in my humble judgment, I do not see that the one proceeds a single iota beyond the other. This report of the majority has been spoken of as a "whitewashing" report. What does it amount to? It amounts to this, Mr. Speaker: That the gentlemen who framed this report have reported that they believe, as my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) believes, that there is not evidence to convict the Minister of Public Works of having been a party to this conspiracy. How would any common criminal standing before any court of justice under the English law leave that court under these circumstances? He would leave that court with a verdict of innocent when the evidence did not prove him to be guilty. Does this so-called "whitewashing" report give him the benefit of that verdict which the lowest criminal in the land could command in any court of justice in this country under such circumstances? No, Sir. This so-called "whitewashing" report does nothing of the kind. This so-called "whitewashing" report does not say that he is innocent. This so-called "whitewashing" report does not extend to him that verdict which the lowest criminal in the land would have been entitled to command had he been standing before the bar of justice under our English law. This so-called "whitewashing" report only amounts to the Scotch verdict of "not proven." As I have said before, and I need hardly repeat it, if any criminal, no matter who he may be, were standing before the bar of his country, any British subject before any British court, under our English law, and it were declared that there was no evidence to convict him as it is declared here, there would be a verdict of "not guilty." But there is no such verdict recorded here, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite profess to say that this is a "whitewashing" report. If hon. gentlemen opposite only tried to divest themselves for a moment of their party prejudices, I venture to say that they would themselves see that a more unfair, and a more unfounded, and a more uncandid statement can scarcely be imagined. The amendment of my hon. friend goes on further to say that because of the responsibility which naturally attaches to a Minister—and which I do not think that any hon. member of this House will for one moment doubt attaches and must necessarily attach to a Minister—that by reason of that the administration of the department has been such that it deserves the censure of this House. I entirely agree with that, and I entirely agree with the other portion of the report so far as the Minister of Public Works is concerned, but I say that this is contained in the report of the majority, and I say that the difference in this particular between my hon. friend's amendment and this report is, that the report of the majority says not only that he should be censured, but it does censure him.

Mr. MULOCK. Will you read it?

Mr. McNEILL. I am just about to do so, but my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) is always a little previous when I am speaking, because he never allows me to get to my point. I suppose I may be a long time getting at it. What the majority report says on that question is this:

"The administration of the department is greatly to be regretted."

I want to know whether a resolution of this House to the effect that the administration of the department of the Minister of Public Works, or the Minister of Finance, or any other Minister, had been conducted in such a way as "to be greatly regretted," would not be a vote of censure passed by this House? My hon. friend seems to be doubtful as to whether it would or would not, but I have no doubt, and I do not think the members of this House doubt that it would be a vote of censure. I say, according to my lights at all events, that when this House passes this report of the majority that it has pronounced a vote of censure upon the administration of that department which my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says we ought to do. I may be mistaken, but according to my lights, so far as I can see, although the phraseology is different and although the phraseology of my hon. friend may be more pointed, still I believe that the conclusions arrived at in the report and the amendment are the same. Some people talk of a report of this kind as if it were to be discussed and read as a spicy newspaper article, but it should be remembered that we have to discuss this as a state document, and we have to consider the phraseology of it from that point of view, and not as a newspaper article. I contend, so far as I can see, that this report condemns the administration of the department, declares that "it is greatly to be regretted," and further says, that it is unable to pronounce that the hon. Minister has not been guilty of the other charges levelled against him.

I do not see any reason why for the sake of the phraseology of my hon. friend's report, I should adopt it, rather than the report which has been drafted by the majority of the Committee. Now, there is another matter in connection with my hon. friend's amendment which so far as I am concerned, I have a great deal of sympathy with, and that is, that portion of it in which he refers to the chief engineer, Mr. Perley. While I should be only too glad to be able to believe that Mr. Perley, for whom I have always entertained the very highest respect, was innocent of these charges, I must say that I would not be prepared to go so far as to differ with the conclusion of those who have heard the evidence which has been offered on that subject, and have heard Mr. Perley himself under examination. Not having heard the evidence myself, and knowing that my hon. friend from Simcoe has not heard that evidence, I do not feel that I would be doing my duty, so far as that matter is concerned, if, through sympathy for Mr. Perley, I disagreed with those who closely followed the enquiry and minutely weighed the evidence. I know my hon. friend has not allowed mere sympathy to interfere with his judgment in this matter. I am sure he does sympathize with Mr. Perley, as I believe everyone in this House does, but I am sure he has come to his conclusion from reading the evidence. For my part I do not feel justified in coming to a conclusion contrary to the conclusion of the whole Committee, I believe, both the majority and the minority, without having heard the evidence myself. The hon. gentleman has had more experience than I have had in sifting evidence, and his opinion is different from mine. All I say is that however great a relief it would be to my mind to vote conscientiously for that clause of this amendment, I do not feel that I would be justified in doing so.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not propose to discuss this question. I wish simply to refer to one observation that fell from the last speaker. He does not characterize the report of the majority as a "whitewashing" report, and he relies on its concluding observations as justfying him in that conclusion. If you turn to the report you will find that its concluding observations are as follows:--

"Your Committee have the following general observations to make on the charges generally:

"Having regard to various features which appear in the contracts which were the subject of this investigation, we feel bound to report that the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. conspired to defraud the Government and the Harbour Commissioners, and were materially aided in their designs by the interference of Thomas McGreevy, as has been shown in earlier parts of this report. This conspiracy has been all the more powerful and effective by reason of the confidence which the late Minister of Public Works had in the integrity and efficiency of his officers and by reason of the confidence which the late Minister entertained with regard to Thomas McGreevy, and has accomplished results which are to be greatly regretted as regards the administration of the department, and greatly to be condemned as regards those who lent themselves knowingly to the purposes of the conspirators."

Here it is stated as the proper conclusion to draw from the evidence that all these frauds were due to the confidence of the Minister in his officers. If that is not entirely exonerating the Minister from blame, I fail to understand what would be a "whitewashing" report. Let the hon. gentleman understand perfectly what he is about. He is engaged in the "whitewashing" business just as he was the other night in a somewhat similar case.

Mr. McNEILL.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I will not refer to a painful subject, which the hon. gentleman would like to have forgotten.

Mr. McNEILL. I believe the hon. gentleman himself has been "whitewashing" a good deal in connection with the Quebec business.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not.

Mr. McNEILL. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend has no right to say that. I am prepared to condemn wrong: I do not care from what quarter it may come. When I am called upon to decide one question, I shall decide that regardless of any other which is not in issue; and I am now considering one of the questions which has engaged the attention of Canada, and more than Canada, for a long time, and has deservedly occupied the attention of this House for several months. The loss of public money is a trifle compared with the loss of public honour. The hon. gentleman says that he is perfectly content to say that the whole of these consequences arose from the abiding confidence of the Minister in his officers. Then, for fear that that paragraph might implicate the Minister of Public Works, the Committee go on to apologize to him for any possible misconstruction of what they have said, by adding these words:

"The charges against Sir Hector Langevin, as already intimated, having been as above set forth, the Committee would observe that in course of the investigation an effort was made to connect him with the wrong-doing of others who have been reported against as directly connected with fraudulent conduct."

There the Committee distinctly apologize to the Minister for the conduct of my hon. friend for Montmorency and the Committee and the general public, for having in some suggested unjustifiable way sought to connect him, with these transactions, although he was directly connected with them by the charges made on the floor of Parliament. The majority of the Committee pretend that the Minister was taken by surprise at the closing moments of the enquiry, and was not fully aware of the seriousness of the accusations made against him. Therefore they go on to say:

"Your Committee, therefore, report that the evidence does not justify them in concluding that the Minister knew of the conspiracy before mentioned, or that he willingly lent himself to its objects."

Let the hon. gentleman take no comfort in the opinion which he has expressed that this is not a "whitewashing" report. It has been analyzed by more than a party tribunal: it has been analyzed by the great jury of the country. The people, the masters of us all, have formed an opinion upon it: and the independent press--and I am thankful to know that there is growing an increasing independent press in Canada--has pronounced this document to be a "whitewashing" report. Let no hon. gentleman misunderstand the position he is assuming by voting in favour of this report.

Mr. McNEILL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me for a moment? I wish to say that whether the independent press or the public of this country express themselves in one way or another way, I shall endeavour to discharge what I believe to be my duty, according to the dictates of my conscience and my judgment.

Mr. MULOCK. I have not the slightest doubt that the hon. gentleman will endeavour to bring a conscientious judgment to bear upon the consideration of this question. I am not questioning his conscience; I know him well, and I would not for one moment question the goodness of his intentions; but I must question the accuracy of his judgment. I cite the opinion of the independent press as proof that he has misconstrued the tenor of this report; and before it is too late let him, and those who propose to vote with him, know full well that while here, surrounded by colleagues, perhaps coerced and dragooned into line by various influences, they may be induced to believe that it is not a "whitewashing" report, I venture to say that when they have left these halls and returned to more peaceful walks—when they come to an atmosphere which is not alive with party feeling, then their better judgment will assert itself, and they will find, when it is too late, that in adopting this report they have condoned high crimes against the country, and will have to suffer the consequences. Therefore, I say there are no two courses open. Hon. gentlemen who support this report condone all that has been charged by the hon. member for Montmorency and all that the evidence has established.

House divided on amendment of Mr. McCarthy:

YEAS:

Messieurs

McCarthy, O'Brien.—2.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams, Allan, Allison, Amyot, Armstrong, Bain, Baker, Barron, Beausoleil, Béchard, Beith, Bergeron, Bergin, Bernier, Bourassa, Bowell, Bowers, Bowman, Brodeur, Brown (Chateauguay), Brown (Monck), Burnham, Burns, Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Inverness), Campbell, Carignan, Carpenter, Caron (Sir Adolphe), Carroll, Cartwright (Sir Richard), Casey, Chapleau, Choquette, Christie, Cleveland, Coatsworth, Cochrane, Cockburn, Colter, Corby, Costigan, Craig, Curran, Daly, Daoust, Davidson, Davies, Davis, Dawson, Delisle, Denison, Desaulniers, Desjardins (Hochelaga), Desjardins (L'Islet), Dewdney, Dickey, Dugas, Dupont, Dyer, Edgar, Edwards, Fairbairn, Fauvel, Featherston, Ferguson (Renfrew), Flint, Foster, Fréchette, Gauthier, Geoffrion, German, Gibson, Gillies, Gillmor, Girouard, Godbout, Gordon, Grandbois, Grieve, Guay, Haggart, Hargraft, Harwood, Hazen, Henderson, Hodgins, Hutchins, Hyman, Ingram, Innes, Ives, Jamieson, Kaulbach, Kenny, King, Kirkpatrick, Landerkin, Langelier, LaRivière, Laurier, Lavergne, Leduc, Léger, Legris, Lépine, Lippé, Livingston, Macdonald (Huron), Macdonald (King's), Macdonald (Winnipeg), Macdonell (Algoma), Mackintosh, McAllister, McDonald (Victoria), McDougald (Pictou), McGregor, McKay, McLean, McLennan, McLeod, McMillan, McMullen, McNeill, Madill, Marshall, Masson, Mignault, Miller, Mills (Annapolis), Mills (Bothwell), Monet, Montague, Mousseau, Mulock, Murray, Ouimet, Paterson (Brant), Patterson (Colchester), Pelletier, Perry, Pope, Préfontaine, Prior, Proulx, Putnam, Reid, Rider, Rinfret, Robillard, Roome, Ross (Dundas), Ross (Lisgar), Rowand, Ryckman, Sanborn, Savard, Scriver, Semple, Simard, Skinner, Somerville, Spohn, Sproule, Stairs, Stevenson, Sutherland, Tarte, Taylor, Temple, Thompson (Sir John), Trow, Truax, Tupper, Tyrwhitt, Vaillancourt, Wallace, Watson, Weldon, White (Cardwell), Wilmot, Wood (Brockville), Wood (Westmoreland), and Yeo.—184.

Amendment to amendment negatived.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, we have reached the last phase of the great political trial which has been in progress for more than three months. This phase is the most important of all, for the verdict which we are now to render will enter the history of the country. Between the two reports upon which we are called on to decide, there is a great divergence of opinion. I have heard the entire debate which has taken place; I have followed the whole investigation with as much attention as I could give it. Some of my friends on this side of the House have expressed the opinion that the majority report was a thorough whitewashing. I cannot share this opinion. In weighing the conclusions of that report, I find that they resolve themselves into this: There has been a conspiracy. In this conspiracy are involved, first, the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co.; and secondly, Thomas McGreevy. And this conspiracy has been enabled to do its work because the hon. Minister of Public Works too fully rested confidence, first, in his officials, and, secondly, in his friend of the last twenty years; in the man who for the ten years past has lived of his life, parliamentary and private. This judgment pronounced on one of the most important public men of the country, is, in my estimation, sufficient to cause him to step down from the lofty position he has occupied until to-day. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not to be lost sight of that the third paragraph of the general conclusions goes still further. The hon. Minister is, by this paragraph, declared guilty of having lent himself to this conspiracy. But, if it is true that the word "willingly" is to be found in it, which means that

he must bear the responsibility of this conspiracy, it must also be said that the paragraph is worded so as to soften its effect. I am ready to say just here, that, in my humble opinion, this report of the majority is less in accordance with the facts and the evidence than the minority report. There has been conspiracy. This is absolutely an undeniable fact. And this conspiracy did not bear upon a single isolated case. If it bore upon an isolated fact, its importance would be much less. It bears upon ten years of the official life of a man who has rightly been called here, the second officer in command of the forces of a great political party. I repeat it here, Mr. Speaker, the verdict given by the majority in its report is sufficient to condemn him to private life; but I add—because I have a duty to fulfil, and because I believe that I can conscientiously fulfil it by expressing the opinion I now utter—I do not believe that the conclusions of that report are sufficient, for we are not speaking merely for ourselves at this moment. The future will judge the important act that we are accomplishing now. Is it just for me, the accuser, after having expressed the opinion which I have expressed to vote between these two reports? If I have to vote, I say it without fear, I would vote for the verdict rendered by the minority. My judgment may have been prejudiced by circumstances surrounding the case. I have known important facts outside of the evidence. My mind has been full of this case for a year already. If under such circumstances, I were called as a juror in a case, would I not feel myself bound to excuse myself? I may be mistaken. I have desired to give this explanation here, and I give it to show that I do not fear to take the responsibility of the verdict rendered by the minority of my colleagues. Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say to my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, that I have only recently known the crimes which I came to denounce here? He told us this afternoon that the Conservative party profited to a great extent by these crimes. I solemnly declare in my name and in the name of my Conservative friends with whom I have been, that I only knew of these crimes when I made them known to the country. Mr. Speaker, the Conservative party has greatly suffered from that state of things,—our national dignity in the Province of Quebec has suffered still more. It is painful for us, the French minority here, to have to admit that the official chief of our race here has been unwillingly and in spite of himself I hope the head of this immense conspiracy. It is a calamity —but if we are willing to stand resolved, like men; if we are willing not too readily to despair of the country; if we are willing not too readily to despair of the forces at our disposal, there is still safety. I resume my seat after making this declaration. I believe that my motives will be understood by those of my colleagues who hear me. I have not depended wholly upon myself to reach this decision. I have consulted high parliamentary authorities outside of this House; men free from all party spirit. I also consulted precedents, although they be rare. And I came to this determination not because I wanted to shirk the responsibility of the report presented by the minority —I believe it is more just than the one that is going to be adopted—but because, I say it again, I would fear that if I should vote, my mind would not perhaps be altogether free from previous prejudice in its verdict.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Davies (P.E.I.):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Harwood,
Allison,	Hyman,
Amyot,	Innes,
Armstrong,	King,
Bain,	Landerkin,
Barron,	Langelier,
Beausoleil,	Laurier,
Béchard,	Lavergne,
Beith,	Leduc,
Bernier,	Legris,
Bourassa,	Livingston,
Bowers,	Macdonald (Huron)
Bowman,	McGregor,
Brodeur,	McMillan,
Brown (Chateauguay),	McMullen,
Brown (Monck),	Mignault,
Cameron (Huron),	Mills (Bothwell),
Campbell,	Monet,
Carroll,	Mousseau,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mulock,
Casey,	Murray,
Choquette,	Paterson (Brant),
Christie,	Perry,
Colter,	Préfontaine,
Davidson,	Proulx,
Davies,	Rider,
Dawson,	Rinfret,
Delisle,	Rowand,
Edgar,	Sanborn,
Edwards,	Savard,
Fauvel,	Scriver,
Featherston,	Semple,
Flint,	Simard,
Gauthier,	Somerville,
Geoffrion,	Spohn,
German,	Sutherland,
Gibson,	Trow,
Gillmor,	Truax,
Godbout,	Vaillancourt,
Grieve,	Watson, and
Guay,	Yeo.—88.
Hargraft,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Kirkpatrick,
Baker,	LaRivière,
Bergeron,	Léger,
Bergin,	Lépine,
Bowell,	Lippé,
Burnham,	Macdonald (King's),
Burns,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Cameron (Inverness),	Macdonell (Algoma),
Carignan,	Mackintosh,
Carpenter,	McAllister,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McCarthy,
Chapleau,	McDonald (Victoria),
Cleveland,	McDougald (Pictou),
Coatsworth,	McKay,
Cochrane,	McLean,
Cockburn,	McLennan,
Corby,	McLeod,
Costigan,	McNeill,
Craig,	Madill,
Curran,	Marshall,
Daly,	Masson,
Daoust,	Miller,
Davin,	Mills (Annapolis),
Davis,	Montague,
Denison,	O'Brien,
Desaulniers,	Ouimet,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Patterson (Colchester),
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Pelletier,
Dewdney,	Pope,
Dickey,	Prior,
Dugas,	Putnam,
Dupont,	Reid,
Dyer,	Robillard,
Fairbairn,	Roome,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Ross (Dundas),

Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Skinner,
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westmoreland).—104.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Barnard,	Mr. Welsh,
Mr. Earle,	Mr. Fauvel,
Mr. White (Shelburne),	Mr. Forbes,
Mr. McKeen,	Mr. Borden,
Mr. Moncrieff,	Mr. Lister,
Mr. McDougall (C. Breton),	Mr. Fraser,
Mr. Tisdale,	Mr. Charlton,
Sir D. Smith,	Mr. Mackenzie,
Mr. Corbould,	Mr. Burdette,
Mr. Macdowall,	Mr. Devlin,
Mr. Mara,	Mr. Frémont,

Amendment negatived.

House divided on motion of Mr. Girouard:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Baker,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bowell,
Burnham,
Burns,
Cameron (Inverness),
Carignan,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corby,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davis,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
LaRivière,
Léger,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Mackintosh,
McAllister,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McKay,
McLean,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Madill,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Montague,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Pelletier,
Pope,
Prior,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Skinner,
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westmoreland).—101.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan,
Allison,
Amyot,
Armstrong,
Bain,
Barron,
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Beith,
Bernier,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Brown (Chateauguay),
Brown (Monck),
Cameron (Huron),
Campbell,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Choquette,
Christie,
Colter,
Davidson,
Davies,
Davin,
Dawson,
Delisle,
Edgar,
Edwards,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Flint,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gibson,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Hargraft,
Harwood,
Hyman,
Innes,
King,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Legris,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
McCarthy,
McGregor,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Mousseau,
Mulock,
Murray,
O'Brien,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Préfontaine,
Proulx,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Savard,
Scriver,
Semple,
Simard,
Somerville,
Spohn,
Sutherland,
Trow,
Truax,
Vaillancourt,
Watson, and
Yeo.—86.

Motion agreed to, and report concurred in.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2.30 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 25th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE MILITIA ACT.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 174) to amend chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Militia and Defence of Canada. He said: I may say in explanation, that this Bill makes provision that when the militia is called out to aid the civil power in suppression of a riot, the civil authorities shall make a deposit of money to meet the expenses of the militia for eight days, and every eight days the militia is kept out the deposit must be renewed. It provides also that if the militia is so called out in an unorganized territory, the Lieutenant Governor shall make the deposit. It also provides that in certain cases the Governor in Council may authorize the calling out of the active militia without a deposit. If other

important amendments are made it will be explained when the Bill is in committee. I may add that it is not the intention to press the Bill this session, but I thought I would introduce it to serve as a notice, and have the Bill printed, so that hon. members may look into it before next session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, with a view of facilitating the despatch of the remaining business of the House, I beg to move :

That when the House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until to-morrow (Saturday) at 3 o'clock, p.m., at which sitting Government measures shall have precedence.

I presume, Mr. Speaker, that it would not be expected that so soon we should be able to announce the day for actual prorogation, but I have reason to believe, in fact an intimation has been conveyed to me by the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, that every disposition will be shown to aid in the despatch of business, and that being the case, it is expected that early next week we may look for prorogation.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I may say that on this side of the House we consider that we have exhausted the fight for the present session, and that we ought to have an era of peace, though it may not be long, I hope, and the shorter it be the more agreeable it will be to all of us. Of course there are certain important matters yet to be disposed of on the Order paper that have to be discussed. However, we will do everything on our side of the House to facilitate the business so as to have as speedy as possible the blessing of a prorogation, if I may call it so.

Motion agreed to.

CHARGES AGAINST THE HONOURABLE THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Mr. HAGGART. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to present a matter before the House. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that a few days ago when I gave an answer to certain charges prepared by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), that I promised to present, as soon as I saw Mr. McLaren of Perth, a statutory declaration confirmatory of the remarks which I made then. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read the declaration of Mr. McLaren to the House. It is as follows :—

"COUNTY OF CARLETON, } *To Wit:* }

"In the matter of the charge made by James Frederick Lister, Esquire, the member representing the district of West Lambton, from his place in the House of Commons, in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, of a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Port Arthur and Rat Portage, known as section B.

"I, Peter McLaren, of the town of Perth, in the County of Lanark, Esquire, do solemnly declare :

"That I have read the statement, which appears in the Official Debates of the House of Commons, made by the Honourable John G. Haggart in reply, which said statement is as follows :—

"'Mr. Speaker, in reply to the motion of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), in which he stated that while I was a member of Parliament representing the South Riding of Lanark, I became beneficially interested in the profits of the contract which was made with the Government in 1879 between Alex. Manning, Alex. Shields, Jno. Jas. Macdonald, Alex. McDonell, Jas. J. Isbester and Peter McLaren, and that the share thereof standing in the name of Peter McLaren I was beneficially interested in, and that I have otherwise derived direct and substantial pecuniary benefits therefrom, let me, in the first place, give the most explicit and full denial to that statement. Perhaps I had better make now an explanation in regard to the whole matter. In the year 1880 the same charge was made. I took the first opportunity of denying it. A Royal Commission was appointed by the Government to enquire into all matters relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I came down here and upon my oath before the said Commission I gave this evidence :

"'Q. Have you had any personal interest in any of the transactions of the Canadian Pacific Railway ?—A. I never had, or in any other contract with the Government, directly or indirectly.'

Further on in the same enquiry, I was asked about the same questions in regard to Mr. John Ryan. To these I said :

"'I was not aware but what he was going on to complete his work when I was up there, and the first intimation I had of the contract being cancelled was seeing it in the public press. I wish also to state as emphatically as I can, because there have been insinuations in some of the newspapers, especially in a newspaper published in my own county, that I was connected in some way or other with these matters, that I am in no way connected, and have no interest in any contract or sub contract; that I never received a cent from any contractor or any person for any service in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other matter as a member of Parliament.'

"'Afterwards in Winnipeg there was a suit conducted there between Lockwood and McLaren. I was examined on oath before that court, when I stated I had not directly or indirectly any interest in connection with Mr. McLaren in section B. Mr. McLaren was examined in the same suit and gave the same denial. Now, it may be necessary to make a statement in reference to my connection with section B. The contract for section B was let in the first place to two tenderers, Fraser, Pitblado & Co., and another firm, connected with the same firm, consisting of Alex. Manning, Alex. McDonell, Jno. Jas. Macdonald, James Shields and Jas. Isbester. After they had received the contract from the Government, from some quarrel or some disagreement between themselves, Fraser and Pitblado could not get along with the other parties, and there was an arrangement entered into by which they left the work to the rest of the partners connected with the contract. In order to strengthen themselves, or in order to carry on their engagements, Mr. McLaren was requested to become a partner and to assist in the purchase of the other partners' interests. At the solicitation of Mr. McLaren, I arranged the partnership between him and the other parties for the purpose of carrying on section B business, and at his solicitation and at his request I overlooked the carrying on of the contract and the final settlement. At the time of the final settlement between the parties in Toronto, at the request of Mr. McLaren and at his solicitation, I went there for the purpose of arranging the pecuniary difficulties between them ; but, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members of this House, that I received no large sums of money from Mr. McLaren for doing this business. The only sums of money which I received during the five or six years which I was looking after that affair were my travelling expenses and bare hotel allowance. I may tell you I was interested with Mr. McLaren in other business, that I was his partner in another transaction, and that I had a good many pecuniary relations with him, but I was always very careful that in all the transactions connected with section B I should have no communication with the Government or any member thereof in reference to the contract, and that I should receive no sums of money in any shape of the profit arising from that contract. The only sums of money that I received from Mr. McLaren was, as I have stated before, barely the travelling expenses to and from attending to his business, and perhaps small sums of money which I got as my hotel fares. I do not know what sums of money are entered in Mr. McLaren's books as against me, because I have not since the charge has been made an opportunity of looking at those books, but for the six years that I attended to that business I do not think that the sum of money charged against me amounts to over $1,500, and that was barely the amount that paid my travelling expenses. Yesterday I heard that Mr. McLaren was going to Virginia, but when the hon. gentleman made the statement in the House I had him telegraphed not to go on any account. I hear he is in Perth to-day and that he will be down this evening in Ottawa, and I will take the first opportunity of getting a statutory declaration from him, and reading it to the House, in which declaration I am sure he will confirm every word I have said. As to the rest of the hon. gentleman's declar-

ation that I was the medium—I had better read it in his own words:

"'That during the progress of the said works, and while the said the Honourable John G. Haggart was so interested therein, members of the said firm were called upon by members of the Government of Canada for large contributions for political purposes, and such contributions were paid out of the moneys of the said firm, and with the knowledge and assent of the said Honourable John G. Haggart were charged against the profits of the firm.'

"'If it is so, I have no knowledge whatever of that statement. I can state here that not to my knowledge did the contractors of section B contribute any sum of money towards any political purpose or to the Government, and I certainly was no medium of communication between the Government and them in reference to it. As that constitutes the whole charge, I think, Mr. Speaker, I have given as emphatic and positive a denial as I possibly could on this motion."

"And I declare the same to be true in every respect.

"That the statement made in the said charge, and which reads as follows:—

"'That the said Honourable John G. Haggart became and was beneficially interested in the profits of the said contract which accrued to the share thereof standing in the name of the said Peter McLaren and has received large sums out of the said profits, and has otherwise derived direct and substantial pecuniary benefits therefrom,'

"Was and is absolutely untrue and without the shadow of any foundation in fact.

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and in pursuance of the Act respecting extra-judicial oaths.

"PETER McLAREN.

"Declared before me at the City of Ottawa, in the County of Carleton, this twenty-fourth September, 1891.

"W. T. CODE, *a Commissioner, &c.*"

Mr. LAURIER. I would just remark to the House in reference to the declaration presented by the hon. gentleman, that, in my judgment at all events, it would have been better, after the resolution of the House the other day, that that statement had not been made. If the matters referred to the other day were investigated, the hon. gentleman himself would admit that this would not be the way of doing it, but the best way would have been to refer the charges to a committee. I wish to make these remarks on this matter.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY ARBITRATION.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to enquire of the Government whether they have received any intimation from the arbitrators employed, how soon the award will be given in the matter of the dispute between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway touching the claims made by the latter in reference to the Pacific coast section?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The information I have from our counsel before the arbitrators is that the award may be expected at a very early date.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would just say this to the Government: that I assume—I would like, however, to have a statement from the Government—that in the event of that award involving the payment of a large sum of money, that it will be dealt with in what I conceive to be the proper way, namely, by a vote of this House, and not by means of a Governor General's warrant, as appears to have been done in some similar cases. I would like an expression from the Minister of Justice on this.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it would be desirable that that course should be pursued, and unless there is some reason that I am not aware of now, it will be pursued.

SUBSIDIES IN LAND TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 173) to authorize the granting of subsidies in land to certain railway companies.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not intend to go in this matter at any length. I rise simply to point out to the House some irregularities, to use a very mild expression, which I think the Government have been guilty of. The hon. Minister of the Interior has been good enough to place in my hands a number of papers in answer to an enquiry; and whilst I have not studied in great detail the earlier documents, which are rather historical than otherwise, I take up a letter dated the 18th January, 1891, and addressed to the Minister by Mr. Burgess, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, which I presume is a pretty fair epitome of the position of matters. I will trouble the House to listen to this letter, which I think on the face of it discloses a looseness in dealing with the public domain which should no longer continue. The letter is as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 18th January, 1891.

"MY DEAR MINISTER,—I beg to direct your attention again to my memorandum of the 23rd March, 1889, respecting the Manitoba South-Western Colonization Railway. This memorandum was used for the purposes of the sub-committee of Council appointed immediately after the last session of Parliament to enquire into the subject of railway lands generally, but my recollection is that it was prepared particularly with a view to obtain such confirmation by Parliament of the land grants earned by the company as might be found necessary.

"The extent to which confirmatory action was required may be briefly stated as follows:—

"The Act 48-49 Victoria, chapter 60, authorized the Governor in Council to grant to the company 6,400 acres per mile of the line from Winnipeg to its terminus at Whitewater Lake, about 150 miles, a total of about 960,000 acres. The company, however, have actually completed 212 miles, for which they would be entitled to a land grant of 1,356,800 acres.

"The Government by Order in Council have undertaken to find for the company 1,132,384 acres as a subsidy for the construction of 177 miles; and 35 miles of road, representing a land grant of 224,416 acres, have been constructed and in operation by the company for some years, in relation to which I am personally aware that the company was promised the usual land grant of 6,400 acres per mile. No provision of that kind has so far been made by Act of Parliament or Order in Council.

"It appears to me that what is necessary to be done now is to (1) authorize, by Order in Council, subject to confirmation by Parliament, a subsidy of 6,400 acres per mile for these 35 miles, and (2) to confirm this action by Act of Parliament, and also confirm the grant for 27 miles in excess of the 150 named in the statutes which was authorized by Order in Council.

"Yours faithfully,

(Signed) "A. M. BURGESS,

"*Deputy Minister of the Interior.*"

Now, what does this letter show? It states, I assume correctly, that there has been no authority whatever for a land grant to the company for more than a distance of 150 miles, amounting to 960,000 acres; yet the Government have undertaken by Order in Council to find for the company, which means to give it, 1,132,384 acres. In the first place, then, the Governor in Council have undertaken to convey to this company over 150,000 acres, for which no statutory authority has been obtained from this House. Passing over that—because it may be replied that their undertaking is not good until ratified—it is now alleged by the Deputy

Minister of the Interior that there should be a further grant made because the first grant which the Government undertook to make was for only 177 miles. Then, the question arises, what is to be done with reference to a subsidy for the remaining 35 miles, making up a total mileage of 212 miles, the distance in respect of which this claim is made? The Deputy Minister of the Interior declares, by way of argument, in order to move the Governor in Council to make a grant for the 35 miles, that he is personally aware that the company was promised the usual land grant of 6,400 acres per mile. Now, Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of this House to this: The Governor in Council is asked to make a land grant for these 35 miles, which have been constructed and in operation for years, and the reason for it is that, according to the recollection of a Deputy Minister, the company was promised it. Who promised it? By what authority was it promised? In this letter he states that there has been no parliamentary sanction for any grant in excess of the distance of 150 miles; and then he says: First, that the Government undertook to find land for 27 miles more than there was any pledge for, and then he says that the company was promised—I presume he means by the Government—as he is personally aware, the usual grant of 6,400 acres per mile for the remaining distance of 35 miles. Now, Sir, quite regardless of the fact that we are called upon now to make a present to a company for a road which has long since been constructed, I call the attention of the House to the extraordinary practice which appears to obtain in the Council, of passing Orders in Council pledging the Government to convey large areas of land to corporations without getting the sanction of Parliament for these pledges. Then, I call the attention of the Government and the House further to this fact, that promise was made, so far as we know not of record, but Parliament is now asked to make good some verbal promise, the only testimony in support of which is the recollection of an irresponsible officer—I mean when I say irresponsible a person who is not a representative of the people. For both these reasons, quite regardless of the fact that the road is now constructed, I venture to say that the action of the Administration, had it been brought to light at an earlier period, would have deservedly invited severe criticism at the hands of the people. In conclusion, I will say further that there is no warrant, so far as here can be seen, for their asking Parliament to make this grant of 6,400 per mile for the 35 miles. There has never been an Act of Parliament pledging the Government to it. There has never been an Order in Council, on the faith of which this company could take steps to spend a single farthing. There has never been, so far as we know, any guarantee given to that company that they would get this grant; and now we are asked to give away this vast area of the public domain to a completed road, in respect of which there is no possible obligation on the part of Parliament. Why are we asked to make this grant? Are we now free, as a matter of honour, to give or withhold it? The Minister of the Interior the other day made a mistake. When I was endeavouring to ascertain the true position of the company, I asked him if he would be good enough to explain whether we were now called on to make this grant, as a matter of obligation binding upon us or as a pure matter of grace. He told us the public was bound by a bargain. I do not know whether he draws a distinction between a bargain made by Order in Council and a bargain made by Parliament as a whole, but I can point out to him the difference. The Governor in Council can make no binding bargain to give away public lands. Parliament has not delegated such authority; and with regard to part of this transaction, the Government does not even pretend, on the face of this instrument, that there was a single Order in Council. True, after this letter of the 19th of January, I believe an Order in Council was passed, but that does not amount to anything, because it was after the enterprise was completed, and therefore it cannot be argued that the company had altered its position or expended a farthing, or that its conduct was in any way affected by that Order in Council. I protest, therefore, against such a loose system of administrating this trust. The subsequent action of the Administration in moving now to make this gift of 200,000 or 300,000 acres of land to a company, on the mere recollection of a Deputy Minister that some person—we know not whom—promised to this company that it should get this gift, is utterly indefensible. Who made this promise? When and why was it made? And why did it not see the light of day before January, 1891? It did not see the light of day even then, for I am not aware the transaction was ever made known until this Parliament met and an attempt was made to carry out this arrangement. The time has come when we should halt before we squander what land we have remaining; or if it has to be squandered, let the squandering be done by the people's representatives and not by the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. With reference to the remarks of the hon. gentleman concerning the statement I made that a bargain had been entered into between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway with reference to this land grant, he will recollect that I stated an Order in Council had been passed, giving to the Canadian Pacific Railway 6,400 acres per mile for 177 miles, and that we were now coming to Parliament for authority to give, not only the surplus of what had been given by statute, but the balance of the land grant to which the Canadian Pacific Railway is entitled. I think the hon. gentleman has been rather unfair in his criticism on the position of the Government and the company in this matter. In 1879, a charter was given for the construction of the Manitoba and South-Western from Winnipeg to Clearwater Lake and subsequently extended some hundred miles beyond that to the Souris coal-fields. If that charter had not expired, the Canadian Pacific Railway would have built that extension on that charter. However, as it had expired, other means were taken to continue the extension to the Souris coal-fields. In 1880, power was taken by the Manitoba and South-Western to build a branch from any point on their line between Whitewater Lake and Winnipeg. The Order in Council which appears in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, after the Canadian Pacific Railway had the charter transferred to them, was dated 24th March, 1885. At a future stage, negotiations were opened with reference to making a change in the land grant on the 150 miles. At that stage communication was

received from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the letters are fyled here which account for the change in the land grant, and authority was given in that Order in Council for a land grant, not only on the 150 miles, but also on a portion of the branch line they were authorized to build in 1880. At a subsequent stage, another Order in Council was passed, giving a land grant to a portion of the extension of the two lines—one on the Manitoba and South-Western proper and also on the branch line —which committed the Government to a land grant on that portion; and it left the remainder, 35 miles, for which no Order in Council was passed and no statutory authority given. That is the reason why we ask now for a Bill covering the whole length of the road, and I contend again that, not only by correspondence but also by interviews with the officers of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the president, its legal adviser, and its secretary, continuous negotiations were going on and there was a perfect understanding that the extension of that road from the main line would receive 6,400 acres per mile. At the time these extensions were being made the road was being built, there was the strongest pressure brought on the Government to have these lines built and to give assistance towards their construction, and great complaints were made that the centres in that part of the country were not receiving the railway communication which they understood would be given them. I do not know that I need say anything further in reference to this matter. I still contend that there is an obligation upon the Government to give that land grant, under the Orders in Council which have been passed and laid on the Table, and I admit that there may be a complaint that a Bill was not introduced at any earlier date. But no land has been transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and no land will be transferred to the Manitoba and South-Western, until we get the authority of Parliament.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is a most extraordinary transaction, and I have heard nothing from the Minister yet as to the ground on which the Government would undertake to transfer a large portion of the public domain of this country to a railway corporation without the sanction and the authority of Parliament. We have a communication from the Deputy Minister to the Minister stating that there was an understanding of that sort. Between whom did that understanding exist? What right had the Administration to pledge any portion of the public lands of this country without coming to Parliament and informing Parliament of what it had done and asking the sanction of Parliament? Here is a railway that is completed, that has been in operation for some years, that had no assurance of any appropriation of this sort at the time it was constructed. It was open to the Government, if they saw proper, to make a general proposition in regard to such grants, but no such proposition exists as a portion of any Act of Parliament. It was open to the Government, if they had any understanding with any corporation, to come down to Parliament and ask the sanction of Parliament before the railway company undertook to construct the road. It has constructed the road in its own interests. It is incidentally serving the public because the company makes profit by giving that service, but it is a most monstrous proceeding, whether this road was in the public interest or not, whether it was built in consequence of the promise of this appropriation or not, for the Government to pledge any portion of the public domain of this country and allow the company to go on and act upon that pledge without immediately coming to Parliament as soon as Parliament was convoked and ascertaining whether it was the will of Parliament that these lands should be appropriated in that way. I find the amount of land contained in this appropriation is nearly 400,000 acres, and, if you take that at $2 an acre—and they are asking more than that in that section—you have nearly a million of dollars promised to a railway corporation by the Government without any authority of Parliament. The Minister of Finance might as well take a million dollars in money from the public treasury without the authority of Parliament, as the Minister of the Interior can take it from the public domain, because the result is exactly the same. That is what the hon. gentleman has done. Then this was done on the eve of the last election. If the hon. gentleman thought the railway corporation had any claim upon the Government, why did he not propose this two or three years ago? This railway has been in operation for several years. Why should those years have been allowed to go by before Parliament is asked to agree to the proposition which the hon. gentleman makes? The railway company took a neutral position in politics, but when an election is about to take place, and when the hon. gentlemen are going to the country to ask for a renewal of its confidence, then the hon. gentleman asks the railway corporation to strengthen its faith in the Administration, because the absence of that faith might cause the Government to lose the support which it desires. This was a most improper proceeding and a suspicious proceeding. It bears upon its face an understanding between the Government and the railway company apart from the public interest, it bears upon its face that this appropriation is not for the purpose of promoting the public interest or keeping faith on behalf of the public or the parties who had the right to pledge that faith; but it is evidently an understanding for the promotion of the interest of hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches, an understanding arrived at on the eve of the general election and years after the railway has been in operation. It is an understanding between the Government and the railway corporation. The very same motives which led the railway corporation to undertake to explain to the people of Canada the impropriety of adopting free trade with the neighbouring republic, the damage which the country would sustain from freer intercourse with it, the same motives which influenced the railway company to publish that manifesto, led to this understanding between the Administration and the railway corporation. I say this is a monstrous proceeding. If it was desirable to act in this way, the action should have been taken years ago, and, if the Government desired to act now, they should have waited until the elections were over, and, if the delay was the result of their negligence, they should have stated their negligence first here, and not on the eve of the elections pledged the country to the appropriation of 400,000 acres of land towards the increase of the capital of that powerful corporation.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported and read the third time and passed.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions on the subject of subsidies to be granted to the railway companies mentioned.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand there are no new resolutions.

Mr. BOWELL. There are no new subsidies. They are only revotes of subsidies, which have already been granted by the House, some of which have already lapsed, and others of which will lapse before next session of Parliament. Some of them have already lapsed, though a large portion of the work has been done.

Mr. BARRON. I suppose that is the reason that no subsidy has been given to the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway.

Mr. BOWELL. No new subsidies are included in these resolutions, not even for a mile in a case in which the parties were entitled to it.

Mr. BARRON. I am anxious that this be understood, because the people in the County of Victoria were expecting a subsidy to the railway I have mentioned. I suppose the Government have not granted a subsidy to this railway, for the reason that no new subsidies are to be granted at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask the Government whether any considerable quantity of work has been done on those lines where a revote of subsidy is granted?

Mr. BOWELL. Every road to which it is proposed to revote a subsidy has had some work done upon it, on some of them to a large extent; on one or two of them $30,000 or $40,000 were due before the subsidy lapsed last May, just before the reports of the engineer had been received as to the quantity of work that had been done. There are none of the roads mentioned in these resolutions upon which surveys, locations and actual work have not been done, at least so I am informed by the engineers, and by the officials of the department to whom instructions were given to prepare these resolutions. I may say, in answer to the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), that there are no new subsidies of any kind or character. The question of granting aid to future railways is still under the consideration of the Government. I may say to the House that the policy of the Government in this respect has not been changed, but in the future we shall be guided by the amount of money which we have at our disposal, and which will enable us to carry out improvements of this kind without increasing the capital indebtedness of the country.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. IVES. I would like to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Railways to an enterprise of very great importance which is partially though not fully completed. It seems to me that the Government, in any further expenditure that they make in aid of railways, should rather give the preference to the completion of lines of railway for which aid has already been given, and which have been partially though not fully completed.

Mr. LAURIER. Louder.

Mr. IVES. I say that in future, whatever aid is given to railways should be given rather to the construction of branch lines and feeding lines, to the great lines of railway already constructed, and that particular attention should be paid to completing and making as effectual as possible and as useful as possible, lines of railway that have already been partially constructed and that have already had aid from the Government. Now, the line of railway that I am particularly referring to, is the extension——

Mr. MULOCK. I rise to a point of order. In Committee I think the hon. gentleman should confine his observations to the particular resolution before the Committee.

Mr. IVES. I am discussing the particular resolution. I say the particular resolutions are all right enough so far as they go, but they do not go far enough.

Mr. MULOCK. You are going too far.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My hon. friend in Committee cannot go on and discuss railways not mentioned in the resolutions. He might have done so before going into Committee.

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for a subsidy from a point at or near New Glasgow or St. Lin to or near to Montcalm, in the Province of Quebec, eighteen miles, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act forty-ninth Victoria, chapter ten, not exceeding in the whole $28,100.

Mr. BARRON. If that rule is going to be enforced it would prevent any reference to other roads. I do not think the Minister himself will object, so far as I am concerned, to a reference to a road.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot speak of any railway not mentioned in the resolutions.

Mr. LAURIER. Can the Minister give us any information as to the work that has been done on that line, and how far it extends now?

Mr. BOWELL. On the 19th August, 1887, a contract was entered into under the Subsidy Act, for the construction and equipment of this road, and the works were prosecuted from that time forward until the subsidy lapsed. The first 10-mile section is completed with the exception of about $2,500 worth of work. The amount paid is $29,500, leaving a balance to be revoted of $28,100. I may state for the information of the Committee, that these subsidies have in some cases been paid on the 10-mile sections, and when application has been made to assist them in the progress of the work we have deducted therefrom the proportion which is due them on the 10 miles in proportion to the amount of work that remains to be done. But in many cases where that has been done, a quantity of work which exceeds the sum which is reserved has been done upon the extension of the other sections of the road. Care is taken that in no case the full amount of the subsidy is paid unless more work is done upon the line than is called for by the resolution.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the actual line of railway? It is stated the railway is to proceed from a point at or near New Glasgow towards the village of Montcalm.

Mr. BOWELL. The 10 miles from New Glasgow towards Montcalm has been built, and the work that has been done in addition is in the same direction. The company did not select the line from St. Lin. My attention was called to this matter yesterday by some gentlemen interested in the line, who stated that either a company or some parties had it under consideration to divert the line more southward. Under the Subsidy Act I do not think any portion of this subsidy could be paid should they divert the line in the manner indicated, and I so informed the parties interested.

Mr. LAURIER. In that section of the country where the line has been built, is it now in operation?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot say.

Mr. McMULLEN. How long has elapsed since the charter was granted?

Mr. BOWELL. The first subsidy was granted by 49 Victoria, chapter 10. On 19th August, 1887, a contract was entered into with the Government for the construction of the road.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for the railway bridge over the St. Charles River to give access to the City of Quebec, the difference between the amount already paid to the company and the limit fixed by the Act fifty-third Victoria, chapter two, a subsidy not exceeding $5,250.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is not this a complete change in the former proposition?

Mr. BOWELL. No. A difficulty in paying the subsidy for the construction of the bridge has arisen from the wording of the original Subsidy Act. It provided that there should be a sum paid not exceeding 15 per cent. on the construction of the bridge, not exceeding in the whole $30,000. The question now is whether the payment should be based on the 15 per cent., or whether the whole subsidy of $30,000 should be paid. Great doubt has arisen in the minds of those whose business it is to interpret the law in this respect. I may further say that a question has arisen as to the actual cost of the construction of the road, from the fact that while the department was inclined to deny the right of the company to charge for the bed of the St. Charles River, as an item in the cost of the construction of the bridge, the contractors contended that they had to pay for the right to place the abutments, &c., in the bed of the river. In order to avoid any complication or any lawsuit with respect to this matter, it was thought better to carry out the real intention of Parliament when the first subsidy was voted and make this grant of $5,250 per mile, which would not exceed $30,000, the amount originally voted by Parliament to aid in the construction of this work, which was to enable the Lake St. John Railway to cross the St. Charles River and enter the City of Quebec, having its terminus at the harbour in that city.

To the Oshawa Railway Company, for seven miles of their railway from Port Oshawa towards Raglan, in lieu of the subsidy for a like amount granted by the Act passed in the session held in the fiftieth and fifty-first years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter twenty-four, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $22,400.

Mr. McMULLEN. What work has been performed on this road? Has the contract been let, and is the work being proceeded with?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government entered into a contract with the company for the construction and equipment of this road on 12th July, 1889, the same to be completed before 1st August, 1891. That has not been carried out. So far the company have made no progress with the work of construction, but they state they have made a final location and are now in a position to proceed with the work. All the right of way has been purchased. The subsidy lapsed on 20th June last.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the road seven miles in length?

Mr. BOWELL. I understand it is longer, but that is all for which the subsidy is asked.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think there should be a distinct understanding respecting the renewal of subsidies that have expired, and that if nothing has been done during several years the subsidy should not be renewed. There should be a distinct understanding when people secure charters that unless the work is proceeded with within the time allotted the charter should be forfeited, and if nothing is done for three years or more it is simply playing with the country's money to allow parties to hang up the enterprise from time to time.

Mr. SKINNER. That would not be a fair rule. In my experience there have been many lines that failed to make a commencement or carry on the work in the time stated, for the very best of reasons. To lay down such a rule as is suggested would be doing great injustice.

Mr. McMULLEN. I admit there is no rule that has not its exceptions, but the rule should be that when men do not make some effort to push forward the work, they should not be granted a renewal of the subsidy except under special circumstances.

To the St. Lawrence, Lower Laurentian and Saguenay Railway Company, for the section of their railway from Grand Piles, on the St. Maurice River, to its junction with the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act passed in the session held in the fiftieth and fifty-first years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter twenty-four, not exceeding in the whole $92,784.

Mr. McMULLEN. What work has been done in this case?

Mr. BOWELL. Work has progressed so far that the company has been already paid $124,816, leaving a balance of subsidy to be paid off, $92,000 odd.

To the Great Eastern Railway Company, for thirty miles of their railway from the River St. Francis to the Arthabaska Railway, at St. Grégoire station, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act passed in the session held in the fiftieth and fifty-first years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter twenty-four, not exceeding in the whole $79,700.

Mr. McMULLEN. What progress has been made in this work?

Mr. BOWELL. Under the contract of 15th March, 1888, the length of railway to be constructed was 21½ miles. It has progressed slowly, work having been done from St. Grégoire to Nicolet, a distance of about 6½ miles. And the Nicolet Bridge, under a special subsidy, has advanced so far as the foundation and masonry piers are concerned, they being completed upon the 6½ miles as above, the company have been paid $16,300, leaving a balance of $79,700, of which it appears to me only $52,500 can be earned, as the distance is twenty and one-half miles, and not thirty miles.

To the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company, for forty-nine and one-half miles of their railway from Woodstock to Hamilton, in the Province of Ontario, in lieu of the subsidy for a like amount granted by the Act fifty-second

Victoria, chapter three, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $158,400.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may say, in connection with this line, that I was very glad last session to learn from the then First Minister that it was not the intention of the Government to subsidize lines in direct competition with other lines. However, I presume that such progress has been made in connection with this work that it is desirable that the faith of the country should be carried out in granting a bonus. I would like to know what progress has been made on this railway, and what are the hopes of final construction?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not prepared to dispute the general principle laid down by the hon. gentleman, but there are circumstances in which competing lines are absolutely necessary in the interest of the trade and development of the country. However, this being simply a revote, I will not discuss the general question with him now. I am informed that the progress of this work has only extended to the surveys and to a certain extent of securing the right of way; but I am assured by those who are interested in the work that they propose to go on and continue it, and it is in order to carry out the pledge of the country that the revote is asked.

To the Tobique Valley Railway Company, for fourteen miles of their railway from Perth Centre station towards Plaister Rock Island, in lieu of the subsidy for a like amount granted by the Act passed in the session held in the fiftieth and fifty-first years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter twenty-four, a subsidy not exceeding $6,400 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $89,600.

Mr. McMULLEN. Where is this road located?

Mr. BOWELL. It is in New Brunswick. The road is nearly built. There is now a sum of over $30,000 due, but before we could get the Orders in Council passed the subsidy lapsed.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the cost per mile?

Mr. SKINNER. The whole road is 28 miles, and it is contemplated that the first half will cost $15,000 per mile at the lowest estimate and the last 14 miles about $9,000 per mile.

Mr. McMULLEN. And you are getting $6,400 per mile.

Mr. SKINNER. The work is very difficult on the first 14 miles, the reason being that the Tobique River flows into the St. John River near the point where the road begins, and it flows through a rocky mouth, not as ordinarily with rivers in the interior where the confluence happens through alluvial land. The work is very expensive, and the lowest figure required to build it will be at least $15,000 per mile. I know the country thoroughly, and also the history of the road, although I am not interested in it.

Mr. McMULLEN. The lowest cost of constructing railways in Ontario is about $10,000 a mile, without rolling stock or anything else, and if there are reasonable difficulties in the way it will cost over $15,000 a mile. The roads we built in our province, costing this sum, only received $3,200 a mile, and it is rather extraordinary that an exception should be made in this case, and that $6,400 should be granted.

Mr. BOWELL. The original subsidy was $3,200 per mile, and when what was termed the doubling up took place, the question was fully discussed in the House and the reasons given on account of which it was increased. I may inform the hon. gentleman that in the case of the Gatineau road and the Temiscouata road, where there were similar difficulties in the way of construction, the same principle was followed.

Mr. SKINNER. I should say that the estimate of expenditure I gave is the very lowest and does not include any rolling stock.

Mr. MULOCK. What are the financial prospects of this company? Can the hon. gentleman state if the country through which it runs is well or sparsely settled?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I can, perhaps, give some information in regard to this railway. The subsidy was originally granted for the construction of 28 miles from Perth Centre station to what was known as the Plaister Rock Island, where there is an inexhaustible deposit of gypsum. A memorial was sent in favour of it from people in the Province of Quebec as well as people in the Province of New Brunswick. So that the road is not a purely local road, and it was on that ground that the subsidy was granted. It runs through an excellent agricultural country, though the great object is, of course, to develop these immense deposits of gypsum. The Legislature of New Brunswick has granted $70,000 to this railway. Fourteen miles have been put under contract, and the contract is about completed, so that nearly all the subsidy has been earned.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is this called the McAllister subsidy?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I never heard that name applied to it.

Mr. MULOCK. Who are the owners of this plaster deposit?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The New Brunswick Government are the principal owners, and that is the reason the local subsidy was granted. I believe some private persons have one or two lots.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the hon. gentleman give the names of the individuals who are interested in the railway?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot tell exactly who are interested in the company. I know that the present contractor is a Mr. Kitchen, who is doing the work very satisfactorily, and Mr. Jones, of St. John, was once connected with the work.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose there would be no objection to the contract for the construction of this railway being laid on the Table next session, if not this session?

Mr. BOWELL. No objection at all.

Mr. MULOCK. If I might venture to go outside of the particular contract in question, I think, in view of our experience, it would be well for Parliament to trace all money granted in this way from the treasury straight to its expenditure, so as to satisfy ourselves where it goes to. I would suggest that it be understood that Parliament be furnished with all this information, not drawn out by motions, but brought down as a matter of course.

Mr. IVES. I do not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I believe he is out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is discussing a question of Government policy, and is

out of order for the same reason that I called the hon. member for Sherbrooke to order.

Resolutions reported, and read the first time.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the resolutions be read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. IVES. Before that motion is adopted, I want to express my regret that the resolutions do not cover a wider field. I want to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to a very important line of railway which has not been completed, and which I think has a fair claim upon the Government for further assistance, that is, the extension of the Maine Central Railway from the County of Wolfe to deep water opposite the City of Quebec, passing through the Counties of Wolfe, Megantic, Lotbinière and Lévis. I may say that already 125 miles have been completed and are in successful and continuous operation, and the traffic results have been such as to fully justify the expenditure which has been made by the capitalists engaged in the matter, and also to justify the Government in giving the assistance of $3,200 per mile to that portion of the line which is in Canada. With regard to the remainder of the line, about 90 miles, a good deal of correspondence has taken place between the people of the Counties of Wolfe and Megantic and the late Minister of Railways, and they were given his assurance that when a charter was obtained and a survey made, which would establish the advisability of continuing the scheme, he would favourably entertain a recommendation to Parliament to grant a subsidy for the completion of the line. I think the people of those counties had a fair right to expect, now that the charter has been obtained and a thorough survey made, and the feasibility of the line established, that this session the Government would have introduced a resolution to subsidize the continuation of this line to the town of Lévis; and I must express my regret that in spite of all my hon. friend from Megantic (Mr. Fréchette) and myself could urge, the Government have not seen their way clear to make any exception in favour of this project from their general decision not to bring down any new subsidies this session. I can only hope that the just expectations of the people of those counties, who have long been without railway facilities, will be gratified at a not very remote date next session.

Mr. BARRON. I quite agree in the remarks of the hon. gentleman. They apply to a road in which a great many of the people of Victoria are interested. I would again ask the acting Minister of Railways if he would say whether the sole reason he has for not granting a subsidy this session is that the Government have decided not to ask for any new subsidies? The hon. gentleman knows that this matter has been approached irrespective of party feeling; he knows there is a unity of action among the people of Victoria in favour of this road, the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Orillia. A grant was made for the portion from Bobcaygeon to the town of Lindsay; and the late First Minister, when discussing the propriety of these subsidies, stated that when a subsidy was partially given and the proprietors of the road showed their intention of going on with it, the balance would be given as a matter of course. I bring this up now, in order that the Minister of Customs may have an opportunity of quieting the minds of the people of Victoria with regard to this matter, because if they were to come to the conclusion that all chance of a subsidy were gone, their feeling would be one of profound disappointment. But if the reason is simply that the Government are not granting new subsidies this year, I take it that will be quite sufficient explanation, and all parties will be satisfied, relying on a subsidy being granted next session.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to add a few words to the remarks made by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, about the railway of which he spoke. This railway should have been built several years ago. In 1887, I came as one of a delegation to Ottawa, to ask for the grant of a subsidy for this railway, and on that occasion, Sir John A. Macdonald said to us: Begin at the beginning; secure a charter from the Quebec Legislature, and then we will give you the usual subsidy, I believe this promise should be fulfilled. We are very far from all railway accommodations, and I see no reason why the Government should not give a subsidy to this railway. I know that this year the Government have decided to grant no new subsidies for the building of railways, but I hope that they will continue their policy of subsidizing railways next year. This line is by nearly thirty miles the shortest between Boston and Quebec, and every one knows that passengers and shippers use the shortest lines by preference. Therefore, I hope that the Government will, next session, grant this railway company a subsidy equal to that already given, in order to help the completion of the road. In this way the Government will do justice, not only to the county which I have the honour to represent, but also to the Counties of Wolfe and Lotbinière, which are crossed by this railway, and the population of which is deprived of all railway communication. The people of these counties pay taxes as well as others, and it is only just that a grant of the public moneys should be used in their interest.

Resolutions read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. BOWELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 175) to authorize the payment of subsidies in aid of the construction of lines of railway therein mentioned. He said: I simply want to say, in reply to the hon. gentlemen who have just spoken, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) and the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Fréchette), that the line to which they have drawn the attention of the House has not been lost sight of by the Government, or the fact that they have strongly urged upon the Government that a subsidy should be granted during this Parliament in aid of the road. But, as I have explained to the House, the Government, for what it believes to be good reasons, have decided not to ask this session for any new subsidies for any new roads. At the same time, I intimated to the House that the policy of the Government had not been changed with regard to the principle of aiding in the building of railways, so far as the revenue of the country will justify it, without adding to the capital indebtedness of the country. There are many deserving lines, and the one referred to by the hon. members for Richmond and Wolfe and Megantic is of that character, and its merits will not be lost sight of. I might make the same remarks in reference to the continuation of the line which has already been

subsidized in the County of Victoria. That question has been very strongly brought to the attention of the Government upon more than one occasion by the representative of the south riding of the county, and by those who are deeply interested in the development of the lumber, of the mineral and the agricultural requirements of that section of the country. I hope, however, in future, when these questions are considered and when the Government feels itself in a position to grant aid to railways which will be in the interests of the country, in developing its various resources, my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Barron) will not accuse us of having done it to purchase constituencies through which the roads run.

Mr. BARRON. I must ask the hon. gentleman to take back that statement. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say he did. The difficulty with the hon. gentleman is that, although he is a barrister or an attorney, he does not appear to understand the English language, or it may be that it is owing to my inability to express myself properly. What I said was that I hoped he would not be found amongst those members of the party to which he belongs who accuse the Government of making these grants for purposes other than those we profess to desire, that is to grant aid to railways, so far as the revenue will permit, in order to develop the various resources of the country. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should be so hasty in this matter. Probably he feels that a guilty conscience needs no accuser, and probably he thought some one had attributed to him something of which he may be guilty, and therefore he felt the truth of the accusation. I have given to the House the reasons why we have confined the present resolutions to renewal of subsidies previously voted, and I have also stated that the policy of the Government, so far as it can, and when practicable and consistent with the revenue of the country, to subsidize railways, has not changed.

Mr. BARRON. I am sorry the hon. Minister is the first I have ever heard to take this railway question out of the category of fair-play. So far as I have known, these grants have been made irrespective of party. They have in regard to this, buried the political hatchet, and if the late Premier were alive, he could produce a letter from me to that effect. It was unfair of the Minister to say that he hoped I was not one of a party who would state that they were doing this for political objects. I think it was out of order when he said, in reference to me, that a guilty party needs no accuser. I made some such remark myself on one occasion, and I was promptly called to order by the late Speaker, but the Minister of Customs thinks it right to make a similar charge, and he is not considered out of order. So far as I am concerned, he is most unjust to me if he includes me in the class of people to whom he is referring, and he is the first that I know of in political life to give this a political complexion. Reformers and Conservatives alike have joined in trying to get this road built, and to get the subsidy, and in order to get the road completed they have sacrificed their political feelings; and I am sorry that the Minister of Customs, when I had approached the matter in such an unbiassed way, should be the first man to give it a political complexion.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. I think the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) wants to run the whole business. We are perfectly satisfied, and my people are perfectly satisfied, and we have a perfect understanding with the Government that, if we do not get this grant this year, we will next year. My section is perfectly satisfied without requiring any interference by the member for North Victoria.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Barron) takes an interest in the development of the whole county and the whole province and the whole of Canada. No pent-up Utica confines us in regard to matters of this kind. We are told that these resolutions are in reference to works for the general advantage of Canada, and it is only on that ground that the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn) can be so much interested in this matter, and so much satisfied as he appears to be in getting some future aid for this railway, but the only ground on which the money can be taken out of the coffers of the country and transferred to this railway is that it is for the general advantage of Canada, and therefore we are entitled to enquire into this and every other grant of a similar nature. The hon. gentleman may talk of the people of that county as "my people," and of the section in which he lives as "my section," as he did, but I suppose he does not carry that constituency in his breeches pocket, and he has no right to assume the monopoly of that riding.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. If there was anything to be done to the advantage of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) in regard to which I considered it my duty to assist him, I should consult him, and then I should think it my duty to assist him in carrying that measure through, but, when an hon. member brings this before the House in regard to a section which has a representative of its own here, I have a right to contradict him on the floor of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—MONTREAL PILOTS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DELISLE. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Marine to a certain article which was published in the Montreal *Herald* on the 12th September instant. It is signed "Montreal Pilots," performing the service between Montreal and Quebec. The article reads as follows :—

"We learn by Saturday's *Star* that the pilot of sailing ship *Trobique* was wholly to blame for the grounding of the said ship. Now, we think otherwise, the Harbour Commissioners being to blame through neglecting to place proper beacons on the shore and proper buoys to mark the channels. Opposite the new sugar refinery's wharf, exactly where the *Trobique* took the ground, the commissioners' chart shows 24 feet of water, while the ship was drawing less than 22 feet. Now, according to the *Star*, the Harbour Commissioners went as far as to say that they gave the pilots warning concerning the buoy at the entrance of the wharf. Perhaps the commissioners will kindly point at the whereabouts of this particular object, because there are many of us who have had neither instructions nor information that would help to safely navigate ships through the channel in question.

"Again, the commissioners advised the master of the *Trobique* not to pay the pilotage or to sign his papers,

which we consider most unfair after piloting the ship safely through the most intricate parts of the river, and then at the end of the journey taking the ground simply through the neglect of the commissioners to properly buoy the channel. Not satisfied with that, the secretary of the commissioners, when the pilot went to make his report, asked him (the pilot) to hand in his branch, though the master of the *Trobique* had not yet made his report. We think it is high time that the shipping interest should take the matter up and question the commissioners' ability to cope with the matter. This is the opinion of the "MONTREAL PILOTS."

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the pilots unanimously complain that the charts furnished to them by the Harbour Commissioners are irregular and false, that they do not show, as they should, the dangerous spots in the St. Lawrence River. I have been told by some pilots that a great many complaints had previously been made to the Harbour Commissioners, and even to the Minister of Marine, on this subject. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that a difficulty arises from the facts mentioned in this article. The pilot Groleau had taken charge of that ship and had proceeded without any accident from Quebec to Montreal. When the ship arrived at the new wharf of the sugar refinery she took ground. Now, the maps that are furnished to the pilots show that there is 24 feet of water at this place, whereas the *Trobique* drew only 22 feet: nevertheless the ship took ground at that place. I think this is a very important fact, to which the attention of the Minister of Marine should be at once directed. The pilots are so severely treated by the Harbour Commissioners that they are entitled to some protection from the Government. Groleau, the pilot in this very case, was summoned to hand in his license, even before any report had been made by the captain of the ship. The Commissioners took their authority, I suppose, from the by-laws of the Harbour Commission, and based their autocratic order on the section 142 of those by-laws. This section 142 never existed before the 26th day of July, 1882. It is an amendment to section 85, which was itself taken from the by-laws, orders, rules and regulations of the Trinity House of Montreal. So that from the 8th March, 1860, up to the 26th July, 1882, the Harbour Commissioners had no right to deprive pilots of their license on account of any accident to vessels, but they could only make an enquiry of witnesses under oath into the truth of the charges brought against such pilots. I will read those sections, in order to show how unjust and unfair is the amendment added by section 142. Under the by-laws of the Trinity House, Montreal, it is the duty of any pilot who has met with an accident to repair to the office of the Harbour Commissioners and report himself, and the accident that had occurred. The rule reads as follows:—

"That whenever an accident shall occur to or be caused by any vessel whilst in charge of a pilot, for and above the harbour of Quebec, it shall be the duty of such pilot forthwith, after he shall cease to be in the actual charge of such vessel, to repair to the office of the Trinity House at Montreal, and there personally report himself and the accident that has occurred, to the Registrar of the said Trinity House of Montreal, and that in default of his so doing such pilot shall, for each and every neglect so to do, forfeit and pay a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds currency."

If the pilot neglected to report himself that way, he forfeited and paid a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds currency. That was the general rule from the 8th March, 1860, up to the 26th January, 1875. At that date the rule was somewhat altered and replaced by section 85, which reads as follows:—

"Whenever any accident shall occur to or be caused by any vessel whilst in the charge of a pilot within the pilotage district of Montreal, such pilot shall forthwith, after he shall cease to be in the actual charge of such vessel, repair to the office of the Harbour Commissioners at Montreal, and there personally report himself and the accident that has occurred, with all particulars thereof, to the secretary of the said commissioners."

This regulation takes the penalty off, but on the 26th July, 1882, for one reason or another, the Harbour Commissioners added the following amendment to section 85:

"Article 85 is hereby amended by adding thereto the following words, which shall hereafter be read and construed as part of the said article, namely:

"And if such accident shall consist of the grounding or stranding of any vessel in charge of such pilot, or the collision of such vessel with any other vessel, such pilot shall be *ipso facto* suspended from the exercise of his functions as such pilot until the cause of such accident shall have been investigated and the decision of the Harbour Commissioners pronounced thereon, and for such further time (if any) as shall be determined by them by such decision. And in such case also such pilot shall also deliver over his license as such pilot to the Harbour Commissioners, along with the report required by this article."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this last amendment I have just read seems to me to be of a very cruel character as concerns the pilots. The pilots on the St. Lawrence River are under great responsibilities: they are entrusted with ships and cargoes of great value, and why should they be always threatened with losing their licenses if they meet with accidents which they cannot, in the majority of cases, foresee or prevent? They are all perfectly qualified for their position; they are subject to a very severe examination. Take the case of a pilot who for 20 or 25 years has piloted ships between Quebec and Montreal. He knows the river thoroughly, but if he is so unfortunate as to meet with an accident he is at once declared incompetent and incapable, and by whom? By persons who do not know anything about the difficulties of the navigation of that river, and whose own negligence is often the cause of the accident. That is not fair; that is not just towards the pilots; and I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine to these facts, in order that he may endeavour to have justice rendered to all parties. I will ask the hon. gentleman to enquire into the negligence of which the Harbour Commissioners are accused, and I will ask him also to endeavour to have clause 142 of the by-laws and regulations of the Harbour Commissioners repealed. There should be some other means of securing safe navigation and protecting ships than to punish with undue severity pilots who are known for their ability and honesty. Let there be an enquiry immediately after the accident, and do not deprive them and their families of their earnings when an accident, perhaps unavoidable, occurs. I hope that the Minister of Marine will take these facts into consideration and that he will endeavour to have justice rendered to all who are concerned.

Mr. TUPPER. I will call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the subject he has discussed is largely within the control of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, who by Act of Parliament are constituted the pilotage authority for that district. A procedure is to be followed in the event of a decision of these Commissioners, wherever an offence is alleged or charged. I sub-

mit that there should be some regular charge made, rather than that, in this off-hand way, Parliament should be called upon to discuss the conduct of that board of enquiry without having any papers or facts of the case before it. I am not familiar with the facts involved in this matter: the subject has not come before me in any shape or form. I will ascertain what the facts are, and whether we have any responsibility in connection with the subject. I may mention to the hon. gentleman that the communication he read appeared to be an anonymous communication, signed, not by any particular pilot, but in the name of the pilots generally. It seemed to be a complaint on the part of those who had been found negligent by the regularly constituted authorities. I may add, in connection with the harbour of Montreal, that the work of placing buoys and other aids to navigation is under the direction of the commissioners, and is immediately under the direction of a very able officer, whom the hon. gentleman no doubt very well knows. I may say, before looking into the facts, that I shall be very much surprised to find either that the buoys were not properly placed or that the Harbour Commissioners had not proceeded according to law. I will also look into the question of by-laws, to which the hon. gentleman has directed attention.

CHARGES AGAINST AN INDIAN AGENT.

Mr. FLINT. It will be remembered that on September 14th, a discussion took place between the hon. Minister and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) in regard to certain charges made against an Indian agent in Nova Scotia. I am not familiar with the particulars of the dispute: but, at the request of the hon. member for Guysborough, I desire to read a declaration made under the statute in connection with that subject, for the information of the Minister. The declaration is as follows:—

"I, Donald Chisholm, of Afton, in the County of Antigonish and Province of Nova Scotia, farmer, do solemnly declare as follows:—

"(1) I am informed that two certificates of mine in reference to a pair of oxen sold by me to Wm. C. Chisholm, Indian agent, were read in the House of Commons recently."

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order in bringing up a statement made by some person outside of the House respecting proceedings in the House.

Mr. LAURIER. It has been done before.

Mr. SPEAKER. It has been done before, but it was not in order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is not what was done the other day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was done this afternoon. The Postmaster General read an affidavit here—a statutory declaration.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No. The hon. gentleman did not read a statutory declaration regarding proceedings that transpired in this House. He read a statutory declaration with respect to a railway contract. Even if it were so, that would not put the hon. member for Yarmouth in order. I submit whether it is quite fair to persons concerned to read a statutory declaration without any notice having been given.

Mr. LAURIER. This is exactly what occurred. This matter was brought up by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who read a statement from a certain person. At a later day the Minister of the Interior read a statutory declaration from that same person, contradicting the first. The hon. member, I submit, is perfectly in order in the action he is now taking, and in referring to this matter for the third time. The first time was by the declaration of the hon. member for Guysborough, the second at a later date by the Minister of the Interior, and now by the hon. member for Yarmouth.

Mr. FLINT. I do not propose to make any remarks, but only to read the declaration.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point of order is that a communication from some person outside of the House is proposed to be read in the House respecting proceedings of the House.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will be glad if the hon. gentleman will bring the matter up on the item in Supply, because I shall also have some remarks to offer.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is this:

"Nor is it in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or other communications, whether printed or written, emanating from persons out of the House, and referring to and commenting on or denying anything said by a member, or expressing any opinion as to proceedings in the House."

Mr. LAURIER. I do not dispute your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I call attention to the fact that the point was not taken when the matter was brought up before. As the point was not taken before, the hon. member very properly thought he might be permitted to bring it up.

Mr. MILLS. The point which might take it out of the rule is that there was no reference to anything that transpired in the House. It was simply a declaration of what happened elsewhere.

Mr. SPEAKER. No. I waited until the declaration had reference to proceedings in the House before I raised the point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Postmaster General, who I understand is in charge of the Department of Agriculture and Statistics, to the statement I made some time ago as to matters connected with that service. Has the hon. gentleman any memorandum from the department to offer?

Mr. HAGGART. Immediately on receiving the memorandum from the hon. gentleman, I submitted it to the Agricultural Department. The department's statement in regard to the matter was obtained on the following day, and I will be prepared to give it this evening.

WALDRON RANCHE AND SETTLERS.

Mr. FLINT. I have a matter to bring to the attention of the House, especially to the attention of the Minister of the Interior, and as the session is drawing to a close I think it is desirable to bring it up at the present time. My remarks will be necessarily very brief. I bring this matter to the attention of the Minister and the House at the request of persons who have placed papers in my possession with a view to make a statement to the Minister, and in this way bring the matter before the Govment, with a view to secure the redress of certain grievances. In the vicinity of Fort Macleod, in the

North-West Territories, a certain ranche has been leased by the Government to the Waldron Ranche Company, of which Dr. McEachran is the manager. The recent history of this land is as follows:—Dr. McEachran has brought an action against certain persons holding possession of lands now included in the limits of the ranche company's lease. About 1883 there was a lease of this particular land, Lot 9, Township 9, Range 28, to John Hollis, on the old form of lease, which permitted of homstead settlement being made on those lands. There is, I understand, another form of lease for grazing lands which does not permit of homestead entry of settlement being made upon them. The lease in 1883 was in the old form. During the existence of this lease *bonâ fide* settlers entered upon this land and proceeded to make homes for themselves in that territory. I need not enlarge upon the advisability of every inducement being held out to *bonâ fide* settlers. That is conceded upon all hands in this House, and has seemed to be, as far as I can learn, one of the principles of settlement in the North-West. These settlers enter upon land and begin to make for themselves homes. Most of them came from the Province of Ontario, taking with them some capital and farming implements. After they had made a great many improvements, and fenced some lands, and built houses, and were in progress of placing themselves in a position to obtain patents for their lands, having made homstead entries in the land office at Lethbridge, the lease of the said Hollis was cancelled about 1888. These settlers then being upon the premises, the Walrond Ranche Company, or Dr. McEachran, were possessed of a grazing lease in another portion of the North-West at some distance from the lands in question, and an engagement was entered into between him and the proper authorities to exchange lands which he held for the lands in question, and this exchange was carried out. Dr. McEachran then enters upon these lands, and by virtue of whatever document he received from the Department of the Interior, brought actions of ejectment against these settlers. If I am correctly informed, the actions must have failed in a court of law had not the Government stepped in and cancelled the pre-emption entries held by these settlers, and we find in consequence of this that these persons are not only in danger of being dispossessed of their lands and of their improvements, but of being saddled with a very heavy bill of costs, which means to them absolute and total ruin. I am not placing the case of these unfortunate people upon strict legal grounds, but I am placing their claims upon equitable grounds, and upon statesman-like grounds, in connection with the settlement of the North-West. I think that the damage and injury that this transaction is likely to do, not only to the persons interested, which must be overwhelming, but to the general interest of settlers in that particular region, will be very great, unless the Government can be induced either to retrace its steps and cancel the present lease of Dr. McEachran, or, if it still insists in keeping the Walrond Ranche Company in possession, to place the settlers in as good a position as they would have been had they been left undisturbed in their holdings. In order to place before the House the manner in which the settlers look upon this matter, I will read the complaint that one of these settlers has made to the late Premier. It is as follows:—

"PORCUPINE HILLS, 3rd September, 1890.

"Sir JOHN MACDONALD, K.C.B., &c., &c.

"HONOURED SIR,—Being of your own age, acquainted somewhat with your acts in connection with the development of this country, having lived in the County of Wellington (9 miles from Guelph) since 1832. My father and mother and a large family, then emigrants, settled in the Township of Eramosa.

"The above and what follows is my excuse for troubling you, notwithstanding your multitudinous business. I mention no difficulties encountered, but we eventually succeeded in farming, continuing in that business almost until the time I left Guelph to come to this very section of country, even the lot I live on to-day, before the township was surveyed, being selected by one of my sons, who came here as a private in the first batch of the Police.

"I sent ahead a lot of agricultural implements, carpenter's tools and household goods in 'bond,' *viâ* the Missouri River.

"This took place in 1882. When we got to Fort Benton the goods had not arrived, and we remained in Montana until the following year, when we removed to this place, bringing our stuff with us.

"The then unsurveyed land we settled on was under application for a lease by Mr. John Hollis, who had no objection to our homesteading occupancy on our different selections. Three of my sons located lots close to mine in 1883, built a small house, and did a little ploughing that year, but afterwards considered it better to first make a comfortable home for their mother and I, as well getting means to start with themselves—always claiming those selected lots, which no person ever attempted to interfere with.

"Before leaving Ontario I obtained information through Doctor Orton from the Minister of the Interior (at that time your honourable self filled that office) stating the squatters' rights would be respected.

"Being satisfied that our claim was good, none of my sons ever being away from here, except that one of them went twice to Ontario for stock, and now to be disturbed by threats of eviction from the Walrond Ranche Company, although my sons have made entries in the Dominion land office at Lethbridge last year for homesteads and pre-emptions, and have this year put in twenty-five (25) acres of crop, built a good house and stable, and done a lot of fencing work, occupying the place continually.

"This company have served them with a writ of injunction to cease operations and not even cut hay on these lots.

"The sheriff at Macleod told one of my sons lately they would be evicted, and they must only sue the Government to recover.

"Honoured Sir,—What disorder and disaster would occur if this Dominion was prevented by some foreign power from its usual industrious course, I leave you to judge. Such has been the grievous deplorable case with me and my sons since the service of this writ of injunction. I wrote to the Minister of the Interior regarding this matter on the 30th of June. The receipt of the letter was acknowledged by the department, but have heard nothing official since. I did not want my family scattered while I lived. To me it is a grievance, unreasonable, for foreign capitalists who take the profits (if any) out of this country, to drive us from our home. They threaten us thus through their agents that they will appeal from court to court, and, if necessary, take it to England. People of small means cannot stand such law expenses. My family is not the only parties ordered off.

"Hitherto your name has been the anchor chain of all *bonâ fide* settlers, and now, honoured sir, I ask your forbearance and interference in this matter, that it may be speedily adjusted, especially as three of my sons have been married within the year.

"I have the honour to be,

"Your obedient servant,

"ROBERT DUNBAR."

Later, there is another letter to the Premier, dated April, 1891, about the time of the meeting of this House, and that letter I will read also:

"PORCUPINE HILLS,

"MACLEOD P. O., April 8, 1891.

"Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, K.C.B., &c., &c.

"SIR,—I have written you on the 3rd of September last regarding this very important business to me and my family (and if I would be allowed an opinion) to this whole country, and therefore to your honourable self as the principal guider of its destinies.

"I thank you for the promptness shown and the interest you took in promising to lay this case before the Minister of the Interior, then in England, as soon as he returned.

"The decision of that Minister in my sons' cases I hope is an unprecedented one in Canada. He cancelled their claims without any remuneration, when there was more than half the required work done to entitle them to their patents.

"The order of cancellation was on the 18th of December last, forcing them out of their comfortable homes in this treacherous winter, with this redeeming (?) feature, 'They could take a homestead and pre-emption on any land open for settlement,' which *liberal* offer was open until the 1st of April, 1891.

"Subsequently, however, they received a notice from the Government land office at Lethbridge to this effect: 'Lest there be any misunderstanding afterwards, that they must pay $2.50 per acre for the pre-emption lots.'

"I don't know what is meant by this extraordinary offer. My sons could not distinguish the favour.

"They are grieved and disgusted with such treatment, being Canadians, apart from being deprived of their rights by the Land Department of the Dominion. By next June it will be eight years since we came to this place, as I mentioned in my former letter to you, and have remained here since then till last year, when Dr. McEachran, manager of the Walrond Ranche, by bullying and threats, caused one of my boys to leave, and others will follow if no reparation is made."

This is the tone of the letter, in which this man expresses considerable anxiety and shows a good deal of feeling. Now, let us glance at the position taken in reference to this matter by other observers. As I am basing a claim almost completely upon the ground that a statesman-like course should be pursued in the matter, and the greatest consideration should be shown for the feelings and interests and rights of the settlers, I feel justified in reading to the House the view taken of this matter by the editor of the Macleod *Gazette* as late as 27th August, 1891:

"The *Gazette* has been hoping against hope that the time was happily past when it would again feel obliged, in the interests of the settlers of the country, and in the interests of every business man in the district, to find fault with the Walrond Ranche Company, and its general manager, Dr. McEachran."

Then, after some kind words with regard to the personal character of Dr. McEachran, the writer goes on to say:

"The *Gazette* means that, in its humble opinion, the action of the Walrond Ranche Company through its manager toward settlers is doing that company more injury than almost any number of settlers happily settled on their leases could do. To be sure, the Walrond Ranche Company and the vast majority of the people in Southern Alberta look at this matter from a different point of view, and the *Gazette* rather despairs of convincing the former of the absolute correctness of the above statement."

I will not read all of this, for it is very long, but it is all to the same effect. I will read a very cogent putting of the case from the same journal, on 27th August, 1891, headed "A Hard Case":

"A case of interference with settlers in their holdings on the part of the Walrond Ranche Company has recently come to our notice which we commend to the immediate and careful consideration of the Minister of the Interior. It may be found that, like the recalled order regarding grazing on public Dominion lands, understrappers in the department are entirely to blame for much of the annoyance and high-handed proceedings in this part of the country. But, however that may be, we distinctly hold that the time has come for interference on the part of the Government with the high-handed proceedings of the general manager of the Walrond Ranche Company. We say that the time has come for a thorough and searching enquiry into the relations existing between the Walrond Ranche and the settlers within its limits, with a view to rectifying the abuses which now exist. Reasonable men, who know to what lengths Dr. McEachran has gone, and is prepared to go, in order to keep settlers off the Walrond lease, must agree with us that matters cannot go on as they are without serious trouble resulting, and that any agitation of the whole leasing system which is thus brought about will be caused entirely by the ill-advised actions of Dr. McEachran. No doubt Dr. McEachran has the law on his side, and we must candidly admit that he is not altogether to blame in endeavouring to retain the rights which are his by lease. It will, however, strike most of us that the almost constant trouble which the Walrond Ranche is having with settlers is proof positive that the time has come, in the case of that ranche at least, when, to quote Sir John Macdonald's often repeated saying, 'the bulls must give way to settlers,' that the land is so valuable for settlement, and so much sought after, that the time has come for its agricultural development, and that that being the case, the plain provision of the lease, viz., that it can be cancelled on giving two years' notice, should be carried out."

I would like the House to bear in mind that these settlers have not entered on the land under the lease given to Dr. McEachran; but they were actually settled on the land, and were performing a portion of the labours necessary to obtain their patents, when, proceedings were brought against them to eject them, and they are deprived, not only of the rights which they were in process of acquiring, but of a large amount of valuable property which they had accumulated or brought with them into the country. The article goes on:

"It would take more space than we can spare in this issue to give an outline of the existing state of affairs on the Walrond Ranche, to name the numerous cases of those who have suffered, and of others who have had their houses pulled down by Dr. McEachran's orders. To-day we shall tell the story of James and Anthony Dixon, and appeal to the Minister of the Interior to protect them and other men who are threatened with ruination. James and Anthony Dixon occupy the S.W. ¼ of Section 31 and the N.W. ¼ of Section 30, in Township 9-2-29. They were recently served with a summons at the instance of the Walrond Ranche, the statement of claim demanding possession of their two quarter sections: an injunction restraining the defendant (Dixon), his servants, workmen and agents from cutting hay on the plaintiff's land; an injunction restraining the defendant, his servants, workmen and agents from fencing or enclosing in the plaintiff's lands, or from otherwise interfering with the plaintiff's quiet possession and enjoyment of the same. This injunction has been granted, and the Dixons are prevented from cutting hay or fencing on their own land. The result of this is two-fold. They are unable to put up hay for their stock; and a portion of their crop had to remain unfenced, obliging them to employ a herder to keep cattle and horses out of their grain."

Another article in the same paper of 13th August, 1891, refers to the case of another family:

"A representative of the *Gazette* last week had the pleasure of inspecting the really fine crops on the ranche of Mr. Robert Dunbar, of the Porcupine Hills. His crop of wheat, oats and barley is well headed out and gives promise of a magnificent yield. A large patch planted in Hungarian grass is looking well, and will be ready to cut in a few days. We saw some enormous potatoes raised on the place, which beat anything we have seen so far for quality and size."

It then describes the interesting features of the farm, and closes as follows:—

"Alberta cannot afford to lose this very industrious family, and it is to be hoped, for the country's good, that the Government will give these loyal Canadians their rights as citizens and settlers. * * The wives of Samuel and Harry Dunbar arrived from British Columbia last week. Their husbands are expected at the ranche the latter end of the present week. * * A log house belonging to Mr. Sam. Dunbar was torn down by the employés of the Walrond Ranche, some two weeks ago, acting under instructions from Dr. McEachran. There are thousands of acres of land in the Porcupine Hills that will never be settled upon, and over which these cattle may roam, and it seems to us very unjust for good settlers to be unable to fence in a home for themselves with so much land lying all ready for the plough of the settler."

Now, I will sum up the case as I understand it. A petition is on the fyles of the House stating the facts, signed by fifteen or twenty settlers of just the class required to build up that country. They have been on the ground since 1883, by permission of the person who then held

the lease of these lands as grazing lands. They have applied for homesteads and pre-emption entries; they planted crops, built houses, made fences, and were prepared to develop the property in a very excellent way. The grazing lease granted to the Waldron Ranche Company now places these settlers completely at the mercy of that company. Actions at law are about being concluded by which they will be ejected, with a heavy bill of costs against them. Their appeal to the Minister of the Interior is, either to cancel the grazing lease to the company and allow it to select lands elsewhere for its purpose, or else, if that cannot be done, to institute steps to give those *bona fide* settlers other lands, and to indemnify them for the losses they have sustained. I believe that this course will be in the interests of those settlers, in the interest of the good-will of the people generally towards the country, and very greatly in the interest of the whole North-West, which is seriously affected by this method of doing business.

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

After Recess.

McMULLEN. I desire to add a few words to the remarks made by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), with regard to the case submitted to this House connected with the Waldron Ranche Company of the North-West. I have carefully perused all the papers placed in my hand and read over the communications which have been addressed to the Minister of the Interior regarding the hardships to which settlers have been subjected in that particular district, and I took the opportunity of laying the facts before the Minister with the view of perhaps causing a settlement to be brought about between Dr. McEachran, the president and manager of the company, and the occupants of the lands, before bringing this matter up in the House. I feel sorry to think that some steps have not been taken to meet the express wishes of those people in that district, as set out in the petition presented to this House. I am not at all prepared to lay the whole blame on the Minister of the Interior. The evil perhaps existed prior to the date when he took charge of that department, but I do think prompt and decisive steps should have been taken long ago to remove the inconveniences to which those settlers have been subjected, and that they should have been allowed to occupy their lands in that as in any other section. I find that the Dunbars became settlers in that district in 1882. I am not going to quote the figures which have been submitted by the hon. member for Yarmouth, but will simply state the facts briefly as the appear in the documents in my hands relating to this unfortunate case. Mr. Dunbar settled there in 1882, and took up a homestead and was permitted to retain his homestead; his sons lived with him for some time in order to secure first for their father and family a comfortable home by erecting a house, and so on, and then in 1883 they took up sections for themselves. After they had been on those locations in peaceable possession of them, and after they had received notice from the department that they would be permitted to homestead and obtain pre-emption entry for that particular section, very unexpectedly and to their extreme surprise they got notice from the Waldron Ranche Company that they were not to continue occupying the land, nor even to cut the hay on their own place. After that the company took an action to prevent their making further cultivation or even cutting the hay. They then employed a lawyer, who presented their case to the Minister of the Interior, in a letter dated 19th December, 1890:

"SIR,—As advocate for Mr. S. V. Dunbar, of Macleod, in an action brought against him by Dr. McEachran and the Walrond Ranche Company (Limited), for the recovery of the west ½ of Section 23, Township 9, Range 28, W. 4, I beg to make the following statement: Mr. Dunbar took up the land as far back as 1883 with the consent of the then leaseholder, Mr. John Hollis. The Government map of the township made by Mr. Francis, D.L.S., in 1883, and approved by the Surveyor General in March, 1884, shows Mr. Dunbar to have commenced his improvements at that date. On 15th November, 1886 (more than two years before the granting of the McEachran lease) Mr. Dunbar was informed by letter from the agent of Dominion lands at Lethbridge that homestead and pre-emption entries would be accorded him for the above mentioned land. On the 31st July, 1889, homestead and pre-emption entries were granted to Mr. Dunbar from the office of Dominion lands at Lethbridge, for the land in question.

"On the 10th June, 1890, Mr. Dunbar was warned by the land agent at Lethbridge to make no further improvement on the land in question, as the entry therefor was granted inadvertently. At that time Mr. Dunbar had a considerable amount of land broken and in crop, and post holes dug, and posts, wire and rails on the ground, ready to put up about a mile of fencing. Since that time Mr. Dunbar had no word from the department, nor so far as he knows has anything further been done in the premises until the receipt by Mr. Dunbar of a letter dated 19th December, 1890, informing him that his entry had been cancelled and offering a half section of available Dominion lands in lieu of the original lands. I may say at once that Mr. Dunbar is quite willing to accept the offer made and will act accordingly, but I wish to point out that an action of ejectment is now pending in our courts, brought by McEachran and the Walrond Ranche Company against Mr. Dunbar. This action, so long as the entry of Mr. Dunbar was in force, was improperly brought.

"Dr. McEachran should have proceeded in the usual way to have the entry cancelled, either by proceedings before the Land Board or by action instituted in the name of the Attorney General of Canada. The entry is not claimed to have been made by fraud, but inadvertently, and indeed Mr. Dunbar has a good claim to the land in spite of the lease. The cancellation of the entry while an action is pending deprives Mr. Dunbar of a good defence to the action, and lays him open to a judgment against him with very heavy costs. I must presume that the department was not aware that such an action was going on, and also that the cancellation of this entry has been obtained to a large extent on the representation of Dr. McEachran, who is a plaintiff in the action. I would therefore ask that either the cancellation of the entry be suspended until the present litigation be concluded or that Dr. McEachran be compelled to withdraw his action and release Mr. Dunbar from all claims arising from it, on condition that Dunbar pays his own costs and accepts the offer of the department.

"I might add that an important motion comes on in the case on Monday, the 29th December, instant, and that in justice to Mr. Dunbar the entry should be allowed to stand until that date at least. I would respectfully call your attention to the necessity for immediate action in this matter, and ask that if possible a telegraphic reply be sent to me on the subject.

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) "F. G. W. HAULTAIN.

"The Honourable
"The Minister of the Interior,
"Ottawa, Ont."

Now, this letter was addressed to the Minister of the Interior at the time Dr. McEachran, on behalf of the Waldron Ranche Company, took action to eject those men from the land of which they had been in possession as squatters for a number of years, and for which they eventually got homestead entries in 1889. Those in the House who are acquainted with legal proceedings will easily

understand that had the Government not come to the assistance of the Waldron Ranche Company by cancelling those entries it would have been impossible for that company to have succeeded in their action at law. But in order to assist Dr. McEachran and the company over which he presides in getting a decree against those men to evict them from the lands they had possessed virtually from 1883—for although, perhaps, they had not resided on them day and night, but had lived with their father in their immediate vicinity, they had made improvements on the land with the view of occupying it, had erected houses, put in a crop and took the necessary steps to secure its being closed in—the Government cancelled their entries. In the face of all that, it was cruel on the part of Government to cancel their entries, even supposing those entries had been inadvertently made. Admitting that the action of the Government was, perhaps, not, at the moment, taken with any evil intent, at the same time it was cruel to cancel those entries and cause those people to be subjected to the great cost of the action of ejectment brought by Dr. McEachran. The reason why they appealed to the Minister of the Interior was that they desired to prevent Dr. McEachran from getting a bill of costs against them. Their lawyer says that, if you allow their interest to stand and relieve them from the costs of the eviction, and allow them to become settlers on some other section, they would accept those terms, but nothing in that direction has been done. I have here a letter which I think will set at rest the question whether any steps were taken or not. In answer to that letter, the Minister of the Interior sent one dated the 9th January, 1891, as follows:—

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
"SECRETARY'S BRANCH,
"OTTAWA, 9th January, 1891.

"SIR,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your two letters, addressed to the Minister of the Interior, of the 19th ultimo, with reference to the cases of William T. V. Dunbar and Samuel G. C. Dunbar, respectively, and to make, for your information, the following explanation about this matter:—

"The lands for which these parties were erroneously granted entries by the Dominion lands agent at Lethbridge were originally, in the year 1883, leased to Mr. John Hollis. On the 14th December, 1888, the Hollis lease was terminated, and on the 3rd January, 1889, a portion of the lands covered by that lease, including Township 9, in Range 28, west of the 4th Meridian, was granted to Dr. McEachran in exchange for a tract of 29,000 acres held by him near Fort Macleod, which he held under the old form of lease, and which he surrendered for settlement purposes. This transaction being in the form of an exchange, the lease of Township 9, in Range 28, given to Dr. McEachran was, of course, of the same nature as the lease of the surrendered territory, that is to say, on the old form. Apart altogether from the provisions of the lease, the agent of the department had specific orders not to grant any homestead entries for lands in this Township 9. Unfortunately, that officer overlooked those instructions and the provisions of the lease, and on the 31st July, 1889, granted to William and Samuel Dunbar the entries which it has been found necessary to disallow.

"The attention of the department having been called to the agent's action, the case was submitted to the Minister of Justice, who has decided that the granting of homestead entries for lands included in Dr. McEachran's lease was an appropriation of such lands quite inconsistent with that made by the lease, and that these entries are null and void so far as they purport to give to the entrants any interest in the land.

"In view of that decision, the department has notified Messrs. Dunbar that the entries in question have been cancelled, but they have each been offered a homestead entry for any available quarter section of Dominion lands on the conditions of actual settlement thereon and cultivation thereof prescribed by the Dominion Lands Act, and this offer will be held open until the end of March next. You are no doubt aware that the privilege of taking a pre-emption ceased a year ago, but the Minister wishes to treat the Dunbars as liberally as possible, and has therefore directed that they each be permitted to purchase a quarter section adjoining the homestead they may select on the same terms as applied to pre-emptions.

"The mistake made by the agent is of course regrettable, and has led to the removal of that officer to another post; but as for the Dunbars, I am afraid that you have been misinformed about their performance of settlement duties. They live with their father, Robert Dunbar, who was himself properly allowed to have the west half of section 15 in the same township, on account of his having settled there before survey and before the issue of the lease to Hollis, but William and Samuel Dunbar have not been *bonâ fide* settlers upon the land for which they obtaine dentry, and, moreover, were always cognizant of the fact that the lands were covered by a lease.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"JOHN R. HALL,
"*Secretary.*"

I may say in regard to this that they were not aware that any lease had been granted to Dr. McEachran which interfered in any way with their homesteading. In the first place, it is unfair and it is taking advantage of these boys to say that, because they lived with their father for the first portion of the year, they could not be permitted to make entries and secure those lands. They were naturally anxious to secure a comfortable home for the old people first, and immediately afterwards they took up the other lands for themselves. The action of the Minister of the Interior has separated the head of the family from the sons, who have been driven to the necessity of going to a distant part of that country, or to Montana or some other part of the United States. They felt very indignant in regard to the treatment they received, and they went to the United States, and have remained there for a considerable time. The father is anxious to have them return and take up lands close to himself, but they have not been able up to this time to do that. Not only has Dr. McEachran prevented them from taking up land near the old people, but he has pulled down their houses and scattered them. He has done that in several cases, and it is a deplorable condition of things that we should be trying to get people to go into that country and should have such a lamentable state of affairs as has been shown by the member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). I have here a petition signed by a number of people of that district. My hon. friend read extracts from the Macleod *Gazette*, which I think is a paper supporting the Government. That petition appealed pointedly and earnestly to the Government to cancel the lease to Dr. McEachran, which the Government have power to do. If these lands were not intended to be settled on, why were they divided up? Here is the petition which I had myself the honour of presenting to this House:

"That in the year A.D. 1883 a lease of Township nine, Range twenty-eight, west Initial Meridian in the said district of Alberta, was granted to one John Hollis along with certain other lands as cattle range. That, in the year 1888 the Hollis lease terminated, previous to which the said township was sub-divided and the same was thrown open to settlement."

Now, these are the express words of those who lived there. They know the fact, and are cognizant of all that took place.

"That in 1889 the said township was leased to Dr. McEachran with other lands in exchange for a tract of land held by him near Fort Macleod, and which he surrendered for settlement purposes. This transaction being in the nature of an exchange, the lease was granted in the old

form, under which no rights of settlement were reserved. That in the meantime a number of settlers had settled upon the said lands, had performed settlement duties and had applied for homestead pre-emption entries of portions of the same. That actions of ejectment have been brought against several of these settlers, who have been ejected from the same, and that other settlers have been threatened with similar proceedings, whereby material and substantial injury has been done to individuals and the settlement of the country signally retarded. That the township in question is in many respects peculiarly fitted for settlers' homesteads. That it is the declared policy of the Government, on several occasions declared in Parliament, to prefer the settlement of the country by homesteaders to the claims of leaseholders for cattle ranging purposes.

"Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will direct the Minister of the Interior to give the holder of the lease of the township in question the notice required by the terms of the said lease to abrogate the same at the expiry of the time required for such notice, to throw the same open for homestead entry to actual settlers.

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

"Dated at Alberta aforesaid, this 27th day of July, A. D. 1891."

This is signed by twenty-five names, I understand that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Davis) has also presented a petition with a number of names, praying the Government in the same direction. Now, as I said before, a mistake may have been made in this case. The Government may have rented this land to Dr. McEachran without first learning the facts with regard to these settlers being in possession of it; but I hold that from the very moment they became aware that these men had gone in there and settled upon that land in good faith, having the assurance of the late First Minister, when he was Minister of the Interior, that squatters' rights would be acknowledged, and under the declared policy of the Minister of the Interior, that in every case the bulls must give away to the settlers who wanted to occupy the lands, I say, in face of all these declarations, it is seriously to be regretted that any settlers should be placed in such a position that they can be harassed and annoyed, instead of being allowed to go in there and make comfortable homes for themselves. I have in my possession letters concerning that section of the country, and I am glad to be able to say, and I state it on information that I can rely upon, that in that section of country this year they have reaped from 45 to 50 bushels of good wheat to the acre; they have reaped as much as 50 bushels of barley, and 50 to 60 bushels of oats. They have splendid crops, and some of these men say to me in their communications that they believe they are in the very centre of creation, that this is the best portion of the world they were ever in; that they have been in the old country, they have been in Ontario and in the United States, yet they never lived in any section that is more delightful, that yields better crops and is a more desirable country to live in, and in which to make comfortable homes. This is the testimony of men that are in possession of these lands, and in view of these facts I say it is in the highest degree in the interest of the people of that section, in the interest of the settlement and development of that country, that the lease should be at once cancelled, and that these people should be allowed to go in there and settle and make comfortable homes for themselves. I do not know what the rent is; it may be one cent, it may be two cents an acre. I fully endorse the sentiment expressed by the late First Minister, when he said that ranching should be a secondary consideration, and that the settlement of the country, and the privilege of the people to go in and make homes, should be the first and great consideration. Now, lest there may be any doubt in regard to the facts that these men had made homestead entries, I will read a letter, dated the 10th June, 1890, from Lethbridge, with regard to the north half of Section 14, Range 28, west 4th Meridian, for which they have obtained homestead and pre-emption entries:

"I beg to notify you to make no more improvements thereon until further advised, as the entries were given inadvertently."

Now, that is dated the 10th June, 1890, and those people were living in that district from July, 1882. They first became possessed of the land in 1883, and they have been allowed to live there undisturbed under the lease, with no interference. Dr. McEachran, when he became lessee, probably knew that these people were in possession. He was out there and saw the ranche, he knew it very well, and notwithstanding that fact, he secured from the Government a lease with the right to eject those people from their comfortable homes, after living there six or seven years. In all my experience, which is not very extensive, I admit, in all the hardships that I ever read of, and the ejectments that have taken place in unfortunate Ireland, where the landlords rule with a rod of iron, I have read no case of hardship that exceeds the one I have now presented to the House, and the case that was presented by the member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) this afternoon. If you allow these things to be published in the newspapers of Europe or Canada it is enough to deter people from going in to settle those lands, when they find that settlers, after being there eight years, struggling with the difficulties and privations they have had to suffer, are subjected to all these additional hardships. I know one man from the County of Wellington who went in there, and teamed his stuff over two hundred miles; he lived out in the open prairie, and suffered the hardships and privations that are common to all those who go into those new districts. He put up buildings worth over $1,500, and now he is told that he cannot live there; his sons are banished, their buildings pulled down and scattered, lest he should re-occupy them. Not only is that so in the case of the Dunbar family, but it is the case with the Dicksons and several other families. I earnestly hope the Minister of the Interior has some reasonable explanation to offer, and that at least, whatever his explanations may be, he will see it to be his duty at once to give the necessary notice to cancel that lease and allow these men to keep peacable possession of the lands that they are well entitled to, after the privations to which they have been subjected.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think the hon. gentleman, after the interviews he had with me on this subject, and the notification he gave me that he proposed to bring it up, might have done so without inflicting upon the House a double dose of this subject, and without putting information into the the hands of the hon. member who first brought it before the House; he might have saved a great deal of time, and would just as well have attained the object he has in view. This question is no doubt an important one, and it is one that will have to be dealt with in the very near future. The question of cattle ranches in Alberta is one of great importance, and one in which, probably a larger amount of capital is invested

than in any other industry in the North-West Territories. The old policy of the Government, as the hon. gentleman knows, in 1880 and 1881, was to encourage the ranching industry in that western country. It was then reported that it was a magnificent cattle country; but it was uncertain, as no one had tested it, but capitalists were encouraged to go in there and take hold of those ranching lands and put cattle upon them. Consequently, in any dealings we have in this matter, in any change of policy we propose to adopt, we must take care that we do not do injury to those who came into the country, paid for their leases and put their cattle on the ground and carried out their part of the bargain in good faith with the Government. A great number of leases at the time were taken up, not only by capitalists, who were able to put cattle on the land, but by others as a speculation. Then from year to year, as the conditions were not fulfilled, as has been the case constantly, lands have been thrown open for settlement, and within the last month or two weeks the leases of two large ranches have been cancelled and the lands thrown open for settlement. We are doing that as rapidly as leases are forfeited, either for non-payment of rent or from the owners not putting on the land the number of cattle which they pledged themselves to place there under the lease. I believe that the ranching country 100 miles east of the mountains is one of the best portions of the territories, and will in the near future be very thickly settled. I quite agree with the sentiment expressed by the late Premier in the early days of the ranching industry, that eventually the cattle would have to give way to the settler. If the whole of the present ranching country on the eastern side of the Rocky Mountains were thickly settled, as I venture to predict it will become, the owners of cattle will have to travel eastward, where the country is equally good for the purpose, and I am told by experienced cattlemen that it is even better for ranching purposes than the land close to the Rocky Mountains. There has been no difficulty in the past, and there is plenty of room yet for cattle to be moved to other tracts of country, and there will be opportunity to come to a favourable understanding with those gentlemen who are so largely interested themselves in cattle raising. In the particular district to which our attention has been called, where the Hollis and McEachran leases are situated, I may say that the Hollis lease was taken up in 1883. In 1888 Mr. Hollis indicated his wish to surrender that lease, and Dr. McEachran notified the Government that he was willing to take it and give up a lease adjoining it, close to Fort Macleod, and in regard to which a number of persons had applied to have thrown open for settlement. Consequently, when application was made by Dr. McEachran to take the Hollis lease, instead of the one he held near Fort Macleod, the Government were very glad to make the exchange. Then, Dr. McEachran's leased land was thrown open for settlement. It appears that on the Hollis lease the Dunbar family were settled. Shortly after Dr. McEachran's lease was given to him information reached the department that the Dunbar family claimed some portion of the land. Representations were made to us regarding other leases that parties were in the habit of making a business of settling on leased land, selecting the springs or other available water or other advantages offered, such as hay land, and causing complications with the object of being bought out. A number of people made it their business, and we had to be very careful to protect those who had invested their money and gone into the country in good faith. In one case I recollect that a man settled on an Indian reserve and made very extensive improvements, and we had to pay him $3,000 to leave. He then went on to the Hollis lease and made some improvements, and the Waldron Ranching Company had to pay about $12,000 to get rid of him. Then the Dunbar case was reported to the department. Mr. Pearce was sent to make a report, and his report was that Dunbar, senior, had settled on the land prior to survey, and prior to Hollis getting his lease. We then gave instructions that a patent should be issued to him for his land. With respect to the two young men, they were sons who lived with the father, who made no claim outside of the old man's pre-emption, and it was not until representations were made by Dr. McEachran that they were endeavouring to secure the springs that we came to the conclusion that the sons were not entitled to land, that they were not *bonâ fide* settlers, and had done nothing but a little ploughing, and had not carried out those extensive improvements stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, but had done work to the value only of probably $50 or $75. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) seemed to complain that sufficient notice had not been taken of the representations of the Dunbars. We had a good many communications with them, but they finally placed their case in the hands of their solicitor, Mr. Haultain, and with him we have had communication. With respect to the young men, they received an entry for the land, not on account of the lands being opened, because they never were opened, as stated in the petition read by the hon. member for Wellington; but when Mr. Hollis indicated his intention of giving up this lease, and we were negotiating with Dr. McEachran, we notified our agent not to give entries on the Hollis lease. In the face of that instruction, for some unaccountable reason, entries were given, and these resulted in rather serious complications. The matter was submitted to the Justice Department, and we received a report stating that the young Dunbars had no right to the land, and consequently we cancelled the entries. I was not aware at that time an action for ejectment was pending. Subsequently, they did not feel inclined to spend any further money than they had already expended on the suit. The hon. member for Wellington also stated that it was evident the lands were sold because they were sub-divided. They have been sub-divided for a good many reasons. No less than 20 or 30 leases have been opened, and we have sub-divided the whole of them with the expectation that they would be thrown open to settlement. In all our new leases it is provided that the even-numbered sections be thrown open for settlement as in any other part of the territory. I agree with the hon. gentleman that this part of the country, which I believe is as good a portion of territory as any in the North-West, should be placed in as favourable a position for settlement as any other portion of the country. There is one point further to which I may refer. The hon. member for Wellington brought the matter to my attention in a very friendly and suitable manner, and we had one or two interviews in

regard to it. I brought Dr. McEachran to talk it over and ascertain if some arrangement could not be arrived at with these young men. After consultation the hon. member for Wellington wrote to the Dunbars stating the interview with Dr. McEachran, and mentioning that he was perfectly willing to buy them out and make a settlement with them. However, the country appears more favourable than it has been, and although at one time they were perfectly willing to sell out, the Dunbars have now changed their mind and propose to remain there. In regard to these two young men, there was a portion of the time between the cancellation of Hollis' lease and the issue of the new lease when the land might be open to settlement. The only claim that I see they can have would be that they were there at that time when the lands were apparently open for settlement. The House will see that so far as the old gentleman was concerned, that immediately it was found he had a right to the land instructions were issued, and he got his patent so soon as we were able to give it to him and when he complied with the regulations. The hon. gentleman at the end of his speech I think was rather violent, and he spoke of the treatment these people received as being not unlike the treatment of the tenants in Ireland. Well, Mr. Speaker, considering the number of the leases and the nature of the country there, I think it speaks well for the ranchers and for everyone concerned that we have not had more difficulties. I know that in a number of the ranches held under the old system, where it required two years' notice to cancel, some persons have gone in and settled with the permission of the ranchers and there has been no difficulty whatever. As long as settlement does not rush into that country I think that the ranchers if they had a little common sense might be able to get along for a short time in that way. The demand which has been made upon me, that a two years' notice only be given, is one that requires a good deal of consideration, and it will be taken up in the near future in connection with the proposed change of policy on this subject. I may say indeed, and it was brought about through the proposal of the manager of the Waldron ranche, I have a report before Council for two months in reference to this matter, and after the House rises it will receive further consideration, and I have no doubt that we shall have to come to a more definite policy in regard to this matter. This question may be somewhat new to this country, but it is not new to other countries. The same difficulties have been experienced in British Columbia and Australia. Where persons got these large tracts of land for ranching purposes it has been found that when settlement comes in a different policy has to be pursued; and now that this country is being opened up by railways both north and south of Calgary, and that settlement is likely to rush in there, I believe that a change will have to be made shortly in that respect, and I trust it will be made in sufficient time to do justice to the two young men whose cases were especially brought before the House by the member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen).

Mr. WATSON. This is a matter that should receive careful consideration by the House, and it proves that the contentions of gentlemen on this side of the House were right when they opposed the granting of these large tracts of country to private corporations. We find that that policy has been retarding the settlement in the far west in the same way that the colonization companies retarded settlements in some parts of Manitoba. The Minister states that this land was given to the Waldron ranche, after the practical cancellation of the lease granted to the Hollis. The Hollis' lease was practically cancelled, and yet the Government extended the same privilege on this land to Dr. McEachran which it appears to me is contrary to the land regulations in force at the time. The Government finding that they had made a mistake in giving a lease for twenty-one years, changed the system of lease which required the permission of the leaseholder before a homesteader could receive a homestead on that lease. After that change the Government claimed that all even sections should be open for homesteaders, without the homesteader getting permission from the leaseholder, and consequently it left the even sections open for homesteading. That would not be so objectionable, but here we find a case where the men have actually occupied land, until they were cancelled under the Hollis lease, and afterwards have been ejected by Dr. McEachran. I believe that the settlers who have located on that land were not molested by the Hollis Ranche Company, because they did not stock the land and had no right to it. The Hollis Company were simply speculators to secure the land and hold it for a number of years without putting any stock on the ranche at all, and consequently the lease was subject to cancellation. It was cancelled, and these settlers were occupying these lands, knowing that the ranche company were not complying with the regulations of the department and feeling safe and secure. But notwithstanding that fact, the Government granted Dr. McEachran a lease for twenty years on the old conditions, where a settler had to secure the permission of the leaseholder to occupy any portion of that land as to homestead. I think that was a great mistake, and I think also that it was contrary to the land regulations. I believe that it is a matter which requires the consideration of this House, and if Dr. McEachran received that lease contrary to the land regulations, then it appears to me the department would be in a position to cancel it. There are other cases besides this of the Dunbars. The Minister will remember the case of the Dicksons, who were settlers on this Hollis ranche lease, and at the time Dr. McEachran got possession of that lease Mr. Pearce, one of the Dominion Land Commissioners, went with Dr. McEachran to inform these settlers. One of the Dicksons asked Mr. Pearce if he could secure an entry for 320 acres. Mr. Pearce informed him that he could. Then, according to the report in the Macleod *Gazette*, Mr. Pearce asked Dr. McEachran if he had any objection to this settler, and he had nothing to say. If that is the case, it does seem to me to be a hardship that Dr. McEachran at a later date should undertake to eject these people, and that he should be sustained in his action by the Government. I would like to ask the Minister if Dr. McEachran secured that lease by competition.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No. I explained that it was an arrangement brought about for the purpose of getting Mr. McEachran to re-release his lease, which was far more valuable to us for settlement than the Hollis lease, because it was close to the town of

Macleod, and the settlers asked that the land covered by it should be thrown open.

Mr. WATSON. It was a mistake to grant these leases in the first place; but why that should be followed up by a lease to Dr. McEachran contrary to the land regulations——

Mr. DEWDNEY. Not contrary to the land regulations.

Mr. WATSON. It was: because if the Hollis lease was cancelled there had to be a new lease granted to Dr. McEachran; and if he did not find it comfortable around Fort Macleod, because people were encroaching on his lands, that was a risk he took when he assumed the lease. Now, a notice was issued by the department on the 17th of September, 1889, which reads as follows:—

"Leases of grazing lands in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and within the railway belt in the Province of British Columbia, may be granted only after public competition, except in the case of an actual settler, to whom may be leased, without public competition, a tract of land not to exceed four sections in area, and to be in the vicinity of the settler's residence."

This was the advertisement posted in the North-West by the department at the time Dr. McEachran appeared to get a lease of this Hollis ranche.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is a regulation.

Mr. WATSON. Though that was the law at that time, it appears that Dr. McEachran had sufficient influence to secure the Hollis lease for that particular section where twenty or twenty-five settlers had lived for some years. Now, I am not going to take up time in going over a number of cases, because the people have had a full statement of the case published in the Macleod *Gazette*, which I believe has been circulated pretty freely among the members of this House. The hon. gentleman has said that these people—not settlers, but speculators—would go on and occupy the best hay lands, and lands where there were springs of water, for the purpose of being bought out. There may have been some cases of that kind, and in such cases the Government would be justified in protecting the leaseholders in their rights and privileges, and not allowing them to be deprived of their supplies of hay and water. But where settlers settled on those lands and cultivated them previous to Dr. McEachran getting his lease, I claim that they ought to be protected in their rights of possession. The hon. gentleman also states that so soon as these lands were wanted for settlement the leases were cancelled and they were immediately surveyed. It appears that this Hollis ranche was surveyed and sub-divided.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It was surveyed in 1882.

Mr. WATSON. I think there has been considerable money spent since that time in surveying these ranches. In the Dunbar case, old Mr. Dunbar did secure his homestead, and one of the sons also secured a homestead entry, after the land was inspected by Mr. Pearce. Now, the Government wishes to cancel that entry, saying that they made some mistake. But Mr. Pearce, one of the land commissioners, and I believe a very efficient officer, having made that inspection, and having told young Dunbar that he could secure an entry, surely he ought to be allowed to retain that entry. Mr. Dunbar should not be made to suffer for the mistake of an officer of the department, especially one occupying the position of Mr. Pearce. I believe that Mr. Pearce was right, but that some influence was brought to bear on the department by Dr. McEachran, who, I believe, performs his duties as a veterinary surgeon for the Government. If the tract of country is correctly described by the Minister as being well fitted for settlement, as I believe it is, or the settlers would not go there, it surely was a great mistake on his part to allow Dr. McEachran to enter into a long lease of these lands in 1889. If that had happened eight or ten years ago, the case might have been different. But these lands were actually in demand for settlement at the time the department allowed Dr. McEachran to take them up for ranching purposes.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There was no application at all. There were only squatters on the lands.

Mr. WATSON. Well, I understand that in that country the squatters' rights were recognized. I believe these people were encouraged to go on those lands.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Not on leases.

Mr. WATSON. Those lands were public lands the moment the Hollis lease was cancelled, and it was cancelled when the Hollis people did not go on and carry out the conditions of the lease; so that the lands were practically open for homestead entry at that time, and it is a hardship upon these people that the department should allow the ranche company to eject them. It can be easily understood that a poor settler living on a quarter section or a half section is not able to fight a powerful ranche company like the one which has Dr. McEachran at its head. If the Government are bound by the lease to the company, I think it is their duty to see that the settlers are not harshly dealt with, but to allow them to secure homesteads in other available places, compensate them for their improvements, and give them a patent for their new homesteads as if they had performed the settlement duties upon them. I think that would be fair. These people have gone there and settled in good faith. It is a mistake for the Government to permit the country to be made the subject of such statements as have been made in the public press. I have yet to learn that any of those statements made in the press are not perfectly accurate. At any rate, they are not denied by the Minister, and if people are to be dealt with in that section, as it is stated in the Macleod *Gazette* they are treated, we cannot expect people to go there and settle. If the ranche companies are going to monopolize that country for years—this large tract of country which has been spoken of by the Minister as now fit for settlement and cultivation—he cannot expect that settlement will rush in, when it is known that the pioneers are harshly dealt with in the manner described in the articles before us. I hope the Government will see fit at once to remedy those evils, and come to the relief of those settlers who are being persecuted by the ranche company.

Mr. LAURIER. I can readily understand that in the administration of such a vast territory as our North-West occasionally, with all the best intentions, mistakes and errors will occur—mistakes of policy and mistakes of administration; but when such mistakes do occur the department should not

hesitate to rectify them. The Minister stated a moment ago that it was our duty to keep faith with the capitalists who have invested their money in the North-West. I agree with him on that point, and I have no doubt he will also agree with me that it is equally important that we should keep faith with the settlers.

Mr. DEWNEY. Certainly.

Mr. LAURIER. And if an injustice has been done, unwittingly and involuntarily, as may happen in the best regulated administration, and if in consequence of those mistakes either the capitalist or the settler must suffer, in my humble opinion it should not be the settler. No one can deny that it is more important, if we want to settle the North-West rapidly and effectively, that every favour possible should be shown the settlers. In this matter an injustice has been done by somebody. These lands were open for settlement as far back as 1872. Whether they were free for entry then or not, certainly an entry was accepted by the Government agents for those lands. I hold here the cancellation of the right of entry which was granted one of these young Dunbars :

"With respect to the north ½ Section 14, Township 9, Range 28, west 4th Meridian, for which you have obtained homestead and pre-emption entries, I beg to notify you to make no more improvements thereon until further advised, as the entries were given inadvertently."

I have no desire to lay blame on anybody. I suppose the agent, acted under misapprehension, but at all events a mistake was made. This young man was allowed to perform the settlement duty, believing that by conforming with the conditions of his entry he would acquire the right of ownership. Several years afterwards he is told that there was a mistake on the part of the department.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Almost immediately.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand it was more than a year; but the point is not material. Of course, the more duties he performed the stronger is his equitable claim; but at all events, in equity and justice, having made his entry in good faith, it is not he who should suffer. But after the entry was granted on these lands a new lease was given Dr. McEachran on the same conditions as the former lease to Mr. Hollis, which lease had been practically cancelled. In the meantime, the regulations for the granting of leases had been altered. When the Hollis lease was granted no reserve was made for the right of settlers, but at the time the McEachran lease was granted the rights of settlers were reserved in the leases. In that lease, however, these conditions and regulations were not inserted, and Dr. McEachran received it without any reservation of the rights of the settlers. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell me that it was simply substituted for the Hollis lease, and the conditions therefore were the same; but if the Hollis lease had been practically cancelled to the extent that a right of entry was granted, when the new lease was given Dr. McEachran the conditions in the old one should not have been continued. At all events, even if the position taken, that Dr. McEachran should have received his lease without any reservation of the rights of settlers, be good, the fact remains, at all events, that the department committed a wrong in granting the entry to this young man. What right then had he to suffer for the mistake of the Government? I am glad that the Minister stated that he would consider the case favourably, and I submit to him if it is not manifest that the settler should not suffer from the mistake of the department, but that the consequences should fall on the department which made it. If the Government has made a mistake, it is rich enough to indemnify the party injured.

Mr. DEWDNEY. We made him an offer which he would not accept.

Mr. LAURIER. I congratulate the hon. Minister on having shown some willingness to deal fairly with the settler, but if the settler did not accept the offer the matter should not rest there. It could be arbitrated upon. At all events, it is a great hardship, that, in consequence of what has taken place, this man should be sued by a powerful company, and of course when you bring a settler into the clutches of the law you ruin him for the best years of his life. Under such circumstances, if the hon. gentleman has made an offer to the settler which the settler does not deem sufficient, the matter ought to be dealt with in justice to the settler.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Post Office Department—To increase the salary of W. H. Smithson.. ..... $200

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this a statutory increase?

Mr. HAGGART. No; but he has been accountant of the Post Office Department for eight years, and this is the first increase he has had during that time.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is his salary now?

Mr. HAGGART. $2,400.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman kindly tell me the reason why a letter carrier in this city named Nelson Marion was dismissed a year ago?

Mr. HAGGART. It was for misconduct of some kind; but the deputy does not at present remember what it was.

Department of Printing and Stationery —Mr. LaMothe's salary from 1st July, 1891 ..... $1,400

Mr. McMULLEN. Was there no provision made for this in the main Estimates?

Mr. LAURIER. I think I can explain this. Mr. Lamothe was an employé in the Civil Service, and he had to be superannuated in consequence of an injury to his eyes. Now he is able to take service again, and his service is accepted.

Department of Marine—To provide for the appointment of A. R. Gordon, Lieut., R.N., as nautical adviser to the Marine Department and Commander of the Fisheries Protection Service... $2,400

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this a new office?

Mr. TUPPER. That is not an increase. The amount of $2,400 is available for the appointment of a chief clerk in the Department of Marine. Lieut. Gordon is now Deputy Superintendent of the Meteorological Service in Toronto, and we propose to abolish that office and to transfer him to the Department of Marine, and thus fill the vacancy there. This amount is already voted, but the object of this is to include the name of Lieut. Gordon. His present salary is not $2,400; therefore we could not appoint him by Order in Council

Department of the Secretary of State—Gabriel de Laporte in the Records Branch.....$ 730

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Laporte is an old employé who has been in the Records Branch and has been paid this sum for a number of years. He has not passed the Civil Service examination, but he is very useful there, and this has been paid to him for many years.

Auditor General's Office—To authorize payment to H. R. Moore and H. Gross, of $700 and $600 per annum, respectively, on their entrance into the service (the balance having been provided in the main Estimates).....$ 100

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire to ask whether these are new appointments? Is Mr. Moore entering the service for the first time now?

Mr. FOSTER. They have been temporary clerks for some time, and are now being appointed permanently. They have passed the examination.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose the reason for putting them here is that you are paying them more than the Civil Service Act warrants, to begin with.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; more than the minimum. It is irregular in that respect, and therefore is introduced here. But the Auditor General has given a very good reason for the employment of these men. They are superior men, both graduates of the university, and good accountants, and he states that they are such men as he requires, and are more useful to him than three or four ordinary clerks would be at the same sum.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I make no objection; I am only asking for information. It seems to me that where a party has been in the Civil Service for a number of years, after he has passed his examination as temporary clerk, it would be well if, without coming to the House, the Minister had power to put him on at that salary which he would have earned if he had been put on the permanent list at the time he passed the examination.

Mr. FOSTER. We could not do it under the present law.

High Commissioner's Office, London—To authorize the payment of over-expenditure in 1890-91 on account of contingencies.....$1,500

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot understand how the expenditures, more particularly the contingent expenditures, of the High Commissioner's office, are scattered all through the Public Accounts. In the Auditor General's Report you find in some cases there are certain items charged to immigration, and there are items charged in other lines. Then we have contingent expenses in addition to the salary of the office. I think it would be well if the hon. gentleman would give us some accurate idea of the actual incidental expenses of that office. Let us have it altogether, not some of it put in the Supplementary Estimates, some put in the ordinary Estimates, some charged to immigration, and so on.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will find the sums stated in the Auditor General's Report. They are not scattered any more than other estimates. If there had been sufficient in the main Estimates we would not have asked for a supplementary vote. This is the balance of about $1,000 which has to be paid, and for which we have an estimate in the supplementaries. I do not think my hon. friend will find the High Commissioner's charges scattered through many different accounts. Possibly he will find some to immigration. If the Minister of Agriculture has sent him on any special service, possibly his travelling expenses may come under that head. But as a rule they are under the head of the High Commissioner's office since it has been brought under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister says we will find it set out in the Auditor General's Report. On page B-73 I find several items. I would like to know what other items above and beyond those here recorded the sum that is now to be voted is to cover. We have postage stamps, we have repairs to the house, repairing furniture, tinting wall, stationery, stock exchange, subscriptions, and so forth.

Mr. FOSTER. We went over all that.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is very true. The hon. Minister, no doubt, has a vivid recollection of his attention being drawn to these things. Now, we want to know what this additional $1,500 is to cover.

Mr. FOSER. You shall have all the items set out. The estimates last year and the expenditures against each one, are as follows:—Rent of office and fuel, appropriation, $3,062; spent, $2,950; printing and stationery, appropriated, $650; spent, $966; postage, appropriated, $800; spent, $833; miscellaneous, appropriated, $960; expended, $1,233; travelling expenses, $200; expended, $68; income tax, appropriation, $122; spent, $188; newspapers and periodicals, appropriated, $256, expended, $406; messengers' wages, appropriated, $740; expended, $677; official residence, not estimated for, about $1,000. The whole appropriation has been $7,790 and the expenditure $8,523, which leaves a small appropriation for which this vote is asked.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is virtually about $17,500 for salary and contingencies, which the High Commissioner cost us.

To increase the salary of J. G. Colmer from 1st July, 1891.....$400

Mr. FOSTER. This is to increase Mr. Colmer's salary to $2,800. Mr. Colmer has been a very efficient officer, and has been a long time in the service. I think he is fully entitled to this increase in his salary. It puts him upon the basis of a deputy head, so far as the salary is concerned. He has charge of the whole office there, and of a very large part of the business.

Office of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada—To provide for a salary of $2,400 from 1st July, 1891, for Mr. J. Pope, assistant Clerk of the Privy Council.....$ 600

Mr. FOSTER. This is the gentleman who was Sir John A. Macdonald's private secretary. He was in receipt of $1,800 as private secretary's allowance, and this will make his salary $2,400. He has had a long and faithful service with the late Premier, and it was thought advisable to make his salary equal to that he would have been in the enjoyment of before, and he is placed in the Privy Council.

Department of Interior—Salaries..... $850

Mr. McMULLEN. Please explain this item.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is to provide for the salaries of two of the old clerks who have been in the department since 1882 or 1883. Under the recent arrangement they were selected as being two of the best clerks and placed on the permanent list.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention of the Govrenment to reinstate any of the officers or clerks of the department who have been suspended on account of irregularities?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot reply to the hon. gentleman at the present time. The Committee have not had sufficient time to go into the whole matter and arrive at a conclusion.

Mr. WATSON. Is a Committee investigating their cases?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Is it going further into the cases than the Public Accounts Committee did.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I notice that one of these officers is Geo. D. Pope. Is this compensation for his visit to Prince Edward Island during the elections?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not aware he was there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will get into a scrape like his colleagues in office if it is possible for his clerks to be away for several weeks and for him not to be aware of it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not follow my clerks wherever they go.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand this man was at the island, and was there on behalf of the Administration. Surely, an hon. colleague would not take an officer from the hon. gentleman's department and send him away without his knowledge.

Mr. McMULLEN. The name of Mr. Pope brings up very vivid recollections of an individual who performed very desirable duty, no doubt, in connection with the election returns one year.

Department of Railways and Canals—
Balance of salary of late Sir John A. Macdonald $533

Mr. LANDERKIN. As one of the members of the House has been very ill during the session—I refer to Mr. Burdett—it would be only right and proper that his indemnity should be paid in full. I hope the Government will take this matter into consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. It has already been brought to our attention by Mr. Trow, the ever diligent whip. The matter is being considered.

Department of Agriculture—Additional salary to J. B. Lynch..... ..... $300

Mr. McMULLEN. What is his salary at the present time?

Mr. HAGGART. He is at present accountant of the Agriculture Department and we propose to make him travelling inspector.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me that instead of increasing these salaries, this expenditure should be reduced.

Mr. FOSTER. The first effect will be to take away such occupations as you have had during part of this session.

Mr. McMULLEN. It was undoubtedly a very unpleasant occupation we had to perform, and it must have been so to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Miscellaneous Justice..... $12,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the Minister of Justice will give some details of this item?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The expenditure will be unusually large this year, and in point of fact the vote last year was not sufficient, and we had to take a supplementary estimate of $10,000. In addition to this outlay, the expenses of counsel employed in the late investigation have to be paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the Minister give any explanation in relation to expenses connected with the late investigation? How many counsel were employed and are to be paid, and what amount are they to receive?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are two counsel employed under the instruction of the Government to attend the Committee, if the hon. gentleman refers to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and in addition to that there was a recommendation strongly urged by the members of the Committee that the counsel who had been employed to conduct the complaint should likewise be paid. That matter has been considered by the Government, but the expenses of the other two gentlemen will amount to probably an average of $4,000 each.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not quite hear what the hon. gentleman said. Did I understand him to say that the Government have agreed to pay the fees of Mr. Geoffrion, who is practically prosecuting counsel, as well as the counsel employed by the defence?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not say positively that the Government had agreed, but I said that the opinion had been expressed in Committee that they should be paid. The Committee refrained from passing a resolution, as it was a money matter and should, therefore, be brought down by the Government. That expression came from both sides of the Committee, and I think it will be favourably considered by the Government. In the meantime, I am in communication with Mr. Geoffrion to ascertain what his fees would be.

To pay Rev. James Fulton the maximum of chaplain's salary from date of appointment, 1st October, 1889..... $300

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire to enquire what Mr. Fulton's salary now is, or what his salary will be when this addition is made?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The regular salary is $1,200 a year, but like all other penitentiary officers, under the Penitentiary Act it is provided that upon his appointment the salary shall be reduced to the minimum, which I think is $900 in the case of the chaplain of St. Vincent de Paul. The House was asked in the main Estimates to abolish that distinction as far as chaplains were concerned, and to allow them to enter at the full salary. This vote makes the difference between the minimum and the full salary.

Mr. SCRIVER. So that he will be paid $1,200 from the date of his appointment ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Manitoba Penitentiary..... ..... $900

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if the Government has come to any decision about the appointment of a warden for that penitentiary yet ? That office has been vacant for a considerable time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The office has not been vacant : it is temporarily filled. As the hon. gentleman knows, I have not thought it desirable to make any decision as to the appointment of a permanent warden at present. I think it is desirable that the present warden should remain there, if not permanently appointed, to put the affairs of the institution in proper order and to establish a basis of expenditure for the future.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Do we understand that the Minister of Justice has appointed this gentleman who is in charge there for the purpose of ascertaining what would be a reasonable expenditure for that institution ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is one of the objects, and also for the purpose of completely disentangling the accounts of the institution so far as possible.

Mr. WATSON. I am sure that no person in this House will object to the course the Minister of Justice is pursuing if the gentleman in charge there now is a competent man, having experience of that kind to ascertain what will be the expenditure in Manitoba Penitentiary. I hope when a permanent appointment is made that the Minister will see fit to select one of the best applicants from the Province of Manitoba. Of course, I understand there are a great number of persons applying for the position, and I believe there are some amongst the number who possess all the bad qualities of the late officer and none of his good ones, for although Mr. Bedson was extravagant he was a good officer, so far as discipline was concerned. I believe Col. Boswell is an applicant for the position, and as a member of the Opposition I might say that I believe that he is a first-class officer, and would make a good warden. He is supported by a large number of the citizens of Manitoba.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid you spoiled his chances.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) That is a candid confession from the Minister.

Mr. WATSON. I do not expect that a gentleman of anything else than the political stripe of hon. gentlemen opposite would be appointed. I can testify to the efficiency of Col. Boswell as a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite during election times. I believe he is a most efficient officer for the interest of the Conservative party.

Mr. DENISON. I have the pleasure of knowing Col. Boswell also. He is an excellent man and a good officer, and I am satisfied that if he is appointed by the Government he will fill the office very satisfactorily. I only hope that the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Watson) will not jeopardize his chances.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

To pay Mr. Macdonell, M. P. for Algoma, 21 days' sessional indemnity..... $168

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to object to this, although the precedent is one of a very objectionable character, to pay a gentleman for services which he could by no possibility have rendered, seeing that he was not elected until 21 days after the House met. But I would say to the hon. Minister of Justice that if this is granted we ought, in all conscience, to grant an indemnity to a gentleman who has been prevented from attending here only by very serious illness. I refer to Mr. Burdett.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is another case somewhat similar to the case of Mr. Macdonell, that is the case of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), who was elected subsequently to the meeting of the House. Before the House met his election was contested and a vacancy occurred, but not because of any act personally affecting himself. He was elected some time after the session began ; but no provision was made for paying him for that time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The case of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) is one that everybody must regret, because when that hon. gentleman was able to be here he was a very diligent member. There is another case of a member who has not been absent so much, but who has not been able to be here the full time. The case of the hon. member for Kent has been overlooked, but it may be considered. The loss of the twenty-one days on the part of the hon. member for Algoma was not in consequence of his not being elected in time, but was in consequence of unavoidable delay in making the return.

To provide amount required to pay the following persons for services rendered in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery during February and March last, in connection with the last general election :—

Adjutor Samson.....	$22 20
J. B. Geo. Samson.....	85 00
Claire Hugg.....	27 00
	$134 20

Mr. TROW. I would like to say, in reference to Claire Hugg, that he is one of the most faithful officers of this House, and I do not think he is paid sufficient. There are several officers receiving $700 per annum, while he only receives $600. He is an old and faithful servant, he has been here for many years, and I think he is entitled to another $100 of salary. I would like to hear the Speaker's opinion of the qualifications of this young man.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have known this young man Hugg for many years, and I have always found him efficient in the discharge of his duties. This year considerably more work than usual has been put upon him owing to the indisposition of the chief of the pages, and I think I may practically agree with what the hon. member for South Perth has said, that Mr. Hugg is perhaps entitled to some consideration. The Committee will understand that of course the question of increasing his salary does not rest entirely with the Speaker. The Commission of Internal Economy has a great deal to do with it, and as the Minister of Finance is a powerful member of that Commission, and every

one knows his economical disposition. I cannot promise that an increase will be made.

Further sum for expenses of Committees.$20,000

Mr. COCKBURN. I should like to see a clause added to this vote to provide for increases to the clerks' salaries: E. Hartney, $200; Walter Todd, $200; N. Robidoux, $100, and L. C. Panet, $100—total $600. Unless the names are specifically mentioned, I think it would be impossible for these gentlemen to claim any part of the vote. I think we all agree that the duties imposed upon them have been onerous, and I do not think that in granting them $600 we shall be going beyond what is reasonable.

Mr. SPEAKER. No portion of this item of $20,000 is intended for the salaries of any officers of the House. It is intended for the payment of expenses connected with the summoning of witnesses and the employment of shorthand writers. I may say that so far as I am concerned I have a very strong objection to the granting of bonuses to the officers of this House. I believe it is an improper mode of remunerating these gentlemen. Their salaries ought to be fixed at a sufficient sum to remunerate them for the work they are called upon to perform; and if, during a session such as this, their work is more onerous than usual, that is no reason why bonuses should be given them. They have simply performed their duty. I have expressed that opinion privately to the officers of the House; and I would very much prefer, if it is intended to increase the salaries of those officers, that the increases should be made permanent, and not take the form of a bonus, on the ground that extra work has been exacted from them. Such a system gives them the idea that all they have to do, if they have done extra work during a particular session, is to put in a claim for a bonus and it will be granted. I would like, however, to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to the salary of Mr. Todd. I understand it was intended that he should be given the grade of a first-class clerk from a certain time, but that his appointment, instead of being dated back, as was intended, was dated ahead, and he thereby lost two statutory increases to which he was entitled, amounting to $100 altogether. His case is one, I think, the Government might take into consideration; but I do not think the amount could be taken out of this vote, which, it seems to me, is intended for an entirely different purpose.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What action has been taken with reference to those clerks in the Civil Service who obtained possession of examination papers improperly, and by this means were enabled to pass their examinations and get certificates?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The clerk in the printing department who did this, instead of waiting to be dismissed, took the best course, and resigned. The clerk in the Post Office Department will be dealt with by the head of that department. Whether they will be prosecuted under the Act passed a couple of years ago or not is a matter which will be determined by the Minister of Justice.

Health Statistics..... $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is half the usual vote. Both the department and the Council have been looking into the matter. It was necessary that this $5,000 should be voted for the half year in order that we might have the statistics in course of preparation completed and published for the remainder of the calendar year. No further expenditure will be made after that, under the present system. It is felt that the system carried on has been defective in some cases, and that we were repeating what the provinces were doing, and the Government are considering what new system will be adopted in the future.

Mr. WATSON. I am glad to know some change will be made, because at present the work is apparently done twice. It would be much better that we should work in conjunction with the Local Legislature. Let them furnish the necessary information and the Dominion Government stand the expense of printing. If we co-operated with the different provinces we would get more valuable information for less money.

Mr. SPROULE. The work done by the provinces is quite different from this, and there is no provision in the provincial Act for this work. Our board does other work beside the collection of mortuary statistics.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The collection of statistics by the Dominion must be a compilation of what is done by the provinces. The work should be thrown on the provinces.

Mr. FOSTER. That is under contemplation.

Mr. Adam Brown, Honorary Commissioner—Honorarium..... $2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He is a very good fellow, but when did this exhibition terminate?

Mr. FOSTER. The end of last May or the beginning of June.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So that, although this is practically paying him for a job undertaken while he was a member, it is so manipulated that he will be paid for the work after he ceased to be a member. You will get out of the snarl that way.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not looked on as pay, but as a honorarium.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This business of appointing a member of Parliament to act as a commissioner and then paying him a salary is coming very perilously close to the Independence of Parliament Act; and I am not sure it is much mitigated by the fact that it was tolerably well known my hon. friend held the reversion of the postmastership of Hamilton in his pocket at the time.

Aid toward the Dominion Dairy Exhibition to be held at Sherbrooke, Quebec, in 1891..... $10,000

Mr. ROOME. Is this aid to be continued another year?

Mr. FOSTER. It has been decided to provide this amount yearly in favour of exhibitions of this kind. This exhibition will be held in the Eastern Townships this year and probably in some other portion of the Dominion another year. As my hon. friend has said, the industry is a growing one, and if an aid of this kind can have the anticipated effect, the money will be well expended.

Mr. EDWARDS. What is being done with this $10,000?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is a rival institution to the provincial exhibitions.

Mr. HAGGART. The intention is to hand the money over to the agricultural authorities to be used in the form of prizes.

Mr. WATSON. It appears to be a bonus to Sherbrooke for holding an exhibition. I do not think the Government can do too much to encourage the manufacture of dairy products in Canada, but I do think better results will be obtained from the expenditure by dividing it among the different provinces. Let the provincial exhibitions have their share and make special prizes for dairy produce. To give $10,000 to one society to have one dairy exhibition seems to me to be an extravagant expenditure, and I think, if the Government would divide this amount up among the different provinces and allow prizes to be given in the different provinces, it would be a better application of this amount.

Mr. ROOME. This exhibition has endeavoured to get all parts of Canada to exhibit there, to exhibit their cheese, and their butter, and their dairy cattle, and also to show the system of ensilage, so as to teach the farmers the best way to feed their cattle, and also to get the proper cheese for the English market. If this money were divided among the different provinces it would be of no use at all, but this is to cause a competition among the farmers of the whole Dominion, and I think it is in the interest of the country at large.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be of great benefit to British Columbia.

Mr. ROOME. Next year let the exhibition be placed somewhere else, but I am sure the farmers of Canada will be willing to support and carry out this proposal.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to know what benefit the people of British Columbia and Manitoba and the North-West are going to derive from an exhibition in the Eastern Townships? Perhaps all the exhibits will come from the Texas ranches.

Mr. EDWARDS. I simply desired to know how $10,000 could be expended for dairy prizes at any such exhibition. It appears to me that this is simply a gift to an exhibition association. I highly approve of these exhibitions. I do not think the Government can do too much in that direction, but I think they should have begun at the fountain head, and that is at the City of Ottawa. For some years past we have had a struggling association here, and have been asking for some aid. Now, the Eastern Townships have got ahead of us, and I suggest that, if an annual grant is to be made to the different exhibitions throughout the Dominion, it should be made next year to Ottawa, as it should have been done this year, if any such system is to be continued. As far as these grants are concerned, I highly approve of them. I think too much cannot be done to promote the dairying interests of the country. I venture to say that, if the prize lists at Sherbrooke are examined, it will be found that $10,000 have not been given by that association for any such purpose. It could not be done; but I take it that this is a grant of $10,000 to the exhibition association, and I hope the Government will continue it, and pass it round and let us have it in Ottawa, where it rightly belongs.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think my hon. friend is mistaken as to the use which is intended to be made of this appropriation. As I understand it, the object, as stated in the item here, is to provide for an exhibition at Sherbrooke of the improved methods of making butter and cheese and of curing ensilage. The management of the whole affair in Sherbrooke was under the control of Professor Robertson, and to those who know Professor Robertson as well as I do it is not necessary to say that the work was efficiently done, and that a great deal of information was afforded to the farmer. Still, I think the amount proposed here is an unnecessarily large one. Knowing what was done at Sherbrooke, I do not see that such a large amount was necessary or should have been expended. However, I have no doubt that Professor Robertson will render to the department a correct and honest and proper account of the way in which the money was disbursed.

Mr. McMILLAN. If it is right to vote this money, I think it should be divided among the different provinces. It is impossible to bring cows together from any great distances, and especially to bring them so as to test their milking qualities. Even when they are kept at home they dry up very rapidly. If this is to be done at all, let the money be given to each province, and let it be given in prizes for the best cheese and the best butter and the best milking cows of any breed, or the best milking cows of each breed.

Mr. SPROULE. I would have no objection to the expenditure of this money if it were equitably distributed, but I think it is setting a bad precedent. If it is given to an exhibition in Sherbrooke this year, that will be a precedent for a similar expenditure in some other locality next year. I agree with the hon. gentlemen who have spoken that, if this money is given, it should be given to some of the societies that are already in existence, so as to enable them to increase their prizes and do more work than they are doing now in the crippled state in which most of them are. It is said that this is given to test ensilage. We have our farm here, which is issuing bulletins every month on that subject. We have the Ontario farm at Guelph and the provincial farm in Quebec doing the same thing. I do not see any reason why we should do that in any other locality. Last year there was an appropriation made for the Dominion Dairy Association which I do not see this year. I think it would be much better to give this to support that association, which did a very valuable work when it met here in Ottawa two years ago when the House was in session. It brought together a number of men of great importance, shippers and exporters and producers. It was barely enough to pay the expenses of the year, and the amount that was used in advertising, I believe, was let drop. I think it would be much better if we had an item for that purpose rather than the one we have here now, which must surely lead to an invitation from different parts of the country to establish in each locality a society of this nature.

Mr. TROW. I do not think an exhibition of this description is intended for any particular locality. This is intended in a great measure for the Province of Quebec and the eastern portion of

Ontario. It is not to exhibit stock, but dairy products. I do not think this Government could do anything that would better promote the farming industry than to change the exhibition from one province to the other, and grant $10,000, and let it go the rounds of all the provinces. It would, in my opinion, do a great deal of good to our butter and cheese industry, and would increase the profits on the sale of our butter to a million dollars per annum. An exhibition of this kind would enlighten the people in the best methods of butter and cheese making.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not understand that this is given to any association : it is given to encourage the industry of cheese and butter making in the Dominion. I am not so narrow-minded as to oppose the granting of $10,000 in Quebec or Ontario, or in any other province, because it is a local exhibition : the question to consider is, whether it is going to do any good. I can see where it is going to do a great deal of good. This is not, as I understand it, altogether for prizes, but it is to bring the cheese from all over Ontario and Quebec, or from any other portion of the Dominion where it is made.

Mr. SCRIVER. That is not the object.

Mr. COCHRANE. I understand it is to pay the expenses of getting it there. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. If he understands it better than I do, he can explain it. They bring the cheese and butter, and are paid the expense of getting it there. It is judged there, and then put on the market of Great Britain. They also know on what principle cheese is manufactured, and when the farmers get the result of the best methods they will be able, not only to award prizes, but also to instruct buyers where the best cheese is made. I think we should not stand about where the money is expended. The only question to consider is : Will it do good to the farming community of this country ?

Mr. BAIN. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and myself do not often find ourselves in accord, but I have strong sympathy with the view expressed by that hon. gentleman this evening. I think that most of us in this House will remember that this is the continuation of a series of grants that have travelled around from one province to another, ostensibly for the purpose of advancing agriculture in some form. I want to say that since we have inaugurated the system, and to a certain extent have taken this departure in the dairying industry, I think that dairymen will agree with me in saying that if it is intended to get anything like a general collection of dairy exhibits at one point in the Dominion, in practice it will be found a very conspicuous failure. The difficulty of removing and handling fine dairy products and carrying them to a distance to exhibit as such will not be found to work well in practice, and the benefit will be largely limited to the immediate localities where the exhibition is held. Now, when we turn to the action we are taking with respect to advancing the quality of our dairy products, both in butter and cheese, when we turn to the action of this Dominion at the central farm here, and in respect to the travelling dairies that are promoted throughout the Dominion, and the work of the Provincial Governments, I think if the Government wanted to economize they might take into account whether it would not be just as wise to abolish this amount altogether at an early day. I think it will be found that the expenditure we are making on travelling dairies and otherwise to bring the use of ensilage before the farmers by our local experimental farms will be of much more benefit to the farmers than the exhibition of these dairy products. I think it will be found that while the locality having the exhibition will be very desirous of getting the $10,000, after all, our funds could be more profitably employed if we withdrew this amount and simply kept up the system we have otherwise employed to advance the interest of agriculture. I do not know why the Central Government should load itself with what might be called the details of the agricultural interest. I think that is a matter that might be left to each province to provide for itself according to its particular wants. While I endorse the action of the central experimental farm with respect to advancing the butter and cheese interest, I think it would be wise for us to confine our attention to these points, and drop this grant altogether.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not agree with the hon. gentlemen at all. I believe in continuing the grant and increasing it, and I suggest that you give Ottawa $10,000 next year, including it in the estimates as it is here for dairy purposes, and we will use it for agricultural purposes generally. I think that is what has been done for Sherbrooke. I believe, instead of doing away with this grant, we should treble it, or perhaps quadruple it, holding an exhibition annually in some one of the several provinces, a Dominion exhibition, such as the Royal in England, where the products of the different provinces can be got together. Now, our exhibitions in different parts of the country each year are simply local exhibitions, but if the Central Government gave a generous amount in this way we would have a good Dominion exhibition in some one of the provinces each year, which would be productive of very good results indeed.

Mr. SPROULE. When the hon. gentleman says these exhibition are local, he forgets that the present exhibition in Montreal has exhibits from all parts of Canada, including Manitoba and the North-West. Now, it is not our experience that exhibitions to-day, either agricultural or dairy, are confined to the locality in which they are held. It has been found that when the Provincial Government subsidized these exhibitions in Ontario, and they went round from place to place, they were generally a failure. The most successful one to-day in that province is the Industrial of Toronto. They have discarded the provincial grant entirely, because they looked upon it rather as a drawback to their enterprise than otherwise. When they got that amount of money it simply detracted from their own energy, and they did not make it as successful as it has been since. We have an exhibition of dairy produce at all these provincial shows. The Industrial of Toronto is open to the Dominion of Canada, and so it is with the Montreal exhibition and the Central one at Ottawa. Therefore, you have exhibits from different parts of the country, the same as you would have if you made special dairy exhibitions in any part of the Dominion. At the present time, with so many agricultural and industrial exhibitions in operation,

much of the farmers' time is spent there which might as well be spent at home.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) advises that this sum should be voted annually for Dominion exhibitions. I desire to remind the hon. member that in 1888, when a similar sum was in the Estimates that year for a Dominion exhibition, the Government of the day announced that they had changed their policy, and had determined that hereafter they would not aid in that way such exhibitions. I have a very painful recollection of that fact, because at the last election the only sin of omission which could be brought against me during my four years term was that I had not secured that amount of money for Nova Scotia and for the exhibition at Halifax. We considered that it was our right to receive it. The custom had been, I believe, to have the money spent annually on a Dominion exhibition, each province having the appropriation in turn; and we considered that in 1888 it was the turn of Nova Scotia. It was a very great disappointment to the people of the province, and especially to the people of Halifax, when the vote was dropped. A sum of $10,000 appears this year to cover expenses incidental to an exhibition in the Eastern Townships of dairy products. I find no fault with that expenditure. I have read in the newspapers very long and elaborate descriptions of it, and have heard here to-night that in every respect it was a success. If we in Nova Scotia are to wait our turn to get this money in rotation, we may have the same experience as we had in 1888. So, in order to protect ourselves against that possibility, I am disposed to support the suggestion which has been urged by several hon. members, that this vote should be divided among the different provinces annually and should be distributed among the central agricultural association of each province. I believe this expenditure will prove of great advantage in improving the character of the dairy products of the different provinces of the Dominion.

The Haras National Company, Montreal, for the use of 6 stallions for the Experimental Farm.. .. .. $6,000

Mr. McMILLAN. Is this system to be continued?

Mr. HAGGART. There is an agreement for a certain number of years.

Mr. McMILLAN. It would be much more beneficial to pay the money and not bring the animals in, because it is a gross injustice to individuals who have spent their own money in bringing in far better animals than these animals that come from this firm. Another gross injustice is that, if any benefit is to be derived from experimental farms, it is confined almost wholly to the farmers in the locality. Are the same stations to be continued next year?

Mr. HAGGART. These animals are to be kept at the different farms.

Mr. McMILLAN. This will prove a gross injustice to farmers in other parts of the province. The farms surrounding these stations are similar as regards conditions, and the experiments made bear directly on the farms of the surrounding districts, while farmers some distance away derive very little benefit from the experiments. There are certain portions of farming which the Government farms can properly take up, but I hold this item under discussion applies to a subject that should be left alone. It is being done in a better way by private individuals, and it will be impossible for the Government to carry it out so as to give satisfaction. I believe the Government should only take up subjects where private enterprise will not be able to meet the requirements, but in this direction the great evil to-day is that private enterprise has done more than the country really requires, and private capital is not paying those who invest in it. I speak from experience on this question. The sooner this system is abolished the better. Hon. gentlemen may turn round and show what large sums have been expended to benefit agriculture. But this outlay of $6,000 a year for five years, or $30,000, might as well have been placed in the stove. The farmers are not benefited thereby. The Government should confine themselves to efforts which would benefit the farmers, and not spend such large sums, and then tell the farmers how large an amount has been expended in their interest. I am afraid there is a reason lying behind this vote, that an arrangement was made with a powerful company before the elections, by which a large sum was to be spent during a number of years.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not agree with my hon. friend. I believe the experimental work at the farms will do good all over the Dominion, and I approve highly of the experiments that are being carried on. While I would not criticise otherwise than favourably, in general terms, the work of the experimental farm, I condemn very strongly this system of having these horses there. There may be a great benefit done by the Government in importing horses, but not that class of horses. Since the adoption of the McKinley tariff the horses that were formerly sold to the United States we cannot now sell there to advantage. The horses we want to raise for the English market are not of this class. What would be a wise thing for the Government to do would be to import a number of first-class English thoroughbred horses and sell them by auction in various parts of the Dominion. In that way we would be enabled to raise the very kind of horses we desire for that market; we would raise cavalry horses and hunters, which sell on the English market. I will explain why I think it would be a reasonable work for the Government to do. It is because theses horses cost very high sums and private individuals will not import them. By adopting the suggestion I have offered, very great benefits would be done to the farmers of Canada and to the Dominion as a whole. So far as this bargain with the Haras Company is concerned, I agree with my hon. friend that it would be better to allow the horses now at the farm to go back and discontinue the cost of keeping them. It is simply nonsense to board them at the experimental farm; they are entirely useless there. The Government have made a mistake, and the sooner that mistake is corrected the better. Let the horses go back. Those who understand the subject will agree with me that there is no better way in which the Government can help agriculture in Canada than by importing, as I have suggested, some first-class English blood horses, and selling them to the highest bidders, with the condition attached that they are to be kept in certain districts of the country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I feel a little diffidence in rising to discuss this matter, because when any criticism is made of the Government expenditure on the experimental farm some hon. gentleman, presumably the hon. member for East Grey, rises and declares that hon. gentlemen on this side are all opposed to expenditure for the benefit of farmers. I wish to say at the outset that I believe in experimental farms, provided they are kept to their legitimate purpose, provided they are utilized to their best advantage, utilized in the branches in which they are calculated to do good, and provided they do not do injustice to the rest of the community. In the grant now asked for the last condition is not complied with, because it does an express injustice to the rest of the community. Again, I say that these experimental farms are calculated to do a great deal of good, and I am free to admit that if the experimental farm at Ottawa can furnish to the North-West and to Manitoba a hard wheat that will ripen ten days before the red fyfe, which has been grown for a number of years past, you will have done a hundred times the good to the country that the farm has cost. But, Sir, while I admit that, on the other hand I hold that we have no right to rush into improper and unjust expenditure. In reference to this item, I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that in this country of ours we have perhaps just as enterprising and just as skilful stockmen as there are anywhere on the face of the earth. I say, without fear of contradiction, that we have just as enterprising men engaged in that particular line of business, and men with as good judgment, as you can furnish at the experimental farm. When the Government, with the finances of the country at their back, draw on the resources of the country to enter into direct competition with private enterprise, they are doing a gross injustice. I know for a fact that there are men within almost gun shot of that experimental farm who have at their own private expense got just about the same class of horses that are kept there. They have imported them or paid high prices for them in this country. You bring these horses there, and you draw upon the resources of the country that these men have contributed to, and you enter into competition with them for the custom of the country. I ask if it is fair and right to do that? My hon. friend beside me reminds me that you put the cost of the service of those horses at a lower price than private individuals can possibly afford, and you pay part of that expense out of the public funds, so that you are interfering with the legitimate business of the country, and you are drawing on the resources of the country to enter into competition with the honest importers. I say that this is utterly unjust, subversive of the first principles of equity, and a thing that should not for one moment be tolerated. You must also bear in mind that this benefit is confined to a very small locality. The rest of the Dominion gets no benefit from it whatever, and as my friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) has pointed out, they are not the class of horses that are wanted at all. I believe it would be in harmony with the principles of justice, and it would be a direct benefit to the community and to the country at large, if you just give the company back their horses, even if you have to pay them, and withdraw them from service altogether in this locality. I cannot see the justice of passing this item. I believe it is not in the interest of the country that such an estimate should continue, and the sooner it is stopped the better.

Expenses in connection with the formation and drill of a new kilted battalion in Toronto.....	$5,000

Mr. AMYOT. I would like to enquire from the Minister of Militia if the camp is to be held at Rimouski this year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is.

Mr. AMYOT. Will the Minister tell us if it will cost the same thing, or if it will cost more than if it were held at Lévis?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I may tell the hon. gentleman, who takes a great deal of interest in military matters, that the policy of the Government is to distribute these favours over various parts of the Dominion, but I cannot say whether the camp will cost more or whether it will cost as much as it would cost at Lévis, until the returns are sent in. As soon as they do come in, I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will take the same interest in the Rimouski camp next session as he is taking now, and if he will put his question then I shall be delighted to give him all the information which he is seeking now.

Mr. AMYOT. I wish to ask——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the item.

Mr. AMYOT. I want to speak on this item, and I will speak on this item.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman will not speak against the rule of the House. It is all very well to ask one question, but if there is to be a discussion, the hon. gentleman must do it when the House is not in Committee.

Mr. AMYOT. I will speak on the item, and the hon. gentleman who always finds that I am out of order when I want to speak will find that he will not expedite the business of the House by that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. AMYOT. I am addressing the Chair. I want to know for what purpose this $5,000 is asked for. I want to have some details. I happen to take some interest in militia matters, Mr. Chairman. I have devoted some of my time to these matters, and very often, instead of enjoying fishing on the lakes, I joined the battalions and helped the country in that regard, and as I do take an interest in the militia force I want some information from the Minister.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have no doubt my hon. friend means the philabeg when he refers to the details which he requires. A kilted regiment, as the hon. gentleman knows, is a regiment which is permitted to wear that picturesque uniform which the Highlanders of Scotland are properly so very proud of. I can tell the hon. gentleman that several leading Scotchmen of Toronto appealed to me for permission to organize the regiment, which will be to Toronto what the Royal Scots are to the Montreal force. In giving the authorization to form this regiment I saw that Toronto had not the quantum of force which from its population it was entitled to. The formation is progressing most successfully, and I have no doubt that the

hon. gentleman, who takes a great deal of interest in the militia force, will be glad to hear that all of our comrades in Montreal and Toronto have joined hands to recommend the organization of that battalion. The hon. gentleman knows, from his intimate knowledge of the internal economy of a regiment, that $5,000 is about the amount required for the uniform and for the annual drill; and as my estimates have been cut very short this year, before allowing the regiment to be organized I had to appeal to the liberality of Parliament to obtain an additional $5,000 for the purpose.

Mr. IVES. I would like to enquire of the Minister of Militia whether he and the general commanding are particularly in favour of the Highland costume over any other uniform. I ask the question, because when I applied for an additional company or two for the Sherbrooke battalion the Minister told me that there was not any money for the purpose, and I find that a new regiment is formed in Toronto, and the explanation is that it is kilted. If necessary, I can get the Sherbrooke regiment kilted, or even exposed to a greater extent to the elements.

Mr. DENISON. The hon. gentleman intimates that the principal reason for the formation of this battalion is that it is a kilted regiment. No doubt that is one reason. We have a large number of Scotchmen in Toronto, many of whom occupy prominent positions there as they do in this House. But the principal reason for the request on behalf of Toronto is this: The city has grown very rapidly during the last ten years, and though we had two regiments when the population was only 50,000, we have to-day the same number when the population is approaching 200,000. In Montreal, which is larger than Toronto, though not much larger, there are six regiments, the 1st, the 3rd, the 5th, the 6th, the 65th and the Garrison Artillery. Therefore, I think it is a reasonable request on the part of Toronto that we should have three regiments. I have been pleased to see that both the *Mail* and the *Globe* heartily endorse the Government's action in granting this sum for this purpose. It shows that they have the interest of the force at heart and are looking at the matter, not from a party standpoint, but from a patriotic standpoint. I am satisfied that what the Government are doing will meet with the approbation, not only of Toronto, but of all the people of Canada.

Mr. COCKBURN. I may add, as supplementary to the remarks which have been made by my brother member from Toronto, that while the sum put down here is only $5,000, I understand that those interested in the formation of this regiment have already out of their own pockets, contributed more than twice that sum; and I can assure my hon. friend from Bellechasse that although they may sport the Scotch kilt, a dress in which I sported in my earlier days, he need never have any fear of them.

Mr. AMYOT. I am glad that my question with regard to Rimouski has brought out these facts. I have followed with a great deal of interest the efforts of the citizens of Toronto to raise a Scotch regiment, and I think it will be a pride to the Dominion. Any expenditures the Government may make towards increasing the number of efficient militiamen will receive my hearty support. I have nothing to say against this vote; I am glad of it; but I wanted to know exactly for what purpose this $5,000 was intended. As to Toronto, I admire the city; I visited it the other day, and I think it is a pride to the Dominion. I only wish all the other cities of the Dominion would prosper as Toronto is doing. But when I want to have some details of the vote, the Minister of Militia thinks it is a great argument to sneer at the volunteers, and to say: You take a great deal of interest in the force. I do take an interest in the force, and I do so practically. I am not a brilliant man; and the hon. gentleman has taken every opportunity to diminish my value; let him take the responsibility of that. I am against the habit we have been following so many years of spending too much on the big bonnets and the feathers, and doing too little for the rank and file. If we desire to keep up the militia force we must devote a greater proportion of the expenditure to the men of the force. I hope the hon. gentleman will satisfy my legitimate curiosity, at least for Toronto, as he does not want to do it for Rimouski. I had special reasons for asking about Rimouski. A refusal to answer a simple question is not calculated to promote the business of the House, for we might, if we choose, prolong the session very much. We do not want to do that, but when we ask a question I think we ought at least to get an answer from the Minister, and not from the Chairman.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I appeal to the hon. gentleman in a spirit of fair-play. I told him I could not give any information about Rimouski, because I had not the return. But I promised him, if we have the pleasure of meeting again, as I hope we shall next session, to get the return and see whether the question he put to me is in favour of Rimouski or in favour of Lévis. The department knows absolutely nothing about it so far. As to the kilted battalions, $5,000 is to provide uniforms, arms, and meet the annual drill expense. This battalion is in addition to the ordinary militia force, and I have to appeal to the liberality of Parliament to enable me to authorize the formation of that battalion. I am extremely sorry the hon. gentleman should have fancied I answered him in any sneering manner, because I did not mean to do so, and am only too happy to give him and any other hon. gentleman any information in my power.

Mr. AMYOT. I entirely approve of the expenditure, and I hope this battalion will be a complete success.

Mr. CASEY. Will $5,000 buy all the uniforms and outfit?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Everything.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 26th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Bill (No. 175) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee thereon.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BOWELL. Before the adoption of that clause, I desire to move an additional clause, notice of which is in the Votes and Proceedings of this morning. The clause is as follows :—

To the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, for twenty miles of their railway, from a point at or near Newborough, towards Palmer's Rapids, in the Province of Ontario, in lieu of a subsidy for a like amount granted by the Act fifty-second Victoria, chapter three, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000.

The intention of this resolution is simply to enable the Government to pay for the four miles of that portion of the road between Brockville and Westport which has been built. The original subsidy was for forty miles of the road from Brockville to Westport, at $3,200 per mile. Upon the completion of the road, it was ascertained that the distance was forty-four miles, but we had no power, under the Subsidy Act, to pay for the additional four miles. Subsequently, another subsidy was granted for an extension from Newborough to Palmer's Rapids, Newborough being the point where the first forty miles terminated. The distance from Newborough to Palmer's Rapids is supposed to be twenty miles, and the subsidy granted was $3,200 per mile, payable on each ten miles when completed. In that extra twenty miles are included the four now built, and the object of this resolution is to enable the Government to pay for these four miles already constructed and running. Then, the balance of the subsidy will not be paid until the sixteen miles are constructed.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand this is a revote, and in my judgment the hon. gentleman should proceed by resolution.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not a revote in that sense. It is simply changing the manner in which the subsidy already voted shall be paid. Under the present Act we can only pay upon the completion of every ten miles, and we propose to change that, so as to enable us to pay for the four miles already constructed, and which would have been paid for under the first subsidy had the proper number of miles been mentioned. This is really not a new vote. The matter has been fully considered by the Minister of Justice and by the Law Clerk, and also by the Clerk of the House, and they all agree that the course taken is the proper one.

Mr. McMULLEN. What progress has been made with the construction of the remaining sixteen miles?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I cannot speak positively, but I do not think they are under actual construction. My hon. friend beside me says the contract is let. The company are in doubt as to whether they will take a course directly west from Westport or a more northerly course to reach Palmer's Rapids.

Mr. McMULLEN. When an Act is passed granting a subsidy to a road the Act usually outlines the terms upon which the subsidy is to be granted, and it will say from such a point to such a point, not exceeding so many miles. From Brockville to Newborough the Act, I presume, would say, a subsidy of $3,200 per mile, not exceeding forty miles. Now it is found out that the length is forty-four miles, and to compensate the company these four miles are added to a subsidy given them for an extension of sixteen miles. This four miles subsidy should stand over and be paid for when the other sixteen miles are completed. It is just possible that the other sixteen miles may not be built if we pay the subsidy on those four miles; and if the people in that district are anxious to have the balance of the road completed, would it not be well for the people to ask Government to hold in reserve this four miles subsidy until the other sixteen miles are built? Surely the company are not in such financial embarrassments that the keeping this back would be a very serious disadvantage to them. They are not likely to do more work this year; and next year, if they are prepared to present such a scheme as will satisfy the Government that they mean to complete the balance of the road, we can then pay them over the subsidy.

Mr. WOOD. I do not think the hon. gentleman will contend that his argument is founded on justice or equity. The company built forty-four miles instead of forty miles. It was intended to subsidise the whole forty miles to Westport. Subsequent to that the Ontario Legislature bonused this same road from Sharbot Lake to Palmer's Rapids, a distance of seventy miles. This Parliament grants a subsidy for eighteen or twenty miles, but it was felt that it would be unjust and inconsistent to subsidize all the rebuilt portion of the road and at the same time to leave four miles, which had been built in perfect good faith by the promoters, without any subsidy. The Government came to the conclusion that those four miles should be subsidized, so as to make the first section a complete section.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can understand how the mistake arose. At first the Government had no survey, but they granted a subsidy of $3,200 a mile for forty miles without, I suppose, having any profile or any survey. That is one defect in our system of granting subsidies. I think any company should first show if they have had a survey of the location of the line, and should state to the Government what the cost of the construction is and their hopes of carrying it through. Instead of that, the Government put the cart before the horse, and say they will give $3,200 a mile for the road, which the company may build when they like. The result is, that the country has to pay so much more than it would otherwise be required to. This is bringing the system down to a very small point, that a sum of $12,000 should have to be voted for four miles of road. The next thing will be that we will be granting a bonus to switches and to little roads running into mills.

On section 3.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask the hon. Minister in what position the South Ontario and Pacific Railway Company are. I think nothing was said to-day about it, as to when the work is likely to commence.

Mr. BOWELL. My information in reference to this road was, that when the revote of the subsidy was asked for it had been surveyed and partially located, and the intention was to go on with the road; so I was assured by the parties interested.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Soon?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; at once. I mean, as soon as it was revoted, so as to assure them the subsidy.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The surveys have taken place, and you mean the actual work was going on?

Mr. BOWELL. That is what I was assured by the representatives of the company.

Mr. MULOCK. Yesterday, when we were in Committee, I mentioned to the Committee that I thought it would be a good plan to adopt a system whereby the House should be informed yearly of what the expenditures have been made. For instance, I suggested I thought it would be only right that the House should have contracts or copies of contracts laid on the Table, and statements of moneys that are being paid or have been paid, and that view seemed to meet with the approval of the Government. If it does, I would like to add a clause requiring such a statement to be submitted to the House. I think such a statement should be furnished, and I have drawn an amendment to that effect.

Mr. BOWELL. I really do not see the necessity for that amendment, because the House at any time may call for any papers that it requires. There can be no possible objection to producing the contracts for each road.

Mr. MULOCK. I know we can get it by special motion, but there is certain information that I think the House is just as well entitled to as, for instance, the Public Accounts Committee are entitled to information. We require every year each departmental head to lay upon the Table certain information, and it comes down as a matter of course. One might just as well argue that we cannot get any information you like about the expenditure of public money without making a motion. But if it is a good thing to have it, why not let it be voluntarily laid upon the Table, instead of making it necessary to make a motion when you want to get information, and it will be weeks or months, perhaps, before it is produced, and Parliament may have been prorogued. Let it be understood that these people take the money subject to their giving you the information yearly as to what has been done with it. I will read the amendment:

That within one month after the commencement of each session of Parliament, whilst any of such moneys are being paid out, there shall be laid before Parliament a statement showing all the payments of such moneys during the then next preceding year, with the names of the respective persons to whom such payments shall have been made, and the amounts paid them respectively, and copies of all contracts, sub-contracts and other agreements under which any works of said railways in respect of which said subsidies are hereby authorized to be paid are being or shall have been constructed, as the case may be.

I think each company when it receives its money ought to accept it, subject to the obligation that this information should be laid upon the Table as a matter of course.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is a condition subsequent.

Mr. MULOCK. It is a condition of getting the gift, so they cannot complain if they are called upon to furnish these statements.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think we ought to accept that amendment without some little consideration. I think all the information asked for by the hon. gentleman appears in the Auditor General's Report, and I think it appears also in the Report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, but I am not speaking positively upon that point just now. I hope the hon. gentleman will put this motion on the Notice paper for Monday, and the Government will not ask the third reading of the Bill until that day, and in the meantime we will consider it.

Mr. MULOCK. The information asked for does not appear in any return made to Parliament. The more wide the information given the less possibility of misunderstanding occurring later on or suspicions being aroused.

Mr. BOWELL. I quite agree with you.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire that the railway company shall feel it to be their duty, before Parliament meets, to place this information in the hands of the Government to lay before Parliament. If it has to be obtained as the result of a motion, it will not be obtained.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY—NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire to claim the attention of the Government for a few moments to a matter of very vital importance to the interest of Canada, more particularly the Maritime Provinces. A subject similar in part to that submitted by me some weeks ago, and in keeping with a resolution I had placed on the Notice paper the early part of this session—and now that the session is nearing its close I approach you again to inspire you to action, to use your most active efforts, its importance being my only apology for claiming the indulgence of this House, to refer to it the second time—I refer particularly to the Bait Act of Newfoundland. The regulations relating to this matter issued by the Government of that colony, permitting vessels of a foreign nation—Americans—free access to all her ports for bait, whilst prohibiting or excluding Canadians from obtaining that article on any terms, is not only literally but practically an outrage, and should not have been tolerated as long as it has. Canada 'might in turn retaliate,' and exclude Newfoundland imports from her free list, but she has so far endured the insult, and not resented the unfriendly Act. It is admitted on all sides that Mr. Bond acted, to say the least of it, very unadvisedly in thus discriminating against Canadian fishermen; but it was done, no doubt, out of a feeling of revenge. Knowing it was the Canadian Government's intervention that blocked his absurd treaty with Blaine, a feeling of indignation, doubtless, was awakened when he found that Governor O'Brien received severe re-

buke from the Imperial Government through the Colonial Secretary, and ordered to withdraw his assent to the Order in Council of the Newfoundland Government in this connection unless Canadians were included. Not satisfied with the ills he had attempted to practice on Canada, and the rebuke his Government suffered, he apparently, to vent out his spleen, cajoled the Government into granting, last spring, by regulation, free license to Americans, whilst refusing bait to Canadians. It is the prevailing opinion that when these regulations were made by the Newfoundland Government, prohibiting the sale of bait to Canadians, but permitting its sale to Americans, not only was the spirit of the Bait Act violated, but the assent of the Governor to those regulations was a breach of his instructions, which forbids his assent to any measure calculated to cause deferential treatment of other countries. I understand the Colonial Office had requested Governor O'Brien to withdraw his assent to regulations made last spring, unless Canadians received bait on the same terms as Americans. The case is more aggravated when we consider that the Bait Act received the Royal Assent on the express condition that it should not be permitted to operate against Canada or Canadian fishermen, and that Sir Robert Thornton, on behalf of the colony, gave the necessary pledge. To show the importance that attaches to this subject, Sir Charles Tupper, as High Commissioner for Canada, in a letter to the Colonial Office, dated London, 27th October, 1890, referring to the negotiations then going on between Mr. Bond and Secretary Blaine, with a view to an independent arrangement between the United States and Newfoundland relating to the fisheries, expresses himself thus:

"I believe I am right in saying that, in reference to the question of the Atlantic North American fisheries, Her Majesty's Government has hitherto invariably recognized the importance of obtaining unity of action, so far as was possible, on the part of the colonies interested. In the treaty of reciprocity with the the United States in 1854 the consent of Newfoundland, as well as of the various provinces of Canada, was made necessary to its going into operation; and the same course was followed, subsequent to Confederation, in reference to the treaties of 1871 and 1888."

And to show the significance he considers due to the subject, the following is his closing paragraph to his letter, with posteript, which reads thus:

"I should fail in my duty to the Crown, as well as to Canada, if I did not promptly assure your Lordship that I feel confident the difficulties of the vexed question of the British North American fisheries will be greatly increased by the wide departure that is now proposed from the long-established policy that has hitherto prevailed upon this very important question.

"I am, &c.,

"CHARLES TUPPER.

"The Right Hon. Lord KNUTSFORD, G.C.M.G.,
"Secretary of State for the Colonies.

"P.S.—Since writing my letter, I have received the following telegram from Sir John A. Macdonald, which I beg to quote for the consideration of Her Majesty's Government:—

"'Can scarcely believe Newfoundland has received authority from Imperial Government to make separate arrangement respecting fisheries. The relations of all the North American provinces to United States and to the Empire would be affected. We are not informed of powers given to Bond, and desire communication of them. Please represent strongly how the fishery and commercial interest of Canada will be injured by such an arrangement as Bond is currently reported as making, and how disastrous from a national point of view it would be for a separate colony to effect an arrangement with the United States more favourable than would be given to the confederated provinces. Our difficulties under new American tariff are sufficiently great now.—C. T.'"

Proving most conclusively that due regard has always been had by Canada for the interest of Newfoundland as a sister colony when any treaty hitherto has been formulated or agreed upon. A great anxiety prevails among fishermen, and owners of vessels, who have invested every dollar of their means in this industry, as to their fate in this connection. On their behalf, and in their interest, the interest of the entire fishing coast of Canada on the east, and Canada as a nation, I must ask the Government to use their every effort to see that this bait restriction, this embargo, is removed. Our fishermen have suffered serious losses this season, and feel that if they have any redress on the Newfoundland Government they have a right to seek it. Our fishermen are certainly not deserving of treatment of this kind at their hands, when we give them free entry to our ports, whilst we, a sister colony, are charged the same as foreigners. The eastern and northern shores of Nova Scotia (Cape Breton coast) at certain periods of the fishing season are the most prolific fish-producing coasts on the continent in proportion to extent: The south and south-west shore-men of Newfoundland, those who fish in large half-decked boats, locally called "Jacks," do about all their cod, herring and mackerel fishing on the shores of Cape Breton at certain seasons, landing without hindrance, to cure their fish, obtain bait, and all necessary supplies equally free with the resident fishermen. How different this is to the treatment shown to us by Newfoundland. I am informed that a shipper of one of our fishing vessels belonging to Lunenburg reports that he entered a Newfoundland port for bait this season, and was stoutly refused to be allowed to purchase one particle, but was compelled to pay the tonnage dues before he could leave, or suffer the rigour of their port regulations. This, Mr. Speaker, is literally an outrage. Many of our vessels are in debt beyond recovery, owing to restrictions on Newfoundland bait to Canadians last year and this. Must we submit to this treatment, and Newfoundland and St. Pierre be allowed to enter our ports, without an equivalent, or without our resenting such deal? Life is too short to tolerate it for one moment. Government have a right to be alive in this matter and protect our main source of livelihood, by imposing a duty upon imports of fish from all quarters hostile to us by regulation, tariff or otherwise. I am informed that on enquiry of fishermen returning from the Banks this season with a very limited catch, as to the cause, their one answer or cry was, want of bait, and, what little there was, was interfered with by American fishermen under the *modus vivendi*. I state seriously that if something is not done to correct this evil, and that at once, our vessels will be laid up, and fishermen who have put their all into the industry will, I fear, rise in open rebellion. If their living is taken from them, it means that or starve, fight or die. I am sorry to have to express myself in this way so strongly, but I am simply voicing the fishermen, and appearing as their mouthpiece. There was a time when we were not depending on Newfoundland for bait, when the Atlantic coast from New York to the Strait of Belle Isle, on the Labrador shore, was prolific of cod, mackerel, herring and other fish; but illicit, reckless and wasteful methods

of fishing -- the cod net, the cod trap, the purse seine and other appliances, have gradually depleted the shore fisheries, as to give but a scanty and precarious living to those engaged in the enterprises in boats and small craft off the shores. In consequence of this, the fishermen are compelled to fish in deep water, and further from the coast, and to construct such a class of vessels essentially different from those employed off the shore, and of a class very superior in appearance, size and description to those of previous times, far more expensive, and better fitted and sufficiently staunch and strong to buffet all the seas and storms of the wild Atlantic, and with stowage capacity to fish the Grand Banks of Newfoundland. Hence the necessity and advisability of a bounty to fishermen to encourage the industry of fishing, and the very legitimate industry of shipbuilding. Such vessels are known as Bankers, which for style, swiftness, and safety, are not excelled in any part of the world. These vessels, with their snowy white sails and clipper-built hulls, present a spectacle more picturesque than anything I could describe, and when viewed in a stiff breeze, on the brow of a dashing sea, appear to skip from sea to sea, and but to play and make sport of the waves --not gentle and caressing waves—but fierce and mighty billows that bear along in wild ferocity. This is the description of craft that composes the fishing fleet of Lunenburg—the Gloucester of America, that our dauntless and brave fishermen claim as their companion and home, and boast that they feel as comfortable and as safe on board of one of them as in their own dwellings on *terra firma*. Here I am sorry to have to offer an exception in my allusion as to the safety of these vessels, as the late terrific hurricane which swept the Nova Scotia coast, carrying devastation in its course, on the 7th instant, I regret to say, has shown to the contrary, and has caused several to succumb—two with the cost of their crews—one from the port of Yarmouth and the other from the port of Lunenburg—proving there is One mightier than man. The latter vessel, the *Morris Wildon*, was well manned with brave hearts, the commander being not only brave, but a general favourite with all who knew him, and one of the most genial and intelligent of skippers. The sorrowing ones in this fatality who have lost their nearest and dearest have my sympathy. To support and sustain a fleet of this description requires protection and careful legislation, and I would strongly urge upon the Government of Canada that they bend their every energy in this direction, through the Imperial Government, to see that our rights are cared for; and in addition to the request, so important, regarding the Newfoundland Bait Act, that they use every prudence and caution, which I have every confidence in them they will do, that Canadian fishermen are not interfered with in any privileges they enjoy at present, or in any treaty they may formulate or consummate with the United States, our fishermen being unwilling to have the fishing privileges on our shores interfered with by Americans. My opinion is that, if we remain as we are, without any treaty with the United States, we can improve our position in every way, and ultimately be infinitely better off. A treaty with the United States could only give us a doubtful market for fish in their ports, and would not give us a market for our agricultural products, as they have a surplus of their own, which finds its way to Great Britain and other places—in fact, a large part to Canada, during the early season of summer; but give us commercial arrangements with England, and our position would be unquestionably greatly improved. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another matter of a very important nature which I desire to bring to the notice of the Government, and which is a very potent factor in the development of our trade with the West Indies. I refer to the trade treaty between Great Britain and Spain, which, as has been announced, will terminate 30th June, 1892. I observe what the hon. Minister of Finance announced to this House a few days ago in reference to this subject, in a letter received from the Foreign Office, dated 20th August, in course of which Sir Charles Tupper says he was advised by Sir F. Clare Ford, of the Foreign Office, "that it would be premature to press Spain in reference to future trade arrangements, pending the settlement of the French tariff." I trust, in the meantime, this Government will look carefully after the interests of the fishermen and farmers of Nova Scotia, who are very greatly concerned in this trade of the Spanish West Indies, and endeavour to arrange, before the present treaty expires, a treaty between Great Britain and her colonies with Spain, whereby our products and exports will be placed on an equal basis with those received by Cuba and Porto Rica from the United States. The value of the products sent to the Spanish West Indies last year from Nova Scotia amounted to over $1,000,000, consisting of dry codfish, potatoes, and lumber, being about one-ninth of the entire export of Nova Scotia. I feel satisfied that, as Sir Charles Tupper, as High Commissioner for Canada, looked after the interest of Canada so carefully in 1886, and obtained for her in that treaty, the most favoured nation treatment, he will be equal to the work if it is assigned him again, and will do the best that can be done for our interest in this connection. I observe that England's imports of Spanish wines, entered direct in 1889, was, in round numbers, something like $4,000,000, and her trade with Great Britain in other particulars is equally as valuable to her, so the outlook for a renewal of the treaty is not unfavourable. I repeat, I hope the Government will spare no pains to do all in their power to see the Newfoundland Bait regulations cancelled at once, and the Bait Act, through the influence of the Imperial Government, repealed at their next sitting of the Newfoundland Government, and the Spanish treaty with Great Britain, as respects our trade with Cuba and Porto Rica, renewed on a basis equal with that of the United States. With diligence and due care I feel we may rest assured the day is not far distant when Canada, with her industries well fostered, and her resources well developed, can place herself in the forefront in the commercial world, as a successful rival among nations.

Mr. TUPPER. I suppose I may say a word or two in reference to the question which the hon. gentleman has brought to the attention of the House. I regret that I am unable to give him the answer which he so much desires. He has been, as we all know, most persistent in keeping this question before the House, and in bringing it to the

attention of the Government; and I can add to that, the Government have been equally persistent in discussing the subject in all its phases with both the Imperial Government and indirectly with the Government of Newfoundland. Although I am not at liberty at present to state, as I should like to do, exactly the position of the case, I think I can safely say this much, that while of necessity these matters take a very long time to settle, the correspondence among the three Governments is now approaching that condition when we have reason to expect a satisfactory settlement will be reached before next fishing season. We have no reason, however, to think that the position of affairs will be changed this year. Of course, the fishermen have been hampered, as the hon. gentleman says, but I trust it will be found that the enterprising men who have fitted out the magnificent fleet he has so graphically described, will be found not to have suffered to the extent his information leads him to believe they have, because many of the vessels have been engaged more or less in the fishing business this past season with varying success. I do not think it is necessary for us to admit that we are absolutely dependent on the ports of Newfoundland for the prosecution of the fishing industry, though it is a great convenience to enjoy the facilities of their ports, as I believe we have every right to do, under certain regulations, as well as our own.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the position at present?

Mr. TUPPER. At present we are not permitted to buy bait on any terms whatever in the ports of Newfoundland. The reason given is, that it is necessary to the successful administration of their Act as regards French fishing vessels that our vessels should be denied that right. Statements have been made—which we do not think are well founded—that our vessels in the past supplied French fishermen with bait obtained in the Newfoundland ports, and, consequently, the Government of that colony found it necessary to prohibit them from purchasing bait at all. I hope that by next spring a satisfactory settlement of the case will be arrived at.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand from the hon gentleman that the only motive for the exclusion of our fishermen from buying bait is the enforcement of that prohibition with regard to French vessels.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not know what may be the motive, but the allegation is, that it has been found our fishermen have violated the laws of Newfoundland by furnishing French fishing vessels with bait from the ports of Newfoundland.

Mr. LAURIER. If the difficulty were settled between France and England that prohibition would be removed.

Mr. TUPPER. No doubt, a strong reason in favour of it would be removed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for Lunenburg has used pretty strong language against the action of the Government of Newfoundland. I think that Government has reason for complaint against the Government of Canada. It will be remembered that some time ago the Government of Newfoundland, which is entirely independent of us, which has no connection with us, except the common connection with the United Kingdom, undertook to negotiate a treaty on its own behalf with the Government at Washington. The people of Newfoundland depend largely on their fishing industry and the markets they may be able to secure for the products of that industry. They had made arrangements satisfactory to them, by which they expected to secure, and would have secured, if we had not interfered, the American market for the sale of their fish. The Government of Canada prevented by its interference that treaty coming into operation, and it was not at all surprising that not only the Government but the people of Newfoundland have been greatly irritated by our action. Of course, the defence of this Government has been that separate and independent negotiations on the part of Newfoundland on its own behalf would be detrimental to the chances of negotiations between Canada and the United States, and they said that the Government of Newfoundland ought to be compelled in this respect to cast in its fortune with Canada, and should be prevented carrying on negotiations in its own behalf, if we could not carry on negotiations along with it. I am not going to say that the Government of Canada did not take, so far as the people of Canada are concerned, a view that is perhaps pecuniarly correct, namely, that we were more likely to secure negotiations in conjunction with Newfoundland than if Newfoundland were allowed to negotiate alone. But it must be remembered that the Government of the United Kingdom did permit Newfoundland to undertake negotiations on its own behalf, in conjunction with the British Minister in Washington, that these negotiations were successful, that the people of Newfoundland were satisfied, and that their position in consequence of our interference—not merely the position of their Government, but the actual condition of the entire population—has been most seriously and detrimentally affected. It is a question we ought to consider, how far that interference was justified. To say the least of it, it was taking an extremely selfish and narrow view, to sacrifice the interests of a colony, which is separate from us and whose people are so peculiarly situated that they have almost only the one means of subsistence, for they were necessarily sacrificed by the action of our Government. I say, I was in hopes that before this session was through we would have had an opportunity of discussing that matter very fully, for I do not believe, that the world is so situated, under the Divine government, that it is necessary we should do somebody else an injury in order that we might obtain ourselves the highest success in our own projects. It seems to me that is what we did. That is the assumption which underlies the action and policy of the Administration, and the protest of the Government of Canada against the Imperial Government allowing the treaty negotiated by the Newfoundland Government to come into operation was one, whatever may be its present and temporary advantage, calculated to create a feeling of hostility against us in Newfoundland not likely to be very soon allayed.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not intend to discuss this question, but I think it would be unfortunate to allow the expression of opinion which has just been placed on record to go without comment at least.

I am sorry the hon. gentleman has thought fit to make such a declaration at this period. If the question is so important as he has stated it to be, it would have been better to have had it brought up on a special motion, and have had a more extended discussion upon it. I do not understand quite the consistency of the hon. gentleman's position. In one breath he said he would not undertake to say that the action taken by the Government of Canada was not the correct one——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER—and in the next breath he proceeded to construct a case against Canada. He appeals to the divine motives underlying government in general and, he inveighs against the selfishness of our doing something which will prevent a neighbour from having advantages without getting the same for ourselves, without having seen that, if the negotiations of Newfoundland had been successful, though they might have inured to the advantage of Newfoundland, they would not have inured to the larger and greater interests of Canada, a sister colony, or to the still larger and greater interests of the Empire of which both Newfoundland and Canada form a part. He also says that this treaty would have been agreed to by the Newfoundland Government and approved of by the people, and would have been operative, to-day but for the action of Canada. In that respect, my hon. friend showed that he is not well informed on the subject, because it is evident to those who have studied the question that, when the whole matter, as arranged in a semi-official way by Mr. Bond, had been discussed and fully understood, it would not have been accepted by the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. LAURIER. Why, then, interfere?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going into the further question of whether a component part of this great Empire, and a sister colony, should be allowed, against all precedent and against all constitutional practice, to make a separate treaty of its own fishing interest to the great detriment of the interest of the other portions of British North America, whose interests are infinitely greater than those of Newfoundland.

Mr. TUPPER. I simply desire to correct the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) in regard to one important phase of the case. As I understand, he bases his argument upon the action of this Government in reference to negotiations which took place between Mr. Bond and the Government of the United States, which he said caused all this trouble. I would point out to him that the trouble commenced before Mr. Bond's mission took place. Newfoundland took this adverse action a year before by the passage of the Bait Act, and the protest of the Canadian Government was lodged with the Imperial Government at that time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I said the action of this Government was one which interfered with the rights of a colony which was entirely independent of us, and that by that action irreparable injury had been done to the interests of Newfoundland, and that the Government had incurred the deep hostility of the people of that Island in consequence of their interference.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not rise to take any art in the dicussion, though it is a very important one. I am very glad, however, that the Minister of Finance has made the statement he did, because it would be unfortunate to allow it to go abroad that we made any unnecessary interference with a sister colony. What I desire to say, however, is that I am disappointed on behalf of my constituents at not finding a sum in the Estimates for the dredging of Collingwood harbour. This harbour, unfortunately, owing to the fluctuation in the depth of the water, is not able to receive the class of vessels now trading upon the Georgian Bay. A year ago a survey was made to see what would be required to dredge it to a depth, not only for present use, but for the larger class of vessels which are likely to be trading on the upper lakes. It was proved that dredging to certain depths was required, and the town council of Collingwood applied to the Government and proposed to expend 25 per cent. of the amount that would be required to do what was necessary for that harbour. They fully hoped and expected to find that that offer would be entertained, and that some progress would be made with the necessary work. They are naturally very much interested in the subject, because it is essential to the well-being of the town of Collingwood that this should be carried out. It is a harbour of great importance, a harbour of refuge, and two piers have been made there which render it a very safe harbour, but the dredging has not been sufficient to accommodate the vessels that will be coming there.

Mr. DYER. I desire to call the attention of the Government to the fact that they have omitted to place an item in the Estimates for the harbour of Newport, on Lake Memphremagog. These people have long been expecting the Government to complete that work. The only passenger steamer there cannot put into that harbour in consequence of the shallowness of the water.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask the indulgence of the House while I say a few words, more especially as the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) spoke twice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an item in the main Estimates for dredging, and it is contemplated by the Public Works Department to have one of their dredges employed in Collingwood harbour when the winter is over.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is referring to any item in the Estimates he is out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is not in the Estimates; it is out of the Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood him to say that there was an item in the Estimates for a dredge.

Mr. FOSTER. In the main Estimates that we have passed.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. member that he cannot discuss any item that has been passed in Committee of Supply, and if the hon. member is discussing an item that has been passed he is out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I wanted to explain that item. I will simply say to my hon. friend that it is proposed to send a dredge upon the lake, and that dredge will undertake operations after the season commences next spring, and will continue operations in that harbour up to the month of July, on

the understanding, of course, that the people of Collingwood give one-fourth of the expenditure that is made. With reference to what was said by my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. Dyer), I may say that an item was placed in the Estimates to do what he asks, and that by an error in the revision of the estimates it has been struck out. Fortunately it was not a large sum, and the amount that is required to do that necessary work will be taken from the general vote. My hon. friend may rest assured that the work will be carried out.

Mr. McNEILL. I also would like to say to the Minister that I would like a little money expended in my constituency, at Wiarton, and Colpoy's, and Lion's Head, and Southampton, Port Elgin, and Dyer's Bay, and one or two other places I might mention. I do not know that it would be well for me to enter into minute particulars with regard to all these places at the present time. I would like to make a general request of the Government that they would attend to these ports as speedily as possible, and make a sort of a general grant for North Bruce. I had hoped to see my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Madill) in his place, as he intended to refer to the matter.

Mr. McCARTHY. He will be here on Monday.

Mr. McNEILL. I am informed he will be here on Monday, and I will take up the matter then.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Oxford and New Glasgow Railway—
Revote..... $42,672 24

Mr. LAURIER. What is this item? Why was not the money expended?

Mr. FOSTER. It lapsed.

Mr. LAURIER. Why did it lapse?

Mr. BOWELL. This is the second time we have voted this sum during the present Parliament. These are items that were voted in the Supplementary Estimates for 1890-91. Portions of the work had not been completed on the 30th of June; consequently, this proportion of the revote lapsed, and we have now to revote it. The leader of the Opposition will remember that I explained fully the purposes for which this money was required when the total amount was voted in the Supplementary Estimates. The revote for the Oxford and New Glasgow, in the first supplementaries, was $233,000. There has been expended of that up to the 30th June the total amount, less the sum now asked for; so that it is simply a revote of that which was voted in June. I may mention to the hon. gentleman that all these votes are of that character, with the exception of $600 for stairs from the Halifax station to Water street.

Increased accommodation at New Glasgow..... $3,000

Mr. BOWELL. That is not a revote. We took the sum of $8,000 for the purpose of constructing a station house and a freight shed, and we found, when we received tenders, that it could not be done for less than $11,000 or $12,000, unless we reduced the dimensions of the building.

To pay Ronald McMillan compensation for land expropriated for railway purposes, with interest, taxed costs, and Government costs, as per judgment of Exchequer Court..... $3,300

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When was that item adjudicated upon?

Mr. BOWELL. That was a dispute as to the value of lands that were taken by the Government to enable the railway to reach the wharf at Charlottetown. Some difficulty arose between the navigation company, in reference to this matter, and the Railway Department. They agreed to pay a certain sum if the Government would make a switch down to the wharf. It was supposed at that time that this land could be procured for about $500, which the navigation company promised to pay; but afterwards a dispute arose as to its value, and the Goverment made a proposal to pay what they deemed a proper sum. This was refused, and the case was sent to the Exchequer Court, who gave a judgment against us. We shall, however, receive $500 from the navigation company.

To pay legal representative of the late James Goodwin, interest on the amount, $67,260, awarded by the arbitrator on the 28th March, 1883, for work executed under his contract for the Grenville Canal enlargement, such interest being calculated from the date of reference to arbitration, 10th September, 1874, to the date of payment, 3rd April, 1883. $34,571 64

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is an old matter.

Mr. BOWELL. It is an old matter, and, unfortunately, a very expensive one. Perhaps I had better give the Committee the full information upon which we came to a decision to pay this sum. On a memorandum dated the 9th February, 1891, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, representing that under the authority of an Order in Council passed on the 7th of September, 1874, reference to Mr. Page (then Chief Engineer of Canals) was made for the sole arbitrament on certain claims presented by Mr. James Goodwin arising out of his contract for work on the Grenville Canal. The Minister further represents that Mr. Page did not make his award until the 20th March, 1883, when he awarded the sum of $67,260, which amount was paid in April, 1883. Mr. George Goodwin, the representative of the said contractor, has put forward a claim to be paid interest on this amount, and the matter having been referred to the Department of Justice, the following opinion has been given by that department:—

"Upon reference to the award it would appear that no sum was awarded to James Goodwin for interest or in consequence of delay in payment, and there is on the fyles a letter from Sir Charles Tupper confirming the statement of Mr. Goodwin that the question of interest was not taken into consideration by the arbitrator."

The original contract contained a stipulation to the effect:

"That should the amount voted for the service by the Legislature be at any time expended previous to the completion of the work, the Government might stop the work at any time, and that the contractor should not be entitled to any further payment for work done after service of a notice to that effect, until the necessary funds should have been voted by the Legislature, nor should the con-

tractor have any claim for compensation or damages for the said suspension of payment.

"I think, considering the following facts, viz.:

"(*a.*) That as between subject and subject interest would be allowed in a case of this kind to a contractor upon the amount of his claim.

"(*b.*) That the principle which will only allow payment of six years' interest ceases to operate from the commencement of a proceeding to its close, so that a party entitled to six years' interest before action is entitled to have added to his verdict all interest which accrues from the commencement of the action until the verdict, no matter what length of time intervenes between the commencement and termination of the proceedings.

"(*c.*) That the delay of payment in this case was solely occasioned by the act of a Government officer to whom the case was referred.

"(*d.*) That the contractor had no possible means of expediting the proceedings and obtaining payment at an earlier stage, inasmuch as the matter, having been referred by the agreement of parties to arbitration, no petition of right would have been allowed.

"(*e.*) That the contract itself, if not expressly, by implication would seem to have contemplated the payment of compensation for delay of payment in certain events.

"(*f.*) That the contractor is, I think, morally entitled to compensation, inasmuch as the delay in payment for so many years must necessarily have been of damage to him, and a loss which is rarely equalized by payment of ordinary interest.

"(*g.*) That heretofore the Government and Parliament have frequently authorized the payment of interest in cases similar to this.

"I think that should the Government pay simple interest on the amount of the award at the rate of 6 per cent. from the date of the original reference in this matter to the date of payment of principal, such payment being just and equitable in fact, would be defensible.

"The Minister concurring, recommends that authority be given for placing in the Estimates to be laid before Parliament in the forthcoming session an item covering the amount required to pay Mr. Goodwin in accordance with the above quoted opinion."

The Committee of Privy Council concurred in that report and hence the item is placed in the Estimates.

Mr. LAURIER. When was the demand from Mr. Goodwin for interest made for the first time?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think it is set forth in the papers. I am informed he claimed interest immediately after payment of the award in 1882.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The statement of the Minister is an explanation so far as it goes. There are, however, two points he might explain a little further. These papers lay the blame on the arbitrator for not proceeding with the work until five years had elapsed. What caused that delay? The second point is, as to why this question has never been raised from 1883 until now.

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed that Mr. Page, in making the award, gave no reason for the delay, and the department is now not aware of it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This matter having stood so long, it would be better to pay another year's interest, if it is proved to be due, and allow the matter to remain until next session, when we can obtain some information in regard to it. It requires explanation. We have not even received a copy of the award or any papers in connection with it. There is first a delay of nine years before the arbitration is entered upon, and not until eight years afterwards is any claim made for interest. We are entirely in the dark as to the matter.

Mr. BOWELL. If any other information can be obtained it will be furnished. The arbitration, and the result of the arbitration, are set forth by the Minister of Justice. He must have had all the papers before him when he gave his opinion. He bases that opinion on the principle of equity as between subject and subject. He gives the opinion that the Government should not take advantage of any lapse of time that occurred from Mr. Page not making his report and award. The letter I read to the House gives as full information as can possibly be given from the papers I have submitted.

Mr. LAURIER. No.

Mr. BOWELL. I am assured by the department that Mr. Goodwin himself made a demand for the interest immediately after the award was given.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will admit that the information he has given to the House may have satisfied the Minister of Justice at the time, but it will not satisfy the House, because hon. members are not in possession of the facts which were laid before the Minister. The hon. gentleman will see what an extraordinary claim this is. It was refered to arbitration in 1874, and nine years afterwards the arbitrator made the award. What prevented Mr. Page making the award before nine years had elapsed? We are brought face to face with these hard facts, that nine years had elapsed after the matter had been referred to arbitration and the parties had agreed to accept Mr. Page's decision before Mr. Page arrived at a conclusion. We are told that upon this award being rendered that the contractor obtained a sum of $67,200.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps if the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will make a proposition, which, if he approves of it, may shorten the discussion. The Minister of Justice, who is more intimately acquainted with this subject than I am, has gone to Montreal, and I will allow the item to remain until he returns. In the meantime, I will obtain the award and all other papers connected with the matter.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well.

Chambly Canal..... .....$5,000

Mr. LAURIER. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to the case of a man named Martial who was employed by the Government on the Chambly Canal, and who while discharging his duties was injured by an accident. The Government, I believe, offered him at the time to employ him as a guardian and to give him a salary of $38 per month, provided he paid his own medical attendance. He thought that not sufficient, and I understand he applied to the Minister of Justice for a petition of right, which was refused, but after a delay of twelve months I believe he accepted the offer made by the Government. He was fulfilling the duties in the meantime, but he was claiming a larger salary, and now he has made a claim to be paid by the Government for the twelve months that the matter was pending between him and the Government. If the Government offered him a certain sum at a certain time, and if he only accepted it later on, under the expectation that he could obtain more, it seems to me a matter of justice that this man should be paid in full from the time the offer was made to him. I bring the case to the attention of the Minister, hoping that it will meet with his sympathy and be fully considered.

Mr. BOWELL. The case has not been brought under my notice, and it has escaped the memory of the deputy. While admitting the moral, not the legal responsibility of the Government in cases where employé are injured, I am scarcely pre-

pared to accept the doctrine laid down by the hon. gentleman, that if we make an offer of compensation to a man, and he refuses to accept it because he cannot get more, and subsequently accepts it, that we ought to pay him from the beginning.

Mr. LAURIER. I would say so too, but that is not the case here. The Government appointed him as a guardian because he was disabled, and gave him a salary of, I believe, $25 per month. He claimed a salary of $38 per month, and the Government did not think fit to accept his offer. He was acting during the entire time, and the claim is only that he should be paid the difference.

Mr. BOWELL. I will carefully consider the whole case.

Lunenburg Post Office, Custom House, &c. $5,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When was this work started?

Mr. FOSTER. The land was bought two years ago. The plans are now about finished, and it is intended to carry on the work during the ensuing year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the work under contract?

Mr. FOSTER. Not yet under contract.

Summerside, Charlottetown and Montague public buildings—Balance of commission due superintending architects on works carried out, 1885-86..... $1,714 91

Mr. LAURIER. What is the explanation of this?

Mr. FOSTER. This has been delayed on account of the death of Mr. Sparling, the principal architect. This claim lay over in the adjustment of his affairs.

Quebec—West Farnham P.O..... $4,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this a new building?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. It has not been started. This is the first vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the amount of the receipts?

Mr. FOSTER. The postal revenue is about $2,000; the money orders issued and paid are about $17,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must say that this is a violation of the principle which has long been laid down, that until a post office yields a certain revenue a building should not be erected. There are half-a-dozen places in my constituency which yield double the revenue of this place, and which have not been given post offices. I think it is not right that post offices costing $15,000 or $20,000 should be built in places yielding a revenue of only $2,000.

Mr. BAKER. The town of Farnham, as most members of the Committee are aware, is an important one. It is a great railway centre, with extensive shops, and it is the seat of important manufactures, including a beet-root sugar manufactory. The census shows that the rate of increase in the population has been 44 per cent. in the last ten years. The revenue of the office is about $2,000, and the Government, in taking steps to provide for a public building for the transaction of its business, is only doing tardy justice to that place. So far as the cost of the building is concerned, I hope my hon. friend is exaggerating it, for I have no hesitation in saying that I think it would be a piece of extravagance to erect a very expensive building there. All that is required is a building sufficient to meet the requirements of the business. It is to be hoped that Farnham will be made a port of entry in the not distant future, and in the meantime the Government is doing wisely and well in making an appropriation for the erection of a suitable building there for the transaction of public business.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find that the actual receipts at Farnham are $1,826.53; the money orders amount to $13,745; the salary paid is $530; the forwarding allowance, $24, and the rent paid, $80; and you are going to build a new post office in a place like that. There are dozens of places with more receipts which have no post offices, and it is nothing short of an outrage, both on Parliament and the country, to build a post office here purely and simply for political purposes, only to strengthen the seat of my hon. friend. I have nothing against my hon. friend. I congratulate him on the success that he has achieved in his efforts to get a post office built there. He has done well, and I would advise him, if there are places in his constituency where the receipts are only $900, to try and get post offices built there also. But I blame the Government for what I consider a bare-faced piece of jobbery—nothing short of it.

Mr. BAKER. I must certainly repel the assertion of my hon. friend that this sum is put in the Estimates for political purposes. It is nothing of the kind; and, so far as the personal suggestion is concerned, that it was put there at my instance, to strengthen my position in the county, I repel that with indignation. My hon. friend has such a habit of making these insinuations that I attribute what he has said to-day to the force of habit; for I am very certain that if he had taken the trouble to inform himself of the position and possibilities of the town of Farnham he would have spared this Committee the exhibition of political malice which he has displayed.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, I have not lost an opportunity, since I have become a member of this House, to draw its attention to the impropriety of erecting public buildings at places where the revenues are so exceedingly limited as they are at the town which my hon. friend represents. He says it has increased in population. I am glad that it has, and I am sorry so many towns have decreased. But the point at issue is not the increase of population, but the respective business to be done. There are a hundred places in Canada where the money order transactions are four or five times what they are at this place, where the revenues are three times greater, where the rent paid is more than double, and where there are no post office buildings. Will hon. gentlemen opposite explain why this discrimination is made? My hon. friend says it is not for political purposes. I would like to know then what it is for—why the Government have thought it wise, out of the whole Dominion, to select the little town of Farnham, and decide to build a post office there?

Mr. BAKER. I am not going to allow my hon. friend to belittle me, or the town of Farnham, without remonstrance. The immediate cause of the inser-

tion of this sum in the Estimates was the resolution passed by the corporation of the town of Farnham, setting forth the reasons for building a post office and calling the attention of the Government to the necessity of doing so. The members of the Government, with that desire to promote the public interest which has characterized them for so many years, considered the question and deemed it expedient to grant the petition of the council of Farnham. That is how this sum found its way into the Estimates. I am sure if my hon. friend would only treat himself to a journey in that part of the country he would see its capabilities are quite sufficient to justify the Government in the course they took.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is only to be expected and it is only right that an hon. gentleman should defend the grant for his own constituency. But I would ask the hon. gentleman, who thinks this vote is simply on the ground of public interest, whether the Government are not very unfortunate in their care for public interests in not having erected a building of this kind in the town of Woodstock, which is five or six times as large as the one in question? If the Government had a line laid down by which, when the revenue of any place reached a certain amount, a building would be provided, there would be no occasion for these remarks. But votes such as this are sure to call forth comment, when places in my constituency, and notably in the constituency of Oxford, are found unprovided with public buildings, though their claims are much greater than many places to which public buildings are given. The Government do not act on principles of equity, and leave their conduct open to the imputation that it is governed by other motives than a desire to promote the public welfare.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the hon. member for Missisquoi is a pretty brave man to come over to this side and find fault with the criticism of the item to build a post office in the town of Farnham. The hon. member for North Wellington does not wish to disparage that town, but he recollects that a year or two ago the principle was admitted in this House that public buildings should only be erected where the public interest demanded their erection. It has been shown that there are many places in which the public interest requires the erection of public buildings more urgently than the town of Farnham. But the hon. member for North Wellington forgot that there are other considerations besides national and material considerations. There are political considerations. My hon. friend, I understand, has a protest hanging over him, and I think wherever it is found a building is put up in a place where the revenue is small you will find there a protest. I hope my hon. friend will not consider I am saying a word in disparagement of Farnham. That county has been in the past represented by great and illustrious men, and I would be willing to do anything I could for it, but there are other places where the demands are more urgent.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am bound to accept the statement of the hon. member for Missisquoi, that he had nothing to do with the obtaining of the grant, but that it was given on the petition of the Board of Trade and council of the town. But, a few sessions ago, this House adopted unanimously, with the consent of the Government, a resolution laying down the principle that appropriations for the erection of public buildings would depend on the amount of revenue derived. Since then, the Board of Trade and the municipal council of the town of Woodstock presented a petition to this Government asking for the erection of a post office in that town. My hon. friend referred to the importance of the town of Farnham. But if he will compare it with the town of Woodstock he will find that Woodstock has three times the population, that its population has increased in a greater percentage during the last ten years, and that it is a more important railway, manufacturing and commercial centre, and furnishes ten times the amount of revenue, if not more. In view of the resolution which was passed by this House, when, as my hon. friend says, there were no political reasons for the vote in question, I would like to have an explanation why no notice was taken of the representations of the town of Woodstock. The memorial of our council and Board of Trade was sent to at least five, if not more, members of the Government, and I do not think that even one them had the courtesy to acknowledge the receipt or state that it would receive consideration, which would have been some balm to an important section of the country. I am certain this matter was laid before the different members of the Government. The Minister of Customs had copies of the memorial presented to him, but the Government had not even the courtesy to acknowledge receipt of the petitions.

Mr. BOWELL. You do not apply that to me.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I apply it to every member of the Government who received the petitions. You do not deny having received it?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not remember, but if I received it I must have acknowledged receipt.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In addition to the one sent to the hon. gentleman by the secretary of the Conservative Association, who is also secretary of the Board of Trade, I presented a copy of a memorial to the Minister myself personally, and as I did so he said "thank you;" but while I have always been treated with the greatest courtesy by the Ministers in laying matters before them, and have no complaint to make on that score, the official representations were not acknowledged. I have no particular complaint to make so far as the town or the county is concerned, except that, if the principle is to be acknowledged, as advocated by my hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Baker) and other members of the House on a former occasion—Conservative members of the House—that the position of the town of Woodstock was such that they would either have to support the construction of public buildings there or to say that the Government was not influenced by public opinion in the expenditure of public money. I would like some member of the Government to say upon what principle these grants are made, if they are not made for political reasons. I think everyone must acknowledge that there must be some other reason than that which has been given, and we are left to judge what reason it may be. I may say that, if the Government and the member for Missisquoi and others are so influenced in this matter, they should take into consideration the public interest, which I think ought to govern the distribution of public money, and in the near future they should consider

the claims of the town of Woodstock and make an appropriation for it.

Mr. BAKER. I must have carelessly expressed myself if I led the hon. gentleman to imagine that I said I had nothing whatever to do with the matter. I brought it before the department. I was anxious to see, and happy to find, that the rights of the town were affirmed. The hon. gentleman is right when he says there is an election petition there, and it is an orthodox petition. It came into existence upon a deposit made by Messrs. Mercier, Beausoleil, Choquette & Co., and they are the attorneys for the petitioner. So far as the merits of the case are concerned, I have had similar cases before in my experience, but they have never yet prevailed. Matters are conducted in that part of the Dominion on such pure grounds that we are not afraid of any petition.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I desire to call the attention of the Government to the fact that there is no appropriation in the Estimates for a building in the town of Alliston.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps there has been no resolution of the council.

Mr. TYRWHITT. In an early part of the session I wrote to Sir John Macdonald, and he promised me in writing that this post office should remain. I asked that this should be given to the town because the old office had been destroyed by fire. I was told that a sum would be put in the Estimates to build post offices in places according to their population and revenue. The revenue in Alliston is $2,330, or about $500 more than in the place now under discussion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But you are an Equal Righter.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I may say that it is for no corrupt reason that I ask for this grant. It cost me $2.50 for printing to be elected, and I think I can be elected again for the same sum.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly the hon. gentleman is a very cheap candidate, and it is, no doubt, an honour for him. I may remind you that there was a resolution of this House which left no discretion to the Administration, declaring that the construction of public buildings should be in the order of the importance of the places, and that was to be decided by the population and the amount of revenue. In my constituency there are three or four places where the revenue is very much larger than at this place. I tell the Administration that they have violated the pledge given to this House, they have disregarded the mandate of this House, that the expenditure should be made in places according to their population and their revenue. The hon. gentleman puts an item in the Estimates for a building in a place with a revenue of less than $1,900, while there are scores of places with a larger population and a larger revenue. I ask why the Government disregards its pledge on this subject? The dignity of the House and the honour of the Administration are pledged to this principle, and it is not easy to understand what grounds the Government can give for disregarding the mandate of Parliament. The hon. gentleman passes by an important town like Woodstock, and undertakes to give a building to a place like Farnham. There are scores of places in this country where more revenue is collected and where it would be of much greater importance to expend this money. In many places where these buildings are put up they will require caretakers, and so on, adding to the public expense and enormously increasing the the fixed expenditure, without any corresponding increase in the revenue, and this is one of these places. There are places where large amounts of revenue are collected, and where it is important that public buildings should be erected in the public interest, but this is not one of those places. I say the Administration are not keeping faith with the House; they are disregarding the principle laid down in this House, without a single dissentient voice, for the guidance of the Administration, and acquiesced in by the members of the Administration, and this House ought not to allow this item to pass without the Government taking the responsibility of asking the House to repeal the resolution adopted twelve months ago. I say, Sir, that the hon. gentlemen cannot go on in this kind of way. The day of boodling, and of commissions, and this attempting to bribe constituencies with their own money, has gone by. We can no longer tolerate it.

Mr. FOSTER. Since the day you got a subsidy for railways in your own county, and filed out of the door to escape voting on it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And the hon. gentleman's leader and master approved of that proposition. The hon. gentlemen need not undertake to defend this. These hon. gentlemen, two months ago, led the public to believe there was to be a reform in the administration of public affairs, that the Government of the country was going to be cleansed of impurities, and that they were going to remove from office those who were guilty of misconduct, and henceforth were going to administer even-handed justice to men in Parliament and out of Parliament, to men on the Government side and on the Opposition side. They had laid down the rule last year by which the public expenditures should be made. These public expenditures are made out of the moneys of the people of this country, and not out of the moneys belonging to the Administration. The hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches are the trustees of the people, and it is our business to see that that trust is fairly administered, and that the scales of justice are held evenly between all classes of the population of this country. I tell the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches that this cannot go on any longer. We enter our protest against their policy. We carried with their consent last year, through this House, a resolution affirming a principle that was perfectly fair, and we ask these hon. gentlemen to observe that, and to remember that they are no longer the masters of the people of this country, or the masters of Parliament. This policy they are pursuing now can no longer be sustained, and the people of this country shall hear of it from one end of it to the other, until those hon. gentlemen either reform their policy or retire from the positions which they occupy. They must remember that they are the trustees of the people of this country, that the moneys they are expending are not their own moneys, but moneys which belong to the people. We find large places where there are thousands of dollars of revenue collected yearly that are left without proper office accommodation, because they are in constituencies represented by

Reformers in this House, and here we find a constituency carried by the hon. gentleman from Missisquoi (Mr. Baker), in which there is a small village and a post office yielding a revenue of a little over $1,800 a year, which is to be provided with a public building, entailing a large expense upon the people of this country, simply because it happens to be in a constituency that he represents, or that may be pretty close between the two parties.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Sir, I am in order. I want the Committee to understand that the rule laid down by those gentlemen has been disregarded. Does the hon. gentleman deny that? Does he pretend to say that he did not support last year the resolution in which it was declared that the expenditure of this country for post offices should be made in places where the largest amount of revenue was collected, and he is disregarding that at this moment. He has left Woodstock without any proper provision, and he is undertaking to make a provision for this village. That is what the hon. gentleman is doing, and I say that course cannot be tolerated. The people of this country must know how the revenues are being used by those hon. gentlemen. I say that they are used in a way that amounts to a misuse of the money of this country.

It being six o'clock, the Committee rose and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. Before recess the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) drew the attention of the House to the fact that a year ago a resolution introduced by himself had been unanimously passed in this House with regard to the underlying principles upon which the public money should be expended on public buildings. On that occasion the hon. gentleman made quite a lengthy speech. I shall not read the entire speech; I do not wish to weary the Committee; but I wish to draw attention to a few words that he made use of in the inception of that address:

"Before that motion is submitted to the House I desire to address to it some observations upon the subject of which I gave notice some time ago, when certain public expenditures were under consideration. I think it is highly desirable that some general rule should be laid down in these matters, where it is possible, which will preserve, as largely as it can be preserved, the control of this House over those expenditures which are made for public improvements."

That was virtually the text of his address to the House upon that occasion. After he had presented the case very forcibly, he moved the following resolution:—

"That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved that in the expenditure of public money the public interest and not party favouritism should control, and in the choice of places for the erection of public buildings for post offices, Customs houses and Inland Revenue purposes, regard should be had to the amount of revenue collected and the public business done."

Now, Sir, the hon. Premier, at that time Sir John A. Macdonald, made use of the following language:—

"Now, in my opinion, the principle laid down in this House by this gentleman is perfectly correct. I agree with what my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has stated, that every expenditure of public money should be based on good, sound reasons, that it should have a justification, that it should not be for the purpose of helping one's friends. That is quite true."

Now, that was the statement that the Minister made in reply, and in the closing part of his address he said:

"However, Sir, although a motion of this kind moved in amendment upon going into Supply, is in a way a motion of want of confidence in the Government, yet I have no doubt, from the whole tone of his speech, that the hon. gentleman did not desire that it should be so considered. To prevent any misapprehension on that point I should have preferred that my hon. friend had made his motion as a substantive motion, but I wish to say that I have not the slightest objection to it, and I shall vote for it."

Now, that was the statement of Sir John A. Macdonald in reply to the address delivered by Mr. Mills on that very important question with regard to the expenditure of public money, after forcibly presenting the grounds upon which he considered the public money should be spent. The hon. the First Minister admitted that the grounds were tenable, and should be accepted, and he, on behalf of the Government, accepted that resolution, and it passed this House unanimously. Now, I would like to know on what grounds the present appropriation is made, and why it is made in violation of the position taken by the Government, and admitted by them, and how it is that they have violated that position by asking this Committee to grant a sum towards the building of a post office in Farnham. On looking over the list I hold in my hand of the places in Ontario where the annual revenue is in excess of the sum that is collected at Farnham, I find that there are something less than 54 places. In order to make a forcible impression on the Committee, I will read over the list. Take Alexandria, for instance, in the County of Glengarry, which returns $2,291.06 of receipts; in Almonte, County of Lanark, the receipts are $4,176.26; Amherstburgh, Essex, $2,000.34, Arnprior, $3,581; Aurora, $2,263; Aylmer West, $4,201; Blenheim, $2,529; Bowmanville, $4,745; Brussels, $2,541; Campbellford, $3,298; Carleton Place, $4,359; Chesley, $2,613; Colborne, $2,911; Clinton, $4,541; Collingwood, $5,822; Deseronto, $4,142; Dresden, $2,278; Dunnville, $3,028; Durham, $2,066; Elora, $2,235; Essex Centre, $3,271; Exeter, $2,106; Forest, $2,574; Gananoque, $5,041; Glencoe, $2,335; Gravenhurst, $2,802; Harriston, $3,092; Hespeler, $2,393; Huntsville, $2,187; Ingersoll, $8,556; Iroquois, $2,056; Kincardine, $4,135; Leamington, $2,716; Lindsay, $8,091; Listowell, $4,129; Lucknow, $2,349; Madoc, $2,169; Mattawa, $2,895; Meaford, $3,050; Midland, $2,438; Milton West, $2,370; Mitchell, $3,314; Morrisburg, $3,888; Mount Forest, $3,902; Newmarket, $3,441; North Bay, $2,919; Norwich, $2,244; Norwood, $2,134; Oakville, $2,364; Oshawa, $5,453; Owen Sound, $9,626; Paisley, $2,777; Paris, $2,661; Parkdale, $5,268; Parkhill, $2,850; Petrolia, $6,113; Port Arthur, $4,972; Port Elgin, $2,181; Port Perry; $2,805; Prescott, $4,811; Preston, $2,156; Rat Portage, $2,675, Renfrew, $3,804; St. Mary's, $5,850; Sarnia, $8,505; Sault Ste. Marie, $3,548; Shelburne, $2,357; Simcoe, $5,139; Smith's Falls $6,023; Sudbury, $2,844; Thorold, $2,854; Tilsonburg, $4174; Uxbridge, $3,526; Trenton, $5,011; Wallaceburg, $2,831; Waterloo West, $4,263; Watford, $2,479;

Welland, $3,343; West Toronto Junction, $3,420; Whitby, $4,235; Wingham, $3,976; Woodstock, $15,432; Yorkville, $6,277. In this list there are 54 places in Ontario where the receipts are considerably in excess of $2,000, while the entire receipts at Farnham only amount to $1,826. The members of the Government accepted the suggestion of the First Minister last year and adopted the resolution submitted by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). One of these places I have named, Woodstock, has receipts of $15,000, while Ingersoll and other places contribute very largely to post office revenue; many places contributing in excess of $5,000 a year. The average of the 54 places I have mentioned will be at least $750 a year more than is contributed by Farnham for which the hon. gentleman wants a vote to erect a post office. I want hon. gentlemen opposite to explain on what basis they claim that the House should consent to this vote, in view of the resolution unanimously adopted by the House last year? I contend, further, that before we consent to the erection of any post office we should have laid on the Table of this House a diagram with the plans and specifications and every item of information that can possibly be presented, before we consent to pass the first dollar towards its erection. In the history of the construction of post offices since 1867—more particularly the history of post offices erected from 1880 or 1881—there is not a single post office in which the sum said to be required to complete it has not been far exceeded. Take, for instance, the investigation we have had in connection with the Napanee post office, for which the estimate presented to the House was $25,400 and which has actually cost $48,000 including site, sidewalks and everything else. Even supposing there was justifiable ground upon which the Government should ask this House to consent to the passage of the item, I claim that in the first place we should have the plans and specifications with a certificate of the anticipated cost from the chief engineer, and that the building should be completed for the sum we are asked to vote. What have been our experience in regard to these matters? First, a resolution is brought in for perhaps $1,000 to buy the site, or, as in the present case, for $4,000 to start the building. Then the site is purchased and the walls and roof of the building probably cost far in excess of the sum voted. Then, next session, the Government ask for a further vote to put the fittings in and complete the building, and in the end the building has probably cost three or four times the amount at first anticipated. In like manner that has been our experience with regard to the construction of railways. There is at first a certain vote, and then an increased expenditure from year to year until such time as the building is completed. I contend that before we pass this vote the Government should lay on the Table of this House the estimate by the chief engineer of what this post office is going to cost ultimately. I say that we are entitled to that information before the item should pass for the building of a post office at Farnham in the constituency of my hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Baker). Has the Minister got the plans and specifications?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the Minister say what is to be the limit of the cost of the building?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say what is to be the exact limit, but it is to be a very moderate building.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have been so accustomed to promises of that kind, and to see them so often broken, that it is useless for the Committee to anticipate that that statement is correct. I have no doubt that the Minister would like to keep within a moderate limit, and I pay him the compliment of saying that I have no doubt he intends to do so. I do not care whether or not the hon. gentleman feels complimented at that statement, for it makes little difference to me. I am merely stating what I think is the truth, and as I expect no favour I will not be disappointed if I do not get it. Is the building to be fitted up for a Custom house as well as a post office? Is it a port of revenue?

Mr. FOSTER. It is to be suitable for a post office and for Customs and Inland Revenue to whatever extent it may be required.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Customs intimates that there is no port of entry there, and, if the statement of the Minister of Finance is correct, you are anticipating the purposes for which it will be erected.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is where the large beetroot manufactory is.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not know what kind of manufactory it is, but if the hon. gentleman's Printing Bureau was there, I should say it would be well to make provision for an extensive business. However, the Printing Bureau is not there; it is here. Would the hon. gentleman say if they manufacture leather for binding there, or other materials which are required in the Printing Bureau?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They manufacture wit there, but they do not manufacture it where you are.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not hear the hon. gentleman; would he make the statement again.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not make a statement.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think I heard him say something about wit, and the hon. gentleman requires all the wit he is possessed of to steer clear of the difficulties he has had to contend with this session. I believe we are entitled to the information I have asked for in this matter before we pass the vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not wish to delay the Committee, but in view of what occurred before six o'clock I wish to say a few words. The Minister of Customs—the only hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who made any remark about this item—said, I think, that he had no recollection of receiving a petition, even in connection with the Woodstock post office.

Mr. BOWELL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did not say that. I said I thought it was strange that if I had received the petition that I did not reply to it, and I thought that if the hon. gentleman looked over the record, he would find I had replied. If he understood me to say as he stated, I certainly did not intend it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I said myself when the complaint was made to me, that I never knew of an instance where at least a formal reply was not given to these requests. I wish to take this

opportunity of pointing out that the item now under discussion for the erection of a public building in the town of Farnham——

Mr. LANDERKIN. The village of Farnham.

Mr. SUTHERLAND—in the village of Farnham——

Mr. BAKER. It is an incorporated town.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It makes very little difference whether it is a town or a village; I am not referring to the place in any derogatory way whatever. I wish to point out that a resolution was carried by the House last session that public money should be expended in the erection of public buildings in towns or cities only in accordance with the amount of revenue received from the places and the business done. It is in accordance with the principle of that resolution that I wish to speak, and of course you will understand that I feel particularly interested in the town of Woodstock as a representative of the riding in which that town is situated. Deputations from that town have waited on the Government, and petitions have been presented showing the necessities of the place. The last petition was one presented by the Board of Trade during the past year, laying before the Government certain facts and figures bearing on this matter; but as no member of the Government appears to have any recollection of that petition, I will now present a few facts to show that justice has not been done to the town of Woodstock in the distribution of public money for the erection of public buildings. For the last fiscal year, the revenue derived from the post office there was $15,732.06, and the total receipts from Customs, Inland Revenue and post office together amounted to $141,282.62. I wish also to make a few comparisons, not with the town for which the present vote is intended, but with some of the more important places in the Dominion where public buildings have been erected. The total postal receipts for the last fiscal year have been in the City of Stratford $10,617; in the City of St. Thomas, $13,637; in the City of St. Catharines $13,368; in the town of Galt, $10,803; in the town of Cobourg, $6,936; in the town of Berlin, $8,971, and in the City of Belleville, $15,982. Leaving aside the large cities, such as Toronto, Montreal and Hamilton, and taking the smaller places of the Dominion, there are only two where the receipts are equal or nearly so to those of the town of Woodstock, and there are none where there are equal receipts from Customs and Inland Revenue. These are plain facts, which I wish to lay before the Government, to show that if a member on this side of the House or some person in the country accuse them of improper or political motives in the expenditure of public money for the erection of public buildings throughout the country, there is some justification for such statements. There are also a very large number of small places, where the receipts are so small in comparison with those in the town I refer to that it is almost unnecessary to make any comparison with them; but in many of these places splendid public buildings have been erected. In the town of Farnham, where a post office is to be erected, I understand the total revenue is only some $1,826, and the population is only between 2,000 and 3,000. It yields in revenue hardly $100 for every $1,000 yielded by the town of Woodstock. I would like to hear some explanation on behalf of the Government as to the reason why they do not carry out the principle which they accepted in this House last year, that public moneys should be distributed for public buildings on the basis of the amount of revenue collected, the business done and the importance of the places. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Baker), that though a town may not be large, it may have important business interests, and this fact should be taken into account. I understand that the town where he resides is a railway and manufacturing centre. But, as I have said, the town of Woodstock in those respects is not second to any other town in the Dominion. There is no other town that I know of which has the same railway, manufacturing and commercial interests that we have. For the fiscal year previous to the last year, the total postal receipts were $14,755.46, which increased in the last fiscal year to $15,432.06.

Mr. SPROULE. There cannot be much exodus going on in that locality.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would just like to tell the hon. gentleman that if business is prospering there and the manufacturing interests are increasing, that is due to the industry and enterprise of the people, which should give them a further claim on the Government for consideration. There is no town in which the citizens have expended so much money out of their own municipal taxes in beautifying the place; and if this Government is a progressive government, it should try to keep up with the times. I wish also to say that the number of money orders issued at Woodstock for the past year was 4,835, the total amount of money orders issued was $47,364.59, and the total amount of money orders paid $91,384.39. Now, are the Government prepared to say that a place where such a large volume of business is done should be left with insufficient buildings and insufficient security for moneys and public documents? As the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) properly said, we do not ask for a post office there as a favour from the Government. The Government do not furnish the money themselves; it is public money placed in their hands as trustees; and when we see money appropriated for buildings in places of so much less importance, we think we have a right to complain. Having brought this matter on several occasions before the House, and in view of the resolution which was supported by the late right hon. the First Minister and unanimously endorsed by his colleagues and the members of this House, I had the right to expect that some fair and just consideration would have been given to the application I presented. I do trust that even at this late hour the Government will see that it is necessary some such principle ought to be fairly carried out.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the principle laid down either by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) or the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) is the correct one which should be followed with regard to the erection of these public buildings. The hon. member for North Wellington gave a long list of towns and villages in Ontario, in which the gross receipts from the post office returns were larger than in the town of Farnham, and the conclusion he arrived at was that because a post office is built in a place where the aggregate receipts were $1,800, therefore

every place with that much or more receipts deserve a similar building.

Mr. McMULLEN. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. SPROULE. There are many places much larger than the town of Farnham were private enterprise has furnished suitable buildings, and the cost to the country is much less than if the Government had put up buildings. In large villages and towns, where there are suitable buildings available at a moderate figure, there is no urgent necessity for the expenditure of public money in putting up others. I could name several places among those mentioned by the hon. gentleman where buildings have been supplied by private enterprise at a lower cost than would have been entailed by the erection of public buildings by the Government. The Government would not be justified in undertaking to put up post offices and Custom houses at these various points. The rule followed is that where urgent necessity demands it and suitable buildings cannot be had at a moderate rental, the Government should provide them; but in those places where there are suitable buildings which can be had at a small rental, the Government would not be justified —whether the place be large or small—in expending money to erect other buildings

Mr. LANDERKIN. There are a few features of this business which it might be well to consider before the item passes. The hon. member for South Simcoe brought up the case of Alliston, a great portion of which had been destroyed by fire, and in connection with which the late First Minister promised that, although the Government could not give a grant in aid of the people burned out, he would see that a public building would be placed there. It is a more important place than Farnham. It is larger and more populous, and there is the promise of the late First Minister which has not yet been fulfilled. I understand that the present Government declared they intend to carry out the old policy, but in this respect they have neglected Alliston and gone to Farnham. What are the reasons for this? The hon. member for Missisquoi said that the council petition was the main reason, and that he himself had done nothing. Then, when challenged, he said he had done a great deal, and the council had not done so much. Now, there are other matters which bear on this matter, which the House and the country cannot forget. At the opening of this session, it was stated that the Eastern Townships had done so well for the Government during the election, they would have a representative in the Cabinet in the place of Mr. Colby who had gone down in the fight.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. Minister of Finance says "order." Then I have not the right to speak on questions which have a bearing on this vote.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has departed from the item under consideration.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will convince you, Sir, that I am speaking pertinently to the question. It was stated in the public press that Mr. Ives was to take the place of Mr. Colby. The hon. member for Missisquoi, who is a gentleman of great experience and once had a seat in the Cabinet which was succeeded by Mr. Mercier's Government, and he does not like Mr. Mercier, and he thought that entitled him to a place in the Cabinet. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) did not go into the Cabinet; the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Baker) did not go into the Cabinet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order. We are not here to amuse ourselves, and he is speeking on something completely irrelevant to the question before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am speaking for Canada, and to say that the honour of Canada must be maintained, whether the Government go down or go up. When a resolution is carried in the House binding the Government, and when the Government depart from that resolution, I would be unworthy to represent a Canadian constituency if I did not rise to vindicate the honour of Canada. The hon. member for Sherbrooke——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. An item went into the post office for Missisquoi.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is a disorderly thing which should not have gone into the Estimates. There was an item in the Estimates for an exhibition at Sherbrooke.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must again call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am out of order there, but not so wholly out of order as the Government were. The item went in, and I want to show you, Sir, how that came about.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to speak of the Sherbrooke fair, which has nothing to do with the question under delate. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the policy of the Government as shown in this matter of erecting a post office in the town of Farnham, and nothing else.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You know they were constructing an agricultural cabinet down there, but neither of these agriculturists got in. I will show you how these items got in. The Compton *County Chronicle* has an article headed the "Ottawa Scandals," dated Wednesday September the 2nd. I want you to notice the date, Sir, which has a bearing on this item:

"From being surprised, the citizens of Canada are now being ashamed of the revelations at Ottawa."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will have to ask the Committee to rise and report to the Speaker unless the hon. gentleman will bow to my ruling. He is entirely out of order, and he knows he is.

Mr. LANDEKIN. I do not care whether the Speaker goes into the Chair or not. He can if he chooses. The articles goes on to say:

"No charges made against the Cabinet Ministers have been proved,"——

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN—

—"but several of them have allowed leading officials and clerks to make use of their position by accepting bribes, and therefore the only alternative is a complete change and thorough house-cleaning from top to bottom."

Mr. FOSTER moved that the Committee rise, report resolutions and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to; Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I desire to say a few words in reference to the adjournment. This newspaper, in the continuation of this article, says:

"A change we must have in the Government at Ottawa. We do not mean by this that the Liberals should be given power, for past and present history shows that their record is far worse than that of the Conservative party, but what we do mean is that the present Premier must have a complete reconstruction of the Cabinet or else resign and let some younger man take his place, and a younger Premier with almost a new Cabinet selected from the honest rank and file of the Conservative party, would infuse such life into the affairs of the country that we would go forward with a rush."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN—

"Most of the present Cabinet Ministers have seen their best days and they have allowed a class of clerks to surround them who have got the party into disgrace for the sake of paltry dollars, they therefore should resign and allow some younger members to take their places who would bring a change into the departments, and if they did not improve it any, turn them out and try another."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN—

"The different counties of the Dominion should take warning from the disgrace we have been brought to and see to it that the member they elect to represent them be a man of unblemished character, who is trusted and respected by all his constituency."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN—

"It is an honour to the Eastern Townships that not a single member from this section has had the least taint of boodle about him, and anyone thinking over the list would recognize men who are a monument where they live for honest, upright business men."

That is the end of the article, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am obliged to hon. gentlemen for their appreciation of an article from a Conservative newspaper.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; louder.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It appears that Conservative newspapers are not popular in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not think I will read any more.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will pursue this question a little further. I was just showing the expenditure of public money when the Committee was asked to rise.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was showing that on the 16th September, after that article was published, the money was granted to Farnham, and the money was granted to Sherbrooke.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 9.15 p.m.

Mr. LANDERKIN.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 28th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

TRADE RELATIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have received a Message from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has adopted an Address to Her Majesty the Queen, humbly requesting that Her Majesty may be wisely pleased to take into consideration the position of Canada with respect to certain important matters concerning its trade relations with the Empire and foreign nations, and requesting the concurrence of this House therein.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the said Address be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

COAL FOR COATICOOK POST OFFICE.

Mr. RIDER asked, Has the contract been made for the supply of coal required for the post office at Coaticook? When was the contract made? What kind and quantity of coal has been contracted for, and when is it to be delivered? To whom has the contract been given, and what is the price to be paid per ton, or otherwise? Were tenders called for, and was the contract given to the lowest tenderers? If not, why not?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, a contract was signed on the 12th of September instant, for 30 tons of coal, anthracite, large egg, and 2 tons of stove coal. The coal has been delivered. B. J. Smith, of Coaticook, is the contractor. The prices are: anthracite, $5.75; stove coal, $6 per ton. Tenders were called for, and only one was received.

TRANSCONTINENTAL MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the Intercolonial Railway is in a condition to fulfil its part in furnishing a fast transcontinental mail service all the way from the easternmost point of railway communication at North Sydney, and whether arrangements are being made for the construction of a suitable railway wharf at the said easternmost point of railway communication at North Sydney, and whether said wharf will be made suitable also for loading coal from any mines that may be opened in the neighbourhood?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, the Intercolonial Railway is in a condition to fulfil its part in furnishing a fast transcontinental mail service all the way from the eastern terminus at Sydney, including the branch to North Sydney. The railway has excellent water facilities for its present business, and the subject of a wharf at North Sydney does not seem to require action during this session. It may be worthy of consideration at a future time, whether railway communication suitable for coal shipments should not be provided at that place.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. BOWELL moved:

That the order for third reading of Bill (No. 175) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construc-

tion of the lines of railway therein mentioned, be discharged, and the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of adding the amendment, somewhat amended, proposed by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock).

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOWELL moved that the following clause be added :—

That within one month after the commencement of each session of Parliament, whilst any such moneys are being paid out, there shall be laid before Parliament a statement showing all payments of such moneys during the next preceding year, with the names of the respective persons to whom such payments have been made and the amounts paid to each respectively, together with copies of all contracts between the Government and the companies, under which any of the works of said railways in respect of which the said subsidies are authorized to be paid, have or shall have been constructed, as the case may be.

My reason for suggesting that amendment is, we have sub-contracts in the agreements to which we entered with the companies. The course is simply to enter into a contract with a company for the construction of the road which is to receive the subsidy, and with what sub-contracts they may enter into with others of course we have nothing whatever to do, nor would it be possible for us to obtain them. I think, so long as we lay on the Table the contracts and agreements entered into between the Government and the companies with whom they contract, that will accomplish the object my hon. friend has in view.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad that the acting Minister of Railways appreciates my object, even if he does not adopt my suggestions in their entirety. As far as his amendment goes, it is fair enough, but I think it is also important that the House, if it is to have full information, should have knowledge of all the arrangements which the railway companies make. Where a railway receives public aid, the country ought to know what is done with the money, and we cannot know that, unless we see the contracts under which the moneys are expended by the railway company. The railway company makes a contract for the construction depending on the subsidy, which may be called money lying in deposit with the Government and to be disbursed under the contracts. The contractors, therefore, receive the public money through the medium of the railway company and under contracts to which the Government is not a party. I think the public money should be traceable from the treasury to the receivers, and the title under which the contractors get it ought to be made manifest also. I happen to know of a subsidy which was given to a railway by this Government some years ago, and the contract was made by the railway company for the construction of the road, and the contractors for the main line sub-let the work at a price very much less than the price the company had contracted with the Government for. I regard the sub-contracts as representing the cost of the road. All the difference between the contract price between the Government and the main contractor and the price between him and the sub-contractors is so much clear profit made by the first contractor, and may be said to have come out of the public funds. We ought to know the real cost of building these railways. We ought not to be so lavish with intermediaries. I can understand that large portions of these moneys provided by the public grant, remain in their hands, and the real contractors who, we may assume, are doing the work at fair prices, simply receive what is the cost of the road, but the middlemen, who do nothing except, perhaps, to promote the enterprise, receive the oyster. For this reason, I think the House ought to have the important information which they would receive if the sub-contracts were laid upon the Table up to the time the money is earned, and I hope the Minister will admit that this is feasible. I do not think his objection is well taken, that it is not feasible for us to obtain possession of these contracts. A railway company that is depending upon a subsidy from the Government will surely, for the sake of receiving the subsidy, make arrangements to have all the information in regard to the sub-contracts given to the Government, and I think the subsidy should be withheld until that information is furnished.

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot say that the reasoning of the hon. gentleman from North York (Mr. Mulock) has convinced me that we ought to accept his proposition to the fullest extent. No doubt it would be very desirable, if it were possible, to obtain information as to the amount paid improperly by any company, but the object of Parliament in granting a subsidy to a railway is to induce parties who have capital, or who can raise sufficient money, to construct the road so that the people in the locality may have the advantage of it. The road may be of a colonization character or of a strictly commercial character, but, so long as the company which enters into a contract with the Government for the construction of the road complies with the terms of the contract, and builds the road, that is all Parliament has asked them to do when it granted the subsidy in aid thereof. We know that no company would go to the trouble of organizing and undertaking the expense incident to the organization of a company and construct the road by sub-contractors or any other means unless they expected to receive some consideration for their trouble and for the time they gave in carrying out their work, and the responsibility they assumed in their financial obligations, &c. If we lay before Parliament the contracts we entered into and the amount of money paid under them, I think we have done all that we should be asked to do. I appreciate the reasoning of the hon. gentleman as to tracing the money from its fountain head to the place where it is expended, but the adoption of that principle would, to a greater or less extent, interfere with every private transaction of a company with which we may have entered into a contract for the construction of a railway. If we have the road completed within the time specified, I think we have all that can be asked. If we enter into a contract for the construction of a road and grant a subsidy, if that road is built according to the terms on which Parliament granted the subsidy, our object is attained. If Parliament receives the information I have proposed the Government should lay on the Table of the House every session, that should be a sufficient basis upon which to take any future action if any hon. gentleman thinks the money has been improperly expended. I have gone as far in this matter as the hon. gentleman should ask.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think the hon. gentleman has gone as far as he ought to go or as far as Parliament is entitled to have him go. We

are granting certain franchises to railway companies. They are public franchises. You give a company the right of expropriation and confer franchises which do not ordinarily belong to a private company. They are in a nature public, and so a railway company having special powers and special franchises given to it, has also imposed upon it corresponding responsibilities. The Minister of Customs says that he will lay on the Table any contracts between the Government and the companies, and an account of moneys that are paid, but that is not sufficient. Suppose a railway company makes arrangements by which a large portion of the money that is paid may be applied to other purposes than the construction of the road. The Minister, it seems to me from his speech, would go so far as to say: that is a matter in which you have no right to enquire, that is a matter about which you have no right to obtain information. But that is not the rule that has been acted upon this session. There are instances in which one or the other House of this Parliament has gone very much further than that. We have enquired, not merely as to the payments made by the Government, and the road to which the payments were made, but we have gone further and enquired what was done with the money after payment had been made. Now the Minister stops short of that. He says that as between the company and the parties who may have a contract with the companies to construct the road, or to ballast it, or to make it fit for operation, we are not to enquire, that information is not to be had. If there is any ground for suspicion, then a motion may be made. But the hon. gentleman will see that the one basis upon which action can be taken is withheld, the information does not exist. If that information was brought down, it may disclose upon its face a reason for further enquiry; but, if information is not brought down, you have nothing before you except the fact that the company have claimed the money and that the Government has paid it. It seems to me that you ought to go further than that, or else the information will be of very little value.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The difficulty is in making the tabling of all these sub-contracts a matter of course in every case. There is a great deal of difficulty in that. In the first place it is not very desirable that we should seem to the public in any way to take supervision of the sub-contracts, because we never can control the liabilities which will be incurred under them, or see those liabilities discharged. When in any sense the Government require sub-contracts to be furnished and laid upon the Table of the House, the impression does get abroad among those who are interested that in some way there is a supervision over these. But apart from that, the question of sub-contracts is a very large one, and extends not only to sub-contracts made by the company itself, but also to those made by the contractors and the sub-contractors, and so on, *ad infinitum*. A company contracts with the Government to do work and build a road according to a specification, and receives a subsidy. They nearly always make a contract with a firm or another company to do the work, but that contracting firm or company, on its part, lets out various portions of the work. The sleepers may be the subject of one contract, the rails another, the bridging another; you may have 40 or 50 sub-contracts on a small line of railway. To enquire into all these, to make it a matter of course that the Government should furnish all these, that they should be tabled, I think is going more minutely into the matter than the public interest requires.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will see, if he reflects for a moment, that even supposing the words used in the motion of which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) gave notice, were adopted by the House, they would not accomplish the object that he seems to have in view. Supposing that the company which has entered into a contract with the Government for the construction of a road to which a subsidy is to be paid, sub-lets it to half a dozen different contractors. All we have to do, upon the report of the engineer that each ten miles of that road is completed in accordance with the contract, is to pay over the $3,200 per mile. We do not pretend to trace that; neither would the House of Commons or any member in it be able to trace a malappropriation of money by the contractors or by the sub-contractors simply by laying the names of the sub-contractors upon the Table. All we could do would be to say that Tom Jones sub-let to Richard Jones the construction of three or four miles of road. That is all we would know, and that is all the motion of the hon. member for North York asks for. If he wants to go further and find out whether a company has entered into any improper agreement or arrangement with other parties for the purpose of obtaining from the Government an appropriation of money which they have spent for other purposes, as has been developed in the investigation to which the hon. gentleman refers, then that object certainly will not be attained by passing the resolution of the hon. member for North York. If it could be, I should be quite willing, for my part, and most anxious, to have it adopted; but we would have no further information than we would have under the motion that I propose.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the hon. gentleman whether his amendment is intended to go so far as to show by the papers laid upon the Table of the House that the work has been actually done which entitles the railway company to receive the subsidy?

Mr. BOWELL. It goes that far. It proposes to lay the contract upon the Table. It proposes to show how much money has been earned and paid, and that all payments are based upon the terms of the contract which provides that upon the completion of each ten miles, and that being certified to by the Government engineer, this money shall be paid.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I would ask if there be any objection to require the railway company itself to furnish such annual statement of all the moneys it has paid out on account of those works towards which the Government is making its contribution? If not, then I would suggest that it be a duty cast upon the railways—

To furnish a statement showing the moneys paid out by or for the company on account of the works in respect of which such subsidy is voted, with the names of the persons to whom such moneys have been paid, the amounts so paid, and the consideration therefor.

I think it is the right of Parliament to know who receives the money that Parliament votes. It will not do simply to furnish a statement by the company under this proposed amendment. I am afraid

that all the information Parliament will get under this amendment will be that the Government has paid so much money to this company. That is no information at all ; that is simply a statement that an obligation has been discharged, that the railway has earned the money, that the money has been paid to the railway, or to those whom the railway might appoint. That is all the information that the proposed amendment of the Minister will give us. Now, I think that the railway ought not to pay out any money on account of its work to any person unless the payment is an honest payment ; therefore, there should be no objection to make known to whom the money is paid. Part of the money comes out of the public treasury. The railway company is after all simply an agent of the Government, it is an instrument of the Government, an instrument of Parliament, in order to accomplish a public work. Part of the cost of the work is contributed by Parliament, and part of it provided from private sources ; so I think that Parliament ought to know who gets this money. It is only handed to the treasurer of the railway company for a moment, it is there temporarily, not to remain there, but it is voted for the purpose of accomplishing a certain end, the completion of the road. Therefore, the money that is paid to these contractors, or to the builders, is the money of the country, to the extent that the country contributes. It does not cease to be that, because it may pass through the machinery or the agency of the railway corporation banks. It is really public money, and the railways are simply distributors of it ; and it is as much the right of the country to know who receives the money, although it may pass through the coffers of the company, as if it were paid to an agent of the Government as an ordinary disbursement.

Mr. BOWELL. The effect of this amendment would be to enable the Government to go into the whole business of the company. We pay a subsidy based on the cost of the rails, and if the road is constructed, then Parliament has accomplished all it expected to accomplish when it paid the money. I do not think the Government can accept the amendment. I have no objection to go further in the direction suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and I, therefore, suggest the addition of the words : "and the engineer's report on which such payment has been recommended."

Mr. MULOCK. I move to add the following words to the section :—

And a detailed statement by the company in respect of which any of such subsidies have been authorized to be paid, showing all moneys paid by or for the company on account of the works in respect of which such subsidies were voted, with the names of the persons to whom such moneys have been paid, the amounts so paid, and the consideration therefor.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The object which my hon. friend has in view is, no doubt, a very praiseworthy one, and we should like to see it secured. It cannot, however, be accomplished by the amendment proposed. It is desirable that Parliament should know that the money voted in subsidies to railways reaches the purpose for which it is intended, that no tribute or tolls are exacted on the way. The amount of subsidy generally voted for railways is $3,200 per mile, or about sufficient to pay for the rails on the road.

Mr. MULOCK. It has gone up as high as $12,000 a mile.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. All the subsidies voted in these resolutions are at the rate of $3,200 per mile, and on only two occasions, and those were special ones, has the subsidy gone up to $12,000 per mile. The reason this amount is taken is that it is about sufficient to iron the road. It would be all very well if we knew that the money was devoted to the object for which it was voted, but it would be improper to compel the companies to give particulars respecting the expenditure of the balance of the money invested in the construction, $12,000 or $15,000 or $20,000, and the name of every person to whom money had been paid. Much of the work may have been let by contract and sub-contract, and much of it may have been done by day's work, and under the amendment the pay roll of thousands of workingmen, including Italians who have no names but only numbers, would have to be laid on the Table of the House. This is going altogether too far. If we ask documents showing that the railway company had carried out the work for which the subsidy was given, and if the engineer's report on which the money was paid, showing also that the road has been ironed, stations built, and other requirements furnished, and a statement of what remains to be finished, were laid before Parliament, those documents should be sufficient.

Mr. MULOCK. I cannot complain of the tone of the hon. gentleman's remarks, although he does not altogether agree with me. Parliament is interested in two ways in getting this information. First, in seeing that the money is devoted to the purpose for which it was intended, and had not been reduced on its way by any other than proper charges. In the second place, Parliament is interested in the economical construction of railways, because whatever they cost is ultimately charged on the industries of the people. If an excessive sum is paid in constructing railways, that means higher freights. The capital invested is expected to be remunerative, and we are undoubtedly interested in the economical construction of roads. I do not mean that the expenditure should be skimped, but there should be a wise economy exercised in their construction. The people in the long run have to pay the interest on the money invested, and if regulations of this character would help to promote economy in the construction of these roads, it is to the benefit of the people that these regulations should be adopted. I believe that the more fully a company is compelled to present the country an account of this expenditure, the more careful it will be not to make expenditures that will not at a later period stand the light of day. I am not vain enough to imagine that the provision I propose is the best that could be made, but my desire is to enable railway promoters to give the best value to the railway itself for every dollar expended, and to resist importunities from those who may have influence. I believe some such statement should be presented to this Parliament. There should be some sort of accountability from the company to the public whose money they receive. It is idle to talk of a company as being a corporation and being accountable to its proprietors, because the shareholders now-a-days in a company, with perhaps the single exception of the Canadian Pacific Railway, have no substantial interest in the enterprise. Stocks or shares in some railway companies

now are given for little or no value. We are every day giving authority to railway companies to issue paid-up shares without service rendered, and when the road goes into the hands of the receiver the persons who put in their money are either creditors, or those who lend the money, and have no voice in the economical construction of a road, or they are the Government who make an absolute present of this money. During the process of construction there is no interested body having a right to audit the accounts or to promote economy. I contend, considering the peculiar methods in vogue in Canada for bringing railways in existence, that Parliament ought to exercise some sort of provision, or at all events should use its influence in trying to cause wise economy during the process of construction. After a road is built the money is gone: the company has a bonded debt, and the efforts of the directorate then are directed to earn enough money to pay obligations and current expenses, and the larger the debt the higher the rates and the more people have to pay for the accommodation which the road affords. For every reason it is the duty of Parliament, before the expenditure has actually taken place, to use the means within its reach in order to see that no money is wasted.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY TO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 111) to authorize the transfer of certain property to Provincial Governments.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I move that there be added to the Bill a clause exempting from the operation of any transfer which may be made under the Act, any works which have been sanctioned by the Governor in Council before the transfer. The Committee may remember that we have an Act relating to works in navigable waters, which requires the approval of the Governor in Council to be given to wharves and booms and constructions of that kind, and it is well that those who are interested in those works should know that rights which have been acquired under the authority of this Parliament shall not be affected under the transfer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the effect of this provision might not be to prevent these works coming under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature? Clearly, if we propose to transfer certain properties now in doubt, and certain rights in public works are needed before that claim is admitted; yet these works will be held as under the Government of Canada, or will be held in future, the same as if the transfer had already been made from the people interested. I can well see how it would be proper to declare that the rights of parties would not be affected, but would not the effect of this clause, just as it stands, be to obtain jurisdiction beyond that which you intend?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We can alter the clause in accordance with the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Bill reported.

Mr. MULOCK.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the Bill be now read the third time. He said: I should, perhaps, have stated at an earlier stage that the assent of the Crown has been given to this measure. It involves to some extent, in the view of the Government, the right of the Crown in the public domain.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 147) further to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act—(Sir John Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 8,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to add the following:—

Hereafter, should any elector be substituted for the petitioner, then and in every such case such elector, before being so substituted, shall make and file an affidavit to the same effect.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In line 30, I propose to strike out "the Chief Justice of Ontario," because the Court of Appeal is being struck off the list of courts to try election cases; and at the end of the section I propose to strike out the words, "and the hearing of such application," and insert the following:—

Provided that with respect to cases pending at the time of passing of this Act, the Chief Justice of Ontario shall take part in such arrangement.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 8,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I wish to insert the following as section 9:—

In case the petitioner in an election petition shall not be qualified to be a petitioner, the petition shall not on that account be dismissed, if within such time as the court or judge shall fix for that purpose another petitioner be substituted, and the substitution may take place on such terms and conditions as to the court or judge may seem meet.

Mr. BARRON. I would like to ask the Minister what is the reason for that proposal, because it seems to me a very dangerous one?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am told that one of the defects of the Act is that the petitioner may turn out not to be a qualified person, and in such case I suppose the petition is abated.

Mr. BARRON. In cases of *bonâ fide* accident, there would be no harm in the proposal; but if it is permitted to pass, we will find fictitious petitioners, and then, if evidence be obtained, a *bonâ fide* petitioner will present himself. The great trouble is to get honest *bonâ fide* men to act as petitioners, and that is the object and spirit of the legislation of this session; but if this becomes law, we will have all sorts of men acting as petitioners, and afterwards, when the evidence is obtained, they will get a *bonâ fide* petitioner. It seems to me this would be an unwise step to take.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The petitioner may be an alien or a non-resident. A month afterwards it may be discovered that he is not qualified to be a petitioner, and, under this amendment, we would

be practically giving double the length of time to petition in that case that we would in any other, because the petition is really in point of law a nullity. If the petitioner's name were found on the voters' list and there was reason to suppose that he was a *bonâ fide* petitioner, there would, in that case, be a great deal to be said in favour of the amendment, but this clause, as now proposed, would cover the case where a person had not even the apparent right to petition at all, and whose petition was an absolute nullity. Yet in this case, the fact that the petition was put in would, nevertheless, perpetuate the right to petition long after the time fixed by law has expired.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I admit it is too late in the session to introduce anything so important, and will not press the clause.

Amendment withdrawn.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The next section I have re-drafted, in order to carry out the amendment agreed to by the House about the amount of deposit being $300 instead of $100 on an appeal, and at the same time to exempt from the operation of that change, appeals on preliminary objections. The clause reads as follows:—

Sub-section one of section fifty is hereby repealed and the following substituted: The party so desiring to appeal, shall, within eight days from the day on which the court or judge has given such decision, deposit with the clerk of the court which gave the decision, or of which the judge who gave such decision is a member, or with the proper officer for receiving moneys paid into such court, at the place where the hearing of the preliminary objection or where the trial of the petition took place, as the case may be, if in the Province of Quebec, or the chief office of such court, if in any other province, in cases of appeal, other than from the judgment, ruling, order or decision on any preliminary objection, the sum of $300, and in such last-mentioned case, the sum of $100 as security for costs, and also the further sum of $10 as a fee for making up and transmitting the report to the Supreme Court of Canada. Such deposit may be made in legal money or the bills of any chartered bank doing business in Canada.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The next amendment proposes only some alterations. It reads thus; it is numbered 12 in the Bill we passed the other evening:

Sub-section 4 of the said section 51 is hereby repealed and the following substituted: The registrar shall certify to the Speaker of the House of Commons the judgment and decision of the Supreme Court confirming, changing, or annulling any decision, report or finding of the court appealed from, upon the several questions of law as well as of fact upon which the appeal was made, and therein shall certify as to the matters and things as to which, by section 44 of this Act, the court would have been required to report to the Speaker whether they had been annulled, or changed or left uneffected by such decision of the Supreme Court; and such decision shall be final.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to say:

That sections 1, 2, 10, 11 and 18 of this Act shall not apply to any proceedings under the Dominion Controverted Elections Act pending at the time of the passing hereof, but except as aforesaid, this Act, so far as applicable, shall apply to all such proceedings.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we are proceeding a little hastily in deciding even that petitions hereafter fyled shall not be triable by judges of the Court of Appeal. I think we made a mistake. The Committee proceeded in their conclusion before, upon the assumption that the Court of Appeal was overworked, that its work was in a congested condition. On enquiry I find that is not the case, and I think I am well advised that they are no way in arrears. If that were the only reason assigned, then that reason is gone. Moreover, I think there are great advantages to the various judges, especially those of the Court of Appeal, in having an opportunity, in the discharge of their judicial duties, of going at times on circuit. Our Court of Appeal, owing to the division of the jurisdiction now, does not have the advantages that the judges of the High Court have, and I think that even the judges of the Court of Appeal would profit by having an opportunity at times to go on circuit. It would be a pleasant change, if nothing more, in the discharge of their monotonous duties, to say nothing of that other question, which, I think, ought long since to have been disposed of, namely, the question of remuneration. I dare say that even judges are not above having some little regard to the incidental advantages that perhaps may accrue to them in being obliged to take charge of election petitions. I regret that the Government have not this session seen fit to do what I have pressed on them now for several sessions, namely, to take up the state of the salaries of the judiciary and deal with them in a satisfactory way. It is not becoming of the bench that they should be compelled to have any regard to the incidental advantages, as it were, such as accrue to them from the trial of election petitions. I hope that by next session the Government will be able to bring down a measure to deal with the matter, putting them in a proper position. It is wholly unworthy the dignity of the bench that the condition should continue to be such that yearly now we have the matter under discussion here. I think they ought not to be left in that position any longer, but next session I hope that the matter will be disposed of by the Government satisfactorily. Although it is too late to open up the question of cancelling the old amendment that was made at the last sitting of the Committee, yet I hope, when the Bill is under discussion next session, the Government will have before them good reasons for seeing that they made a mistake in legislating away, even for the future, the jurisdiction of the judges of the Court of Appeal in respect of the trial of election petitions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was not informed when the Bill was going through, and this amendment was made, of the facts one way or the other, to enable me to say whether the amendment was a wise one or not; but it was adopted deliberately by the Committee, discussed on two evenings, and I think it would not be well to go back upon it now. But this may be well worthy of consideration at a future session.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE DOMINION LANDS ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 165) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

(In the Committee.)

On section 5,

Mr. DEWDNEY. I move that the date at which the privilege of obtaining entry under subclauses 6 and 7 of clause 38 of Dominion Lands Act shall be discontinued and placed at 1st January, 1894.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I propose to add the following clause:—

Provided further, that after a homestead has been so recommended for patent, the holder of the pre-emption right may legally dispose of, convey, assign or transfer his right or title in the lands for which he wants a pre-emption entry, and this provision should also apply retrospectively, but shall have no force or effect as respects any land in relation to which the subject-matter of this clause has already been adjudicated upon, or is in adjudication by any court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. LAURIER. Of course, I speak with some diffidence in this matter, because I do not pretend to be as familiar with the legislation of the North-West as hon. gentlemen who come from that portion of the Dominion; but will not the amendment which we have adopted defeat the very object of the law, which, as I understand, was to protect the settler, and to protect him to the extent of making any mortgages which he could give inoperative?

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman will understand that no person is entitled to mortgage his land until such time as he has received recommendation for patent for his homestead quarter section. In a great many instances they want to mortgage both the homestead quarter and the pre-emption quarter. The production of a certificate of recommendation is sufficient evidence to entitle him to mortgage his homestead, but the question has arisen as to the validity of the mortgage on the pre-emption; without legislation giving it legal effect.

Mr. LAURIER. Was not the object of the Act to prevent the settler mortgaging his homestead?

Mr. DALY. No.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DEWDNEY. At the request of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) I beg to move this amendment:

That henceforth, notwithstanding anything in this Act and until the repeal of the provisions in this behalf, the settler may homestead any cancelled quarter section, or cancelled pre-emption, while residing within two miles of said homestead.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I would ask the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), if he feels very strongly in reference to this clause about the water in coulées?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not feel so strongly about it as I do about the second homestead, but I think it should be inserted.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Very well. I beg to move:

Whenever, under this Act, lands are entered for either as a homestead or pre-emption, or sold or otherwise disposed of, and such lands contain or border upon a coulée or ravine, which has been utilized for the purpose of forming a reservoir for the storage of water, or which, in the opinion of the Minister or of the agent or other officer by whom such entry is issued or such sale or disposal is made, is capable of being so utilized to advantage, such entry may be issued or such sale or disposal made subject to the condition that no building shall be erected within a specified distance from the border of such coulée or ravine, and to such other conditions as, under the circumstances of the case, seem desirable with a view to the prevention of the pollution of the water stored in such reservoir; and in every such case any patent issued for such land shall be expressed to be subject to the conditions so imposed.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Bill is reported, I trust that the hon. Minister of Justice will say something about the second homestead clause, because we really had a kind of understanding, though not such as pledged the Minister or the Government, that the matter would be placed in a more satisfactory position.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I certainly did promise that I would state our views upon the question of second homesteads before this Bill should be disposed of. At the time the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) presented his resolution to the House, I took a hostile view of the principle of the resolution; but I specially urged the House to adjourn the discussion of the matter for some time, in consideration of two views. One view, which was put forward not only in the argument of the hon. gentleman, but in petitions which had then just been placed upon the Table, was that there were persons in the list of claimants who had peculiar claims in relation to second homesteads; and the other was that the conceding of the principle involved a very large extent of the public domain, and it was absolutely necessary that we should make a full enquiry into that branch of the subject before asking Parliament to make a change of policy which involved the giving away of such a great amount of territory. The same reasons compel me to say to the House now that the Government desires, until the early part of next session, to complete its investigation of the whole matter—to ascertain, in the first place, what classes of claims have arisen under this clause, for it is said that there are some people who actually intended and expected to secure a second homestead, and made their preparations in view of that state of the law; and there are others, we are informed, who do not desire the concession at all. I believe that if the principle were worked out, as regards all who might possibly make claims, it would involve a concession of upwards of a million acres of land. We desire to investigate what these various classes of claimants are, and what extent of land would be involved in meeting their claims; and we shall be in a position to deal with the matter next session, perhaps as a Government measure. At all events, we shall be in a position to give the House such information as will enable it to deal with the matter with intelligence in the early part of the session.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 126) to amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories.

Mr. DAVIN. I would have moved that these amendments be not agreed to, but I had a conversation with the Hon. Mr. Dewdney, who tells me that certain changes will be made which will, I think, be quite satisfactory to the North-West.

Mr. LAURIER. I would say to the Minister that I have received from the Territory of Saskatchewan a protest that the electoral districts as they are now arranged will not be satisfactory, some being too small and others too large. I stated to my correspondent that I would make the protest, but that I could not do anything more, as I do not profess to be familiar with the localities.

Mr. DAVIN. They are going to be altered.

Amendments concurred in.

SUPPLY—CLAIM OF DAVID PORTER.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MADILL. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few remarks in reference to the claim of a contractor for $1,113 for construction of certain works at Beaverton, on the eastern shore of Lake Simcoe. This lake is 26 miles by 28 miles in extent, is connected with Lake Couchiching, which is 10 by 12 miles in extent, and affords communication with Barrie, 14 miles to the west. By means of these works, Beaverton has communication with other ports around Lake Simcoe and Lake Couchiching, including Jackson's Point, Big Bay Point, Peninsula Point, Roach's Point, Belle Ewart, Barrie, Bradford, Brechin, Atherley, Orillia, Couchiching Park, Longford, and Washago. At one time there was a private wharf at Beaverton which cost some $20,000. This wharf lasted about thirty-five years, and a great deal of business was done there by the Northern Railway and Lake Simcoe, furnishing supplies at that time to various places and as far as Lindsay and Peterborough. This wharf was destroyed by ice jams, and another wharf, costing $18,000, was built by the Midland Railway Company. That wharf was also destroyed. The people of Beaverton, in the desire to re-establish that traffic which had fallen away, petitioned the Government in favour of dredging a channel at Beaverton for the purpose of enabling boats to come to Beaverton. This petition, which was signed unanimously by all parties at Beaverton, asked the Government to make a grant for this purpose, the people of Beaverton agreeing to contribute a certain sum. The channel was inspected by the Government, but it was found that the bottom of the lake was composed of a very hard, coarse, blue clay. The clay was so hard that it would be impossible to dredge out this channel unless a steam dredge was built for that purpose. The engineer, in his report, claimed that it would cost $23,000 to dredge the channel, and he recommended instead the building of a wharf at $8,000, which would answer the same purpose. A by-law was passed by the corporation, almost unanimously, granting $1,500, as their share of this expenditure, and the Government placed a sum in the Estimates for the purpose of constructing this wharf. On Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching some fourteen steam tugs and steam yachts ply, which show that considerable traffic could be done on these lakes, but Beaverton was entirely cut off because it had no wharf. Tenders were called for by the Government, and some twelve or thirteen were received. Mr. David Porter, who was the lowest tenderer, was given the contract. The following tenders were received: Mr. Porter, whose tender amounted to $7,500; John Stewart of Ottawa, $14,800, or $7,300 above the lowest; Tobin & O'Keefe of Ottawa, $12,500, or $5,000 above the lowest; Navin of Lindsay, $12,400, or $4,900 above the lowest; Treleven of Beaverton, $11,770, or $4,270 above the lowest; G. Wilson of Ottawa, $11,400, or $3,900 over the lowest; John Burns of York, $11,490, or $3,900 over the lowest; A. J. Belcher of Peterborough and E. Thompson of Burleigh, $10,570, or $3,020 over the lowest; Smith & Heney of Ottawa, $9,917, or $2,417 over the lowest; H. Walters of Lindsay, $9,832, or $2,332 over the lowest; Robt. Grant of Toronto, $9,603, or $2,103 over the lowest; Chas. Wynn of Peterborough, $8,300, or $800 above the lowest tenderer, and the lowest tender was that of David Porter, who received the contract at $7,500. After it was decided to construct this wharf, instead of dredging the channel of Beaver River, it was considered whether it would be advisable to build this pier on the north side or the south side of the channel. It was decided, before specifications were made out or plans of the work prepared, to have it on the south side, so that the location was not changed, and it was so decided for these reasons: It was ascertained that the heavy storms, during the past two or three years, had come from the south-west portion of the lake, and that it would be better to construct this wharf on the south side of the channel. There was also some difficulty about the right of way on the north side, the title to the land being in litigation, and the dispute only decided at the last assizes. It would have been necessary, had we constructed the wharf on that side, to build a bridge across the river for the benefit of the people on the south side. Again, objection was taken to placing it on the north side on account of the action of the Grand Trunk Railway. A petition was sent to the Grand Trunk Railway asking them to relay the track from Beaverton down to the lake shore, and they refused. Therefore, so far as the reason given for building the wharf on the north side is concerned, connecting with the Grand Trunk Railway, we had the refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway to meet our views in this respect. Then plans and specifications were asked and tenders were received, a list of which I have just given. The only change in the location consisted in turning the extreme end of the wharf out in the lake 50 feet to the north, so as to be parallel to the channel of the river, where there was greater depth of water. The contract price was $7,500. Then it was ascertained, while the wharf was being constructed, that there would not be sufficient wharfage at its extreme limit, and it was necessary to add 50 feet to the embankment and extend the stone work in order to obtain sufficient depth for boats drawing 6½ feet to 7 feet on the lake. The contractor, however, did that work at exactly the same rate as the contract price. Then it was necessary to fill in between the two outside cribs for shelter, which work was extra and cost some $500, but after the work was completed, the whole cost, including these extras and the extension of the wharf some 50 feet, and the filling in of these cribs for the protection of boats, only amounted to $8,349, the extras costing $849, or the whole cost was only $49 above the next lowest tender. The work has still cost some $6,250 less than Stewart's tender; $4,151 less than Tobin & O'Keefe's; $4,051 less than Navan's of Lindsay tender; $3,421 less than Trealeven's; $3,150 less than Wilson's of Ottawa; $3,141 less than Burn's tender; $2,120 less than Belcher & Thompson's; $1,568 less than Smith & Heney's tender; $1,483 less than the original tender of Walters, of Lindsay; $1,254 less than Grant's tender, so that the extra $849, added to the original tender, only made the total cost $49 more than the next lowest tender, without any extras at all; and the work I believe was well done. Good material was supplied, and I am satisfied that the work was fully carried out, according to plans and

specifications. It was taken off the hands of the contractor by the inspector, who said that, if anything, the contractor had done more than he was called upon to do according to the plans and specifications. Then Beaverton itself had given $1,500 towards this work, and appointed a local inspector, who is the reeve of the corporation. He had a double interest. He had an interest, not only as inspector, but also as representing the corporation, and was thoroughly well qualified. He has been a builder all his life, has built tug boats, worked as bridge builder, worked on the Lindsay docks and has had twenty or thirty years' experience in this business. Mr. Grey, the engineer, reported of him that the people had been very fortunate in obtaining the services of so able an inspector. In the engineer's report, it is stated that the bottom of the lake, on which this pier was constructed, is composed of very hard rocky substance. He had inspected it at certain places, and had reported to that effect. However, before the wharf was completed, there was one of the worst storms on Lake Simcoe that had been known for 17 or 18 years, and the cribs broke through with the weight of stone upon them, about two-thirds of the way out, to about a foot deep in the water, and beneath that was sand. That damage has been repaired by the contractor, who stated that he wanted to make a good job whether he made any money or not. The cribs have been replaced and made stronger than ever. He has a claim for extras of about $1,113 for rebuilding these cribs, and I feel satisfied that the job has been a good one and that the contractor has lost money on it already. I think the Government should fairly consider this matter of his extra claim.

Mr. FOSTER. I will bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Public Works, and the remarks of the hon. gentleman, having been placed on record, will be put before the Minister who, I am sure, will pay attention to it. Of course I do not know enough about the department to make any promises, but I have no doubt whatever that right and justice will be done.

Mr. McNEILL. This work has not been constructed in my constituency, and, so far as the work is concerned, I have nothing to do with it, but Mr. Porter is a constituent of mine, and not only so, but he is a very warm political supporter of mine. I do not think he is any the worse for that, nor do I suppose that my hon. friends opposite think he is any the better, but I mention it so that hon. gentlemen may take what I have to say at its value. I would say neither more nor less than I believed to be the fact if Mr. Porter were not a supporter of mine. I know that in some quarters some observations have been made injurious to the reputation of this man in connection with this work, and it is only right for me to say—as I do with all the weight of responsibility which attaches to me speaking in my place in this House— that, if you search this Dominion through and through, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the international boundary as far north as our country goes, you will not find a more deserving contractor than Mr. Porter. He has completed a number of works for the Department of Public Works, and he has not put out of his hands a work that has not been a credit to him and to the department. Not only does he do his work well, but extraordinarily cheaply. That is something which should commend itself to the approval of members of this House. He has constructed works so cheaply as to astound the engineers of the Public Works Department. I may cite a work that he completed at the village near which I live, the village of Wiarton. I would hardly like to mention the figures, but his tender was so extraordinarily low that the engineers of the department believed he must have made a mistake.

Mr. LAURIER. They were not accustomed to that.

Mr. McNEILL. No, they were not accustomed to that, and I think a man who does his work so well and so cheaply should have the support of every hon. member in this House. When it has been suggested outside that Mr. Porter has been favoured by the Government in reference to the work, I may say that I think he has been very hardly treated with regard to it by the department. Mr. Porter tendered for the work and the tenders were opened in November. He succeeded in doing his work so cheaply because he has a practical knowledge of every detail in connection with it. He is a man who made himself. He began as a workingman and has made himself by his honesty, his intelligence and his ability. He has a wonderful faculty for organization, and for seeing every man is doing full work, and yet he is one of the most popular masters of work you can find anywhere. He has succeeded always in doing his work so cheaply by reason of the fact that he does work so quickly. There is no lost time. He knows exactly where everyone should be, and what every man should be doing, and every man is at his place and the work is kept moving on. He tendered in November, when he expected to be able to carry on his work without check or let or hindrance by reason of broken weather. The tenders were opened in the latter end of November, but he could not get his contract, and he told me that he was afraid, as the season was going on, he might not be able to complete the work at the figures. The winter passed on until near the month of February, and he came to me and said: I am afraid to undertake this work at all; and he wrote to the department and asked to be relieved of his contract and to have his deposit returned. The department—I do not know whether they were justified legally in doing so or not—refused to return his deposit, although the two reliable months of the winter when he had depended upon doing his work had passed away and he was forced to go on with it. What he anticipated, occurred. A great thaw came and his roads were flooded and destroyed, and his men were idle. Then this great storm came on and the damage was done. I think he has been harshly dealt with in not being paid extra for the trouble caused by the delays which occurred in the department. Surely a man who has proved himself so valuable in the public interest and has saved this country thousands and thousands of dollars by the contracts he has undertaken, ought to receive some consideration at the hands of the Department of Public Works. I sincerely hope that the Government will take the matter into their consideration. The two months' delay, even supposing these accidents had not occurred, meant the difference to him between profit and loss, and, when these accidents did occur, it meant a very considerable difference. Something has

been said about his using wedges to level up the work. I understand that is the usual way to level up such work, and that he has done the work of levelling according to the requirements of the engineer and has turned it out as a good job, as he does every job that leaves his hands.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) makes a charge against the Government, that they refused either to return the deposit of this contractor or to award the contract to him for two months, and that this delay so altered the circumstances under which he was tendering, that the claim now advanced is the result thereof. Of course, one can understand how, under the circumstances that we have enquired into, such a tenderer as this would not, perhaps, have his tender accepted with a great deal of promptitude, and I regret that the hon. member for North Bruce, therefore, has not at an earlier period of the session been able to discover that the Department of Public Works did not desire to have a cheap and yet efficient tenderer or contractor. That is the conclusion that must be drawn from the charge that is made against the Government. The hon. member for North Bruce has given an excellent character to this contractor. He is a stranger, probably, in the Public Works Department. I hope that he will hereafter be better known.

Mr. McNEILL. He is well known in the Public Works Department.

DISMISSAL OF THE STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the House forms itself into Committee of Supply, I wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General and of the Government to the dismissal of the postmaster at Ste. Angèle, in the County of Rouville. I gave notice to the hon. Postmaster General last week that I would bring this matter before the House, and he then stated that he had no objection. Twice I had an opportunity to do so, but refrained on account of his not being in his seat. Unfortunately, I find again that he is not in the House at this moment; but as this is probably the last time the House will form into Committee of Supply, I think it my duty to bring the matter up to-day. The Government decided to dismiss the postmaster at Ste. Angèle on account of certain irregularities alleged to have taken place in the administration of the post office under his charge. I see that on the 14th of September last, in answer to a question put to the Government asking for the reasons for the dismissal of the postmaster, the hon. Minister said that he had been dismissed on account of a registered letter having been detained too long in the post office, and that owing to this fact the man deserved to be dismissed. It was said, also, that the postmaster had even erased, or altered, the stamp on the letter, so as to show that it had arrived at a different date from that upon which it had in reality reached his office. I must say just here, Mr. Speaker, that this statement of the hon. Postmaster General is not in accordance with the facts. I do not wish to say that this statement was made to the House in bad faith, but I believe that the Postmaster General has been misinformed, and that consequently he should order the post office inspector to make a new investigation. However, on the 17th of September, three days after this answer was given in this House, I wrote to the hon. Postmaster General, making him acquainted with what had happened, offering to prove to him that this postmaster had not committed the offence of which he was accused, and asking at least for an opportunity to establish this. If, in the opinion of the Government, this dismissal must be, I understand that I have not the power to prevent it; but I would like that the true reasons for it be given. I do not want would-be reasons given here, which are not those which actuated the Postmaster General in this dismissal. I, therefore, asked, in my letter to the hon. Postmaster General, that he be pleased to order an investigation. There has been none. According to my information, the post office inspector simply went to Ste. Angèle, where he only conferred with the party who wished the post office for himself, and he made a report unfavourable to the officer. I may say now that Mr. Loiselle, the postmaster in question, went to the post office inspector to ask him if he was charged with any irregularity. The inspector stated to him that there had been certain irregularities in the matter of a letter which left St. Césaire and arrived at Ste. Angèle on the 10th of June, 1890, according to the complainant, but which really only arrived on the 13th of June. The question, then, is, when did this letter arrive at Ste. Angèle? Now, I hold in my hand a certificate from the postmaster at St. Césaire, which establishes that the letter in question was mailed at his office on the 12th of June, 1890, and that it left that office on the 13th of June, 1890. This is the certificate:

"ST. CÉSAIRE, 17th September, 1891.

"I, the undersigned postmaster at St. Césaire, certify that on the 12th of June, 1890, J. O. Demers deposited a letter which was registered under the number 875, for A. Guillet, at Ste. Angèle. This letter was mailed on the 13th of June, 1890, by way of Montreal.

"C. PEPIN,

"*Postmaster.*"

Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened after this? I see by the affidavit which I hold in my hand that this letter arrived at Ste. Angèle on the evening of the same day, that is to say, on the 13th of June, 1890. On that day the person to whom it was addressed did not come to the post office. He sent another person, one of his employés, I believe; but as the latter had no power to take out a registered letter belonging to Mr. Guillet, the postmaster, or the party representing him, told this employé, a man by the name of Lavallée, to tell his employer to come and get his registered letter. Mr. Guillet did not come that day nor the day after. Two days later, on the 15th of June, the wife of the postmaster, seeing that Mr. Guillet was not coming for his letter, went herself to his place to tell him to come and get it. Unfortunately, Mr. Guillet was not at home, and she notified his son, who immediately started to go and tell their father that there was a registered letter for him at the post office. This gentleman did not come on the 15th. But on the morning of the 16th, when Mr. Guillet was passing in front of the post office, he was notified by the postmaster himself that he had a registered letter, and a few minutes afterwards he came in and gave a receipt for it. Here is a solemn declaration of Madame Loiselle, which fully corroborates this statement of the facts:

"I, Célina Cadieux, wife of B. Loiselle, assistant at the post office of Ste. Angèle de Monnoir, solemnly declare: That on the 13th of June, 1890, I was at the post office between six and seven o'clock in the evening when the mail came. There was also present J. E. Boulais, assistant. It was I and J. E. Boulais who arranged the letters and papers, but it was J. E. Boulais who saw to the registered letters. There was one addressed to A. Guillet and it was J. E. Boulais who entered it in the book. I saw to the distribution of the papers and other letters. It was a Mr. Lavallée who asked for Mr. Guillet's newspapers, and I told him then to tell Mr. Guillet that he had a registered letter. In the evening, towards nine o'clock, when my husband arrived, he asked me if I had sent word to Mr. Guillet that he had a registered letter. I answered: 'Yes; I sent him word by Mr. Lavallée.' On the morrow, Saturday, the 14th of June, when I saw that Mr. Guillet did not come to get his letter, I thought he was absent, and on Sunday afternoon, seeing that Mr. Guillet had not come after mass, I went to his house about three o'clock. When I arrived his two little boys were near the house, and I asked them if their father was in. They answered me, 'No.' They said, 'We can fetch him; he is not far.' I said to them, 'It is not necessary; I wanted to tell him that he has a registered letter in the post office. I had asked Mr. Lavallée to let him know.' They replied, 'Lavallée may have forgotten to tell him,' and adding, 'We will go and tell him,' started away running.

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, under the Act passed in the thirty-seventh year of the reign of Her Majesty, called an Act for the suppression of voluntary and extra-judicial oaths. And I, the said deponent, signed this nineteenth day of September, eighteen hundred and ninety-one.

(Signed) "CÉLINA CADIEUX.

"Taken and attested at Ste. Marie de Monnoir, this nineteenth day of September, eighteen hundred and ninety-one, before me, the undersigned justice of the peace.

(Signed) "DAMASE BOULAIS, *J.P.*"

This affidavit is corroborated by that of Mr. J. E. Boulais, which reads as follows:—

"I, J. E. Boulais, assistant in the post office of Ste. Angèle de Monnoir, solemnly declare that on the 13th of June, 1890, I was at the post office in the evening, at the arrival of the mail. There was also Madame Célina Cadieux, wife of B. Loiselle, and assistant in the post office. It is I who entered in the book the registered letter for Mr. A. Guillet. It was a letter that came from St. Césaire, and was stamped 13th June, 1890, as shown by the book. I was present, and heard Madame Célina Cadieux bid Mr. Lavallée tell Mr. Guillet that he had a registered letter.

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, under the Act passed in the thirty-seventh year of the reign of Her Majesty, called an Act for the suppression of voluntary and extra-judicial oaths, and I, the said deponent, signed this nineteenth day of September, eighteen hundred and ninety-one.

(Signed) "J. E. BOULAIS.

"Taken and attested at Ste. Marie de Monnoir, this nineteenth day of September, eighteen hundred and ninety-one, before me, the undersigned justice of the peace.

(Signed) "DAMASE BOULAIS, *J.P.*"

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also have the affidavit of the postmaster himself, which reads as follows:—

"I, the undersigned, B. Loiselle, postmaster at Ste. Angèle de Monnoir, solemnly declare that on the 13th of June, 1890, there arrived at the Ste. Angèle post office a registered letter addressed to Mr. A. Guillet; that there were on that evening at the post office for opening the bag and delivering the papers and letters, Madame Célina Cadieux, my wife and assistant in the office, and J. E. Boulais, also a post office assistant;

"That I arrived that night after the close of the post office, and that having gone in to see my letters and papers I saw, in the book of registered letters, that there was a registered letter for Mr. A. Guillet, of Ste. Angèle, coming from St. Césaire, and bearing the date 13th of June, 1890; seeing that the Ste. Angèle stamp was not well printed, as the figure 13 could hardly be seen, I took a pen and re-wrote the figure.

Mr. BRODEUR.

"I then asked my wife if Mr. Guillet had come to the post office. She said 'No; but I sent word to him by Mr. Lavallée that there was a registered letter for him.'

"This took place on the evening of 13th June, 1890. The next day, Saturday, the 14th, Mr. Guillet did not come to get his letter, and I thought he was away. On Sunday, after mass, he still did not come. Then on Monday morning as he was passing by the post office, going to church, where he was going to sing at a high mass, I said to him: 'Mr. Guillet, you have had a registered letter here for a couple of days; won't you come and get it?' And he answered, 'I will stop and get it after mass.'

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, under the Act passed in the thirty-seventh year of the reign of Her Majesty, called an Act for the suppression of voluntary and extra-judicial oaths. And I, the said dependent, signed this nineteenth day of September, eighteen hundred and ninety-one.

(Signed) "B. LOISELLE, *P.M.*

"Taken and attested at Ste. Marie de Monnoir, this nineteenth day of September, eighteen hundred and ninety-one, before me, the undersigned justice of the peace.

(Signed) "DAMASE BOULAIS, *J.P.*"

I must say that these facts show conclusively that far from being negligent in the discharge of his duties, this postmaster did even more than he was bound to do, for it certainly cannot be contended that the postmasters are obliged to run after people to beg them to come and get their letters. It is the business of the people to do so. In this case the postmaster receives a registered letter; he sends word to the person to whom it is directed; he even takes the pains to send to his house to let him know; he stops him on the street to tell him himself, and it is now claimed that this postmaster has not done his duty as he ought to, and that this is the reason why he was dismissed. Well, the reason he was dismissed is not for having kept a letter a day or two, but solely because he is a Liberal—because of his political opinions. That is the only reason; for it is seen by the certificate itself of the post office from which this letter started that it was sent on the same day that it appears to have been entered in the post office book at Ste. Angèle de Monnoir. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the Postmaster General has not thought fit to answer the letter which I sent him on the 17th of September last, asking for an investigation of this matter. It seems to me that when one has the audacity to come before the House and before the country and accuse a man of having committed what might be called a forgery, if this man asks for an investigation, when none has been made it would only be justice on the part of the Government to grant the desired investigation, if the Government is suspectible of doing justice. But I understand, Mr. Speaker, what there is at the bottom of that question. My opponent in the last election, Mr. Gigault, wants to revenge himself upon this postmaster for his conduct during the last election, by taking away from him the little salary of $40 or $50 a year which goes with this office. This man does not depend upon this salary to live; he is rich enough without it. But if it is the will of some that he should lose his office, he does not want to lose it under the cloud of accusations brought against him as postmaster. I hope that the Government will have enough courage and heart to grant the investigation, which is asked for. I say that this dismissal has been made for a purely political object, and I prove it by the declaration of Mr. Loiselle, who, after having received notice

of his dismissal, went to see the inspector, to learn the reason for it. Here is this declaration:

"I, Bénoni Loiselle, *bourgeois* and postmaster for the parish of Ste. Angèle, in the County of Rouville, solemnly declare as follows:—

"That on the 4th of September, 1891, after having received a letter from Mr. King, post office inspector, to the effect that the Postmaster General had considered it expedient to repeal my appointment as postmaster, I went to see the said Mr. King to learn the reasons for this repeal.

"That then and there the said Mr. King told me that the only reason why I had been dismissed was that a postmaster was wanted who would not meddle with politics.

"That I have always been a follower of the Liberal party, and that the person designated as my successor is the chief of the Conservative party in the parish.

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, and under the Act for the suppression of voluntary and extra-judicial oaths, and I sign.

"B. LOISELLE.

"Taken and attested before me, at Montreal, on the 21st of September, 1891.

"R. DANDURAND, *J.P.*, P.Q."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that after this declaration, which positively affirms what I stated, it is evident that the Government has only made this dismissal at the demand of Mr. Gigault. There is a not unimportant detail in the affair: this letter came from Mr. Gigault's post office; it was mailed by Mr. Gigault's partner, and was probably a trap through which Mr. Gigault hoped to lead the postmaster into some irregularity. Unluckily for him, the facts establish beyond all doubt that there was no irregularity, and that the position taken by the Government and its friend, Mr. Gigault, show that they do not want to do justice to the postmaster, but intrench themselves behind what I will not call a lie, but certainly something not absolutely true, to deny justice to this postmaster. So, I hope that the Government will have heart and courage enough, and energy enough, to give this postmaster the opportunity of substantiating the evidence he offers. If they do not do it, I will be obliged to say that the Government, through its Postmaster General, did not tell all the truth in the statement made the other day before the House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have not had the advantage of being present at the beginning of the remarks of my hon. friend, the member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur), but I understand from information which I am given, that he complains of the dismissal of the Ste. Angèle postmaster. Am I right?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Undoubtedly.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) This postmaster was dismissed, as was stated by the hon. Postmaster General, for two reasons—the first, because he had made of his office, during the elections, a place of political meetings.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) The Postmaster General has not stated that. I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) One of the facts brought to the knowledge of the Postmaster General was that Mr. Loiselle had made his post office a place of public meetings. There is no doubt as to the rule established by the Government that a public employé must not be dismissed from his duties for his political opinions, only provided that in the exercise of his rights as elector he does not neglect his duties of Government employé. But, Mr. Speaker, a nother reason was given by the Postmaster General. It is that Loiselle was found guilty of irregularities in the exercise of his duties. I do not want to discuss this point, not having at my disposal the departmental fyle. But I know, and affirm this much, the Ste. Angèle postmaster, during the election, received a letter which was to be delivered to someone in the parish of Ste. Angèle.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) It was in 1890 that it took place, not during the last election.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) I do not know when it took place; the date is not material. Let it be 1890 or 1891. I speak of a fact which I gathered from the documents. A letter had been sent from a neighbouring parish to a citizen of the parish of Ste. Angèle. The letter should have been delivered upon the day of its arrival. It contained instructions for election work, given by one of the election agents. The person to whom the letter was addressed had been informed that this document would be sent on that day. He applied to the post office, and was answered that the letter had not come. He was refused the letter. He was made to wait two, if not three, days. I am positive, because I remember having seen the documents. I will call attention to the fact that this post office is not one where the multiplicity of business can cause such mistakes. The letter was not delivered. The person to whom it was addressed made enquiries, and learned that the letter had been mailed on such a day. He asked for the letter and it was not delivered. When it was delivered it was found that the post office stamp showed that the letter had only arrived the day it was delivered. Yet it ought to have been stamped the day it arrived. The postmaster had stamped it on the day he delivered it, to make believe and to be able to prove, if need be, before a court, that the letter had only arrived on that day.

Mr. BÉCHARD. (Translation.) What proof is there to the contrary?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) I am coming to that, and I am sure that my hon. friend will be of my opinion. Was the postmaster not aware that he would be accused? I do not know. But on the day that the letter was delivered a correction was made with the pen, changing the date of the stamp of the post office from which the letter had come, and substituting the date of the letter's arrival at Ste. Angèle—that is to say, two or three days before he delivered this letter. In a court of justice, before a tribunal, the circumstantial evidence would be held absolute; for, it being certain that the letter had arrived on a certain day, the fact that on the envelope the printed stamp was changed so as to substitute the date on which the letter was received is evidence of irregularity somewhere. At the time of delivery the office stamp was on the envelope, and the postmaster turned away with the letter which he was to deliver, and changed the first date with a pen. When the person to whom the letter was addressed received it, he said to the postmaster: "How is it this letter bears the stamp of such a date, and has been received two days ago?" The postmaster answered: "The letter was received on the date it bears."

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Must I understand that this took place during the last election, or that of 1890?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) I could not say whether it was during the last election or that which preceded it. I do not remember. I was under the impression that it took place during the election of 1891. But it may have been during that of 1890.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) According to my information, it was during the local election of 1890 that the affair took place.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

West Farnham Post Office $4,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Did I understand the Minister to say he would drop that?

Mr. FOSTER. That?

Mr. McMULLEN. I thought you made some remark in regard to that item.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say anything.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not wish to detain the Committee, but I simply move that the item be struck out.

Mr. SPROULE. I think, after the debate we had last Saturday night, it is too bad for the hon member for North Wellington to commence his tactics again. Certainly there were very clear grounds given for the erection of that post office, whether the place is small or large. In the first place, there is no good accommodation in the public building there, and no fit place can be had without paying an extra price for it. In the next place, the town is rapidly growing and is becoming a very important place, and I do not think it is unreasonable that a post office should be erected there.

Mr. LAURIER. I think this question has been sufficiently debated. Although, in my opinion, it is an item which cannot be justified in any way, we will not carry the discussion of it any further.

Ontario—Picton Post office, Custom-house, &c... ....$5,000

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. Minister explain what the proposed scheme is?

Mr. FOSTER. The scheme is to build a new public building which shall do for a post office, Custom-house, Inland Revenue office, and so on. The work was called for by the Town Council of Picton by a resolution carried on the 20th June, 1887, a copy of which was submitted to the Postmaster General, and another one to the Minister of Customs. The postal revenue collected at this office is $5,020.

Mr. MULOCK. Have you bought the land?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the estimated cost of the site and building?

Mr. FOSTER. There is no estimate of the cost of the site. It is not proposed to build an expensive building.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this $5,000 based upon any data at all? Have you any definite scheme in view?

Mr. FOSTER. The scheme in view is this, that we ask Parliament for $5,000 to make arrangements for the location and purchase of a site. This money will purchase the site and give us something towards preparing plans, and the like of that.

Mr. MULOCK. Don't you think that before we take the initial step of putting $5,000 into a scheme, there should be laid before Parliament some estimate as to the total expenditure you are likely to be led into?

Mr. FOSTER. It might be valuable. My hon. friend will see that before very much is done Parliament will have to be drawn upon for another vote.

Mr. MULOCK. I don't think this is a fair way to deal with Parliament. I do not want to take any captious objection, but I do not call it fair, and not being fair, I do not think it is honest. Before we embark in an enterprise of this kind, an intelligent statement should be laid before the House as to the probable expenditure. The officers of the department have been engaged in drawing plans of a similar character all over the Dominion, and they should be able, from mere sketches, to estimate the probable cost. This system of commencing buildings without knowing the probable cost, should terminate. It is not fair. If this Government want to recover public confidence, they should proceed in a business-like way with this proposed undertaking, and the interests of the country should be first considered. To come down in the Supplementary Estimates with an item of $5,000, in connection with an enterprise, without informing the House what the total cost should be, is not a proper way to deal with the public exchequer. I submit there should be more information given. If the Minister does not propose to reply to these observations I should like to know it.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will deal in a decent way with this side of the House, we will do so. The hon. gentleman made the assertion that it is not honest. He has no right to throw such an assertion across the floor.

Mr. MULOCK. I said that to ask Parliament to vote $5,000 without stating what the total building would probably cost, was not a fair way to deal with the public funds, and not being a fair way, it is not an honest way. I did not say that the Minister was not honest. He must not make an accusation against himself, unless he knows it is well founded. It is not an honest way to deal with the matter. I repeat that, without desiring to take any captious objection, before we enter into an expenditure of this kind, which may involve a large sum, we should know the probable expenditure.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has accused the Government of not replying to his remarks. He scarcely gave us time to do so. The Minister of Finance was discussing with me at that moment what I thought the probable cost of a building would be in that locality, and whether $5,000 would be sufficient to purchase a site. I told him it was more than would be required to purchase a site, and what my hon. friend was going to inform the hon. gentleman was that the Government would not enter into a contract for the construction of a building until they knew the

cost. If he had not been so impetuous, he would have got that answer.

Mr. MULOCK. The purchase of a site is one thing, and the estimate of the building is another.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman would have taken what I told him without flying off the handle so quickly, there would not have been necessity for this discussion. We have $5,000 in these Estimates, which will be sufficient to buy a site and defray the initial expenses, and before we proceed with the building we propose to come to Parliament and ask a vote. If the hon. gentleman has such a poor opinion of the Goverment as not to consider it desirable to place in their hands $5,000 to meet the cost of site and initial expenses, he must keep that opinion.

Mr. MULOCK. Five thousand dollars does not in any way indicate the cost into which the country will be ultimately led. Before we commence, we should have a reasonable presentation of the case, and should be informed within reasonable limit as to the probable total expenditure. The department has been engaged on buildings of this kind in various parts of the Dominion, and there is no great mystery about that matter. The departmental officers should have very little trouble in informing the Minister as to about the total cost of such a building as this town will require. That information should be given to this House before we proceed with this item, because we have seen how expenditure has grown from small sums to large sums in connection with local public works. The Minister has not in the slightest degree improved his position. He says we now propose to get Parliament committed to this enterprise, at all events to the extent of $5,000, and yet we have not the faintest idea how much the building will cost. I submit this is not fair. The Minister of Finance may, if he will, take offence at a criticism, but that will not in the slightest degree cause any member to neglect his duty and fail to ascertain before beginning this undertaking, what the total cost will be. Anyone who enters on the building of a house without first counting the cost is always described as a most improvident person.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) does not comprehend the whole circumstances, or he would know why the vote was asked. The County of Prince Edward has returned a member to support the Government, and there is a protest against his election. Should the protest be successful, this gentleman will then be able to say that there is a vote of $5,000 for a post office, and if the constituency elects him, it will be built. The Minister of Finance is not in a position to give the slightest idea as to where it is going to be built, its size, dimensions or material. But all these particulars are not necessary. There is no certainty that anything of the kind will be wanted, because the erection of the building depends entirely upon the return of a Conservative member for the county. If a Government supporter is sent, the construction may go forward; if not, no plans would be wanted, no site would be required and nothing else will be needed, and the vote will lapse. Consequently, the Government are not in a position to give any information. This case is on a par with that of the post office at Perth. The hon. gentlemen opposite found fault with my hon. friend for the course he adopted in making his criticism. I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen opposite have the face to come before this Committee in violation of a resolution passed unanimously by this House that such a proposition as this should not be proceeded with until those towns with the largest annual receipts have first secured post offices. Picton is entitled to a post office, and I should be glad to see it furnished with one. It is an old and respectable town. But I am afraid the Government is not going to build a post office, because they are not in position to give the Committee any information regarding it. They are now taking a vote for a site. They will peddle the site round during the coming election, and if they are not successful they will come back and say we do not want a site.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. MULOCK. No; more information is required. I move the matter be reconsidered.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I propose to ask a few more questions.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this item carried or not?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It has been carried.

Mr. MULOCK. I move the matter be reconsidered. The reason I move it is this: I should like to ask the Minister how it comes that, if this action of to-day is based on a resolution of the town council four years ago, the Minister only acted on that resolution at the last moment in 1891. How has it become so urgent just now?

Mr. McMULLEN. I second the motion.

Napanee Post Office, Custom-house, &c.—Balance due, superintending architect	$ 963 65

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. Chairman, we have had a statement from the Minister of Public Works this session that the Napanee post office had been paid for in full and finished. That statement is published in *Hansard*, and I should like to know how it comes now that this extra charge should be asked for?

Mr. FOSTER. This money is to provide for the amount which the chief architect states is due to the superintending architect of the Napanee building. The building is paid for, and this is only a balance due to the superintending architect.

Mr. LAURIER. Who is that architect?

Mr. FOSTER. F. Barnett.

Mr. LAURIER. Is he an employé of the department?

Mr. FOSTER. He is not.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was paid this architect?

Mr. FOSTER. 3½ per cent. on the cost of the building.

Mr. MULOCK. Did he prepare the plans for the work in the first place?

Mr. FOSTER. He prepared the detailed plans; he is the superintending architect. The department itself prepared the plans.

Mr. MULOCK. Was there, in addition to the superintending architect, a clerk of works?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the hon. gentleman say how much was paid to the clerk of works?

Mr. FOSTER. $75 per month.

Mr. MULOCK. For how many months was he paid?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not that information here.

Mr. ALLISON. Was there any claim made for this amount previous to this session?

Mr. FOSTER. No; the superintending architect has been at work ever since the plans were made and sent to the builder, and the arrangement with him was, that he should be paid 3½ per cent. of the cost of the building, which amounted to $1,515; $550 has been paid him, leaving $965 due on these buildings. There is always a superintending architect and a clerk of works. Their department is not the same, and both of them must be competent men.

Mr. MULOCK. I think I would not be in error in saying that this building was in course of construction for at least three years, and that the clerk of works was paid during that time.

Mr. ALLISON. When was this building completed?

Mr. FOSTER. It must have been completed in 1890.

Mr. ALLISON. Was this architect's claim sent in to the Government before this meeting of Parliament?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. It is not a new claim?

Mr. FOSTER. No; this is wages due to the superintending architect of the building who was paid, not by salary, but on the percentage of the cost. It is not a new thing at all, and it is the same in the case of all the large public buildings throughout the Dominion.

Mr. ALLISON. But his services are not required when the building is finished?

Mr. FOSTER. And no wages are paid him after the building is finished. I tried to inform my hon. friend that the superintending architect is paid by a percentage and not by salary. When the work is completed, the total cost is known and then you know what to pay the architect.

Mr. BARRON. I am informed that in the case of the Lindsay and Peterborough buildings there was no architect. There was simply a clerk of works in charge, and if that is so I cannot see why you should have a superintending architect in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend must be wrong in that. I base my information simply on what I find in going through the Estimates here and the explanations of them. In the case of all these large public buildings there is an estimate for a clerk of works and a superintending architect as well.

Mr. BARRON. I understand in this case you have a superintending architect and a clerk of works besides. In the case of the Lindsay public building you had a clerk of works and no local architect, as the clerk of works was a Government official?

Mr. FOSTER. That might be.

Mr. BARRON. But in this case you have an architect outside of the Government officials?

Mr. FOSTER. It might be impossible to have a Government official at every one of these places. There was an architect at Lindsay, but the work there was done by one of the officers here who went up from time to time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who was the architect at Napanee?

Mr. FOSTER. Barnett.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because I had the pleasure of inspecting the other day at Napanee a piece of work in the shape of two or three steps for which $57 was charged. I have had a good deal of building of my own done at various times, and I would consider myself very much overcharged, if I had been required to pay $10 for that work. If this is an example of this architect's charges, not only should this vote not be passed, but he should be sued for as gross and deliberate a fraud as was ever perpetrated.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend speaks inadvisably.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I speak with knowledge obtained on the spot. This job was shown to me; and the Auditor General's Report is there also.

Mr. FOSTER. We have superior information, because, while my hon. friend was away visiting, we had an investigation here before the Public Accounts Committee, where his hon. colleague from Wellington put a number of persons through their facings on the subject of that account; and it turns out that the $57 for those steps came to be paid in this way. In the first place, there was a miscalculation in regard to the steps, which was no fault of the architect, but was due to the grading of the street. A larger number of steps were planned for than were necessary——

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Just one.

Mr. FOSTER,—and they had to be remodelled. There is also a fine granolithic step on the sidewalk which cost quite an amount of money. When you add these together, and allow a fair profit, you will see how the amount is made up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then all I can say is that a more blundering piece of botch work was never perpetrated; and what is there is not worth more than $10.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. gentleman says that I am right—that at Lindsay the architect was a Government official, who did not receive any more than his regular pay. If that was the case at Lindsay and at Peterborough, I would like to know from the Minister why in the single case of Napanee, in the construction of a post office which has cost an enormous amount of money, and which, notwithstanding what the Minister has said, is reeking with fraud, an architect was specially employed to do work which the officers of the department are supposed to do. There must be some reason for the exception in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it is impossible to have sufficient men in the department here, without keeping a very large permanent staff, to attend to all these buildings. A large number of works are going on in different parts of the Dominion, and it is not possible to multiply our officials so that they can attend to them all. A reasonable-minded man would take that into account. The

hon. gentleman made an assertion which he had no right to make: he said that the building at Napanee was reeking with fraud. Upon what ground does the hon. gentleman base that assertion? He had this matter before the Public Accounts Committee, and examined witnesses there in regard to it, and not only was no fraud proven, but on the contrary certain leads which it was thought would show fraud were proved to have been deceptive. You may say, if you like, that the cost has been extravagant, but to say that the work was reeking with fraud, when no fraud has been shown, is to go beyond the record. My hon. friend must not get into the habit of making an assertion as proved when he has had every opportunity to prove it, and no proof has been given.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It strikes me that another explanation may be given of this matter. The probability is that there was an architect in the town of Napanee who was a supporter of the Government, and they wanted to do him some favour. In the town of Lindsay I fancy there was no Conservative architect, and there was no necessity of employing a local architect, so that the work was done under the Government. I fancy that is the explanation that ought to be given.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not appear on the record.

Mr. BARRON. Notwithstanding what the Minister says, I am not in the habit of making statements unless I believe them to be true. Although this matter has been partially investigated, with perhaps a very satisfactory result to the hon. Minister, he will probably find next session that it may not be quite so satisfactory.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you should wait until next session

Mr. BARRON. I am warning the hon. gentleman what he may expect. The mere fact that this building cost $48,000. without the steps, I think, is sufficient justification of what I have said, apart from the fact that the hon. gentleman has another session before him, when it will be proved that these statements are true.

Kingston Military College—New dormitory (revote, $8,000)..... $15,000

Mr. MULOCK. Is the residental part of the institution self-sustaining?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell that. My hon. friend has heard this subject discussed. It has been very strongly urged by hon. gentlemen about these boards, and by the Minister as well, that the sleeping and residence accommodation is not at all equal to the teaching capacity of the college, and it is thought best to take this vote to build a dormitory which will accommodate a large number of pupils. This will also effect a saving, because, by accommodating fifteen or twenty more pupils, we shall receive a corresponding increase in the fees, which, as the hon. gentleman knows, are now large; and the same teaching staff can take care of twenty more pupils as well as of the smaller number.

Mr. MULOCK. We must draw a distinction between cheap education and cheap boarding at residental institutions. I am not depreciating the school, but when supplying dormitory accommodation for the pupils, we should see that the residence is self-sustaining. We ought to know what returns it is giving us. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can give us that information.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not able to give that information. Of course, a detailed statement of both expenditures and receipts will be found in the Auditor General's Report each year.

Mr. MULOCK. Does that show the course fees?

Mr. FOSTER. It shows the fees.

Mr. MULOCK. Does it show what is paid each individual.

Mr. FOSTER. Whether it goes into all the details, and divides them under different heads, I do not know.

Mr. MULOCK. When buildings are owned by the Dominion and used for these purposes, they have to be kept in repair and become a continuous source of expenditure. I think the fees collected from the students for residence should be sufficient to cover all the expenditures of residence, including the maintenance of the building. Perhaps we would not ask for anything as return for the capital invested, but there ought to be sufficient received to keep the building in repair.

Mr. FOSTER. In B—250 of the Auditor General's Report, you will find the whole of the expenditures.

Peterborough Custom-house—including vault accommodation for Customs andInland revenue purposes (revote)..... $9,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Have the Government a resident superintendent of this work at Peterborough?

Mr. FOSTER. There is a resident architect.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this the final estimate for the completion of this building?

Mr. FOSTER. The total amount expended up to 31st December, 1890, was $5,951. That was the cost of the site. Then the amount of the contract for the erection of the building was $13,487; fittings and furniture, $2,000; heating, $1,500; fireproof vault and burglar-proof vaults, $2,000; fencing and footpaths, $2,500; architect, $1,000; clerk of works, $1,500; incidental expenses, $30,938. Up to 3rd June, 1891, there was expended $10,938. In the Estimates is a grant of $6,000 and this grant of $9,000, making a total of $25,938, leaving $5,000 to complete.

Mr. BARRON. From whom was the site purchased?

Mr. FOSTER. From E. Phelan.

Mr. BARRON. That is $30,000, not one cent of which need have been spent, if the hon. gentleman had pursued the proper policy, and, as in other places, combined the post office and Custom-house in the one building. It was the original intention of the Government to have done so, but a gentleman who owned a site of land expected to sell it, and he interested some of his friends, and they came to Ottawa and got the Government to buy this particular site. In the meantime, another gentleman interested in another site came to Ottawa. There were two applicants knocking at the door of the treasury, both wanting their sites purchased. The Government, in order not to disappoint their

followers, spent $30,000, not one cent of which need have been spent if the hon. gentleman had backbone enough to refuse to buy the other site, which the Government never intended to buy in the first instance. But, because the Government had not sufficient courage to resist the importunities of gentlemen having sites to sell, the people of Canada have to pay unnecessarily $30,000. Had the Government pursued the same policy followed in other places, of combining the post office and the Custom house in one building, the one site and building would have been sufficient; but as they would not offend either one of these parties, they bought from both. The expenditure is estimated at $30,000, but if we are to judge the future by the past, it will be more like $60,000 by the time they get through, and all this useless expenditure is caused because they dare not refuse the man who came down and threatened to withdraw his support if they did not buy his site.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you stake your reputation on that assertion?

Mr. BARRON. I believe it to be true, and my information is that it is true. Having been compelled to buy both sites, they felt bound to put up two buildings, when one would have sufficed. Will the hon. gentleman stake his reputation that that is not true? Will he say there were not two parties wanting the Government to buy their respective sites, and that they did so, and put up two buildings, when it was their intention to have bought only one and constructed the one building, the Custom-house and post office? I say the Minister of Finance dare not risk his reputation so far as to state that what I say is not correct. My information is most reliable, that there were two different syndicates formed which came down to Ottawa, and these Conservatives were threatening the Government that they must not buy the property of the other syndicate; so, in order to let themselves out of their difficulty, the Government, not having sufficient backbone, bought both sites and put up two buildings, when they intended originally to put up only one.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is going to be the result of all this folly? There will be two sets of officials instead of one. That will be the result of the folly of having two buildings instead of one.

Mr. MULOCK. Were the plans for this building prepared in Ottawa?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I am surprised at the expenditure on architect's fees and clerk of works. The hon. gentleman has told us that the contract price is $13,487; fittings, $2,000—I do not know whether the architect gets a commission on that, but I will give him credit for it—heating $1,500, vaults $2,000, fencing $2,500, making a total of $21,487. But the plans were prepared at Ottawa, and yet he is giving the architect $1,000 in connection with carrying out the works, or 4½ per cent. on the total amount. If the preparation of plans is valued as has been represented, you have allowed the architect twice as much as you ought. Then the clerk of works would have nothing to do except possibly with the carrying out of the plans and the fencing, and you have allowed him about 10 per cent. on the expenditure. That seems to be a very extravagant way of erecting public buildings, and no private person would act in this way. Will the Minister state how it is that so much money is thrown away in these items?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not a practical builder, but I suppose the Department of Public Works and their officers go practically to work. The clerk of works has to be there every day from the time the work commences until it is over. The duties of the superintending architect are to see that the building is constructed according to the plans, and he has to make frequent visits. My hon. friend makes a computation as to the payment of the clerk of works on a percentage. If that officer is competent, he must be paid a fair wage, and I do not think $75 a month is too much.

Mr. MULOCK. I should think a work of this kind could be carried through in one season, but from the amount asked for it must take two years to build it.

Mr. FOSTER. He had only one year.

Mr. MULOCK. But you allow the clerk of works $1,500 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. He is paid $75 a month. The amount of $1,500 is only an estimate, and it is the same in regard to the architect.

Mr. MULOCK. Then you have not paid this out yet?

Mr. FOSTER. No, and it may not amount to this.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, when it is found that $1,500 has been paid to the clerk of works and $1,000 paid to the architect to supervise the construction of this work, when the plans were prepared by the Government architect at Ottawa, the transactions will be open to criticism.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and I understand my hon. friend will leave that over till next year.

Mr. BARRON. What is the name of the resident architect?

Mr. FOSTER. Belcher.

Mr. McMILLAN. What is the duty of a clerk of works when there is an architect there?

Mr. FOSTER. The clerk of the works has to see that every stone and brick is put in properly, and certainly that is not the duty of the architect.

Regina Court House, Land Office and Registry Office..... $10,000

Mr. MULOCK. Does that represent the total cost?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the total cost will be about double this. At present the court is held in a building which is owned jointly by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government, and the expenses in the way of rental and so forth amount to, at any rate, $2,000 a year. It was found necessary to construct new land registry offices in Regina, and, looking at the whole position of affairs, it was found better to use the present building for a registry office and build a new one for the court house.

Lethbridge Custom-house and court house $7,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is a new vote to make provision towards the erection of a building to be used as a Custom-house and court house, the site

being furnished free. The total cost will be about $20,000.

North-West Council Chamber, Government offices, Regina—heating apparatus $4,500

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that Regina is getting a considerable amount of expenditure this season. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia is getting well rewarded. It is going to cost the country a good deal to buy off men at such prices.

Medicine Hat Immigrant Building—alterations required to provide Court house and Police accommodation.. $1,000

Mr. TROW. I would ask the Minister if the Government intend to put up immigration buildings also in Moosomin, Edmonton and Prince Albert? I would like to know the necessity of three immigration buildings at these remote localities where there will be no immigrants worth speaking of at either place. There may be at Medicine Hat, because there is a building there already.

Mr. FOSTER. This is for alterations and repairs required in the immigrant building at Medicine Hat, according to the estimate of the chief architect, to provide the court house accommodation and North-West Police quarters called for by the Department of Justice in the communication of 2nd December, 1890. The immigrant building at Medicine Hat is a three-story wooden building, with a one-story kitchen annexed. It is proposed to sub-divide the ground floor so as to provide quarters for male and female immigrants, with two cells and a police office, besides separate entrances to the court room. On the upper floor there will be a court room, rooms for the judge and barristers, and police quarters, consisting of barrack room, mess room, sergeant's room, wash room and kitchen.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how many immigrants got off at this station last year; because I suppose this is considered the distributing point from the railway station for immigrants going into the western portion of the territories? It is very desirable to know what number of immigrants got off at that station with a view of seeking settlement in the surrounding country.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This building was erected to accommodate the neighbourhood of Medicine Hat. I do not know how many immigrants came in last year. Quite a number of German immigrants came and settled in the neighbourhood of Dunmore. They have not been as successful as we hoped, and a good many are moving further west. The building, after it was originally constructed, was found too large for the immigration in that locality. There were three or four immigration buildings of that size erected, one at Qu'Appelle Station, one at Medicine Hat, one at Calgary. The one at Qu'Appelle Station is also used as a court house, and for a few mounted police.

Mr. TROW. I think if it was properly named it will be called a poor house, or a place for indigent persons to remain a certain time until they recuperate so they could move onward. Evidently it cannot be intended for settlers in that locality. It might be an advantage to the Galt Mine at Lethbridge, or some miners when they want to rest for a week or two.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend is quite mistaken as to the character of the country. He speaks of the place being used as a rest for indigent persons. Now, I know that country well around Medicine Hat and Dunmore, and better places for ranching or for mixed farming you cannot find in the whole North-West. If my hon. friend knows it as well as he professes at times to know the North-West, he must know that what I say is true. But what we complain of in the North-West is this: that nearly half the House do not believe in the North-West, nearly half in the House do not realize what the North-West is going to be, nearly half the House is not acquainted with this fact, and I doubt if many in the whole House are acquainted with this fact, that the amount of money we get is wholly inadequate as compared with our population. We are entitled to about $200,000 more than we get. The moment that $1,000 for a post office or $1,000 for something else is required, here are hon. gentlemen getting up, on the Opposition side, and throwing some of their moles in regard to the North-West. We always expect the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to object. He is what the French would call, speaking from a *cuisine* point of view, a *pièce de résistance* in this matter; he is an eternal joint, he is always there. But really, Mr. Chairman, it is almost provoking to hear the tide of criticisms we hear in this House on these items. As a fact, you cannot possibly get on in Medicine Hat without an immigrant shed there. The Government, when they built the original immigrant shed, were, as Milton says, "On hospitable thought intent." Now they are going to narrow the public appropriation that will be devoted to immigrants there, and are going to have a court house and police station in the same building, without enlarging it one iota. This expenditure is moderate; in fact, it is too small.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is perfectly clear that the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with the amount of the appropriations for the North-West. The hon. gentleman says this expenditure is necessary. The hon. gentleman also sees that this building is a case of great expectations. It is larger than we require, and there is more room than is necessary, and the Government are taking pains to reduce its dimensions, and asking an appropriation for the purpose. The hon. gentleman does not know how they could get on without those improvements in that particular district. I should have thought the hon. gentleman would have been rather more ambitious, and asked a more commodious place than the immigrant shed at Medicine Hat would afford even for travellers inured to the hardships of the North-West. But the hon. gentleman says that country is admirably adapted for agriculture and ranching. I do not know any portion of the territory about Medicine Hat and east of Calgary that is adapted to anything else than ranching. The soil is in itself fertile, but the atmosphere is very dry, there being scarcely any rainfall. Certainly the country is not adapted to farming. Then, you do not require a very large population to be carried into a ranching country, for a very small population will spread over a very extensive territory when it is only suitable for ranching purposes. Some of the territory near the foot of the Rocky Mountains is, no doubt, suited for settlement, as is, no doubt, territory further east; but the territory

at the foot of the Rocky Mountains and the territory further east will not be accommodated by an immigrant shed at Medicine Hat. I do not pretend to say the Minister is acting unwisely in seeking to diminish the accommodation there afforded and seeking to utilize a portion of the building for other purposes. That is a very different matter from the justification which the hon. gentleman has just given for this appropriation. It is not in order that immigrants may be accommodated, but that the space which has been afforded to immigrants in the shed should be utilized for other than immigration purposes.

Prince Albert—Immigration building.. $1,000

Mr. TROW. Has there not been expenditure made for immigrant buildings at Prince Albert and Edmonton?

Mr. DEWDNEY. After it was found that these expensive immigrant sheds were not used as we expected, the policy was changed, and last year two sheds were built for the same figure, $1,000, one at Whitewood, and one at Regina. Each building contains one or two rooms, and a stove is provided. As soon as the head of the family finds his location, the family move out of the building.

Mr. TROW. Do I understand that the head of the family can go away and obtain employment, and have his family provided for at the expense of the Government?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. TROW. Is there no limit as to time?

Mr. DEWDNEY. If they are there for a week or two, there is no objection. We do not keep them; they keep themselves; but they have the use of a stove and the building.

Mr. McMULLEN. Have we an immigration agent at each of these points?

Mr. DEWDNEY. At Whitewood the homestead inspector looks after the shed. In Regina there is an immigrant agent who draws a very small salary.

New Public Buildings, Victoria, B.C.....$10,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). For what purpose is the money required?

Mr. FOSTER. This is the first vote for the erection of public buildings in Victoria.

Mr. MULOCK. What is to be the total cost?

Mr. FOSTER. It is proposed to erect a post office, Custom house, examining warehouse and Inland Revenue office. This is an initial vote, the object of which is to obtain a site for the public buildings, and it is also to cover the initial expenses.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is to be the total cost?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think the Minister of Finance is astray as regards the post office. The present post office at Victoria is situated in the very heart of the city, in one of the most valuable locations. I understand the scheme is to sell the present site and buildings and purchase another site, which would be just as central for the post office now, in view of the manner in which the city has spread, and no doubt the new building could be erected and site bought for what the present site and old building would realize. That is the intention in regard to the post office. I think this amount of $10,000 is with respect to some alterations at the Custom house.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is to be the cost of the building?

Mr. DEWDNEY. My idea of the cost of the present building and site would be probably $140,000 or $150,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. gentleman expect to obtain that amount for the present building and site?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes. This vote is, however, in regard to the Custom house.

Mr. HAGGART. No determination with regard to the post office has been arrived at.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then no estimate has been prepared, no plans have been prepared, and there is no intention to build it?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. BOWELL. We have rented at a very high rental a building some distance from the Custom house, which is used as an examining warehouse, where the appraisers examine all goods. I suggested, after having made an investigation through the officers of the department, that an addition should be made to the present Custom house, which is on the harbour front and very convenient for Customs, Inland Revenue and Marine Departments. The proposition was made that a large building in the centre of the city should be erected for all Government purposes, which I objected to as being inconvenient for the Customs, and with an addition of $8,000 or $10,000 expended on it I thought it would give all the accommodation required for Customs and Inland Revenue purposes on the present site. Of course, it has been objected to by those who would like to see a magnificent building erected in the city, but I thought it would be in the interest of the Government and of the public service and of the country that an expenditure equal to the amount asked for should be made on the improvement of that building, which will cause it to answer all the purposes required. The present building is well situated, and when enlarged will afford sufficient accommodation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would ask the Minister if it is not a fact that the receipts at Victoria are dropping off, while those at Vancouver are increasing very rapidly?

Mr. BOWELL. That is not the case. I can inform the hon. gentleman that while the income at Vancouver has increased over 100 per cent. last year, and from 50 to 75 per cent. this year, the income at Victoria has increased in almost equal proportion. The revenue in both cities has increased in nearly equal ratio, and I may add also that the revenue at New Westminster has increased during the last four or five years by 200 to 300 per cent. For the year ending 30th June, 1890, Victoria collected $814,654.20, and Vancouver $153,726, and both have increased this year.

Mr. BARRON. I would ask the Government if they intend to repay Mr. B. C. Woodman who paid for fuel, and which money went into the pocket of some person else? The acting Minister of Agriculture will remember that Mr. Woodman paid for fuel for the office and that the money was paid to Mr. Têtu, but it never got into Mr. Woodman's hands at all.

I would like to know if it is the intention of the Government to refund that money to him?

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman what disposal is to be made of the money, as I do not know the circumstances.

Government Printing Bureau, Ottawa—
Babcock Fire Extinguishers..... $671

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will these extinguish the tolls usually charged there?

Mr. McMULLEN. I understood that the Printing Bureau was a fire-proof building. What are these required for?

Mr. FOSTER. This is to procure some large and small Babcock fire extinguishers for the protection of the Government Printing Bureau, and more especially the valuable plant contained therein——

Mr. MULOCK. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER—against serious danger by fire. The whole recommended by the hon. the Secretary of State.

Mr. LANDEKKIN. From whom were they bought?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. From the only agent of the manufacturers there is. It would have been very imprudent to leave the immense stock of paper and machinery that we have in the binding and stationery department especially without the ordinary protection which every establishment of a great deal less magnitude than this one has. We tried to get them from the Public Works Department, but some delay occurred, and as there is no insurance on that stock and plant, it was absolutely necessary to get them at once. These were bought at the usual prices, and there is only one agent at Ottawa, I believe.

Mr. TROW. Which of the hon. Minister's officials made the purchase?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They were bought by the Queen's Printer himself.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What commission did he get?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I ask twenty-four hours to give an answer.

Mr. MULOCK. From whom were they purchased?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know. The Queen's Printer stated that they were necessary, and they were bought by the Queen's Printer.

Mr. MULOCK. But the hon. gentleman ought to know when and from whom they were bought.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know from whom they were bought. I know that they were bought on the recommendation of the deputy head of the department, after a requisition to the Public Works Department, and because I would not take the responsibility of leaving the building without this protection.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not saying that these machines should not have been bought; I have no doubt that they should. But the Minister has not answered my question. From whom were they bought?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know. I think from the agent of the manufacturers.

Mr. DAVIN. Sir George Cornewall Lewis said that his duty was to see that his department worked, not to work his department. It is perfectly impossible for a Minister to work his department; and I may say, for the size of that building, these engines are very cheaply bought for that amount. I may also say here, as a practical man, that I have been over that building, and I suppose a more perfect establishment of the kind does not exist in the world.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Was it the superintendent who made the purchase of these extinguishers?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; that is nonsense.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister says that they were recommended by the deputy head. I presume he means the late deputy head, Mr. Senécal, or is the Queen's Printer a deputy head.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is only one deputy head in the department, the hon. gentleman should know. I said the Queen's Printer, who is the deputy head, had recommended that we should not leave the establishment a long time without protection.

Bayfield Wharf, N.S.—Reconstruction... $5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Has this been entirely destroyed?

Mr. FOSTER. It was almost entirely destroyed by a storm of unusual severity on 1st December, 1890.

Port Maitland—Repairs to breakwater and
landing pier..... $600

Mr. FLINT. I am very glad to see this appropriation, and I think the money will be well spent.

Mr. FOSTER. What county is that in?

Mr. FLINT. In the County of Yarmouth. While I am pleased with this appropriation, I wish to express my regret that one or two other necessary repairs in the same county have not received a small appropriation. I presume it is too late this session to press their claims upon the Government; but I should like to say that there are two or three places in the county where a small expenditure of $600 or $1,000 before the coming winter would save a large amount of money to the Government before this time next year. However, as there are no votes for these works this year, I shall endeavour, if I am here next session, to press their claims upon the Government. While on my feet, I would like to refer to an application which has been made for an appropriation for the removal of obstructions in the navigable portion of the Chebogue River. A very small amount would be of very great advantage, and I trust that before the end of next session the Government will be in a position to grant it, as it would be very greatly in the public interest.

Sault Ste. Marie—To complete payments
for contract and additional works
performed..... $1,475

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see any provision in this for the improvement of the River Sydenham or the removal of the bar at the mouth of the River Thames. The attention of the Government was called at an early perioc of the session,

to the condition of both these rivers. There is a very large, much larger traffic on them than on many of the rivers on which improvement is sought and for which estimates are provided. There is a larger number of entries in the port of Wallaceburg than in almost any other place in Ontario, with the single exception of Toronto, and there are boats running daily between Dresdon on the east branch of the Sydenham harbour as well as from Wallaceburg, and very serious obstacles to navigation exist in that river. There are many million feet of elm logs floated down the river, and a number of them sunk to the bottom, and there are occasionally falling trees that are carried down at high water from a long distance up the river, which sink in the river, and vessels are often seriously damaged by these obstacles to navigation. Steps ought to be taken to remove these obstacles. They are rivers on which there is a very large trade. I see in these estimates large appropriations for places where there is not one-twentieth part of the trade that exists on the River Sydenham and on the River Thames. There is the town of Chatham, centre of the County of Kent, from which a very large trade is carried on, and serious obstacles to navigation exist in the bar formed at the mouth of that river. The Minister of Public Works stated two or three years ago that immediate steps would be taken to remove that bar. Steps were not taken that year or last year, nor have any been taken this year, although the matter has been at least twice brought under the attention of the Government this session and although it was brought under the attention during the previous sessions ever since the obstruction has existed. I have frequently called the attention of the Administration to the condition of both these rivers, and I say that it is only proper that sections of the country which contribute so very largely to the public revenues should, in matters of this sort, where the necessity exists, not be overlooked. They should receive at least the same treatment as is extended to other portions of the Dominion where the claim is less than it is in those cases.

Mr. FOSTER. There has been a good deal of discussion with reference to that, and money has been expended on those rivers. I will bring my hon. friend's remarks to the attention of the acting Minister of Public Works, and no doubt they will be considered by him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When will they be considered?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that this matter was called to his attention very early in the session, and there is no provision in the Estimates. The hon. gentleman has taken several thousand dollars for the improvement of the navigation of other rivers where the commerce is but a mere fraction of that carried on in those rivers. The trade upon the River Sydenham, I will venture to say, is many hundreds of thousand dollars every year. The hon. gentleman will see that he is acting most improperly to pass over the condition of those rivers when they have been brought to the attention of the Government.

Mr. CAMPBELL. For the last four or five years I have brought this matter to the attention of the Government, and every year I have had a promise from the Minister of Public Works that the matter would be attended to and a sum for it placed in the Estimates. Early this session I drew his attention to it, and he assured me that a sum would be placed in the Estimates. I also saw the present acting Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Agriculture, who knows the need of this appropriation very well, and they both assured me that they would do all they could to bring the matter before Council and have a sum placed in the Estimates. I think the Government are not treating that part of the country rightly in neglecting to make an appropriation for that purpose. The traffic on the River Thames is very extensive, but is interrupted by this bar at the mouth of the river, about 18 miles from the town of Chatham. Two years ago an appropriation of $4,000 was made to remove the bar, but the passage was only cut one-third of the way through, so that it was of no advantage. It only requires an expenditure of about $5,000 more to enable vessels drawing 12 feet of water to pass over the bar. It is a very great inconvenience to the people of that country that every vessel which is loaded with lumber and coal or grain has to be lightened in order to get over the bar. A vessel drawing more than 8½ feet cannot be taken over the bar. I see that the Minister of Finance last night said the Government intended to send a dredge to Collingwood this season in response to a question by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). If they do send one there, it would be a good opportunity for that dredge to stop at the mouth of the River Thames and clean up that bar. A week or two would make a passage so that vessels could get through, and that would answer the needs of that part of the country for many years to come. It was many years since that was dredged, and it would be very little out of the revenue to allow the dredge to stop there. Then, on the River Sydenham, there is an immense traffic.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that run into the St. Clair?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It runs into St. Clair Lake. The same dredge could do both those jobs and then continue its way to Collingwood. It is a matter of very great importance, and there is not a single dollar expended there this year or last year.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. member say what this $1,475 is for?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the Minister answers that question, I would like to ask if these improvements in the Thames and Sydenham rivers will take place?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be impossible to do what my hon. friend asks at the mouth of the Thames. If my recollection is correct, it will require a very large expenditure to make that channel available permanently, as it silts in and fills in very rapidly. I have seen a report of the Public Works Department showing that the amount required would be very large. As to the River Sydenham, the department might remove any sunken logs and so on, and I will call the attention of the Minister to that matter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If that were done, the principal difficulty would be overcome.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I know there was a report of the engineer that, in order to make the work on the Thames a lasting work, there should be sheet-piling which would cost, according to the estimate,

$20,000. The people who know that channel best do not think that would be a wise expenditure, because they think that, to dredge a channel through of 12 feet in depth, many years would elapse before that channel would fill up, and the interest on the money required to make a permanent work would more than pay for this. The people there do not want that done. What they want is that a passage way should be cut through there, and they believe that $4,000 or $5,000 will complete the work there, so as to give a 12-foot passage.

Mr. FOSTER. We have not enough money voted for that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If you are sending the dredge up to Collingwood this summer, it could stop there.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not to go up this summer. It will only be available for the opening of navigation next spring.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understood the hon. gentleman to have said that he was going to send the dredge in the spring up to Collingwood.

Mr. FOSTER. I said it would be sent up at the end of the season of navigation, so as to be ready for work there in the spring.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why should it not stop at these places this fall?

Mr. FOSTER. It might be frozen up there.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It might as well be frozen up there as in Collingwood. It would only be about two days from one place to the other.

Mr. BOWELL. Was not that bar dredged out to the extent of 14 feet two or three years ago?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No; but there was an attempt made to dredge it out; the dredge only went one-third through the bar. If they had continued for two weeks longer, they would have made the channel 12 feet deep through the bar.

Mr. McNEILL. I hope if the dredge is to stop anywhere on its way to Goderich, it will stop at Lion's Head, where it is very much required indeed. My hon. friend may say it is required in his part of the world; I am quite sure it is required in mine, and I hope that he will not interfere with the needs of my constituents. I want it very much there. I dare say a good many other people may require it in other places, too.

Mr. BARRON. Rest easy; you have got a protest.

Mr. BOWELL. The engineer of the department tells me that three years ago they dredged that channel to the depth of 16 feet, and that the next year it filled up. No doubt, from the nature of the soil there, and the currents, it will require constant dredging.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have the drawing, and the plan that was prepared by the Public Works Department showing the whole work that they intended to do. About a year ago there was only $4,000 voted for that work, and it only carried the cut through the bar about one-third of the way. The engineer surely knows that, and the cut is made 12 feet deep, not 16 feet deep. It was continued, and the dredge got about one-third of the way through the bar, when the appropriation ran out and this work was stopped. So that the $4,000 that was expended did not do any good at all, because the vessels could not get over. If it had been continued two weeks longer right through the bar, then it would have been useful; but the way it is now the money that was spent did no good at all. I hope that when the dredge goes up there in the spring, it will continue the work that was started two years ago.

Mr. BOWELL. There is a slight difference between the hon. gentleman's statement and that of the engineer of the department. I do not give it on my own responsibility; but he assured me again, while the hon. gentleman was speaking, that they did dredge through the bar to a depth of 14 feet. I think I made a mistake in saying 16 feet. It filled up the year following. However, we will make further enquiries into that and see who is right.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The engineer, in the many duties that he has to perform, has probably forgotten. I know whereof I speak, that the dredging was only done to the extent of 12 feet deep, and it was only continued one-third of the way through the bar. I do not think it filled up at all. I think that the work that was done was all right if it had only been continued through the bar. I think the Government ought to do this in the spring any way, if they cannot do it this fall. It is a work of very great importance to the people of that part of the country, and it ought not to be neglected.

Mr. McNEILL. I hope the Government will not lose sight of the importance of having the dredging done at Lion's Head as early as possible during this fall. Lion's Head is really a harbour of refuge for a very dangerous part of the coast. It has now filled up so that navigation cannot have the benefit of that harbour of refuge. If it was dredged, it would be all that is required.

Mr. BARRON. May I trouble the hon. gentleman——

Mr. McNEILL. I hope the hon. gentleman will not interrupt me. He interjected something a moment ago about a protest. I do not myself think that there is much benefit in a protest, but if it has the effect of sending a dredge to the people of Lion's Head, they may think there is some benefit in a protest. However that may be, it is really a matter of great importance in the interest of navigation that Lion's Head should be dredged out as early as possible this fall. I am sure, if my hon. friend had his request granted, it would not be impossible to get the dredge at Lion's Head this fall.

Mr. FOSTER. This vote of $1,475 is to provide for the payment due to Messrs. Parker and Lefebvre for work performed by them in 1888-89 at Sault Ste. Marie, according to the final estimate rendered by the chief engineer in favour of the contractors.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the contract on which this was paid?

Mr. FOSTER. The original contract was $9,885. Then, after it had been in progress for some time, it was decided to build two additional docks containing 300 cubic yards of crib-work, and that cost $1,970, making a total amount of $11,955, and payments $10,480.

Mr. MULOCK. Why were these extras not included in the original contract?

Mr. FOSTER. These are not extras for the amount of work contemplated by the original contract, but they were additional cribs built after the contract was let, and they were paid for accordingly. Orders were given to the contractors to build two additional cribs and they were paid for at the rate of $1.65. The quantity of work shown on the plan was the average value of the work per cubic yard.

Mr. MULOCK. To do what sort of work was the original contract?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not here the details of the original work.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister will see that the contract was let, I suppose, by tender, and afterwards additional work or extras was done, so that nearly 20 per cent. more was expended than was ever the subject of tender. To that extent there were no tenders invited. I should like to know how it comes that when these specifications were being drawn and advertised for, the specifications were not perfect.

Mr. FOSTER. The information I have is that when the original plans and specifications were made out, the wharf was built in this way: Cribs, and platforms upon the cribs, and a portion of it was afterwards required to receive coal, a large quantity of which arrives there. At that portion an additional crib had to be placed between the two cribs, so that the planking should be solid and hold up the great weight of coal. This extra amount was paid for the additional cribs.

Mr. MULOCK. That does not commend itself to my mind as a satisfactory answer.

Mr. FOSTER. We could not foresee everything.

Mr. MULOCK. Coal had been coming there before, and this was evidently an oversight on the part of the department. Who collects the tolls on that wharf?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a Government wharf.

Mr. BOWELL. The officer is Mr. Plummer. This wharf is a Government wharf open to the public; it is under Government supervision, and all tolls collected come into the hands of the Government, and the wharfinger is allowed a percentage, as is usual in such cases.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the wharfinger, connected with the collector of Customs, in business?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

Mr. MULOCK. I ask the Minister of Customs whether he would appoint as collector of Customs the partner of a man who had control of a Government wharf?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not see why the brother of a man in control of a Government wharf should not be appointed collector of Customs.

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose A and B were partners in the importing business. A is appointed Government wharfinger. He is to see that all goods pay proper tribute. Would the Minister appoint B as collector of Customs?

Mr. TUPPER. The wharfinger has nothing to do with collecting Customs. The wharfingers are under the Marine Department, and they have simply to see that the dues specified by Order in Council are collected on all goods landed. If the wharfinger happens to be the Custom's officer, that is another matter. As a rule they are not officers of the Customs Department, although in some particular instances the offices are combined.

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose goods were landed at this particular wharf, has the wharfinger no power to prevent them from passing into private hands until they have paid the Government dues?

Mr. TUPPER. No. The wharfinger's duties cease when the dues are paid.

Mr. BOWELL. If a vessel from the American Sault crosses the river to the wharf under consideration, a Customs official is there, and if there are any dutiable goods on board it is his duty to superintend their landing, and see that the duties are paid or the goods sent to the bonding warehouse. The wharfinger has nothing to do with the matter except to collect wharfage dues. If the goods are to go to another part of Canada the manifest follows them.

Mr. MULOCK. What other officers are there at this particular wharf except the wharfinger?

Mr. BOWELL. There are four or five officers at Sault Ste. Marie under the collector, and two or three additional officers had to be appointed at the opening of the Sault bridge to attend to trains crossing the river. There are two officers stationed constantly at the wharf, in addition to the collector and clerk, and one or two at the railway.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that outside of the wharfinger and Custom house officer there are some other officers continually on the warf while it is open.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. While goods were being landed some Government officer would be present, in addition to the wharfinger, so that no goods could pass under private control without the consent of some third person, he being neither the wharfinger nor Custom house officer.

Mr. BOWELL. The wharfinger has nothing to do with it. No vessel is supposed to arrive at the wharf from the United States unless a Customs official is there to attend to it.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that the practice?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. If the officers do not do so, they neglect their duties.

Mr. MULOCK. I have received a long communication on the subject. My recollection of it is that it declared that by reason of the business relations existing between the Customs officer and the wharfinger, the revenue suffered.

Works at Little Nation River.....$4,000

Mr. SPOHN. I do not find any amount in the Estimates for a wharf at Christian Island. I do not think it is fair, because it was promised during the last election.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I cannot permit these questions to be asked on votes to which they are not applicable. There is a proper time to raise these questions, and that is before going into Supply. I mention this for the information of members; but I will permit the hon. gentleman on this occasion to ask for the information.

Mr. SPOHN. During the last election missionaries sent by the Government directly promised the Indians that, if they voted rightly, this wharf

would be built. I can assure the Government they voted rightly, for the Government candidate and against myself. It is only fair that the Government should carry out their part of the contract and give them the wharf.

Ottawa River Works, Gatineau Boom —Legal expenses incurred 1876 to 1879 and 1888 to 1890 in connection with suit brought by Noé Chevrier against Her Majesty the Queen to recover a sum of $200,000 for lands acquired and improved by the Government of Canada for booming purposes since 1856..... $8,716 67

Mr. McMULLEN. What is this?

Mr. FOSTER. This is for payment of legal expenses which have been incurred by the Dominion Government between 12th September, 1876, and March, 1879; and 1st May, 1888, and 1st October, 1890, in connection with the suit brought by Noé Chevrier against Her Majesty the Queen to recover an amount of $200,000 on the ground of being a connection of the heirs Wright of Hull, and as such entitled to a portion of the lands near the mouth of the Gatineau River which have been acquired since 1855 by the Government of Canada. Judgment was rendered in favour of the Crown in the Exchequer Court, and Chevrier proving to be a man of no means, Mr. W. W. Robertson, Q.C., the Government lawyer, had to collect costs from the Crown.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I call the attention of the Minister of Justice particularly to the fact that we are called upon to pay a sum for legal expenses 13 years old, which I suppose is barred under the statute of limitations, if nothing else. I would like to know why we are called upon to pay legal expenses incurred between 1876 and 1879?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was a very heavy suit, extending over a long period of years, until 1888, at which time I had the bill of costs before me for my own inspection. Mr. Robertson was the agent at Montreal of the late Government, and at the termination of the suit, being unable to recover from the plaintiff in the case, who lost the suit, he rendered an account to us for about $1,000 more than the appropriation now asked. There could be no doubt that he had been retained by the late Government and that he had conducted the suit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this gentleman the solicitor of the Bank of Montreal?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know. There could be no doubt that he was retained and carried on the suit in a way to which no exception could be taken at all. Eventually, we agreed that the bill of costs should be taxed by counsel of high standing in Montreal. The result of the taxation was that something like $1,100 was struck off the claim, and I have no doubt that the sum now asked for is properly due to Mr. Robertson.

To assist in the publication of the Historical and Topographical Map for the Dominion of Canada, by G. F. Baillairgé, Esq., Civil Engineer, dated 31st December, 1890..... $500

Mr. McMULLEN. What is this for?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a very beautiful and very labouriously executed map of the Dominion of Canada, executed by Mr. Baillairgé, and is the result of many years' study and research by him. As my hon. friend knows, he is an old public servant, with wonderful abilities in that direction, and he has utilized them in this way, and he has left this map as a monument to posterity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Just explain what a historical map is?

Mr. FOSTER. I really cannot explain it, but I will bring the map down to-morrow and lay it on the Table, and I know that when the hon. gentleman sees it, he will raise no objection to this vote.

Mr. McNEILL. Before that item is carried, I should like to call the attention of the House and of the Government to the fact that we have here in Ottawa at the present time, in the Department of Railways and Canals, a young man who is a credit and an ornament to the Dominion of Canada; I refer to Mr. William Wilfred Campbell. He is now employed there at $1.50 a day. With the permission of the House, I will give you in a few words an idea of the kind of person of whom I speak. This young gentleman's work is not such as we meet with every day. I can very well understand that there is great difficulty in the Government recognizing local talent at all, because they will naturally say that it is hard to decide where to draw the line. But I think they may very well draw the line at the point where the talent of the person is recognized by the critics of foreign countries, and I will give you an idea of the extent to which the talent of this young gentleman is recognized in other countries as well as in Canada. One of the critics is no less an authority than the London *Athenæum*. Then we have in the United States the New York *Critic*, the Boston *Herald*, the Boston *Traveller*, the Boston *Pilot*, the New York *Independent*, and many other literary authorities. These are all papers of light and leading on the other side of the line. I will quote from one which is recognized as being one of the very highest in literary matters, to indicate the nature of the work that this young man has done for his country and for mankind; I refer to the Chicago *Inter-Ocean*. Many of the critics I have named have spoken in high terms of the book which he has published; but the Chicago *Inter-Ocean* devotes a leading article to one particular poem. After speaking of the decadence of poetry in the United States at the present day and also of its probable decadence in England, this paper says:

"The nearest approach to a great poem which has cropped out in current literature for many a long day is 'The Mother' in *Harper's Monthly* for April. It may be a self-condemnatory confession, but we must say that the name of the author, William Wilfred Campbell, is new to us. A subject inviting poetic treatment, and rich in the pathos which gives to poetry its flavour and stamps it as being the choicest vintage of literary expression, is so treated in 'The Mother' that one feels that it could never be improved upon. There are many such poems. Milton's 'Hymn of the Nativity,' Hamlet's 'Soliloquy upon Man,' Whittier's 'Maud Müller,' Buchanan Reed's 'Drifting,' Longfellow's 'Psalm of Life,' Shelley's 'Skylark,' Matthew Arnold's 'Obermann Again,' all belong in that same category."

That, I think, is placing our young Canadian poet in pretty good company. The writer goes on to say:

"Greater poems than any of these have been written, greater still may yet be composed, but the particular subject of which each treats should be regarded as closed out. Others may imitate or dilute, but nobody can hope to rival, and these poems should be put away in the cabinet

of literature as gems which are in themselves complete and priceless. It is no small thing to add another gem to such a collection, and the addition deserves to attract some attention."

Then, after some further criticism, the article proceeds:

"It would be impossible to give in common prose even the most remote idea of the beauty and poetic sweetness of the poem. Nor does the charm lie in quotable lines. The picture as a whole needs to be seen in its unity to be felt in its personation of a high and tender ideal."

Now, I am not myself very familiar with the publications of the United States, but I am informed that Mr. Steadman, who is one of the greatest literary critics in the United States, holds that literary work in Chicago is on a level with if not above that of both Boston and New York; and the Chicago *Inter-Ocean* is the acknowledged exponent of literary life in Chicago. That being the case, this is surely high praise. Then, a San Francisco paper speaks of the same poem in these terms:

"William Wilfred Campbell is the name of a new star in the world of poetry that has arisen in the east of late; his poem, 'The Mother,' in *Harper's Monthly* for April, having quite turned loose the tongues and pens of the critics. 'The Mother' is the work of a literary genius indeed."

Then, in our own country, Mr. Goldwin Smith, whose eminent position as a literary critic we all know, speaks in the highest terms of Mr. Campbell's work. *Grip* refers to it in these words:

"While our Canadian bosoms are swelling with pride over the poetic success of William Wilfred Campbell, whose recent contribution to *Harper's Magazine*, 'The Mother,' is declared by foreign critics to be one of the great poems of the century——"

And so forth. Now, I do not think that I need apologize to this House for having called its attention of this young man. I may say that since writing "The Mother" Mr. Campbell has produced several other poems which, in my humble opinion, possess very high merit indeed. I think it would be only right and fitting that work of this kind should be recognized in Mr. Campbell's own country, which is likely to be so greatly benefited by it: because I am one of those who believe that men of his genius and the work they do are almost invaluable to any country, especially to a young country like ours, where we are apt, from the very nature of our conditions, to regard everything from too much of a utilitarian point of view. I believe the value of the work which men of this kind can do for Canada can scarcely be exaggerated, and we cannot afford to lose them. They are an honour and a glory to our country. Their influence is all for good. Such men occupy a higher plane of intellectual existence than most of us do. They deal with the greater and deeper meanings of things which are always present with us but which are too often hidden from those who are involved in the hurry and the worry of the world. These men bring them to our notice. They interpret them to us, and reveal their power and beauty. And thus men are charmed and instructed, at the same time that they are elevated and refined. I do think that such a man as this is a great and glorious gift to the country that possesses him, and the people among whom he was born, and who have the honour of claiming him as a compatriot, ought to see that he is looked after and cared for, and not so neglected that he will be forced to leave the country to seek appreciation and support elsewhere. I do hope that something will be done to retain him here, and I would venture to suggest, as literary work is his natural work, that if it be at all possible, the Government should consider the feasibility of placing him in the library of Parliament. In that library there is a great want felt at the present time, that is, some one to look after that special branch of literature with which this young gentleman is familiar—*belles lettres*. If he were placed in the superintendence of that branch of the library I think it would redound greatly to the advantage of all who have the privilege of using the library. I am quite sure of this, that if the Government were to adopt such a course, if they place him in such a position that he will be able to follow out the bent of his genius, the day will come when it will be proved, whether they receive it or not, that they have earned the lasting gratitude of the people of Canada. I venture to say that if this young man develops in depth and breadth of conception and beauty of expression at the same rate as he has done within the short time since his writings have appeared before the public, he will rank far higher among the poets than the poet Longfellow; and I think, under these circumstances, we would be only doing what is right if we recognize the fact that we have such a young man among us. I think there are circumstances which have occurred of late which would make it a peculiarly felicitous thing to do an action of this kind at the present time. I believe it would command the approval of the literary and thinking men of every country in the civilized world where it was known, and I venture to hope that some such action will be taken.

Mr. LAURIER. I very gladly endorse the recommendation of the hon. gentleman in favour of Mr. Campbell, and commend it to the favourable consideration of the Government. I do not pretend to be at all a judge of English literature or poetry, but, in my estimation, Mr. Campbell is one of the real living poets to-day in the English language. The book of poems which has been placed in my hands, but especially the poem called "The Mother," which I read in *Harper's Magazine* for the month of April, is certainly something the like of which has scarcely been seen since the days of Edgar Poe. Mr. Campbell is a young man, and I think if the Government could, as I am sure they might do, because vacancies often occur in the library, give him a position which would put him above the wants of life, and which would give him the opportunity of cultivating his poetical talent and genius, it would be money well applied; and on both sides of the House and in all parts of the country the Government would win hearty approval.

Gratuity to the widow of the late W. O. Strong, civil engineer, equal to six months of the salary received by her late husband, while engineer in charge of the Kingston graving dock. $1,110

Mr. MULOCK. How long was he in charge of the graving dock?

Mr. FOSTER. From the commencement until his death. He was in the service of the department in December, 1888, and died on the 25th of April, 1889, from a cold resulting from exposure while superintending the dock.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not finding fault with the proposition, but I would like to know if there is a

general rule applicable to such cases? What is the rule requiring us to pay half a year's gratuity to the family of an engineer who has been in the service two years and a half or three years and then died?

Mr. FOSTER. We have no general rule. These cases are settled, as they occur, on their merits, and the circumstances under which Mr. Strong contracted his illness made this seem a very hard case.

Mr. BARRON. I am very glad indeed to see this sum placed in the Estimates. I understand this young man took an active interest in the work he was engaged in, in fact he was on a sick bed when called to do specific work for the department; and so much interested was he in it that rather than leave it in the hands of another, he left his sick bed, and his death resulted from the exposure. I am only sorry the Government could not find it possible to give a year's gratuity instead of six months.

Mr. FOSTER. His services had not been long.

Mr. BARRON. Under all the circumstances, he was a very deserving officer, and the Government would be justified in giving his widow a year's gratuity.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think the Minister of Finance is mistaken in saying there is no general rule followed in cases of this kind. I can appeal to the Minister of Customs in support of the statement that the usual practice is to give the widow of a deceased officer two months' salary.

Mr. FOSTER. That is with reference to permanent officers. This was a temporary officer.

Ocean and river service—To meet claims in connection with the collision off Cape George, N. S., between the Dominion Steamer *Alert* and the schooner *Scylla*..... $6,000

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Minister explain this item?

Mr. TUPPER. The Dominion steamer *Alert* was coming through the Strait of Canso, and the master went into the cabin to look at the chart and left on the bridge in command one of the pilots who was not a certificated officer, and, while he was in charge, they ran into the schooner *Scylla*. After an investigation, which was conducted under the supervision of the examiner of masters and mates, Captain Smith, of Halifax, and Lieutenant Gordon, R.N., it was held by them that the reason for the collision was the improper course taken by the *Alert*, so that the Government, if it were a private owner, or if the action was brought in the Vice-Admiralty Court, would be liable for the damage. The amount of $6,000 is a little over what we have ascertained to be the damage. The schooner was sunk and her cargo lost, and we have investigated the amount involved in that loss and we have found as follows, after a most careful investigation, the parties being examined under oath:—The vessel was worth $3,000; provisions, $340; freight, $330; board and expenses of the crew, $100.35; effects of crew, $511; value of cargo, $1,600; salvage, $250; total $6,131.35; from which we deduct the amount realized by the sale of the wreck $550, making the total loss $5,581.35. It is proposed to pay this amount in the following way:—To the Boston Marine Insurance Company, $2,251; to the Reliance Insurance Company, $1,100; to J. E. Newson & Co. who were the owners of the freight, $500; to D. W. Hennessy, owner of the vessel, which includes the effects of the crew, $1,730.35, making a total of $5,581.35.

Mr. MULOCK. Do these two men certify that the liability depends on the fact that the vessel was steering a wrong course?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes. The court held under the provisions of the Act found that instead of getting out of the way of the schooner, the steamer had kept her course, while, being a steamer, she should have gone to port instead of to starboard.

Mr. MULOCK. Was the captain blamed for that?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes, he was censured by the court of enquiry and the case came before me as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and then, according to the custom, I consulted the Imperial Board of Trade, who have had a great deal of experience in these matters, as to the extent of punishment to which the captain should be liable, as to whether censure was sufficient or whether his certificate should be taken away, and they advised that, under the circumstances, there seemed to be no reason for going further than the finding of the court of first instance, and that the censure was sufficient. His absence from the deck was very short. It was not for the purpose of going to sleep or anything of that kind, but was simply to consult the chart. There was a very short interval during which he was absent, I think about 15 minutes, and during that time this person, who was an experienced pilot, but not a certificated officer, was in charge.

Mr. MULOCK. It seems extraordinary that anyone who was an experienced pilot should not have known that a sailing vessel had the right of way.

Mr. TUPPER. It has often happened that certificated officers have been censured for acting stubbornly or negligently in regard to the right of way when they were on the bridge.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose this resulted from the uncertificated officer not knowing what was the law.

Mr. TUPPER. No; but he thought the schooner was keeping stubbornly on her way without reason, whereas the court found that the captain of the schooner had not been guilty.

Lighthouse and Coast Service $1,630

Mr. BARRON. I think perhaps this is the proper time to bring up something which has taken place in the department, which is of rather a serious character. I see in one of the Quebec papers an article headed:

"A BRUTAL GOVERNMENT.

"INHUMAN TREATMENT OF AN INJURED LIGHTHOUSE ASSISTANT—LEFT TO DIE BY ORDER OF THE AUTHORITIES."

The article goes on to say:

"SIR,—In the interests of humanity the public attention is called to a case of culpable mismanagement, resulting in the loss of a useful life. On Monday, September 7, Arthur Lamire, assistant lighthouse keeper, was loading the fog-gun at Heath Point, Anticosti. Bad weather was being experienced, and operations about the wrecked SS. *Circe* were suspended. The gun prematurely discharged and shot away part of Lamire's hand, while he himself was hurled over the cliff, thus breaking his arm. Immediate

attention was required, and would have averted further disaster. The case was reported to Ottawa. Captain Brown, of Quebec, was at hand with his steam schooner attending the wrecked steamer. In spite of bad weather, Captain Brown offered, for a moderate sum, to take the injured man to Gaspé. The Marine Department would not allow this, and ordered the man to wait until they sent the SS. *La Canadienne*. But Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday passed, and Lamire lay in his pain. At length, on Thursday evening the department gave instructions for the man to be removed on Captain Brown's vessel. But the schooner was securing a valuable piece of wreckage. Though it involved a loss of $2,000 this was relinquished, and the sufferer was taken to Gaspé. But it was now too late. Drs. Smilie and Williamson, immediately on the vessel's arrival, were called in, but the case was hopeless; gangrene pervaded the whole arm and shoulder, and on Saturday morning Lamire died."

The article goes on to speak of the indignation felt by the people at the negligent treatment of this case by the Marine Department. The case apparently is a very serious one, and reflects upon the department as if they took no notice of the request made by parties there to have immediate assistance, in consequence of which neglect this man died. This article I have read appears in the *Daily Telegraph* of 26th September.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is very fair in bringing that up, particularly in view of the manner in which the item has been circulated and characterized in the Toronto *Globe* and the *Telegraph* which the hon. gentleman was good enough to show me. Other papers including the Montreal *Witness*, have been sufficiently brutal to make the statement that we were practically responsible for the death of this poor man who was an assistant at Heath Point Light, Anticosti. The accident occurred in connection with the signal gun by which his hand was blown off. There were wrecking steamers working there in connection with the wrecked steamer *Circe*. We received at Ottawa, on the 8th September, a telegram from the light-keeper stating that the man was in danger. I mention this to show the House the exact information that was before me, so that they may judge of the action taken. The telegram stated that the man was in danger through an accident by a gun and asked immediate assistance. I was in the House of Commons at the time that telegram was given to me, and I immediately answered:

"You may send the wounded man to Gaspé. Tell agent at Quebec to send assistance."

It was necessary to have a man there at Heath Point at once to fire the gun, which it was the keeper's duty to do, to warn ships coming up in the fog, and it was necessary that some man should be sent in his place. If the accounts that have reached me be true, and from what I know, it appears that the wrecking steamers actually haggled with this keeper for the price of taking this wounded man to shore. At any rate, he did not reach the coast until several days afterwards, when one of the wrecking steamers took him to shore. I ask the House to remark that we were not in a position to know what was going on. We had no reply from the keeper to whom we had sent instructions, under which we could have made any bargain with one of these steamers for the relief of this man. Finally they did send him to shore, and we all know what happened in the meanwhile. I have instituted a thorough enquiry to see whether the agent of the department, the keeper at Heath Point, was guilty of negligence. I did as any member of this House would have done in my place, I gave him *carte blanche* instructions to send that man ashore as he had asked for authority to do so. The accident by which the delay occurred, I am unable to explain yet.

Mr. MULOCK. I read the letter in the *Globe* referring to this accident, and I am much pleased at the explanation of the Minister of Marine. His having sent that telegram in that unlimited way, I think, wholly exonerates him from any responsibility for what followed.

Fisheries—To meet cost of enquiry by experts in connection with the seal fishery in Behring Sea. $5,000

Mr. BARRON. If the Minister will allow me, I want to refer to a circumstance I spoke of the other day. He will remember that at the beginning of the session I drew his attention to the fact that Mr. J. R. Graham had been discharged. The Minister replied that in point of fact he was not discharged. Technically I suppose he was correct, although in reality I was correct, because, although he had not received his formal dismissal from the department, as a matter of fact he had really been suspended by Mr. Gordon, who had gone up there, and who, I find by the papers brought down, had in point of fact suspended him and appointed somebody else in his place. So I think the Minister owes me an apology for attacking me so viciously as he did, and trying to make it appear that I was wrong when in point of fact I was correct.

Mr. TUPPER. I certainly did not attack you viciously. Perhaps I ought to have done so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order. He cannot bring up that subject under this item.

Mr. TUPPER. I have no objections to discussing it with him now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am in this difficulty, that the Ministers are the first ones to transgress the rule that we should not have anything to do with those items which are not directly before the Committee, and that is the reason why the Estimates are dragging so slowly. Of course I cannot go against the wishes of the whole Committee.

Mr. BARRON. My object is to secure justice to a man to whom a great injustice has been done. It seems to me that this man Graham has been unfairly dealt with, although, perhaps, not knowingly, by the Minister of Marine. I think on the information the Minister obtained perhaps he was right. I do not say that the fishery inspector was either an efficient officer or the reverse; but from the information given to me I think great injustice has been done him, more especially from the report of Mr. McDermot who was overseer there. I draw the Minister's attention to one or two clauses of a letter, on which it appears he based his judgment in having the officer suspended and afterwards dismissed. The first letter is from A. Graham and it says:

"The fishery overseer for North Victoria, J. R. Graham, here is a rank, tankerous Grit, and he has used or rather abused his power or office during the late election campaign in favour of John A. Barron and against Sam Hughes, Esq. He, Graham, was posting up bills advertising Barron's campaign meeting, and when he came here. There is a nice large lake known as Mud Lake, Carden Township. As he sold four or five fish-houses on the ice he either fines the Tories or made them promise to vote for Barron or stay at home. Those that would not do

either he cracked on a heavy fine and an unreasonable cost, and I happened to be one of those that would not be driven, consequently I had to pay a handsome bill of $8."

Mr. TUPPER. Whose letter are you reading from?

Mr. BARRON. The letter of Mr. A. Graham, upon which action was taken by the department. The main charge is that he was a rank, tankerous Grit. Like a lady's letter, the postscript is most important. He says:

"It would not be a very heavy draw on the fishing exchequer if you would send me the amount of my fine. It is the spring of the year, and I need the money he took from me very badly to buy seed for my farming. If you think well it would greatly assist me."

That is one of the letters on which his dismissal was based.

Mr. TUPPER. Where does the hon. gentleman get the information that I based the dismissal on that letter, because I deny it? That is a letter on the fyle, I admit.

Mr. BARRON. It is one of the letters which induced the Minister to act.

Mr. TUPPER. No. I should like the hon. gentleman to prove that I dismissed the officer on that letter.

Mr. BARRON. I state that on that letter and another letter written by another gentleman, subsequently the officer's removal was authorized, and Mr. Gordon was sent to those waters, and the result of Mr. Gordon's visit was the dismissal. There are a great many matters which I intended to bring up in regard to this matter, but as it is late in the session, I will only take up some features of them. On 11th April, 1891, this letter was sent to the department, and the Minister must admit that this letter, with the letter just read, induced the department to send Mr. Gordon up there. This letter, written by a gentleman living in Lindsay, says:

"Mr. Graham has been a Provincial Government bailiff in the past, and since has been an agent for a manufacturing firm in Peterborough. In the discharge of those duties he was almost all the time in sections of the country remote from the fishing waters."

I fail to see what reason that would be for cause for his dismissal. The writer refers to this charge:

"For instance the account dated Fenelon Falls, 6th November, 1890, signed by W. Golden, $6 for three days horse hire was incurred in endeavouring to sell threshing machines and other wares, and not in the discharge of his duty."

The account referred to was not one by Mr. Golden, but one by another livery stable keeper, whose account appears in those rendered to the department. The next paragraph goes on to say:

"In Mr. Graham's capacity as paid agent and bill poster for Mr. John A. Barron during February and March, Mr. Graham chanced to visit Mud and Dalrymple Lakes in Carden."

The charge there was that he happened, when on private duty for me, to discover the illegal fishing, and then he caused the party to be fined. As a matter of fact, I have a letter written here by Mr. Graham, which shows that he was induced to go there from noticing in the columns of the *Warder* newspaper that illegal fishing was being carried on. The Minister will see that it was Mr. Graham's first letter which directed the attention of the department to Inspector Graham not performing his duty, if he did not perform it. There is a letter from the first gentleman who made the charge written to this very fishery inspector. This letter the department had not before it; but it only shows how unreliable is information frequently obtained, and what great care should be taken by the department to see that injustice is not done, and that the department should not rely on letters upon which to take such severe action as was taken in this case, and which to a certain extent affected the man's reputation, especially when he was dismissed on charges to which I will presently refer. Let it be remembered that it was Graham who made the charges. Writing to the inspector, he says:

"I was sorry that I was not at home the other day when you were having such a jubilee with those old cads. You never heard a greater panic in your life, nor a worse name for anyone than me. You must not read the *Warder* any more, as I did not intend you would see anything of the kind."

The impression is sought to be conveyed to the Minister that it was when he was on his own business that the officer imposed these fines; but it was in consequence of his having seen a report in the *Warder* in regard to illegal fishing that he was induced to go there. This letter of Edward Graham thanked the officer for having done his duty so well. The very man who made the complaint was subsequently the very man who was thanked for having performed his duty so well in looking after the fishing. In the fourth paragraph of the letter, 11th April, 1891, the writer says:

"Mr. Graham's duty as overseer requires, I believe, that he post up notices *re* fishery close season, &c. Such has not been done at any time on those waters."

The reason it was not done was because the department itself by a letter dated 27th May, 1889, formally instructed the officer not to do so. In that letter, signed by Mr. Tilton, it is stated:

"The Minister directs that in future no special trips are to be made by fishing overseers for the purpose of posting up notices, but the business is to be done when there is some necessary travelling done for other purposes."

Mr. TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON. I do not say that is not correct, but it is one of the charges made against the fishery inspector on which action was taken by the department. Further on, the letter proceeds to refer to James O'Brien, and I would ask the Minister's particular attention to that point, because I understand some charges have been brought against O'Brien. We have the evidence here in the papers that this very man, James O'Brien, is criticised in Mr. McDermot's report, is equally as bad as, if bad he was, as Mr. Graham. Mr. McDermot says:

"I would further inform the department that officer O'Brien is just as useless as Graham, and that he can't cope with the poachers in the Victoria division."

Now, if Mr. O'Brien was just as useless as Mr. Graham, I ask why Mr. James O'Brien was not dismissed, and why Mr. Graham should be singled out for dismissal. It must be understood that I am not advocating the case of Mr. Graham the fishery inspector, because I am not sufficiently acquainted with all the facts of the case to say whether he was an efficient officer or not, but it does appear from the papers that some injustice has been done him. In Mr. McDermot's report there is a very serious charge made against Mr. Graham, which has done him considerable injury in the neighbourhood wherein he lives. Mr. McDermot

made two reports, and in the first report he does not seem to be so severe upon Mr. Graham, but between the first report and second report some influence seems to be brought upon him. I am not at all blaming the Minister, because, of course, he would not be aware of it, and I believe he has been misled in this matter—but in the second report Mr. McDermot is very severe on Mr. Graham, and in that report he states:

"That he visited Fenelon Falls, and when he was there he was informed by one of the hotel-keepers that Mr. Graham was in the habit of becoming intoxicated, and was so rendered totally unfit to perform his duties."

The residents of Fenelon Falls when they heard of that statement in the document were annoyed about it, because whether Mr. Graham may have faults or not in his official capacity, so far as his temperate habits are concerned, I have every reason to believe that he is a temperate man. To make a serious charge of that kind against Mr. Graham, apart altogether from his official capacity, is too serious to allow to pass, especially as it has become known all through the vicinity. I have here three affidavits, one from each of the hotel-keepers at Fenelon Falls, and I will just read one of them:

Some hon. MEMBERS. Dispense.

Mr. TUPPER. If you hand them over to me I will deal with them. I may tell the hon. gentleman that Graham is not dismissed at all. The man has resigned, while very serious charges are pending against him. I did not dismiss him, nor would I accept his resignation and that is the whole trouble. I have ordered a formal investigation, and all that man can say would be much better said in open day before the proper officer when he comes to make the examination. The charges were so serious against Graham that I felt it my duty not to accept his resignation. He wants me to accept his resignation, but I have not done it. The hon. gentleman had better put the affidavits before the proper tribunal.

Mr. BARRON. I will give the Minister the affidavits, but I want to state the fact that they deny the allegations made by Mr. McDermot.

Mr. TUPPER. You do not deny that he has resigned?

Mr. BARRON. The Minister must admit that Mr. Gordon went there and suspended him.

Mr. TUPPER. He was suspended on serious charges, but he was not dismissed from the service.

Mr. BARRON. But Mr. Gordon appointed another man in his place.

Mr. TUPPER. Until after the investigation?

Mr. BARRON. When he was told by Mr. Gordon that he was suspended, he resigned his position, as he said he was not going to be dismissed.

Mr. TUPPER. I propose to give him a fair trial, and if you wish these affidavits to be put in they can be laid before the proper officer.

Mr. BARRON. Certainly I will.

Mr. TUPPER. I have abundant information under my hand to show that it was my bounden duty to act as I did in this case. I do not care about this man bill posting or bill sticking during the hon. gentleman's election. He was charged with the most serious offence of collecting money in fines and not returning it to the Receiver General; and on these serious charges, being made by my officers—officers who said it was a perfect farce the way in which he did his work—I suspended him and authorized the inspector to hear what he had to say, give him a fair trial and then report to me. Instead of this man courting enquiry and demanding fair-play, he sends in his resignation. I have had that resignation for a long time, and, therefore, no injustice can be done to Graham. The hon. gentleman says that I gave way to party feelings in this matter. I did nothing of the kind. I sent Lieut. Gordon from the Meteorological service in Toronto up there, a gentleman who is thoroughly competent to judge of what is required, and I put in force a temporary arrangement pending enquiry. There is not the slightest desire to push these charges unduly against Graham, and I have hesitated from any action all this summer, because I have not had Graham's statement of the case. But in view of the charge that he was using his position as fishery officer for his own purposes, and stealing public money, I could not do otherwise than to suspend him pending enquiry. The charges were made over McDermot's signature, and if shown to be false they mean McDermot's dismissal or the dismissal of any man making these charges without reason. In view of these charges I could not accept his resignation and I felt it my duty to suspend him. I will be glad to have the hon. gentleman's affidavits and have them fyled in the case

Mr. BARRON. The hon. gentleman says that this Mr. Graham was charged with stealing.

Mr. TUPPER. Yes; I say that is the charge.

Mr. BARRON. I do not think that statement should go without explanation.

Mr. TUPPER. One of the worst features in the case was that, with that charge in front of him, he should have sent in his resignation without waiting for the investigation.

Mr. BARRON. I think the Minister knows the explanation about the money charges.

Mr. TUPPER. I only heard it from the hon. gentleman, but I never had it from Mr. Graham.

Mr. BARRON. In justice to Mr. Graham I should say that he has a claim against the department, whether right or wrong I do not know, and he says he cannot get the money from the department. He is quite ready to hand over these moneys referred to as soon as he gets his claim settled against the department.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. TUPPER. We do not owe him a single sixpence, and even if we owed him a thousand dollars he knows, as well as the hon. gentleman knows, that he has to account to the Receiver General for the money he receives for the Crown and not to the Marine Department. All that surprises me is that the hon. gentleman should attempt to defend such conduct, more especially in advance of the fair trial that is offered to this man.

Indians—To provide for an increase in the salary paid to Mr. Ovide Roy, teacher of the boys' school at Caughnawaga..... $ 50

Mr. SCRIVER. It appears from this vote that the Dominion Government pays the salaries of the teachers at Caughnawaga. At St. Régis, where the Indians occupy the same relation to the Domi-

nion Government, the salary of the teacher, though paid by the Dominion Government, is deducted from the moneys distributed to the Indians by the Government. I should like to know why this difference is made between the two tribes?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The reason is that the Indians of St. Régis have a considerable sum to their credit while the Indians at Caughnawaga have hardly anything.

Mr. SCRIVER. I am afraid that is the fault of the Indians at Caughnawaga. They have just as large and valuable a reserve as the Indians at St. Régis, and if they do not manage as well as their brothers. I do not see why they should be treated any better.

Indians, Nova Scotia—Grant towards building fund of Indian Chapel on Chapel Island, Cape Breton..... $450

Mr. FLINT. I will read the affidavit which was referred to the other day, having been sent by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). I will make no comments upon it. It completes the record of the discussion on page 5420 of *Hansard*. Then it will be left with the Department of the Interior to make such further investigation as they see fit :

"CANADA,
"PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA,
"County of Antigonish.

"I, Donald Chisholm, of Afton, in the County of Antigonish and Province of Nova Scotia, farmer, do solemnly declare as follows :—

"(1.) I am informed that two certificates of mine in reference to a pair of oxen sold by Mr. William C. Chisholm, Indian agent, were read in the House of Commons, Ottawa, recently.

"(2.) The first certificate, alleging that $60 was the price paid for the oxen, is the true and correct one. I sold the oxen in question in 1887 for $60, and received some time afterwards $40 cash for them from the said William C. Chisholm, and he then and there gave me credit on his book for twenty dollars. The money was paid in his own store at Heatherton.

"(3.) The said William C. Chisholm never told me that a cheque came for the sum of seventy dollars or for any other sum for me. I am informed that a cheque is returned to the department as having been signed or endorsed by me. I never signed or endorsed any such cheque, neither did I authorize anyone for me to do so at any time.

"(4.) I signed the second certificate at the request of the said William C. Chisholm on his showing me an entry in his book for seventy dollars appeared to be credited to me, instead of sixty dollars, the price of the oxen. The entry appeared to me to be new figures made over erased figures and at the time I had no doubt in my mind but I was getting ten dollars more by this entry. I did not think there would be any trouble about the matter, and to obtain the additional ten dollars I signed the second certificate, thinking I was harming no one. I believed at the time the second certificate was given after I looked at the book that the figures were changed, and I still believe so, and I positively assert that the oxen in question were sold by me for sixty dollars, and not for seventy dollars or any other sum.

"(5.) The second certificate was signed by me the day I looked at his book at his own request, and I think it was about the first of August, 1891.

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act passed in the 37th year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled: 'An Act for the suppression of voluntary and extra-judicial oaths.'

"DONALD CHISHOLM."

To provide for the maintenance of ten additional pupils at the Roman Catholic schools at St. Boniface, at $100 per annum $1,000

Mr. WATSON. Is $100 the usual price?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes ; they have already some thirty or forty pupils paid for at the same price. There is a large number of applications made now, much larger than we have allowed this year, for admittance into that school.

Mr. WATSON. Are all schools paid at the same rate?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; some get $72 and some $100. $100 is the highest where the children are taken care of and everything found, without anything from the Government, except providing and furnishing the building.

To pay Claims in connection with the North-West Rebellion in 1885..... $600

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is to pay for the burning of the blacksmith shop at Batoche during the rebellion. On the 21st of March scouts were sent out from Prince Albert from the direction of Batoche to watch the movements of the Indians. A number of horses had to be re-shod, and volunteer Gordon was ordered to take possession of the blacksmith shop owned by William Graham. While the shop was in possession of the volunteers it caught fire and was burned down, and a claim was presented to the Department of Justice in 1888, which the department reported was not one which could be recognized. Graham then made a claim against Gordon in connection with the matter, and the department reported that it might be proper to consider whether Gordon should not be defended at the expense of the Government. Further representations were made by Mr. Macdowall, and the papers were again referred to the Department of Justice on the 2nd of June last. A few days later, the Deputy Minister expressed the opinion that Graham's claim, as then presented, should receive favourable consideration and the value of the building paid.

Mr. LAURIER. Although this is a doubtful claim, I make no objection, as the item is a small one, and it is better to err on the side of generosity. I would take occasion to ask the Minister what has been done with regard to Bremner?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The last petition presented by the solicitor of Bremner some time during the session is still before the Department of Justice.

Mr. LAURIER. There is nothing done?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. LAURIER. There is nothing to be done in any way?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Nothing has been done.

Mr. WATSON. I have had a letter recently about that matter. It appears to be a great hardship. A Special Committee of this House found Mr. Bremner had lost certain property during the rebellion. It was the opinion of that committee that the Government should pay the loss, as the property had been taken by the General of the forces. It is a great hardship that Bremner has not yet had his claim settled. His claim was investigated in this House eighteen months ago, so that the Government have had ample time to settle it. The item we have just passed is for a claim of which the Rebellion Losses Commission could not recommend payment, but, notwithstanding their report, on the representation of the hon. member for Saskatchewan, we find an item in the Estimates to

cover the amount. I am not objecting to this, because I believe it better to err on the side of generosity in these cases, but I think that the report of the Special Committee of this House in the case of Bremner should have received consideration at the hands of the Government before this late date. Bremner is in a state of destitution, caused by the loss during the rebellion of his property, and the Government ought to take immediate steps to settle his claim.

Mr. LAURIER. My information is the same as that of the hon. gentleman, that Bremner is in a state, not only of poverty, but of destitution. It matters not, however, whether he is in destitution or affluence, he was despoiled of his property—I will not use a stronger word—and, under the circumstances, the Government should recoup him. The Government should not bear the loss itself, but should see that the real culprits make the loss good to the Government; but, as between Bremner and the Government, it is not to be tolerated that he, who was unjustly deprived of his property by the action of an official of the Government, should not be compensated. The thing is not to be tolerated at all, because you have this fact, that this man, who was not in the rebellion, but was a victim of the rebellion, was deprived of almost everything he had in the world, and after six years he has not been recouped for his losses. I put the case very strongly to the Government that he ought to be at once recouped for the losses he has suffered, and the Government ought to see that the other parties are made to pay what is due from them.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This question will be taken up very shortly. Bremner's last account has swollen, until it is between $16,000 and $19,000.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that he is an uneducated man, and cannot write, and probably he is not altogether responsible for the claims presented in his name. He puts his accounts in the hands of agents, but I think the Government should exercise its judgment and give a fair compensation.

Mr. WATSON. The committee appointed by this House awarded Bremner something like $4,000 or $4,500, and I think that should be paid. There is no doubt that everyone on that committee was satisfied that Bremner lost more than that, but at all events the amount found by the committee should be paid to him.

Arbitration respecting the accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. (Payments on account of services rendered may be made to members of the Civil Service notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act)..... $10,000

Mr. LAURIER. Who are the parties intended to be entitled to receive that money?

Mr. FOSTER. The judges are acting as arbitrators.

Medicine Hat Hospital..... $1,000

Mr. DAVIN. This is a very inadequate sum. This hospital was established in 1880, and it has done great service since, both in the way of beneficence and of medical skill. It fulfils all the purposes of a great hospital, and this amount is very small. I think we ought to look forward to expending a larger sum for such a beneficent institution.

Allowance to the family of the late Chief Justice Palmer..... $1,000

Mr. LAURIER. What is this for?

Mr. FOSTER. During his lifetime, Mr. Palmer, in Prince Edward Island, was the judge of the Admiralty Court, and he received no payment in that capacity. After his death, the present chief justice was appointed, and was and is paid a salary for Vice Admiralty work, and it is contemplated that the family of the late chief justice should be paid this small amount in consideration of his acting as judge of the Admiralty Court as his successor has been.

Mr. LAURIER. He was not paid for this during his life?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. LAURIER. That is fair enough.

To pay the Canada Atlantic Railway Company for the funeral train, Ottawa to Montreal and return, on the occasion of the death of the late Hon. Thomas White, and other expenses in connection with the funeral..... $734 40

Mr. WATSON. Why was this not paid at an earlier date?

Mr. FOSTER. They did not render this bill sooner.

Mr. LAURIER. It is very strange that a railway company should not render its bills for about four years.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a larger sum charged by the Canada Atlantic Company, and they have agreed to reduce it from $996.40 to this amount.

Expenses of Prohibition Commission... $5,000

Mr. SCRIVER. I would like to enquire whether the members of this commission have been named yet, and if not, when they are likely to be named?

Mr. FOSTER. They have not been named. The Government has been so busy with the work of this session that it has been impossible for them to settle the scope and constitution of this commission. A sub-committee of the Council has been appointed to deal with it, and just as soon as Parliament has prorogued they will make their report to the Government, and the commission will be constituted.

Mr. DAVIN. The amount is very small, and it can only mean the beginning. I do hope that when this commission is framed it will be framed in such a manner as to meet the confidence of the temperance people throughout the country.

To provide for an addition to the statutory salary of the Clerk of the North-West Council $400

Mr. WATSON. What is his present salary?

Mr. DEWDNEY. His present salary is $2,000, and this is to make it equal to that of a chief clerk, which was also the salary that was given to the late Clerk of the Assembly, Mr. Forget. It is a very responsible position, and he has been there now for three years. His name is Gordon.

Mr. DAVIN. I know him well, and you could not have in that position a more capable man, and one more earnest in the discharge of his duty.

Amount required to pay for books for the North-West Government Library.....$1,669 58

Mr. DAVIN. I may say that a charge was made against Governor Royal of crowding into the library Catholic books. I examined the library myself, and I may say here that a better selected library for its size does not exist. Perhaps I may speak to some small extent as an expert on a question of that kind, and I will venture to say that there is a larger percentage of Protestant books in the library than any other library of its size in the world. There was no foundation whatever for the charge, and I think it ought to go broadcast to the world that there is no foundation. Anyway, I examined it thoroughly, and that settles the matter.

To provide for a Revenue Cruiser, and expenses in connection therewith..$40,000

Mr. BOWELL. This is the only opportunity I shall have of giving the explanations I promised the House when we were in Committee before. I do not, however, see the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) present, who asked a question in reference to the cartage contract in Montreal; nor the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) who asked information in reference to certain seizures. These points are pertinent to the question before the House, and therefore can be referred to. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) stated that $1,000 had been taken from Mr. Hunter in the west and had not been refunded. I promised to give him an explanation, more particularly as he threatened to make it hot for somebody, and certainly we do not desire to be any warmer than we have been for the last few months. While making these explanations I also desire to refer to a statement made by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Truax) in reference to money which he said had been paid to the sub-collector at Walkerton, Mr. McNamara. In justice to that gentleman I took it upon myself to look into the matter, and will now correct what I believe to be an error, or a misunderstanding, of the Auditor General's Report as read to the House by the hon. member for Bruce, who is reported in the *Hansard* at that time to have said:

"Mr. TRUAX. I notice, in the Auditor General's Report that Mr. McNamara, a sub-collector, was paid $590.56; fuel, $15.61; stove, &c., $16.10; cleaning, $48.25; telegrams, $56.25. I was not aware that Mr. McNamara had to keep an office open to the public, and cannot understand how it is he is paid $48.25 for cleaning office."

I notice also that this gentleman has corresponded with the newspapers. In his letter he repeated his statement in the House, and added:

"My intentions are to go into the expenditure of the public money so far as I am able; and as is well known to the public, almost every department of the Civil Service is rotten to the core."

The fact is, Mr. McNamara never received one cent except his salary. Anyone who looks through the Auditor General's Report will see that all the items which there appear are chargeable to Guelph, of which Walkerton is an outport, where Mr. McNamara acts as sub-collector. Mr. McNamara having seen the statement published in the official reports of this House, wrote to the Auditor General. Mr. McNamara, who wrote to me, says:

"I wrote to the Auditor General on the 15th instant and he replied under date 17th instant, in which letter he states that the only amount paid to me was my salary, and that the other items are contingencies for the ports and outports, and were paid by cheque to the collector at Guelph."

The Committee will understand from this that the charge made against Mr. McNamara is quite incorrect, and that the items in the Auditor General's Report to which I have referred apply to the port of Guelph, and not the outport where Mr. McNamara is stationed. I do not think I need take up the time of the House further with this matter than to say that the statements made by the member for Bruce were wholly incorrect, and that it is upon such incorrect statements that the gentleman takes upon himself to declare that all the departments are "rotten to the core." I have documents in my hands showing that the statement made by the hon. member for South Grey is not correct. It is true a seizure was made of machinery which was subsequently sold to Mr. Hunter, that gentleman depositing $1,000. After full investigation into the matter it was found that Mr. Hunter having purchased the machinery at auction at a sheriff's sale, after the failure of the party who imported it, he therefore was only punished by exacting from him the amount of the undervaluation, some $170; and the balance was paid back to him. It was denied on the part of the heirs that this sum was ever received. I hold in my hand the receipt given by Mr. Hunter to the collector at Stratford for the sum of $821.25. I also have the cheque which was issued to him, endorsed by the same Mr. Hunter. I have also a letter written by Mr. Hunter to myself—I mention this with a view to a comparison of the signatures—and a memorandum made on it by myself, "have the balance paid over to depositor," who was Mr. Hunter. No doubt, the hon. member for South Grey was misinformed by the information obtained. I am also informed that since this question was before the House the member for South Grey had communicated with the heirs of Mr. Hunter, and that those heirs still contended that Mr. Hunter, or his estate, never received the money. I have taken the trouble to give this information to the Committee, so that in case the member for South Grey has anything to show that the proper parties did not receive the money, and the information be given to the department, the case will be fully investigated. The fact that there are three signatures: First, the signature of Mr. Hunter to the letter to myself; second, his signature to the receipt given to the collector at Stratford; and, third, the endorsation on the cheque itself, all in the same handwriting, lead me to believe that there must be some mistake on the part of the heirs of this estate when they make the assertion that the money was not received.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman lay the papers on the Table?

Mr. BOWELL. It must be understood that they are the original papers obtained from the Auditor General, and must be returned.

Mr. SCRIVER. Is the revenue cruiser intended for service on the lower St. Lawrence?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. I hope to be able to intercept the vessels which we believe are constantly

coming from St. Pierre with smuggled liquors and other goods, which are transferred into other vessels and brought into port.

To pay H. N. Case, late Postmaster at Hamilton, the sum of $500 per year from 1st August, 1887, to 1st July 1891..... $1,958.33

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would it not be well to add a few words in explanation: "for compensation for getting out of the way of our esteemed friend, Mr. Brown?"

Mr. FOSTER. It is not for that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then what is it for?

Mr. HAGGART. He claimed that when he was appointed to the position he should have a residence in the post office, but he had to leave the post office and go outside. He has been making this claim for a number of years to compensate him for that.

Mr. MULOCK. What did you compensate him for?

Mr. HAGGART. He is eighty years of age.

Four additional letter carriers at Hamilton Post Office, at $360 each. $1,440

Mr. MULOCK. What is this for? Why do you increase the number?

Mr. McKAY. It is to provide a delivery system for the newly annexed district to the City of Hamilton, and to give that district all the postal conveniences which are now happily enjoyed by the older part of Hamilton.

Mr. MULOCK. How many letter carriers have you in Hamilton?

Mr. HAGGART. There were thirty-five, and there will be thirty-nine now.

Mr. MULOCK. How does that compare with Toronto?

Mr. HAGGART. The number in Toronto is 132.

To pay J. H. Bartlett for attendance of clock, Ottawa Post Office..... $60

Mr. MULOCK. How does this sum come to be in the Estimates?

Mr. HAGGART. He has been paid this for a number of years, but the Auditor General, on account of the recent criticisms of his accounts, refuses to pay it any longer in the manner he has been doing, and he insists in having a separate item voted for it.

To provide for salary of John Mason, carpenter, $2 per day.. $732

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that the Mr. Mason who figured in the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. He gave very honest testimony.

Mr. MULOCK. Has the Minister of the Interior anything to say about this?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; I would like to say one or two words about it. I read Mr. Mason's evidence for the first time to-day and I see he has given very straightforward evidence. He stated that for the work he had done for me outside of office hours I had paid him, but he did not remember the dates or the amounts of the payments. I hold in my hand the cheques of the different dates—one of 12th January, 1889, one of 27th June, 1889, one of 3rd January, 1890, one of 10th January, 1891, and one of 12th December, 1890—representing, I think, all the work that Mason did for me; and I shall be glad to give the Public Accounts Committee all the details, if they desire them.

Territorial Account—Clerical work in connection with settling Claims..... ... $200

Mr. MULOCK. It is extraordinary that you have to pay $200 for clerical work to settle accounts amounting to $600 or $700.

Mr. FOSTER. The claims were much more. They were worked down.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the name of the patriot who did this work?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not got it, but I will get it for the hon. gentleman.

To pay Dr. Bergin balance of salary and allowances whilst Surgeon General in 1885 $775

Mr. TYRWHITT. I would like to have a little explanation of this.

Mr. FOSTER. I can give a partial explanation, but I prefer to leave it to my hon. colleague the Minister of Militia.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Finance has all the information, and the only information I can give is contained in the item which is submitted to Parliament.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I do not think this item can be allowed to pass in that way. I think the honour of knighthood should certainly have been conferred upon the hon. Surgeon General.

Mr. SCRIVER. Why has this account dragged for so many years? I do not say that it is an improper payment, but I would like to know why it has remained so long unsettled?

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister of Militia will soon be through with the session, and he might explain this. It is a claim for salary which appears to be six years overdue, and there is not even a vote for clerical and legal assistance in settling it, which appears to be the proper adjunct for these items. The hon. Minister surely cannot be serious when he says that all the information he has is contained in the item before the House, because that is no information at all.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman does not surely intend to carry this item without explanation? If the information is not ready, he should let the item stand till to-morrow.

Mr. CASEY. Of course nobody wishes to be unduly critical about this item, but it is one which should be explained. The hon. Minister of Militia is generally let off very easily with his estimates, so far as explanations are concerned, and we do not expect much from him in that line. But when he says that he does not know anything about the vote, more than is contained in the Estimates, that is a little too military.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps we had better draw on the Minister of Finance first. He says he can give a partial explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. I believe that Dr. Bergin was appointed Surgeon General of the North-West forces at the time of the rebellion. I do not know what that position means, but I believe it is an office in the Imperial Army. According to the Queen's Regulations, I believe the Surgeon General, on appointment here, is entitled to the same pay as an Imperial officer; and when the war was over and the victorious troops had marched back to their homes and families, Dr. Bergin——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did he march back with them?

Mr. FOSTER. Dr. Bergin was paid a smaller amount than the pay of an Imperial officer, and the difference between the small amount he was paid and the pay of an Imperial officer, which the Queen's Regulations say he should have, is represented by this vote of $775.

Mr. LAURIER. Then, why did you not pay him according to the Queen's Regulations?

Mr. FOSTER. Some mistake occurred, so that it was not paid at first. I am informed by the Minister of Justice, whose word we must all take on this point, that it is a perfectly legal claim, which could be enforced in law. We do not propose to stand on that, however; but, it being a valid claim, we propose to meet it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Was there a salary fixed at the time of the appointment?

Mr. FOSTER. It was not fixed until the war was over.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It might be well if the hon. Minister would inform us how many men Dr. Bergin killed?

Mr. FOSTER. His office was not to kill but to keep men sound and healthy, and he did so to the satisfaction of the department and the country.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think he attended the forces at all. He was in the House of Commons at the time the war was going on.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). You are quite mistaken; he was in the North-West.

Mr. BARRON. Dr. Bergin was not there at all, but mixing his medicines here at the Capital.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). If the hon. gentleman will refer to the report, he will find that I am quite correct.

Mr. MULOCK. We have heard for the first time that a person has been appointed to the office of Surgeon General. To what rank is he entitled? Is he a colonel?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. As the Minister of Militia has been listening with attention to the Minister of Finance, he probably now knows what this item is about. We must ask the Minister of Finance, or the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville, what correspondence there has been about this matter, and how it happened it took the Government six years to find out that they had not paid Dr. Bergin his proper salary? That hon. gentleman has a valid claim against the Government for arrears of interest during those six years.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether this item includes all extras and additions, and whether we may expect any subsequent claim for interest?

Mr. FOSTER. This represents exactly the difference between the salary paid him and the pay he was entitled to by the Queen's Regulations as Surgeon General.

Mr. MULOCK. If this claim was due six years ago and not paid, he may bring a claim for interest. Have you made an arrangement by which this is to be accepted in full?

Mr. FOSTER. We cannot take a receipt in full until we pay the item.

Mr. MULOCK. What is your arrangement? If this money was due in 1885, interest may be hereafter claimed. In these same Estimates we have a case in point, where we are settling a claim for interest because the claimant was not paid his debt until some years after it was due.

An hon. MEMBER. That was a lawyer.

Mr. MULOCK. No: Mr. Goodwin is not a lawyer, and we are settling a claim for interest due him. I want to know whether in this settlement it will be agreed that no further claims will be made.

Mr. FOSTER. I have heard of no claim for interest. So far as I know, this is settlement in full on the question of salary.

Mr. TYRWHITT. This will require some discussion in the country between the hon. member for North York and myself, and explanations in our counties where great interest is taken in the militia. We should have some explanation from the Minister of Militia, as this is a most important matter.

Mr. BARRON. The Minister says the payment is made on account of salary. If that is so, there must have been some salary fixed at the time Dr. Bergin went into the service. But there does not appear to have been any arrangement whatever, and the payment appears to be an afterthought, which has seized the Minister of Finance or the Government quite recently. If Dr. Bergin is entitled to this amount on a basis of salaries paid Imperial officers, that reason must have been present to the mind of the Minister before this session, and to say that the only reason now for paying the sum is because he should receive the same pay as an Imperial officer of the same rank is not a plausible one. The hon. member for Leeds and Grenville defends this; but, of course, he belongs to the same profession. He appears to know more about it than the Government.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). The position is simply this, that Dr. Bergin accepted the position as surgeon without any provision as to salary, but as a large number of these items were to be settled by the Government by arrangement hereafter, his salary was among these items. No special arrangement as to salary was made after his appointment, until the settlement of the war claims, and he has made his claim by right of his legal status under the Queen's Regulations. This item represents what is honestly due him for services rendered.

Mr. TYRWHITT. It appears to me that this pay which is accorded to the Surgeon General is altogether out of proportion to what was accorded to the York-Simcoe Battalion. You will remember that the kit allowance was before the House for some years, and we had some difficulty in getting the Minister of Militia to grant this to the York-Simcoe Battalion. I think that to my hon. friend

from North York (Mr. Mulock) belonged the laurels for having brought that about. I thought that, belonging myself to the York-Simcoe battalion, I might have done something; but I found exertions futile and vain until my hon. friend from North York brought his powerful influence to bear on the Minister of Militia, and then at last we got this kit allowance granted.

Mr. CASEY. This is a question which has its humourous side, but it also has its serious side. The Minister of Militia does not pretend to know anything about the matter. A partial explanation has been made by the Minister of Finance, and a fuller explanation by the member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Ferguson). It is, however, a serious matter that a Minister of Militia should confess his entire ignorance of why this payment is made to a member of this House six years after it is said to have become due. This passes a joke when a serious item of this kind comes up, and the Minister treats himself and the item and the House as a mere joke. It confirms our idea of the Minister, no doubt, and allows us to regard him as a humourous item, but it does not conduce to the dignity of the House. It has been pointed out that the Surgeon General, as a member of this House, spent most of his time, or all of his time, here. Yet he acquired a rank above that of the combatant colonels who were in the field. I think Col. Gzowski and he were the only two who obtained the full rank of colonel, while others who were in the field were left with the title of lieutenant-colonel, and were consequently inferior in rank to those gentlemen who remained at home. I have the highest esteem and respect for the Surgeon-General, but this vote requires some explanation as to why he should have received his high rank and his high pay, and what he did, and why this balance has been left over for six years? We have asked for this information seriously and humourously, and the only outcome has been to make a farce of the whole Department of Militia, and to show that the Minister either knows nothing about it or will not explain. I think the department is a farce, but there is no doubt that the Minister himself can be regarded as nothing else than a huge joke.

Mr. TYRWHITT. It seems to me impossible that this item should be adopted in the present temper of the House, as it is a matter of such importance to the hon. member from North York and myself, we being so intensely interested in the welfare of the militia, that it is necessary to have a thorough explanation from the Minister in order that we may place ourselves properly before our constituents, whom I might describe as the most intelligent people in the Dominion of Canada, and the most interested in the welfare of the militia, as must be evident from the fact that they are represented here by the hon. member for North York and myself. As my people are not possibly as well informed as they might be as to the standing of militia, I think this is a proper time to inform them as to the different ranks of the militia. For my own part, possibly I am as well informed as my hon. friend for North York, I have endeavoured to post myself so as to meet him in the country, and that is a most difficult task, but I do what I can in order to meet my friend here and to defend the course the Minister of Militia has taken. Of course, he has taken a very unpopular course in our part of the country, and I think this is an item which requires a good deal of explanation on the part of the Minister of Militia.

Mr. WATSON. I think the Minister of Militia shoud give some explanation of this.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). What do you know about the militia? Sit down, moccasins.

Mr. WATSON. If the member for North Leeds (Mr. Ferguson) will keep quiet, I would ask the Minister why this amount was not paid five or six years ago? I think, also, we ought to know what particular services Dr. Bergin rendered, how long he was in the employ of the Government, what was the total amount he received, before this balance became due to him? I think the Minister of Militia should give some explanation why this amount was placed in the Estimates at least five years after it was due, or if any services have been rendered by the Surgeon General since that time. I am not reflecting on the duties performed by that gentleman. I believe he performed his duties honourably and well, but some explanation should be given as to why this is now asked for.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. Minister will tell us what length of time Dr. Bergin was in the service as Surgeon General, what rate per month the Government undertook to pay him, what ground did they proceed upon at the time they fixed his salary, when did Dr. Bergin first make a claim to an additional amount, and what reason the Government have for this long delay? I think we are entitled to a statement. I do not think we ought to do Dr. Bergin any wrong, but we are entitled to know how long he was in the service, what was the rate of payment fixed, how that rate came to be fixed, and when this claim was first made?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The item of $775 is a claim to pay the Surgeon General of Militia upon the same rate as the Surgeon General at head-quarters, as provided by the British Army Regulations. The amount under British Army Regulations would be £1,300 sterling per annum. From the first of April to the 31st of August, 1885, Surgeon General Bergin was paid at the rate of £2 10s., equal to $12.16 per day, amounting $2,636.49. The amount which he received according to that rate, and which was regulated by an Order in Council of the 29th October, 1885, was $1,861.49. He has made a claim for the balance, which is the item now in the Estimates.

Mr. LAURIER. Would the hon. gentleman tell me if the colonels and other officers are paid according to the Queen's Regulations?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No; they are paid according to an Order in Council of the 29th of October, 1885.

Mr. LAURIER. Then if we paid Surgeon General Bergin according to the Queen's Regulations, why not pay all the officers by the same rule? You open the door for a precedent, which will afford other officers an excuse for making a claim on the same basis as Dr. Bergin. I move that the item be struck out.

Motion negatived: Yeas, 20; nays, 25.

Resolutions reported.

PETROLEUM AT CROW'S NEST PASS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior whether he has any information in regard to the discovery of petroleum springs at Crow's Nest Pass?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The public have known for some years that petroleum existed in the Crow's Nest Pass, and that Dr. Selwyn had lately made an examination. He has brought home some of the oil which he had collected himself from the surveys of some of the waters, and he found oil oozing out of the mountain.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the Minister whether Dr. Selwyn will make a report of a visit he paid to the Rocky Mountains, and his visit to Crow's Nest Pass, in regard to coal oil and also to the coal that he found there. This is a matter of great importance, not only to the Province of British Columbia but also to the Dominion of Canada as a whole. There is no doubt that that country will in a short time come to the fore as a large coal-producing region, and also, I believe, from all I can hear from men who have been in that country, as a large coal oil-producing region. I think when we have men like Dr. Selwyn to examine that country, the least the Government can do is to give his report to the public.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Dr. Selwyn will, in the near future, give his report, and it will be published. He has brought back with him several specimens of coal and of other minerals, and they are now in the hands of the assayers.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.25 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 29th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

EXPULSION OF MEMBER FOR QUEBEC WEST.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It becomes my duty to make a motion to the House which naturally follows the adoption by the House of the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It is hardly necessary to say that it would be much more agreeable to me, personally, if that duty did not devolve upon me. I need hardly say that to the House, because I am sure that every member who was on that Committee, while fulfilling an important trust, was also performing a very disagreeable duty in investigating the charges made by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte), and in having to report the censure of that Committee on a fellow-member of this House. At the same time, the conclusions which the Committee have come to and which have been adopted by the House, and the conclusions which have been come to also by the minority, leave no alternative but for me to ask the judgment of the House upon the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy). It is true that one of the branches of the report of that Committee suggests that a prosecution should take place of the persons who were implicated in the frauds on the Government, but, notwithstanding that, the precedents fully justify the pronouncement by the House of the penalty which can be applied by the House itself. It is impossible to overlook the fact likewise that, while some of the offences charged against the hon. member fall under the criminal law, the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) was found to have been guilty of offences against the House, apart from those which fall under the cognizance of the criminal law. Under those circumstances, and without further dealing with the details of the matter, which must be fully in the minds of hon. members, after the elaborate debate which we have had on the subject, I feel it my duty to move:

That the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, member for the electoral district of Quebec West, having been guilty of a contempt of the authority of this House, by failing to obey its order to attend in his place therein, and having been adjudged by this House guilty of certain of the charges made against him on the 11th day of May last, be expelled from this House.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC WEST WRIT OF ELECTION.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant for a new Writ of election of a member for the electoral district of Quebec West, in the place of the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, expelled from this House.

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. TAYLOR moved the adoption of the 9th and 10th Reports of the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL REPORTING OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved the adoption of the 4th Report of the Committee appointed to supervise the reporting of the Debates of this House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will not raise the point of order in opposition to this report, after having heard the explanations of the chairman of the Committee as to the merits of the case. I understand the application is a reasonable one, according to the precedent of 1885.

Motion agreed to.

TAKING EVIDENCE IN RAILWAY ARBITRATIONS.

Mr. BOWELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 175) to amend the Railway Acts. He said: I shall have to ask the indulgence of the House to pass the three readings at once. This Bill simply provides for the repeal of the second sub-section of section 155 of the Railway Act, and to substitute another section for it, giving power to arbitrators to insist upon having the evidence taken by stenography. That is the only change in the Act. Our

attention was called to the necessity of this amendment by representations made to me of the abuses that have arisen in taking evidence before arbitrators in different parts of the Dominion, in cases of expropriation or other matters affecting railways which are referred to arbitrators. It has been represented that in many cases time has been taken up for days and weeks, and in some cases even longer, by one party insisting that the whole evidence should be taken down in long-hand writing. I shall ask leave to have this Bill read from the Table in the usual way, and pass its three readings this sitting. The leader of the Opposition has taken cognizance of this Bill, and I think will consent to this course being taken.

Mr. LAURIER. I look upon this Bill as very proper. The Railway Act seems to make it imperative that in cases of arbitration for expropriation the old antiquated system of taking evidence by long-hand shall be followed. Of course in these modern days we have discovered a much more expeditious way of taking evidence. I agree with the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Customs that the Bill shall take its three readings at once.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times, considered in Committee, read the third time and passed.

THE LAW OF COPYRIGHT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With your permission and the consent of the House, I propose to adopt a more expeditious method of reaching the Address of which I have given notice in this resolution. The notice for this Address, which was put upon the Paper, would require, if followed out, that I move the House into committee to consider the resolutions. With the consent of the House, I propose to move the Address at once. I, therefore, move that the House adopt the following Address:—

TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY:

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN:

We, Your Majesty's must dutiful and loyal subjects the and Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled humbly beg leave to approach Your Majesty for the purpose of representing:

That by the statutes of Your Majesty's Parliament (5 and 6 Vic., cap. 45) the privilege of copyright was given to any person who should publish a literary work in the United Kingdom, if he should be a subject of Your Majesty or a resident of any part of Your Majesty's Dominion, and the re-publication within the Empire and the importation into the Empire of any copyrighted work was prohibited.

The operation of the above-mentioned Act was attended with great inconvenience to the people of the North American colonies and formed the subject of formal remonstrances from several of their Legislatures.

These remonstrances were replied to by a circular despatch from Earl Grey (then Your Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies), directed to all the Governors of the North American colonies. The circular was in the words following:—

"DOWNING STREET, Nov., 1846.

"SIR,—Her Majesty's Government having had under their consideration the representations which have been received from the Governors of some of the British North American Provinces complaining of the effect in those colonies of the Imperial copyright law, have decided on proposing measures to Parliament in the ensuing session which, if sanctioned by the Legislature, will, they hope, tend to remove the dissatisfaction which has been expressed on this subject, and place the literature of this country within the reach of the colonies on easier terms than it is at present. With this view, relying upon the disposition of the colonies to protect the authors of this country from the fraudulent appropriation of the fruits of labours upon which they are often entirely dependent, Her Majesty's Government propose to leave to the Local Legislatures the duty and responsibility of passing such enactment as they may deem proper for securing both the rights of authors and the interests of the public. Her Majesty's Government will accordingly submit to Parliament a Bill authorizing the Queen in Council to confirm and finally enact any colonial law or ordinance respecting copyright, notwithstanding any repugnancy of any such law or ordinance to the copyright law of this country; it being provided by the proposed Act of Parliament that no such law or ordinance shall be of any force or effect until so confirmed and finally enacted by the Queen in Council, but that from the confirmation and final enactment thereof the copyright law of this country shall cease to be of any force or effect within the colony in which any such colonial law or ordinance has been made, in so far as it may be repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the operation of any such colonial law or ordinance.

"I have, etc.,

(Signed) "GREY."

The intention of Your Majesty's Government as expressed in this circular has never been carried into effect. The importation from foreign countries of works copyrighted in the United Kingdom was permitted under certain conditions, but the re-publication of such works in the colonies, even under any conditions, as regards the holders of copyright, has never been permitted, nor has the right of the Legislatures of the provinces or of the Dominion of Canada to make enactments to regulate the law of copyright been recognized by Your Majesty's Government, unless such enactments could be shown to be consistent with and subordinate to the Act of the United Kingdom before mentioned.

Your Majesty's Parliament, in the year 1867, in establishing the Dominion of Canada, gave to its Parliament very extensive powers of Government, including the right to legislate on this important subject. The Parliament of Canada has enacted several statutes regulating the law of copyright for Canada. These statutes adopted the provisions which the interests and welfare of the people of this country as connected with this matter seemed to require, and at the same time gave liberal protection to the interests of all such persons as had acquired or might acquire copyright in the United Kingdom. These statutes have always been regarded by Your Majesty's Government, however, as requiring sanction by the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and the most recent of them—passed in the year 1889—remains inoperative for want of the assent of Your Majesty's Government to a proclamation which will bring it into force.

The provisions of the Act of 1889, just mentioned, are such as are required in the interests of the people of Canada, and its provisions have not been shown to be in any respect unfair as regards any portion of Your Majesty's subjects. The Act was passed unanimously by both Houses of the Parliament of Canada, and has been earnestly pressed by the Government of Canada upon the favourable consideration of Your Majesty's Government.

While your memorialists hold the view that such a statute is within the competence of the Parliament of Canada under the British North America Act, they have been informed that doubts upon that subject have been raised, and they humbly submit that such doubts should be removed by statute of Your Majesty's Parliament, giving effect to the Canadian Copyright Act of 1889 at once and confirming the right of the Parliament of Canada, according to the promise made by Your Majesty's Government in 1846, to make laws on the subject of copyright, as may from time to time be required for the country, notwithstanding that such laws may be inconsistent with the provisions of Imperial statutes passed before the adoption of the British North America Act of 1867.

Your memorialists beg to call attention to the fact that Your Majesty's Royal Commissioners on Copyright, in the year 1876, recommended that the Colonial Legislature should be given the right to pass statutes embodying principles precisely the same as those which form the basis of the Canadian Act of 1889 before referred to.

We, therefore, humbly pray that Your Majesty will be graciously pleased to invite such legislation in the Parliament of the United Kingdom as will remove the doubts hereinbefore referred to, and explicitly confer upon the Parliament of Canada the power to legislate in the interests of the people of the Dominion on all matters relating to the subject of copyright, without regard to the statutes which may have been in force when the Parliament of Canada was established.

We further pray that in order to give full effect to the Act of the Parliament of Canada of 1889, aforesaid, notice

may be given by Your Majesty's Government of the withdrawal of Canada from the Berne Copyright Convention.

Address agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

That a Message to be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House has adopted an Address to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to invite such legislation in the Parliament of the United Kingdom as will remove the doubts therein referred to and explicitly confer upon the Parliament of Canada the power to legislate in the interest of the people of the Dominion on all matters relating to the subject of copyright, without regard to the statutes which may have been in force when the Parliament of Canada was established, and further praying that in order to give full effect to the Act of Parliament of Canada of 1889, with regard to copyright, notice may be given to Her Majesty's Government of the withdrawal of Canada from the Berne Copyright Convention ; and requesting the concurrence of their Honours therein.

Motion agreed to.

FRAUDS UPON THE GOVERNMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 172) respecting frauds upon the Government.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. This Bill, as I read it, is simply an amendment to chapter 173 of the Consolidated Statutes, with certain modifications to extend the offences and to make them more accessible of proof. This Act was taken from the Bill introduced by Mr. Casgrain in 1886, I think, but unfortunately at that time the Bill was emasculated of what seemed to me its most important clause. I propose to offer to the hon. gentleman for incorporation in this Bill the clause which was then to be found in the Bill of Mr. Casgrain, and which was left out of the Bill as it passed this House. I hope it will commend itself to his favourable consideration. The clause to which I refer was as follows :—

" Whosoever, for the purpose of assisting in any election to the Parliament of Canada, while performing any such contract or awaiting payment in respect of any such contract, subscribes, furnishes, gives, or promises to give or furnishes any sum of money or consideration, whomsoever either directly or indirectly by himself or by the agency of any other person on his behalf, to any person whatsoever, is guilty of a misdemeanour, and shall, on conviction thereof, be liable, at the discretion of the court, to a penalty of not less than $1,000, together with imprisonment for a term of not less than one month and not more than twelve months ; and in default of payment of the penalty so incurred, the offender shall be imprisoned for a further term of twelve months unless such penalty be sooner paid."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I shall leave the Bill in Committee, as this clause, irrespective of its principle, would have to be re-drawn.

Mr. LAURIER. I notice now it would have to be amended so as to conform it with the last clause of the Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will leave the Bill in Committee, and report progress. We can go into Committee on the Bill again to-day.

Committee rose and reported progress.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FOSTER presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1892, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 28th September, 1891.

INDEMNITY TO SENATORS AND MEMBERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That the Message and Estimates included therewith be referred to the Committee of the whole House on Supply.

He said : In doing so, I beg leave to say that the Government has come to the conclusion to submit this estimate to the House for several reasons, which I shall briefly name. In the first place, the session has been an unusually long one. We are now five months and a little more in session, arduously attending to the very heavy duties which have this year fallen upon the members of the House Added to that, the session has fallen at a period of the year during which business men and professional men leave their homes and their avocations with greatest inconvenience and greatest personal and business loss to themselves. It is upon this account, it having been strongly and repeatedly represented to the Government from both sides of the House, that the Government thought it would only be fair to take this into consideration, and for this session to recommend an increased allowance for the indemnity of the members of both Houses of Parliament. Doctors and lawyers and business men have attended here these months at very great sacrifice of their interests, which require, particularly during this season of the year, their constant and unremitting attention at home. Farmers have been here from every section of the country, whose supervision and care at home has been very much missed, and the lack of which has been detrimental to their pecuniary interests to a large extent. It is not thought, and it is not put forward with the idea, that this increased indemnity of $500 is at all a compensation for that loss of which I have just spoken ; but in connection with that, gentlemen in attendance here have been put to very much increased personal cost in attending to their duties as members of Parliament. And while this is no compensation at all for their loss of business at home, it is a little compensation for the largely increased personal expenses to which they have been put here. It is, therefore, in obedience to these representations, which have been made from both sides of the House, that the Government has concluded to bring before the House this matter which is peculiarly their own. With these few observations, I would invite from my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Oxford an expression of their view of the case.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to approve and endorse every word which has been spoken on this occasion by the hon. Minister of Finance. The necessity of the measure which has just been introduced does not require to be defended on the floor of this House ; for the public at large will realize, I am sure, that all the members of this House, with perhaps not more than four or five exceptions, are men who have to depend on their labour for their living—men who are not capitalists, and who have no income but what their daily labour gives them. Under such circumstances, it is absolutely impossible for men to continue to discharge the duties which devolve upon them as

members of Parliament if the sessions are to last, as this one has lasted, five months in the year. This increase is not asked to be permanent, but for this year only, and is not only on account of the unusual length of the session, but because of this other fact, that during a part of the time which members have been accustomed to give to their duties in this House we have had a general election; and a general election means to every member of this House an absolute cessation from his regular occupation for six or eight weeks in the year. Therefore, if the members of this House have been withdrawn from their daily avocations for more than half the year, it seems to me that every reasonable man must agree that the increase to the usual indemnity now asked is a fair one, and ought not to be objected to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no doubt, Sir, I think, that the statements made by the hon. Minister of Finance and by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will be most fully appreciated on both sides of this House. Whether they will be equally appreciated outside I am not quite so sure. But under the circumstances I, for one, am perfectly prepared to share the responsibility and to justify the action of the Government. There is no doubt whatever, as my hon. friend has stated, that from the first day of February last up to this present first day of October the vast proportion of the members of this House, who are dependent upon their professional exertions for their maintenance, have suffered very great loss. It is a very different thing indeed to make provision for sparing three months in the early part of the year, which are ordinarily considered to be the time of the parliamentary session, and to have a protracted session of five months coming after six or seven weeks of an election contest, with the consequent disorganization and trouble, which, as a rule, extend to four or five weeks after the day of polling. Bearing that in mind, and bearing in mind the fact that hon. gentlemen on both sides have been subjected, not merely to a long session, but to a severe session; bearing in mind the amount of absolute work which members have had to perform during the sultry portion of the year here in Ottawa, and the atmosphere in which it has been performed, I would not have been surprised, if we had a pension list here, that a number of us who are utterly *hors de combat* would have to be placed upon that list. However, I for one am quite prepared to share the responsibility with my hon. friend and the Government in saying that, under the circumstances, this is a just and fair provision.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister of Finance, among the reasons which in his judgment warranted the motion, mentioned that the session this year happened to have been called at a season specially inconvenient to the various members. In saying that, he, of course, rebuked the Administration for having selected that inconvenient period of the year for the convention of Parliament. With regard to the losses sustained by members by reason of the length of the session, and the unfortunate season when the House was called together, I am quite willing to admit all that has been said; and if the right of Parliament to vote money for this purpose simply depended upon those arguments, there could be no possible reason in my judgment for opposing such a vote. But I venture to suggest that no person should allow his interests to come into collision with his duty; and the weak point in connection with a motion of this kind is that the members of this House are passing judgment upon their own claims. They are interested, and it is not to be expected that they can arrive at an unbiassed judgment. Under these circumstances, I regret that it has been deemed necessary to make this motion.

Mr. FOSTER. It can be easily undone.

Mr. MULOCK. The inconveniences of public life do not fall equally upon all. I am well aware that there are some members in this House who make much greater sacrifices than others do. I am aware, as the country is aware, that many members, in obedience to the call of duty, have sacrificed perhaps all that they own in the world to serve the state; and, therefore, a session such as this is peculiarly hard upon them. I am aware that any criticism of mine will very properly be open to the answer that, perhaps, I do not suffer to to the extent of many of my fellow members, and, for that reason, I feel a diffidence in expressing what, nevertheless, is my conviction. I would say that it would be more becoming, in my judgment, for the future, if it is not deemed wise to adopt the suggestion at present, that there should be legislation on the Statute-book providing for exceptional sessions such as this, so that all will know in advance how exceptional sessions should be dealt with. Such legislation should not be the work of those who are going to benefit or suffer by it, but be applicable to succeeding Parliaments alone. If this resolution be adopted, I trust that the Administration will, before another session rolls by, introduce a measure that can be discussed by those who are not to be affected by it—a measure applicable only to succeeding Parliaments. There will be then no loss of dignity in putting in force the provisions of such legislation. There is a rule of our House, founded upon good judgment, and the wisdom of which has not been controverted, that no one shall vote upon any matter in which he is personally interested, and that rule would debar any member of this House from dealing with a motion such as this. In the future, members of this House ought not to be placed in the position of bringing, by their vote, their own interests in conflict with their duty, and I hope, therefore, if this resolution passes, this will be the last time that members will have to deal with a case of this kind.

Mr. OUIMET. In order to relive the injured feelings of my hon. friend who has just spoken, I would remind him and the House that when the Act was passed providing for an indemnity the principle upon which the House acted was that an indemnity of $10 per day would be fair and reasonable; and it was provided that, should any session last less then thirty days, the members would be paid at the rate of $10 per day. It was also supposed that no session would, for many years to come, last over 100 days. The principle of this increase we are now voting has been always acted on, as regards every servant of the House. It was acted on in the session of 1885 by myself and the House, when I had the honour to preside over our meetings, and when the session was like this present one, unusually long. The proposition to grant an additional indemnity to members is only

carrying out the spirit, if not the letter of the law; and from that point of view, my hon. friend, although a millionaire, may feel relieved, since he is only doing what those who made this law contemplated. I hope it will not be considered that I am solely guided by my own personal interest in this matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am exceedingly sorry that the condition of affairs generally in this country necessitated our sitting five months this year. There are two or three things we have much reason to regret. In the first place, we were compelled to meet at a very inopportune season of the year. I am quite prepared to accept the statements of the Finance Minister and the leader of the Opposition, as regards the inconvenience suffered by professional men, and even by farmers, in having had to absent themselves from their private business duties at a season when their presence was particularly required, and when the harvest was being gathered. At the same time, we ought to come to some definite understanding as to the allowance to be paid members of Parliament, and thus avoid being called on, from time to time, to vote money into our own pockets. I quite agree in the remarks of the hon. member for North York, and earnestly hope that the Government, in order to prevent repetition of this kind of thing, will, by statutory enactment next session, make provision for a period in excess of the ordinary term, either by allowing a certain fixed amount per day for such period in excess or by fixing on proper compensation in some other way. It is certainly a great hardship that we should have had to remain in Ottawa for five months during the hot season of the year; and, I am quite sure, if the experience of others had been that of mine, that $1,000 allowed would hardly pay their incidental expenses in this city. At the same time, the amount our people pay for members of Parliament, including Federal and Provincial representatives, is pretty large, and it is highly desirable, in my opinion, we should have a change made in the constitution and reduce the number of representatives in this House by one-half. I have been looking over the indemnity allowed in other countries. I find in the commonwealth of Australia they allow, by their constitution recently adopted, their representatives from each state a sessional indemnity of £500 or $2,500. In the State of New York, the local state representatives are paid $1,500 per year and travelling expenses. The senators and members of Congress in the United States get $5,000 a year and travelling expenses, but they represent a very much larger percentage of population than we do. Our representation is based upon about 25,000 to each member, whereas each United States senator and member of Congress represents over 150,000. The representation in the Australian colonies is based upon 30,000, so that after all the cost of our representation is, perhaps, not very much in excess to what it is in other countries. The objectionable feature in this whole matter is our being called on to vote money into our own pockets. I am opposed to taking this matter up session by session. Let an allowance be fixed for a term of years, as it is exceedingly objectionable that we should be called on, whenever there is a long session, to vote money for ourselves. Another objection I see is this, that the Finance Minister—I do not blame him, because possibly the matter was not fully agreed upon—should have brought the matter down before many of the members had left for their homes. They should be called upon to bear the responsibility as well as those present. I earnestly hope, in the interest of this country, that we will never be called on to sit a whole summer again, investigating such matters as those we have had to look into this session. I earnestly hope the affairs of the country will be conducted in future in such a manner that we will not have a recurrence of the immoralities such as those unearthed during this session.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was not in when this motion was proposed, and I feel it is necessary that I should make a few observations with regard to it. I believe the proposition is a reasonable one, one that is in the public interest, and I have no disposition to apologize in any way for supporting what I believe to be proper. I feel that I ought not to undertake to represent a constituency if I am not as ready to defend what I believe to be the rights of myself and my fellow-members as I am to defend the rights of the people. It was well said by Mr. Burke, many years ago, that no system of government which was undertaken to be established upon the heroic virtues could ever end in any other way than that of corruption. I think that is a sound political maxim and it is the more necessary in a country like this, where you have not sitting in Parliament men of great fortune, but men like the rest of the community, who are obliged to pursue some useful avocation in order to obtain for themselves and their families the necessary means of subsistence. That being the case, it is right and proper that a reasonable indemnity shall be allowed to the members while they are here, and we have always before us the fact that we are responsible to the people for what we do. The question is as to what is a reasonable indemnity for the services we are performing, or rather for the loss we individually sustain through our devotion to these public duties. There are many persons in the United Kingdom who are employed in various ways, not simply as members of Parliament, but in the discharge of other public duties, who receive indemnities and not salaries. It is of course true, as the hon. member for Wellington has said, that large sums are paid in some of the Australian colonies and in other countries, but in those cases salaries are paid and not an indemnity. The distinction, as I understand it, is that an indemnity is a gratuity paid to a member of Parliament or other official representative to cover those expenses which are incident to his position, and which is intended to protect him against loss; and, when you look at the case of High Commissioners and others who are appointed in the special service of the Crown, you will see that the indemnity is very much larger than that which is usually voted to members, and for the reason that, incident to their duties, there are certain expenses imposed upon them which it is necessary that they should meet and which the state is better able to discharge than they are. I think $1,000 is a reasonable indemnity for an ordinary session. I think the indemnity ought never to be fixed at a sum that would invite candidates to run for Parliament for the sake of the indemnity which is offered. That is one thing to be guarded against, and in order to guard against that, members who

have business of their own to discharge must always undertake the duties at a considerable loss to themselves; but, whatever expense they are put to, whether during the session or during the period when Parliament is not in session, which is a necessary outcome of their position as members of Parliament, is an expense that the members are called upon to bear from the amount of indemnity which is granted. We might sit here for three months. It is possible for the Government to keep back important measures that they might think unpopular measures, and then rush them through when every member is anxious to get away. Under the ordinary system of indemnity, without any provision for its being supplemented, the longer a member is here the worse he is off, the greater the loss he sustains here, as well as the loss he sustains by being away from his own residence. It is always in the public interest that, when important measures are under consideration, or important subjects are being investigated, Parliament should remain in session, and the duties that devolve upon it should be carefully and efficiently discharged. In order that that may be done, if you require members to sit beyond the ordinary period of a session they ought to be protected against loss in consequence of remaining here, and you can only do that by giving them a per diem or some other allowance in addition to what they receive for the ordinary period of three months. My own opinion has been in favour of a per diem allowance after 90 days have expired, a very moderate allowance, an allowance that would be no temptation to the man in the most straitened circumstances to remain longer than necessary. If you were here ten days you would get something. If you were here twenty days you would get something more. If you vote a lump sum for a period of two months, such as we have spent here beyond the time of the ordinary session, you have no rule laid down for anything less than two months; but if you had a per diem allowance for anything over the 90 days, no matter how small it might be, you would still have something. Last year we sat for over four months, and there was no additional indemnity. I do not think that was fair to the House, and I think it is always easier for the public at large to bear the additional loss that arises in consequence of a protracted session than it is for the individual members who sit in this House. The five millions outside are better able to bear that than the 200 inside this House. Care should be taken that the amount should not go beyond a moderate sum, so that no temptation should be offered to remain longer than necessary, but the important thing is that the public should have honest service, that members should remain here till the work is done, and, if you say that the House is to receive nothing after the three months have expired and that all the additional time is to be spent here at the expense of the members themselves, then I apprehend that the time will be made very short indeed, and you will have very few sessions, no matter how important the public business is, which will extend beyond the three months. I say here, as I say to those I represent, and as I say to the whole country, that the country is bound to see that this House shall give them the best service in the power of those who represent them in the interests of the community, and that the community shall protect the members of this House against actual loss on account of the services they faithfully and honestly perform.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL ACTS.

Mr. LAURIER. Before going into Committee of Supply, I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that all the papers promised early in the session in regard to the disallowance of certain Acts of the Local Legislatures have not been brought down.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Two sets of papers have been brought down.

Mr. LAURIER. Certain papers have been brought down, but others have not. The Minister of Justice pronounced on four Acts, two of which he allowed and two he disallowed. The correspondence in regard to the two which were allowed was brought down, but not the correspondence in regard to those he disallowed. This is an important subject, and should have been debated this session, but it is too late now, and I simply call the attention of the Minister to it with regard to the future.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was under the impression that they had all been brought down.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

To pay legal representative of the late James Goodwin, interest on the amount, $67,260, awarded by the arbitrator on the 28th March, 1883, for work executed under his contract for Grenville Canal enlargement, such interest being calculated from the date of reference to arbitration, 10th September, 1874, to the date of payment, 3rd April, 1883 ..... $34,571 64

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Finance promised the other evening to give some further information to the Committee before this item finally passed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the Minister of Customs has some papers to lay upon the Table of the House, or has laid them on the Table. I will explain the circumstances of this case so far as I am able, inasmuch as among the papers is a reference to my department, and an opinion upon the subject of this claim. Of course, it was not in my power to recommend, nor would it have been proper to recommend the payment, but the opinion of my department recommended that the matter be brought to the attention of the House by an item inserted in the Estimates. The circumstances under which that was done, were these: The late Mr. Goodwin had a contract with the Government for the construction of canal works, one condition of which was that for any claims which he had against the Government he should have a right to refer to the chief engineer of canals as sole arbitrator and valuator. That was the form of contract which was in use in the Department of Canals for I do not know how many years, but until a very late period. Under the new practice with regard to claims they are adjudicated upon by the Exchequer Court. Having under that

contract a claim for extras, or for a balance due on the contract, the Government of 1874 made a reference to the late Mr. Page as sole arbitrator and valuator. For nine years Mr. Page failed to proceed with the reference. I am not able to state to the House why he failed, because it was at his own option that he did so. For four years the same Government remained in office which had made the reference, and for nearly four years under their successors Mr. Page declined to go on with the reference, alleging his own business engagements as a reason for not doing so, at the same time not declining the reference, and the matter remained in his hand in that way. During that period Mr. Goodwin seemed to me to have been in the position of a suitor who had commenced his action, and who was entitled to be paid interest while the suit was pending on such sums as he might afterwards recover. After the lapse of nine years Mr. Page went on with the reference, and the result was an award against the Government of upwards of $67,000, and there was still a lapse of time after that before the claim was paid. It is during that period and on that amount that the claim for interest was put forward. I was influenced by two considerations a good deal in suggesting that the claim be presented for the consideration of the House. One of them was that during that period he was absolutely deprived of any other remedy; he could not offer a petition of right, a fiat would not have been granted to him, because, in pursuance of his own application, a reference had been made to the arbitrator whom he was entitled to have under the contract. The other consideration was that after the award was made, and when the principal was paid, he demanded payment of the interest as well. Everything, I think, tends to show that there was no interest whatever included in the award. The terms in which the award was made seemed to preclude that, because it was an explicit award for the amount due for work done under his contract. We have further on the fyles a written statement from the gentleman who was then Minister of Railways and Canals, Sir Charles Tupper, who, on the matter being brought to his attention, declared that there was no reference of a claim for interest to Mr. Page, and that Mr. Page was not in any way authorized to take that into consideration. It seemed to me, therefore, that the claim was a fair one, and that Mr. Goodwin should be put in the position of an ordinary litigant who, as I said before, claims interest during the time the suit is pending. I would have come to a different conclusion if I could have found that in any way he was in fault in the delay that occurred. I cannot say that at any period of the delay the fault rested with the Government; it seems to have rested with the arbitrator himself, and there are cases in which we have known that Mr. Page did make considerable delay in references made to him, for reasons connected with his duties and his work.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister of Customs yesterday placed in my hands the papers connected with this claim, and if I could have found therein proof that when the award was made by Mr. Page, and when the amount was paid to Mr. Goodwin, the latter had taken exception to the award, or had made a claim for interest, that would be a very strong argument in favour of the present claim. Now, these works were performed in 1872-73. The reference to the arbitrator, Mr. Page, which was made by consent of both parties, was made in 1874. Nine years elapsed before an award was made, and I agree with the statement of the Minister of Justice that as long as the reference was in the hands of the arbitrator the claimant was precluded from taking any other course. The award was made in 1883, and the reports which I hold in my hand do not show that at that time James Goodwin fyled any protest, or put in any objection, or pretended that interest should be paid upon his claim. On the contrary, in so far as the papers in my hands show, Mr. Goodwin at that time accepted the money without any protest whatever, and was glad to do so. It is only six years afterwards that a claim was put forward—not by Mr. Goodwin himself, because in the meantime Mr. Goodwin had departed this life, but by his heir, or legatee.

Mr. BOWELL. Is Mr. James Goodwin's letter of 1883 among the papers?

Mr. LAURIER. I find first the petition of James Goodwin of 21st October, 1873, making his claim. Then I find a reference of the claim to Mr. Page dated 10th September, 1874. I find the award on 21st March, 1883. The next paper is a claim of George Goodwin dated 7th February, 1889: and then a report of the Privy Council on the report. In all these papers I do not find any claim from James Goodwin for interest. So far as the papers show, the claim was not made by James Goodwin himself, but by his representative, George Goodwin, as late as 1889.

Mr. BOWELL. The reason I asked the question was, that if the letter to which I refer is not among the papers, it has failed to be copied. The memorandum reads as follows:—On 30th of that month, April, 1883, immediately after the award had been made by Mr. Page, James Goodwin wrote urging that he should be allowed interest, and on 20th July he was informed that it could not be allowed. So the objection that Mr. James Goodwin did not claim interest is not a valid one: at the same time, I do not find fault with the hon. gentleman, as I see the letter is not here.

Mr. LAURIER. If at the time when the award was made James Goodwin immediately presented a claim for interest, that would certainly present the case, whether good or bad, in a different light from that which it now bears, as being the result of an afterthought six years after the award was made.

Mr. MULOCK. Was there any reference in writing?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes: an Order in Council.

Mr. MULOCK. What did it refer to the arbitrator?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It referred the claim.

Mr. MULOCK. The way the case strikes me is this: an Order in Council was passed referring certain claims to an arbitrator, and the award made was a discharge of all those claims so referred. If the order of reference covered all claims against the Government at that time, the award covers interest and everything else. The question wholly depends on what was referred.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was merely his claim for work done under the contract. I may mention that in the Public Works Act there is a prohibition against arbitrators awarding interest. In the same connection, I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the language of the award itself, as expressing that it covered simply work done under the contract.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes: it is for work done.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the whole matter turns on the order of reference; but it is to be interpreted, of course, by any special legislation. The Act to which the Minister of Justice has referred might affect our decision, because if it did not allow an arbitrator to award interest, no matter what was referred, the Act itself would exempt the claim of interest and that would still remain an outstanding claim.

Mr. BOWELL. I read the order of reference the other day. The order of reference covered all matters in dispute arising out of the contract only for works on the canal; that was for work which had been done at the time of the reference in 1874. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the Public Works Act he will find there a clause preventing any arbitrator awarding interest on any question of dispute between contractors and the department, so that the question of interest could not be referred. That was the law at the time of reference, and is the law now.

Mr. MULOCK. If that were the Act, the interest could not have been adjudicated upon.

Mr. BOWELL. The interest now claimed accrued after the reference was made. The reference was as follows:—

"DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.

"Whereas James Goodwin, of the City of Ottawa, in the Province of Ontario, contractor, hath entered into a certain contract with the Minister of Public Works of Canada, on the 25th October, 1870, for the works required in and for the enlargement of the channel of the Grenville Canal for lock No. A to the upper entrance of the said canal, and for the construction of locks Nos. 9, 10 and 11 thereof;

"And whereas, on 16th August, 1871, another contract was entered into by and between the parties above named for certain additional works of masonry and excavation required to increase the height and length of the said locks Nos. 9, 10 and 11, and to give an additional length of 3 feet in the lock pits of the canal, as ordered by Parliament at its then last session, and the completion thereof within certain dates therein specified;

"And whereas, on 19th February, 1873, in view of certain great public advantages to be derived therefrom, if the works could be carried on in summer and located so as not to interrupt the free navigation of the canal, a third contract to change the location of the said locks, so as to leave a certain space between the north side of the contemplated lock and the south side of the old or existing locks, was entered into by and between the parties above named;

"And whereas, on 25th October, 1873, the said James Goodwin hath preferred certain claims against Her Majesty's Government of Canada for work done, losses sustained, and disbursements made in connection with the work above mentioned;

"And whereas, on 31st October, 1873, the Minister of Public Works was authorized by an Order of the Governor General in Council to refer the claim preferred by the said James Goodwin to John Page, Esq., Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works, for his valuation and report;

"And whereas, the Minister of Public Works, deeming it expedient to have all claims and matters connected with the contract aforementioned fully settled and closed, recommended that the whole matter be referred to the sole valuation and arbitrament and award of the said Mr. Page;

"And whereas, an Order of His Excellency the Governor General in Council, bearing date the seventh day of September instant, authorizes the reference of the said claim to the sole valuation, arbitration and award of John Page, Esquire, Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works of Canada;

"The Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, the Minister of Public Works of Canada, acting on behalf of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, as such Minister, hereby refers to the sole valuation and award of the said John Page all claims made, stated and alleged by the said James Goodwin, against Her Majesty the Queen, for matters arising out of the above-mentioned contracts, and all matters arising thereunder and in respect of such claims, whether made on the part of the claimant or of Her said Majesty.

"And the said Minister of Public Works, under the authority aforesaid, appoints the said John Page to be the said sole arbitrator, and agrees that the valuation, arbitration and award of the said John Page be accepted as final, conclusive and without appeal.

"Dated at Ottawa this 10th day of September, A.D. 1874.

(Sgd.) "A. MACKENZIE,
"*Minister of Public Works, Canada.*

"Countersigned.
(Sgd.) "F. BRAUN.
"*Secretary.*"

James Goodwin then accepts that reference in writing, which I presume I need not read. Upon that reference, which the Committee will see were all matters in dispute up to that time between the Government of Canada, then represented by the then Minister of Public Works, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, and James Goodwin; and it was upon that, irrespective of the question of interest, which I have already pointed out he could not under the law adjudicate upon, that the award was made. This claim is for the interest from the time that he made the claim up to the time the award was made, and from which time the money was withheld through no fault of his. Four years of it was during the time hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and four years during the time the Conservative Government were in power, so that I suppose so far as the pushing—if I may use that expression—of the chief engineer to a conclusion as to the amount of money that should be awarded, is concerned, the blame, if blame there is, rests upon one party just as much as on the other.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When was the award made?

Mr. BOWELL. In 1883. The question arises whether Mr. Goodwin is not entitled to interest since the award was made; but, however, that is not claimed here, nor do I suppose that he intends making a claim for that.

Mr. McMULLEN. There are one or two objectionable features in regard to this claim. In the first place it should not have been left over for so many years, and in the second place it is a claim that has arisen between Mr. James Goodwin and Sir Hector Langevin, who was Minister of Public Works. The past history of this country teaches us that this James Goodwin was an active leader in getting up the testimonial to Sir Hector Langevin, and was one of the largest subscribers in getting up that testimonial.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This was in the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. BOWELL. And was not under the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Goodwin took an active part in getting up that testimonial. We do not know whether the present move is in order to make up to his heirs and relations some compensation

for the active part he took or not, but it is wrong that a claim of this kind should be allowed to lie over for nearly nine years, and that then interest should be allowed from the time of the reference to the time the award was made. It is wrong that such claims should be left over, for they carry with them a very suspicious surrounding. I hope this is the last of this kind of claims we will have before Parliament.

Mr. BOWELL. I agree in the hope expressed by the member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), but it is a very great pity that we cannot deal with a question of this kind on its merits. Whether or not Mr. Goodwin had anything to do with the testimonial to Sir Hector Langevin I do not know, but I do know that to the testimonial presented to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie Mr. Goodwin contributed $1,000, and I should be sorry to say that either before he left office or afterwards, that in any way influenced the mind of the late Premier of this country. I know that that testimonial was contributed to by a number of Conservatives, because of their high appreciation of Mr. Mackenzie's character, and their knowledge that the hon. gentleman had ruined his health and was in a pecuniary position that justified them at the time in subscribing whatever they thought proper in order to compensate him, or as a reward for his faithful services to the country. It was a tribute from those who believed in him, as well as from those who did not agree in his political views. Believing the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie to be a hard-worked man who ruined his health in the service of his country, and a man who might have been better in a pecuniary standpoint in his private business if he had devoted himself to his private affairs, they freely contributed to this testimonial. I always opposed that hon. gentleman as bitterly as any one in this House, and I have attributed to him, politically, perhaps as many improprieties as any one possibly could, but I do not wish to be understood as even insinuating in the remotest degree that that testimonial which was presented, I believe after he left office, could, by any possibility, have any effect upon him, even had he returned to power afterwards. I trust it will be a long time before I impute any such motive to that hon. gentleman. I merely mention this to enter my protest against this constant hurling across the floor of the House of improper motives against members on this side, and more particularly against Ministers, in everything they do, be it of an important or insignificant character. I object most strongly to this practice. If there are any charges that can be brought against the Government, let them be made fairly, openly and honestly. But to suppose that Sir Hector Langevin, who was not in this department at all, or to insinuate that the Government were actuated by the motives that have been attributed to them, is a charge which I think the hon. gentleman upon reflection will see is unworthy of him, and the sooner these motives which are constantly attributed by our opponents are dropped, the better it will be for the dignity of this House and for the public men of Canada.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has spoken of matters of which he has the advantage of some of us, because he has just made a statement in regard to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), of which I was not aware.

Mr. BOWELL. I read it in the newspapers.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope the hon. gentleman does not take everything he reads in the newspapers as a fact which he ought to assert on the floor of this House.

Mr. BOWELL. I saw the name amongst the subscribers; that is what I mean.

Mr. LAURIER. He will all the more hesitate to believe what is published in newspapers, because he is connected with the press himself.

Mr. BOWELL. No; I am not.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, you were.

Mr. BOWELL. And I am not ashamed of it.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman must admit that there is a difference between the case cited by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) and the case he cites. The hon. gentleman knows himself that he has voted a resolution only some weeks ago condemning the receipt of testimonials by Ministers who are in a position to deal with contractors; but he must admit that there is quite a difference between that case which he condemns and the other case which he does not condemn, and which no one will condemn—that is, when a man who has sacrificed his life to the public service and is at last ruined in fortune and in health and out of office when he can give no favour, no one can find fault, if the friends of that man who has given everything he had in life to the service of the country come to help him in that way. That is a very different position. I do not say that the department in this matter has been influenced by this or that consideration. We have no evidence of that; but the hon. gentleman will himself admit, I am sure, that it is not good government that claims should be resuscitated six or seven years after they have been refused. If I understood the hon. gentleman aright, he said that after the award had been made Mr. Goodwin put in a claim for interest, and that the department had told him that he was not entitled to interest, and refused his claim. The hon. gentleman must admit that if the claimant was not satisfied with the answer of the Railway Department at that time his remedy was either to apply for a petition of right or to appeal to the Minister of Justice for a decision; but after he had accepted as final the answer then given by the department that he was not entitled to the interest, it seems to me that when he renews his demand six or seven years afterwards it should not be allowed.

Mr. BOWELL. So far as papers show, while Mr. Goodwin was alive he never accepted the award as final; he always claimed the interest, and the hon. gentleman knows that when a man makes a claim he never takes "no" for an answer, but keeps at it continually. When the matter was fully investigated, and the Minister of Justice came to the conclusion that he could collect this claim in the Exchequer Court, we considered it much better that we should recognize the claim. I desire to say that the particular reason why I spoke of the matter to which I called attention was to show that I did not know that Mr. Goodwin had anything to do with getting up the testimonial referred to. It is questionable whether he was alive at that time, or whether it was not the younger man who was meant. But the Committee should bear in

mind that this matter did not belong to Sir Hector Langevin's department. He never was the Minister of Railways and Canals, and he could not have been actuated by the feelings attributed to him.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot allow this matter to pass without saying a few words in reply to the hon. Minister of Customs. With regard to the testimonial presented to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, he led this House, and no doubt intended to lead the country, to suppose that that presentation was during the ministerial life of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BOWELL. I stated distinctly and positively that it was after he had left office. I object to having language put into my mouth.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman did not make the statement so as to show clearly that it was after the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie had ceased to be a Minister of the Crown that the presentation was made.

Mr. BOWELL. I said so distinctly.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not hear the hon. gentleman say so. If he did, I am quite willing to accept his statement. But it is one thing for a man to accept a testimonial after he has ceased to be a Minister of the Crown and has retired to private life, with his health so seriously injured as to be virtually prevented for the remainder of his days from taking an active part in public affairs, and quite a different thing for a man to accept a testimonial while he is a Minister of the Crown, and continues to be a Minister of the Crown until a few days ago, when he was removed. I do not think the cases are parallel, and it was not becoming in the Minister of Customs, in the absence of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), to have a prod at him on this occasion.

Mr. BOWELL. I repudiate that. I had no thought of it.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman is always willing to take advantage of any little technicality of that kind; it is usual with him. He can adopt that course as often as he chooses, but he will find that he will only suffer instead of benefit by that sort of tactics. Mr. Goodwin undoubtedly took an active part, not only in subscribing, but in securing subscriptions and presenting the testimonial to Sir Hector Langevin while he was a Minister. That is a different thing altogether from presenting a testimonial to a man after he has retired from official life.

Resolution reported.

CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Miscellaneous Justice..... $12,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What decision has been arrived at with respect to the payment to be made to Mr. Geoffrion?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No decision has been come to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought that matter was under consideration, and that the Minister intended to state before concurrence the decision.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not understand that, or I would have pressed the matter. Nothing but the hurry of work has prevented my bringing it before Council and having it decided. I think I may say it will be paid.

Winnipeg General Hospital..... $3,178.60

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this for the benefit of immigrants solely, or for what purpose is it asked?

Mr. FOSTER. This has been granted for many years. It is an amount granted to aid these two hospitals for persons who come from outside of Manitoba. The grant arose at first from the idea that some of the immigrants going in there would have to be taken care of, but the expenditure has been overrunning the estimate. The whole expenditure is subject to revision by the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is for the benefit of persons outside of Manitoba who are not perfectly chargeable to the Manitoba hospitals?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Rideau Canal—Bridge at Merrickville . $7,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this a new work, or is it replacing an old one?

Mr. BOWELL. It is replacing an old one which has fallen down. It is a little more expensive than it otherwise would be because they have straightened the approaches to it, which were circuitous. The same reasons apply to the next item, which is a very expensive bridge, and which arises from the fact that the construction of the canal there is extended over the drowned lands on either side, and it is proposed to make it a permanent work.

Government Printing Office—Fencing.. $1,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of this Printing Bureau up to date—I mean the building itself?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot give you the total. My book has simply explanations for this item.

British Columbia—Victoria military buildings, including Macaulay Point Battery..... $9,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see the Minister of War here; perhaps his colleagues could tell me with what kind of arms this battery is intended to be equipped?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot tell at the moment. I will make a note of it and answer to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a considerable reason for causing a point like that to be protected, I am aware; but it is an utter waste of public money if you are going to put in nowadays the worn-out and obsolete ordnance that was good enough a few years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. It strikes me the Imperial Government furnishes the guns.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If they are to be of any use at all for such purposes, they must be good weapons; otherwise the money is much worse than wasted.

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine that will be looked after.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am aware how it has been looked after on other occasions, and I am aware that the public money has been made use of on these very works with very little benefit.

Mr. FOSTER. I will have the information for my hon. friend to-morrow.

Public Works—Prince Edward Island.. $8,325

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think I must trouble the Minister of Finance for a statement giving separately the constituencies in which these various votes appear.

Mr. FOSTER. I made a note of them last night and I find that in Nova Scotia there were about eight that belonged to constituencies represented by the Opposition.

Mr. LAURIER. What about Prince Edward Island?

Mr. FOSTER. That has about the same proportion.

Mr. LAURIER. I congratulate you.

To pay Dr. Bergin balance of salary and allowances whilst Surgeon-General in 1885.....$775

Mr. LAURIER. I submit again that there is no justification whatever for this vote. The reason given for it last evening was that Dr. Bergin was to be paid according to the Queen's Regulations, as he had not been so paid after the close of the rebellion. The Minister of Militia stated in answer to a question put by me last evening that the other officers were not paid according to the Queen's Regulations. I am at a loss to know why the Surgeon General should be more favoured than the other officers. If Dr. Bergin is paid according to one rule, there is no reason why the same rule should not be extended to the officers who served in the field; in fact, there is more reason why it should be extended to them. Under such circumstances I must protest against this item.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the case be put to the hon. gentleman as it stands, I think he will see that his protest ought not to be raised against this item. The law of the country fixes the pay of an officer in the active militia, when on duty for active service, at that provided by the Queen's Regulations. The Surgeon General received his appointment and discharged all his duties under that state of the law: and, after his services were completed, an Order in Council was passed providing that he should receive a smaller sum; but that he never acquiesced in or accepted in any way. The question simply is whether he has not an absolute right by law to receive these moneys. I was under the impression that there were no others to whom the same principle applies. It may be that there are some, and it may be that they engaged themselves under special circumstances; but there was no defence against the view that Dr. Bergin was entitled to be paid the salary provided for by the Queen's Regulations. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that, whether the remuneration is large or small, it is only fair that we should pay it, and not leave ourselves open to be sued for this small balance of pay.

Mr. MULOCK. If Dr. Bergin has legal rights, I suppose no person would wish to deprive him of them. But last night we were told that an Order in Council was passed by which Dr. Bergin was paid less than he was entitled to under the Queen's Regulations. The Minister of Militia, who was very economical of explanations, I think did admit that the officers who took the field were paid a lesser sum than they were entitled to by the Queen's Regulations, though they had been paid at a rate provided by other regulations. If Dr. Bergin is entitled to be paid this extra amount under the Queen's Regulations, are not all the other officers equally entitled?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think they were all so paid. At any rate, there cannot be more than two or three exceptions.

Mr. MULOCK. Of course, if the Minister of Militia were here, he would give some explanations. If the officers who served in the field have not been paid according to the Queen's Regulations, they should be included in this provision equally with the Surgeon General.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know anyone who was not paid under the Queen's Regulations other than General Laurie, who did not receive the pay of a general while on service in the North-West, for the reason that he volunteered his services in the rebellion even if he should receive no pay at all. That was an understanding between the general himself and the department. I know of no other case, and I think the case of General Laurie must have been the one to which the Minister of Militia had reference. The Queen's Regulations are the law of the land, and men who serve are legally entitled to such pay as those regulations provide for. I have been on active service two or three times myself, and those who are called to go on active service do so under the law.

Mr. LAURIER. I am surprised that Dr. Bergin was not treated in that manner earlier.

Mr. TYRWHITT. Speaking for myself and the officers of my force generally, I may say that we were more than satisfied with our pay. I never met an officer of the field force who expressed dissatisfaction with his pay; and when Parliament voted an indemnity in addition, we felt that we were most magnanimously dealt with. But I regret to say that there were officers in the field force who were not dealt with in the magnanimous way that the Surgeon General has been. I refer especially to General Strange and General Laurie, whose pay was put down to that of colonels, and who were dealt with in a very mean way. Why the Surgeon General should be selected to be paid an indemnity out of all proportion to the indemnities paid other men I cannot conceive. I believe that, in addition to the $1,500 he received at that time as a member of Parliament, he received in the neighbourhood of $2,500, and I am told he is not yet satisfied. I can only hope that this House may yet see that it is their duty, when dealing out what we are told is law to the Surgeon General, to deal simple, even-handed justice to General Strange and General Laurie, who, in my humble opinion, were not dealt with as they should have been.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the Minister of Justice to say that Dr. Bergin was the only person entitled to be paid according to the Queen's Regulations?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He is the only person I know of who was, unless the two cases men-

tioned by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the answer which the Minister of Militia gave last night. When asked if the colonels and other officers were paid according to the Queen's Regulations, he replied: "No, they were paid according to the Order in Council of the 29th October, 1885." If the answer given by the Minister of War be right, and only Dr. Bergin has been paid according to the Queen's Regulations, the other officers who are not will undoubtedly feel that they are hardly treated and will claim that they should be paid on the same footing.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know the reason for the difference of opinion, but I spoke from the fact that the Order in Council, which undertook to fix Dr. Bergin's pay at less than the amount allowed by the Queen's Regulations, included one or two others only—the two generals, I think, who have been mentioned just now. I was under the impression they were the only exceptions from these regulations.

Mr. LAURIER. With all deference to the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Militia should be the better authority.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As to questions of fact.

Mr. LAURIER. I wanted to know if that was to bring Dr. Bergin in the same category as the others, and the Minister of Militia said that the others were not paid according to the Queen's Regulations but under Order in Council. Under the circumstances it seemed to me there was no reason at all why Dr. Bergin should be given a preference over the others.

Item concurred in on division.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER moved:

Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1892, the sum of $9,404,941.21 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolution read the first and the second time, and concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 177) to grant to Her Majesty certain sums of money required to defray certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first, second and third times and passed.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved first reading of Bill (No. 178) further to amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories. He said: I stated yesterday we found after the census returns came in, that the proportions of the districts were not as they would have been if we had had the returns when we made the electoral districts. On consultation with the members from that western country, we concluded the most satisfactory way would be to reduce the Saskatchewan district to five members instead of six, that would give Assiniboia twelve and Saskatchewan and Alberta eight. That was the nearest we could come to, and the only way we found to bring this about was by a short Bill in the Senate. Of course, if the House has no objection, I would like to put that through.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that when the House adjourns it stands adjourned until 11 a. m. to-morrow morning.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to know what the programme is for to-morrow. We have the trade address from the Senate?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Then we have the Bill respecting frauds upon the Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Then what will you do with the Bill respecting dead bodies from the Senate?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Let the dead bury their dead.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That Bill is an amendment to the criminal law, and, as both Houses have abstained this session from passing amendments to the criminal law in order to take up the general Act next year, in that view I would prefer not to go on with that Bill, and, of course, it goes without saying, that the Act respecting the criminal law will not be taken up to-morrow. The Committee on Printing were good enough to have a large number of copies of that Bill distributed for the consideration of members before next session. The Bill with regard to the counting of time and the Bill with regard to the militia and defence it was understood would not be proceeded with this session. They were introduced in order to call public attention to them.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Militia is present now, so that the hon. member for South Oxford might ask him the question he desired to have an answer to before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All I desired to know was what kind of armament is to be put at this Victoria point.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is almost impossible to answer the hon. gentleman's question at present, but the information we have is that these batteries will be armed by the Imperial Government, and, under an Order in Council and an agreement entered into between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Government, the Canadian Government undertake to perform certain defensive works, and the Imperial Government undertake to provide certain armaments for the forts which the Canadian Government are to build. They will be the most improved armaments, because the Imperial

Government reserved that for itself in order to have the very best kind of armament.

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 6.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 30th September, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication:—

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 29th September, 1891.

SIR,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber to prorogue the Session of the Dominion Parliament on Wednesday the 30th instant, at 3.30 o'clock.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
CHARLES COLVILLE, *Major*,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable,
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

VACANCY IN QUEBEC WEST.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have issued my Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for a new Writ of election for the Electoral District of Quebec West, to fill the vacancy caused by the expulsion of Thomas McGreevy, Esq.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to ask the Government whether they intended to bring on the Quebec West election before the lists are revised, or whether they will postpone it, as I understand has been agreed, until after that revision?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The matter has not been considered by the Government, but I think we would prefer to delay the election until the revision of the list is completed.

Mr. LAURIER. I had understood that the matter had been arranged or agreed to by both parties, that no election would be held under the old list.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course I am not free to give any pledge.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg to move that the House do concur in the following Address of the Senate to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen in respect of certain important matters affecting its trade relations with the Empire, and with foreign nations, after filling up the blank with the words "and House of Commons"; and amending the same by striking out the words "as with any other nation in respect of which such provisions are now in force":—

To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty:

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN:

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Senate of Canada, in Parliament assembled, humbly request that Your Majesty may be graciously pleased to take into consideration the position of Canada in respect of certain important matters affecting its trade relations with the Empire, and with foreign nations.

Your memorialists desire in the first place, to draw attention to certains stipulations in the existing treaties with Belgium and with the German Zollverein, ordinarily referred to as the "most favoured nations" clauses, which are extended to other countries whose commercial treaties with Great Britain contain a "most favoured nation" clause, and which apply to British colonies. By Art. XV of the Treaty with Belgium, entered into in 1862, Canada is compelled to admit all articles, the produce or manufacture of Belgium, at the same or at no higher rate of duty than is imposed upon similar articles of British origin. And in the treaty with the German Zollverein, entered into in 1865, it is stipulated that the produce of those states shall not be subject to any higher or other import duties than the produce of the United Kingdom or any other country of the like kind: and that the exports to those states shall not be subject to any higher duties than exports to the United Kingdom.

Your memorialists consider that these provisions in treaties with foreign powers are incompatible with the rights and powers subsequently conferred by the British North America Act upon the Parliament of Canada, for the regulation of the trade and commerce of the Dominion: and that their continuance in force tends to produce complications and embarrassments in such an empire as that under the rule of Your Majesty, wherein the self-governing colonies are recognized as possessing the right to define their respective fiscal relations to all foreign nations, to the mother country, and to each other.

Your memorialists further believe, that in view of the foreign fiscal policy of increasingly protective and discriminative duties, it is clearly adverse to the interests of the United Kingdom, and of each and all of its possessions, that the Parliament of the United Kingdom, or of any of Your Majesty's self-governing colonies, should be thus restricted in the power of adopting such modifications of its tariff arrangements as may be required for the promotion of its trade, or for its defence against aggressive or injurious measures of foreign policy.

Your memorialists desire also to point out that the immense resources of the Dominion in its facilities for the growth of food materials, its minerals, its fisheries, and its lumber, require for their profitable development the largest practicable extension of its markets, more especially in countries whose native supply of such productions is limited, while its rapidly developing manufacturing industries demand large and increasing supplies of raw material, to be mainly supplied by countries which are extensive consumers of the productions of Canada. Your memorialists believe that among the countries with which such an interchange of traffic takes place, the British Empire holds the highest rank in amount, and from its diversity of climate and productions affords the widest prospect of rapid and practically limitless increase, while the trade of the Dominion with the United States is second only to that with the British Empire, and its development and extension are of great importance to us; though, from the similarity of most of the products of the two countries, it is probably not susceptible of so great an expansion as might be effected in the interchange of traffic with the Empire.

Your memorialists earnestly desire to foster and extend the trade of the Dominion with the Empire, with its great neighbour, the United States, and with other countries throughout the world, wherever opportunity offers; and believe that by mutual concessions, and the adoption of measures for the rearrangement of trade relations between the various portions of the British Empire, and between the Empire and foreign nations, important and lasting beneficial results may be attained, and that to the way of the attainment of these great objects, the continuation of the restrictions imposed upon Canada and other portions of the Empire by the so-called favoured nations clause creates an unnecessary and unjustifiable obstruction.

The Senate and House of Commons therefore humbly request Your Majesty to take such steps as may be necessary to denounce and terminate the effect of the provisions referred to, as well in the treaties with the German Zollverein, and with the Kingdom of Belgium, as with any other nation, in respect of which such provisions are now in force.

I do not propose to discuss this at any length, but

to make just a simple statement as to why it is proposed to pass this Address. We find in the two treaties, one with Belgium and the other with the Zollverein, that there are certain clauses generally known as the most favoured nation clauses, which exist to the present day, and which are binding upon Great Britain and her colonies. The treaty with Belgium was framed on the 23rd July, 1862, and the article to which I refer in that treaty reads as follows:—

"Article 7. Articles the produce or manufacture of Belgium shall not be subject in the British colonies to other or higher duties than those which are, or may be, imposed upon similar articles of British origin."

The article in the treaty with the Zollverein of 1865, is Article 7, which reads as follows:—

"The stipulations of the preceding articles I to VI shall also be applied to the colonies and foreign possessions of Her Britannic Majesty. In those colonies and possessions the produce of the states of the Zollverein shall not be subject to any higher or other import duties than the produce of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or any other country of the like kind; nor shall the exportations from those colonies or possessions to the Zollverein be subject to any higher or other duties than the exportations to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland."

These two clauses are, as I have said, in force at this time, and are to remain in force until one or other of the great parties interested give certain notice of abrogation. These clauses, or their substance, have been extended to, or incorporated in, treaties with other nations, to the number of some twenty or more. The effects of these, of course, were, in the first place, to give Great Britain certain advantages in the markets of Belgium and of the states of the Zollverein in return for certain advantages which Great Britain gave to those several states. But the effects of those treaties were not confined to the principal signatory powers. The colonies of Great Britain and the possessions of these other states were included as well, so that so far as Canada, for instance, is concerned, these clauses have a binding effect upon us. Over and above the advantages that may accrue to us from the status given to us in trade with Belgium and the Zollverein, there may be disadvantages. These, in short, debar Canada from making a treaty with any other power of like kind with Great Britain, which shall place their articles on more favourable terms than at present are enjoyed by those countries—Belgium and the German states of the Zollverein, by the present treaty. So that, if with any other country Canada with the consent of Great Britain makes a reciprocity treaty or a preferential arrangement for trade, we shall be obliged by these clauses to give to the German states of the Zollverein the same deductions, differentiations or advantages we give to this third power. It also debars any preferential arrangement for trade between Canada and the colonies and Great Britain, which would not admit at the same time to those preferential advantages the trade of Belgium and of the Zollverein, particularly so with respect to the Zollverein. It would be a question, and such a question has been to a certain extent debated in this House, as to how far a reciprocity treaty where mutual advantages are given by both sides, *a quid pro quo* is affected by these clauses. Authorities differ on this point, and the positions of the countries differ. The United States contend that a reciprocity treaty does not fall under the most favoured nation clause. However, we have had a practical instance of late in the case of the Spanish American Treaty, in regard to which it has been assented to by both Great Britain and Spain that the most favoured nation arrangement in the Convention of 1886 does hold even as against the Spanish American reciprocity arrangement. As the House has been informed by papers placed before it, up to the time of the termination of that convention our Canadian products go on the most favoured nation footing, that is, they are given equal advantages to those gained by the products of the United States under the arrangement made by the United States with Spain.

Mr. CASEY. Has the hon. gentleman any information that this is being practically carried out?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. The papers have been laid on the Table; and cargoes have since gone in under the arrangement. The attention of Canada was directed years ago towards this matter, and as early as 1881 I find an Order in Council was passed, on 26th March of that year, which set out the position of Canada as regards these clauses, and Sir Alexander Galt, who was at that time High Commissioner in London, brought the substance of the Order in Council before the attention of the British Government, and they in their turn communicated with the Governments of Belgium and Germany. But the answer in each case was against the abrogation of these clauses as regards Canada; the answer of Belgium being, in fact, that one article could not be denounced without denouncing the whole treaty; the reply of the German states being that it would not be wise to revise this article without a general revision of the treaty, for which, in their opinion, there was no good reason adduced. We did, however, gain something cotemporary with, and subsequent to, our protest in this matter, and what we gained may be summarized in this way: Canada received the option of having herself included in any treaty made by Great Britain with any foreign power in which the most favoured nation clause was incorporated; and from that time on we have not been included in any treaties without having been given an option of having our name withdrawn. And we have gained something still further, that on the inception of any treaty we are informed of the fact, and asked if we have any representations to make in regard to being included or not in the proposed treaty with that power. That was done in the case of Egypt, not very long ago. We have also gained the recognition, so far as that goes, of our High Commissioner being given co-ordinate power with the British Minister resident at a foreign state, to negotiate a treaty, subject, of course, to the approval and sanction of the Queen. The matter also aroused attention in Great Britain itself, and as early as 1888, in response to an address of the House of Commons, a return was brought down showing all the treaties in which preferential arrangements in commerce and the most favoured nation clause were embodied, and a certain amount of discussion took place in the House. In 1890 an influential committee was appointed by the Board of Trade, to whom was referred the question of the expiry of commercial treaties, and that committee has, I think, made its first report to the Government. Coterminous with that the Canadian Government passed another Order in Council reiterating our previous position, and we

communicated that to Great Britain, namely, the desirability, in our opinion, of these clauses being abrogated so far as the colonies were concerned. That is, in brief, a statement of the matter as it is. No one doubts but that the existence of these clauses forms obstructions in the way of Canada's treament of her own fiscal and commercial arrangements, obstructions which, I think, there will be no two opinions in this House, ought to be removed, if it possibly can be done; and the object of this Address is to bring the matter in this way directly to the attention of the British Government and to strengthen their hands, if this be needed, in an attempt to get rid and free from these restrictive clauses. They interfere with the rights and privileges which have been conferred on us by the constitution. There is no need for me to argue that question. They impede our efforts towards the extending of our commercial relations with outside countries, inasmuch as whatever arrangements we may make to get favourable terms from those outside countries, must also equally apply to those countries to which I refer. Then, again, as I stated before, they preclude the possibility of any arrangement being made between Great Britain and her colonies looking to more favourable trade relations between Great Britain and Canada and her colonies. It does not need that I should call the attention of hon. members of the House who keenly and carefully observe the trend of events in the commercial world to the fact that, at the present time, in Europe as well as in America, events are transpiring which may have very great results in a commercial point of view, and that there is observable a tendency which may produce very great changes in the commercial relations of Great Britain and the different states of Europe, as well as wider relations, in a short period of time. Different European states are now negotiating with respect to the formation of treaties of commerce between themselves, which may very materially affect the trade of Great Britain with respect to those countries. It is well known that France has adopted the policy of denouncing treaties of commerce which exist between herself and other countries as rapidly as they may be, and adopting the policy of controlling her commerce and trade by legislative enactments simply. It is not a matter of impossibility that the effect of these divers actions upon Great Britain may be to accelerate very much that which already is in progress, a direction of the thought and feeling of the people as to future trade possibilities, as to the future of the commerce of the whole Empire, which may have the effect at no distant period of inducing more thought and more attention being given towards the betterment of the commercial relation between Great Britain and her various colonies. It is not necessary for me to enter into the possibility or probability of that. I simply mention it so far as to point an argument for the passage of this Address: that, if sooner or later such a state of things is brought about, and a dominant sentiment is created in the colonies and in Great Britain which would be favourable to such an arrangement, obstacles stand now directly in their way, and for our own interests, and these larger interests, if at any future time they become possible, it is well we should use what influence we have to have these obstacles and restrictive clauses done away with, so far as Canada is concerned. Of course, so far as the Empire is concerned, the Government and Legislature of Great Britain will safeguard their own interests as best becomes them.

Mr. LAURIER. I need not tell the House that on this side we are in complete sympathy and accord with the prayer of this petition. I am sorry to say, however, that so far as the argument and the comments upon the prayer are founded there must be some difference of opinion, and I must express my regret that a matter of this importance should have been kept to the very last hours of the session, when it is impossible to give it the attention which its importance demands. I had hoped that, seeing the notice of this Address in the other branch of the Legislature, that at some future time, within a reasonable period of the session, the matter would have been brought before us, so that ample opportunity would have been given to discuss it thoroughly and fully. The Minister of Finance himself stated at the opening of his remarks that he would not—and I infer he could not—give to the subject that full consideration to which it is entitled. However, as I have said, with the prayer of the petition we are in complete sympathy with the Government, and I am glad to see that the Government is more and more coming to the conclusion that the commercial interests of the mother land and the commercial interests of Canada—I might include the other colonies—are at total variance. Great Britain has industrial, commercial, and business interests of her own; Canada has her interests peculiar to herself also, and the principle is more and more recognized that it is impossible to properly regulate those interests by uniform fiscal legislation. Great Britain has her own system of legislation and Canada has her own, and the Government of Great Britain has always recognized that fact, but the Government so far has not been able to recognize the fact that not only the internal policy should be left to Canada, but that the policy as well, in so far as it relates to our relations with other nations, should also be left to the Parliament of Canada. The proper and logical effect of this Address which it is now asked Parliament to present to Her Majesty, would be to obtain the power long maintained upon this side of the House, that Canada should make her own treaties and should not be bound by commercial treaties negotiated by the Government of Great Britain which affect the interests of Canada. At all events it is conceded in this Address that the policy of the two countries is not identical not only in their internal aspect but in the aspect of their relations to other countries. This principle is admitted in the Address, and the logical conclusion will be that Canada should have power to negotiate her own treaties. The Opposition in this House in 1882 and 1889 asserted that policy, and if this matter had been brought before us earlier in this Session we would have asserted it again; but I may say at once, as we are in the last hours of this session, that, in the earliest hours of the next session, my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will take occasion to present again that policy and to assert it once more, with better results I hope than we have attained hitherto; because the Government is only and by slow degrees coming to the full truth of the principle in this matter. I said a moment ago that the truth

is here recognized, that the Parliament of Great Britain and the Parliament of Canada should have power to regulate the interests of each country. The hon. gentleman has now asked this House to petition Her Majesty to relieve us from the effect of two particular treaties—the treaty with Belgium and with the German Zollverein—the one passed in 1862 and the other in 1865. Lord Salisbury, speaking some time ago upon this subject, stated that he was at a loss to understand why the Government of Lord Palmerston should have included the colonies in these treaties. I have no doubt that the Government of Lord Palmerston at that time was under the impression that it was conferring a favour on the colonies when it included them within the disposition of this treaty; and this once more shows what I said a moment ago, that the interests of the one country and the interests of the other are at total variance. It is found that this treaty is satisfactory to the motherland, as of course all such treaties which provide for the extension of trade are satisfactory and for the advantage of the country which negotiates them. The British Government are satisfied with that; but what is to the advantage of the mother country has proved to be an injury to the colonies, or, at least, to Canada; and that is the reason why Canada has been sensible—hitherto, however, without any successful result—that she should be relieved from the effect of these treaties. In 1881, we asked for the first time to be relieved from the effect of these treaties. Ten years have passed since that time and with every disposition, I am sure, on the part of the British Government to help Canada, not to injure Canada, nothing has come out of these efforts. What is the reason? The reason is that a treaty is satisfactory to England and in order to relieve Canada from the injury done by that treaty, England would have to denounce the whole treaty and thereby to encounter the loss which would follow. Having to choose, therefore, either to sacrifice the interests of Canada or the interests of Great Britain, Great Britain has preferred to keep the treaty as a whole, to maintain the advantage to herself, and at the same time to the injury of the colonies. I do not blame the British Government for so acting, because after all in these matters the treaty is advantageous to them although it is injurious to us, and it shows us once more that Great Britain will not hesitate to do her own business even to the detriment of the colonies. Upon another question we have been reproached that our policy, if it were adopted, would interfere with British trade. Our answer to this was: Our duty is to Canada and not to England, just in the same manner as the British Government teaches this Government that the first duty of the British Government is to England and not to Canada. And so I insist, Mr. Speaker, that in all these matters it is for any self-governing country to look to its own interests first, last and always. It is for this reason that I find in this very Address a vindication of the policy which we have advocated, and a refutation of the objections which have been urged against that policy. Now, in this Address there are statements which I think are not altogether in accordance with the truth of history. For instance, the third paragraph says:

"Your memorialists consider that these provisions in treaties with foreign powers are incompatible with the rights and powers conferred by the British North America Act upon the Parliament of Canada for the regulation of the trade and commerce of the Dominion."

I agree that these provisions in foreign treaties are incompatible with our rights and powers, delegated to us, not at Confederation, but prior to Confederation, when the colonies of British North America were granted self-government. Confederation did not give us any new constitutional powers which we had not before; Confederation simply consolidated together the self-governing colonies. So far, it seems to me, the language of the Address is not historically accurate. There are a few words at the end of this paragraph to which I give my very hearty concurrence:

"And that their continuance in force tends to produce complications and embarrassments in such an Empire as that under the rule of Your Majesty, wherein the self-governing colonies are recognized as possessing the right to define their respective fiscal relations to all foreign nations, to the mother country, and to each other."

It was only three or four days ago that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) affirmed that very principle—that every colony had the right to define its own fiscal policy, not only as regards itself, but as regards the motherland, foreign countries and other colonies as well. My hon. friend insisted a few moments ago that the Government of Canada, in preventing the Colony of Newfoundland from negotiating a treaty which suited that colony, had violated this very principle; and the only way to keep together this Empire is to allow every part which has been granted self-governing powers to regulate not only its own fiscal policy but its foreign relations with other countries and other colonies. The next paragraph is one to which I would especially call the attention of the Government, because it seems to me that on consideration it will not be possible to accept it as it is. It reads as follows:—

"Your memorialists further believe, that in view of the foreign fiscal policy of increasingly protective and discriminative duties, it is clearly adverse to the interests of the United Kingdom, and of each and all of its possessions, that the Parliament of the United Kingdom, or of any of Your Majesty's self-governing colonies, should be thus restricted in the power of adopting such modifications of its tariff arrangements as may be required for the promotion of its trade, or for its defence against aggressive or injurious measures of foreign policy."

The meaning of this, as it is here expressed, is that it is not judicious at the present time for the Parliament of Great Britain, or for the Parliament of any colony to bind itself by treaty, because it may afterwards find itself hampered in repulsing aggressive or injurious measures on the part of foreign countries. It seems to me that the Government could not admit that. It seems to me that the language here is not felicitous, because I do not suppose that the Government intend to say that it would not be advisable for the Government of Great Britain to enter into commercial treaties with other nations. This I do not understand to be the meaning of the Government. If it were I would strongly object to it. I cannot assume that this is what is meant—that we should advise the Government of Great Britain not to enter into any treaty at all, because that Government might afterwards find itself hampered in its relations with other nations. I object to our giving any advice to the Government or Parliament of Great Britain. Let the Parliament of Great Britain attend to the business of Great Britain as the Parliament of Canada will attend to the business of

Canada. Therefore, I would move in amendment to this clause that the following words be struck out: "in view of the foreign fiscal policy of increasing the protective and discriminating duties:" and the words "of the United Kingdon and of each and all of its possessions that the Parliament of the United Kingdom or" and the words "or for its defence against aggressive or injurious measures of foreign policy." The paragraph would then read as follows:—

Your memorialists further believe that it is clearly adverse to the interests of any of Your Majesty's self-governing colonies that it should be thus restricted in the power of adopting such modifications of its tariff arrangement as may be required for the promotion of its trade.

The object of this Address is to ask the British Government to relieve us of the effects of two treaties—the Belgian Treaty and the German Treaty. I submit that it would be more conducive to the object in view to limit ourselves strictly to the arguments necessary to attain that object. Then, there is in this Address a very mild suggestion indeed of something in the direction of the purposes of the United Empire Trade League. I am not disposed to enter into this branch of the subject. I am willing to consider that question whenever it is fairly and frankly brought forward for discussion in the House. I have only this to say at this moment, that any attempt to establish a commercial policy upon allegiance, upon sentiment, seems to me to be necessarily fraught with ill results. Commercial policy can be founded alone upon interest, upon profit. If you attempt to build up a trade simply on sentiment, you are sure to be met with failure. Then, I call the attention of the Government to the following words in the last paragraph but one:—

"Your memorialists believe that by mutual concessions, and the adoption of measures for the re-arrangement of trade relations between the various portions of the British Empire, and between the Empire and foreign nations, important and lasting beneficial results may be attained."

That is a suggestion of something in the minds of the Government. I submit that the Government have no right to make suggestions of this kind unless they are prepared to say what they mean. What measures are here referred to? Are the Government prepared to throw out such a vague suggestion without explaining what kind of trade relations they want established between the various portions of the British Empire and between the Empire and foreign nations? These words mean that the trade relations which we have at the present time with the motherland might be improved. I do not say that they might not; but if the Government assert that they might, it is important for them to say what it is they have in their minds. They must be prepared to say what measure they will be prepared, if any, to submit, or at least to indicate such measure as will be likely to produce those results. The Government should not ask us to commit ourselves to a proposition of this kind unless they are prepared to define it; and, for my part, I strongly object to it, unless we have a definition which we can not only understand now, but which will stand as a basis for future negotiations, if necessary. With these changes, we are prepared on this side to vote the Address.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may say a word or two, Mr. Speaker, before the Minister of Finance makes a fuller statement, if he should be disposed to do so. As regards the hon. gentleman's criticism of the reference to the British North America Act, I would agree with him if we were undertaking to state history in that phrase, but we are not stating history. The powers possessed by the provinces before Confederation were as great as those now possessed by the Dominion of Canada undoubtedly, but the intention of the framers of the Address was not, in any way, to state history, but simply to state the existing fact that these provisions in the foreign treaties are incompatible with the powers we possess, and interfere with the exercise of those powers. As a matter of fact, it is now under the provisions of the British North America Act that we would exercise any legislative or fiscal control, and that is all we desire to state, namely, that the full exercise of the powers we possess under that statute is hampered by the provisions of these treaties. I think the hon. gentleman carries his criticism too far in respect of the phrase which he seeks to strike out by his amendment. The hon. gentleman is only aiming at the elimination of an argument from the Address. The argument is presented here that these treaties should be revoked in so far as Canada is concerned, because relations have of late years been created by foreign countries which may possibly require defensive fiscal legislation on the part of the United Kingdom and her colonies. That argument may not be conclusive, but no one can say that it does not possess in the minds of a great number of persons a great deal of strength, in view of the fiscal legislation of other countries in recent years, and we know that a large number of persons, and influential persons too, both in the colonies and the mother country, have reached the conclusion that, in view of that legislation of other countries, it is desirable that concessions be made in the fiscal legislation of the United Kingdom in favour of the colonial possessions. We seek to avail ourselves of the contention, not to urge that such concessions are imperatively called for at the present time, but to ask the mother country to keep her legislation and treaty arrangements free from any obligation which would prevent her, at any time, should the necessity arise, in the interests of the Empire as a whole, for making such concessions as would be mutually beneficial to the colonies as well as the mother country, and increase at the same time the strength of the union which exists between them. It seems to me that, whatever view we may entertain as regards the fiscal policy of the Government of Canada, whether we think it ought to continue protective or to branch off in the direction of free trade, it is in the interests of this country that the Government of the United Kingdom should keep its hands free to confer upon us any benefit which may seem to her reasonable and just, in view of the relations which exist between the mother country and her colonies. That is the only argument which is presented by this Address; it does not seem to me to denounce any legislation existing at present, or to contain any pledge of future action on the part of this country, or to desire the United Kingdom to give any pledge as to its future fiscal policy, but it simply expresses the desire that we should be free to join hands, if it should be necessary to do so, as regards the promotion of commerce, or for any other object. Under these circumstances, it seems to me the

contention of the leader of the Opposition has been somewhat strained concerning these two paragraphs, and I think they are the only two aimed at in his amendment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there is much more than argument in the three paragraphs of the Address to which my hon. friend has taken exception and which he proposes to amend. I am satisfied that these paragraphs never could have been drawn by the Minister of Justice, for I am sure that no one in this House would feel more certain than he that a paragraph simply stating a fact which we wish the Imperial Government to take action upon, should not be accompanied by a great deal that is not only argument, but is in fact, instruction to the Imperial Government as to the course it should take in its own policy, acting within its own sphere and jurisdiction. What are we asking for in this Address? We are asking that the Imperial Government should leave to us the power to deal in the future with our external commercial relations: we are asking the Imperial Government not to undertake to legislate in a way that will tie our hands and put it in the power of another country to seriously cripple us when we undertake to deal in commercial matters in a way that may be demanded by our own interests. A portion of this Address, as it stands, seems to me to rather point against commercial treaties altogether, and that is not what we desire. The hon. gentleman himself is under pledge to meet an official of the United States in the coming month. This address is hardly consistent with what the hon. gentleman proposes to undertake when he visits Washington. He proposes to negotiate a reciprocity treaty, and at the same time he declares that any commercial treaty relations with foreign states, which may bind the future action of the Government, are things to be deprecated. I do not think that is so. Then I find here this statement:

"Your memorialists further believe that, in view of the foreign fiscal policy of increasingly protective and discriminative duties, it is clearly adverse to the interests of the United Kingdom——"

to do so and so. In the first place, I do not think there is an increasingly protective and discriminative fiscal policy as is here asserted. I think the tendency is rather the other way. It is true that such a course has been taken for a series of years on the continent of Europe, growing largely out of the great armed force that is kept up in those countries, which necessitates very high revenues, and this demands the existence of a protective policy. But taking the neighbouring republic, it is true that there has been legislation there in the direction of increased protection, but the hon. gentleman knows that there has been a very large popular vote in the last two elections in the opposite direction, showing that the growth of opinion in the United States is not in favour of extreme protection, but the reverse. Why should we say that the United Kingdom and each of its possessions ought to adopt a different policy? The United Kingdom is pledged to the policy of free trade. There is overwhelming sentiment existing there in the two great political parties of the state in favour of the maintenance of that system. Why should we undertake to tell the people of the United Kingdom that, looking at the growth of this protective and discriminative spirit, it is to their interest to adopt the policy of retaliation, for that is what is proposed. I understood that we were going to ask for legislation which would leave us free to do as we pleased in regard to our own matters, but by these resolutions, at the same time that we are making this request, we are undertaking to tell the Imperial Government what they ought to do in the management of their own affairs. That is going a very long way. If we said we would like you to allow us to attend to our business, while leaving you to attend to yours, that would be a different thing; but this is doing a very extraordinary thing, to tell them the course which they ought to take in the interest of the people of the United Kingdom. They would naturally say, you ask us to leave you free to deal with your own affairs, and at the same time you undertake to burden us with your good advice; surely, if you think you are the best judges of what is for your interest, we ought to be allowed to be the best judges of what is for our interest. It is going out of the record and beyond the question for us to undertake to instruct the Imperial Government as to the course the Imperial Parliament ought to take in regard to matters which affect the people of the United Kingdom alone. If they leave us free to take our own course, surely the least we can do is to leave them free to do what they consider is best for them. Then, this paragraph also says that it is the interest "of the United Kingdom, or of any of Your Majesty's self-governing colonies" not to be restricted "in the power of adopting such modifications of its tariff arrangements as may be required for the promotion of its trade," and so on. Why should we speak for all Her Majesty's self-governing colonies? We are the representatives of Canada; we are not the representatives of Australia, or New Zealand or South Africa. Let them speak for themselves. Let us speak for Canada, and let us confine our resolution and Address to the interests of Canada alone. Surely we do not want to dictate to the whole British Empire. Why should we speak for Australia or for New Zealand or for South Africa? The Imperial Government might say to us: You have undertaken to speak for these other colonies, but we may tell you that their views are not in accord with yours. What we desire is to state what Canada wants, what we should do is to speak for Canada alone and for nobody else. We are not authorized to speak for anybody else, and to speak for Canada is as far as we should go. Then this clause makes a declaration against "aggressive or injurious measures of foreign policy." In fact it proposes retaliation. In 1878, the hon. gentlemen came into power on the proposed principle of retaliation, but after they got a majority, they did not carry out that principle and they did not dare to assert it. The policy of retaliation they dared not assert in regard to the American Republic after their attention was brought to the effect of it. Do they suppose that the English Government are going to adopt any policy of retaliation between this time and the day of judgment? Certainly not. It is not in their interest to do so or in that of any country. The policy of the British Government is founded on the principle that the interests of men do not stand in antagonism but in consonance with each other, and that no country can promote its own interest by seeking to trample upon the interests of any other country, that the Creator has so made the world

that each nation, in framing its own policy with a view to its own interest will conduce to the interest of any other country, just as any merchant will be glad to promote the welfare of his customers. No nation can benefit by the degradation or the poverty of another nation. That is the principle which has been acted on in the mother country for fifty years, and it has been so successful that it is not to be expected that they will go back to the barbarous policy of retaliation. That policy may be believed in, but it is not practised by the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. What is the use of putting in such a clause? What the hon. gentlemen want we agree with, but when they insert in their resolution all the political doctrines of the Tory party we object. If the hon. gentlemen want this Address carried with the unanimous support of this House, let them leave out these doctrinaire opinions which we believe to be at variance with the principles of political economy as well as with the best interest of this country. Then there is a clause vaguely pointing to the scheme of an Imperial federation. Nothing is definitely asserted, but a vague expression of opinion has been given in favour of views of that sort. Are all the hon. gentlemen on that side prepared at this moment, on the last day of the session, to declare themselves in favour of an Imperial league of that sort? Assuredly not. I know many hon. gentlemen on that side who, while loyal to their party, are not in favour of that scheme, and here on the last day of the session, when there is no opportunity for discussion, when most of the members are absent, the Government come down with a declaration vaguely committing the House to a policy which is not supported by any party in the United Kingdom and will not be supported by a majority of those who sit behind hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Then there is in the last paragraph a phrase that I did not notice, which seems to me rather meaningless:

"The Senate and House of Commons therefore humbly request Your Majesty to take such steps as may be necessary to denounce and terminate the effect of the provisions referred to."

"Denounce and terminate the effect"—that seems to me rather an extraordinary form of expression. These provisions must be terminated in order to terminate the effect. The effect closes with the existence of the provisions. You do not want these provisions terminated except in so far as they affect yourselves. I do not suppose you are going to speak for the United Kingdom and all the other self-governing colonies of the Empire. That being the case, the word "effect" should come out and the words "so far as affecting the Dominion of Canada" should be put in at the end. Then the last paragraph of the resolution would be made to fairly represent the views which the House intends should be embodied in the Address. I think the hon. gentleman ought to modify the Address in the way suggested by the leader of the Opposition. They will sacrifice nothing; they will embody everything that the Address should contain for the purpose of accomplishing the object in view, and it leaves every member of the House, both on that side and on this, perfectly free in regard to those disputed questions which are not at all relevant to this matter, and which ought not to be forced upon the House when a large majority of its members have already gone to their homes.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to formulate a question which I put to the hon. Minister casually while he was speaking. I would like to have from him a definite answer on this point that will go to the country, and will be extremely interesting to that part of the country especially in which my own riding is situated, I mean in regard to trade with Cuba. Of course, we have seen the correspondence that has come down, and we have heard what the Minister has had to say upon the matter; but I want to ask him more particularly whether any difficulty has been found in entering cargoes of Canadian produce in Cuban ports on the same terms as those from the United States, since the treaty has come into force? I ask an answer to this question, for the reason that I am getting letters from a number of shippers who are interested and who say they have seen it in the debates, or in the newspapers, and who want to know positively whether as a matter of fact this privilege has been granted already to Canadian shippers, and, therefore, whether they are safe in sending out consignments to Cuba. Of course they will not send any unless they know that this understanding is not only considered to be good by the English Government, but that it is practically carried out by the Cuban Customs house officers. That is the point I want to know, as to whether Canadian cargoes have been entered?

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the question which has been asked by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, I can state nothing more fully than the statements which have already been made to the House, and the information contained in the papers which have been laid upon the Table, which I think are entirely conclusive, and such as should satisfy every person that shipments from Canada of produce of like kinds as that included in the schedules in the Spanish American arrangement, are admitted into Cuba, and will be admitted into Cuba, until the 1st of July, 1892 on most favoured nation terms. I may say in addition, that cargoes have already been shipped from Lower Province ports and have entered Cuba, since the 1st of December, under those conditions. I think that ought to be entirely conclusive. Now a word in reference to some statements that have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite. In the first place, I wish to say that I cannot see that the memorial under consideration, so far as its tendency is concerned, leads necessarily to what my hon. friend opposite says is the logical conclusion, that Canada should have perfect freedom in itself to negotiate its own commercial treaties. The two clauses with which we are finding fault—if I may be allowed that expression—were placed in the treaties of 1862 and 1865, without the colonies having been asked to consent, without their having been consulted in any way; and these we take to be inconsistent with the powers which we at present possess. These provisions we think to be obstructions which may be very adverse to our interests in the future, although I cannot say that they have been adverse so far. The difficulty will arise whenever Canada has an opportunity of making arrangements with a foreign power to which this will be a bar, or with regard to which this will open the door so wide as to make it almost impossible for us to enjoy the good effects of an arrangement which we might be on the eve of making. Since that time, as I have stated, and of late years, the practice of the British Govern-

ment is not to conclude such treaties, or to put such clauses in them without having the assent of the colonies being included therein. So that the practice has entirely changed, and we are now in a position far different from the one we are complaining of having been put in by these two clauses inserted in the Address, which were adopted long before Confederation. So that I do not consider the logical conclusion my hon. friend sees in this Address, is fairly drawn. However, as he has promised us an unexpectedly great treat for the opening hours of next session, namely, a learned disquisition by the hon. gentleman from Bothwell upon the effect of commercial treaties, we must repress our desire to be regaled in this way for some two or three months, until we meet about these boards again. The hon. gentleman from Bothwell has gone rather extensively into the arguments upon trade grounds, and he has found fault with the statements here embodied in the words "in view of the foreign fiscal policy of increasingly protective and discriminative duties;" and he has endeavoured to show that the tendency is in the other direction. Well, if my hon. friend can find a tendency in the legislation of late years in the other direction, he has a stronger microscope than I am gifted with. If he can find any tendency in that direction in the last election in the United States or in the tariff which has resulted from it as the outcome of the principles enunciated during that contest, and embodied in the McKinley Bill, he is welcome to any such satisfaction he can find. In respect of the different European countries, I think he will be at a loss to show us actual results which would indicate a departure from the protective system. He has mentioned that a large and permanent military organization has to be kept up which necessitates a large revenue for that purpose. It is a fact that they do. But protective tariffs, as a rule, are not for revenue purposes; and if the hon. gentleman will look closely he will find the trend is in the direction of increased protection in European countries quite outside of revenue purposes, and with which in some regards that consideration is not consistent. The objection which is mainly spoken of by the hon. gentleman is that included in the fourth paragraph, in which we, as the hon. gentleman says, venture to give advice to the United Kingdom as to its policy. I do not think there is very much in that criticism. We are simply expressing in a very mild form an opinion which, I think, we have a right to express in a memorial, and I do not see that detracts from the prayer of the memorial, or that it will be followed by such dire consequences as the hon. gentleman seems to think. We are simply expressing, in a mild form, an opinion as to two particular clauses. It is not with respect to the general policy, nor with respect to the future policy. It is simply with respect to those two clauses which were framed in 1862 and 1865, and which we consider obstructive, and which it is admitted by Great Britain as well are strongly restrictive. Any one who has read the speech of Lord Salisbury to the deputation who waited on him will see, in addition to the words quoted by the hon. member for Quebec, there is also running through it the idea that those two clauses in their present shape hamper the United Kingdom of Great Britain as well in her power of making trade arrangements which she might otherwise wish to make. I do not see the force of the objection raised to that clause, especially in view of the fact that, while we are memorializing the British Government on those two clauses existing in these two treaties of 1862 and 1865, we are not expressing an opinion on the general policy. The hon. gentleman has not brought forward a sufficient objection to cause us to wish to remodel the Address.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that it goes beyond that; for he intimates that these clauses should be repealed in order that a certain other policy should be adopted by the mother country.

Mr. FOSTER. Most certainly. There would be no point in our wishing and asking, or the Government of Great Britain desiring and endeavouring to get rid of these clauses, if it did not leave them freer in their trade arrangements than they are under these clauses.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman was not presenting this Address for a general denunciation of the treaties, but that they should be denounced so far as Canada is concerned, that Canada should be relieved of the obligations. If the hon. gentleman were asking for the treaties to be denounced generally there might be some force in his remarks, assuming the policy to be well founded, which we never admit. That is not what he is asking, and therefore they are not relevant.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to strike out the words "the effect of."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suggest that this clause should be amended to read as follows:—

That your memorialists desire to foster and extend the trade of the Dominion with that of the Empire, with its great neighbour the United States, and with other countries throughout the world, wherever opportunity offers, and the continuation of the restriction imposed on Canada by the so-called favoured nation clause creates an unnecessary and unjustifiable obstruction.

The hon. gentleman would thus confine himself to the matter in hand, and not commit this Parliament on the last day of the session to questions concerning Imperial federation, or a federation league or anything of that sort. The hon. gentleman will then bring before the attention of the British Cabinet that for which he is really asking, the denunciation of these two treaties, so far as regards this country and this country alone.

Mr. FOSTER. The objection has been well answered by the Minister of Justice, and we will allow the Address to stand, as drawn, after removing the three words, "the effect of."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If it is allowed to remain in that way, it will amount to an absolute denunciation. The following words are required to be added:—"So far as they affect the Dominion of Canada." The proposition is to relieve this country, and the intention should be so confined.

Mr. FOSTER. Not only is the proposition to relieve this country, but we think it would also be well that Great Britain should be free so far as these two clauses are concerned, that if any better trade arrangements may be made between other countries and ourselves, between Great Britain and other countries or between Canada and a third country, so far as these two clauses are concerned Great Britain should be free from their restrictions.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not in accordance with the drift of the Address. I understood the object was the release of Canada from those treaties.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Now the hon. gentleman says he wants Great Britain relieved, and this is a prayer to have her relieved. Surely, if Great Britain desires to be relieved, she does not require a prayer from Canada for her release. She will make a request herself.

Mr. LAURIER. It is a pity that my hon. friend has not got the courage of his opinions. Why does he not say boldly that this is a step in the direction of the Imperial Free Trade League? We ask Great Britain what? To relieve us of the effect of these treaties. They may be advantageous to her, but they are not advantageous to us, and we ask to be relieved in so far as we are concerned. But that is not sufficient for the hon. gentleman. He wants to give advice to Great Britain not to enter into commercial treaties unless such treaties are in the interests of Canada. He wants us to keep our hands clear so that we may take part in forming a trade league between Great Britain and the distant colonies. He does not dare say so, but his proposition amounts to that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It takes two persons to make a bargain, and if only one is free to make a bargain, there will never be a bargain made. We want not only Canada to be relieved from the operation of these treaties, but the other colonies of Great Britain as well, in order that they may be free to make an arrangement with us.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They can speak for themselves.

Amendment agreed to on division, and Address concurred in.

LOCAL REPRESENTATION OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 178) further to amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories. He said: This is an amendment which I explained yesterday, and its object is to equalize the representation of the several provisional districts of the North-West Territories. It has been found since the census was taken that the arrangement we had made does not give a fair representation to the different provisional districts. The population of Alberta, for instance, is 26,123, of Assiniboia, 30,285, and of Saskatchewan, 11,146. By allowing six representatives to the Saskatchewan district, it gave one representative for each 1,857 inhabitants. By giving twelve representatives to Assiniboia, it gives them one to every 2,523. In Alberta eight representatives gives one to each 3,640 inhabitants; showing that Alberta really suffers more than any of the other districts. It is proposed to take one from Saskatchewan which would then give a representative to a population of over 3,000 and equalize it to that extent.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. I have no doubt that there is, perhaps, some arguments in favour of basing the representation strictly on population; but I believe there are other considerations that we must remember, there is a territorial representation to be considered as well. Now, it is true that Assiniboia has a larger population than Saskatchewan, but the territory of Assiniboia is a great deal smaller than that of Saskatchewan, and though the population of Saskatchewan may not be as large, it is more scattered, and perhaps requires a great deal more attention from the representatives than more thickly settled districts. I am sorry that in order to give Assiniboia an increase of representation—which I would not deny, as they are perhaps entitled to it—we should be asked to deprive Saskatchewan of a division which has only been granted to it a few days ago. We knew at the time we made these new divisions, what the census was, and it was for those who were responsible to call our attention to this fact, if that was an argument strong enough to require us to make the alterations that are asked to-day. I do not see why, after agreeing to these electoral divisions in the district of Saskatchewan, we should now be called upon to stultify ourselves in making a re-arrangement of those divisions. I am aware, and the House is aware, that the passing of this Bill a few days ago has had the effect of leading the people to select candidates for those divisions we have already created, and those candidates have already begun the campaign for an election which will take place in a short time. Now, these people are greatly dissatisfied, and when the rumour was set afloat that such a change was to take place, I, for one, received several telegrams from interested parties, asking whether such changes were going to be made, and why the people should be made mere playthings of by this House, and whether, after creating the electoral divisions for them, we were going to take them away after the people had already begun to act in accordance with the law that has been passed. I, therefore, hope that while this measure may grant an additional electoral division to Assiniboia, to which I do not object, it will not be to the detriment of Saskatchewan. Add another division, if you like, but do not rob Peter in order to pay Paul.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think any great harm would be done to any one, even if the Bill was allowed to remain as it came from the Senate. It certainly would do Saskatchewan a little good, because it would then leave for that territory the members which it was understood they were entitled to, and the people there had already made arrangements, I believe, to select members to represent the districts which we had created. I may say, in regard to Saskatchewan, that since the completion of the railway a large immigration is going in there. During the last few years I have had application to send a surveyor to sub-divide two townships, in order that the families who are there waiting may be located on the land. Therefore, in anticipation of a very large immigration into that district it is very desirable to make provisions for a large representation. The hon. gentleman who has spoken knows that in that district a portion of the inhabitants would consider it a hardship if we did not make a re-arrangement. An understanding was come to between the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and myself that this change should be made; but of course we cannot go on with the Bill without the unanimous consent of the House, and if the hon. gentleman feels so strongly that we should not do so, of course I can do nothing but withdraw the Bill.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. I only object to one clause of the Bill, that is, the second clause, taking away from one district what is wanted in the other. I do not object to the other clauses at all.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will see that this is a matter which has just been disposed of. It should have been brought up earlier in the session. It is impossible to say whether the new divisions or the old divisions are right. It is impossible for any man in this House, except perhaps the Minister or the hon. members from the North-West, to give a sound judgment on the matter.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

FRAUDS UPON THE GOVERNMENT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 172) respecting frauds upon the Government.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the following be added to section 1 :—

Every person having any contract with the Government for the performance of any work, the doing of anything, or the furnishing of any goods, effects, food or materials, and having or expecting to have any claim or demand against the Government by reason of such contract, who either directly or indirectly by himself, or by any person on his behalf, subscribes, furnishes or gives, or promises to subscribe, furnish or give any money or valuable consideration for the purpose of promoting the election of any candidate, or of any member, class or party of candidates to a Legislature or to Parliament, or with the intent in any way of influencing or affecting the result of a Provincial or Dominion election.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

House rose during pleasure.

House resumed at three o'clock.

TRADE ADDRESS.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General praying that His Excellency will be pleased to transmit the joint Address of both Houses to Her Majesty on the subject of certain important matters affecting the trade relations of Canada with the Empire and with foreign nations in such manner as His Excellency may see fit, in order that the same may be laid at the foot of the Throne.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the said Address be engrossed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. TROW. I beg leave to ask the Minister of War to give us his opinion as to whether we may expect peace during the recess——

Mr. FOSTER. How big a piece?

Mr. TROW,—or whether there is any prospect of foreign aggression or internal commotion.

Mr. CURRAN. No war till next session.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It seems to me that, after this cruel war that has just ended, it is not right in my hon. friend to speak of anything else than the most profound peace. It will, doubtless, take us a long time to recover from the attacks made by the hon. gentleman and his friends. However, I can tell the hon. gentleman that, in so far as my knowledge of coming events extends, we foresee no great danger of any external war. I can only hope that the hon. gentleman, during the recess, will give his time and attention to studying those arts of peace which make a people happy and prosperous. As regards my own department, I have often told the House that I am always on the defensive, and that it is not a War Department in the sense of attacking other countries. I hope to be able to maintain that strict neutrality which I always endeavour to maintain with foreign nations, so that the army of Canada may not be called upon to engage in active hostilities that may prove disastrous to our peace. Mr. Speaker, before we break up this session, I take this opportunity of wishing the hon. gentleman, whom I have known for so many years, continued health and prosperity. During many years I have acted with him in endeavouring to keep peace and order between the two contending parties, and when he and I were together in performing those functions we always succeeded in maintaining peace and harmony between the two great political parties that divide public opinion in Canada. I take this opportunity to tender to the hon. gentleman my best possible wishes for his continued good health and prosperity, and I hope that when he comes back to us with his colleagues on that side of your Chair, Mr. Speaker, he will come back as well as he looks to-day.

Mr. TROW. The Minister of Militia is usually very logical in his expression, but I never heard him make utterances so illogical as those he has just expressed. He forgets that during the contest which has taken place this session, quite a number of wounded have been left on the field, and it will take a long time before they will recover. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman speaks feelingly in hoping for peace during the future. I question very much whether it will not take a good deal more time than he anticipates to bring back to political health those who have been wounded in this contest. However, some of those hon. gentlemen opposite have not been wounded, and I hope that the wholesome lessons they have received this session will not be lost upon them in the future, and that both the Cabinet and their supporters will in the future be exceedingly guarded not to covet other men's goods. I will only say further that, notwithstanding the protests that are pending against the most of us, we expect to be back here in the flesh, and if so I shall endeavour to do my little part to keep myself in trim, at all events, so that I may be able to assist those with whom I am associated in realizing the present very bright prospects of being on the other side of the House in a very short time.

Mr. FOSTER. For a very short time.

Mr. TROW. We have already seen to-day our hon. friend the Minister of Customs coming over here and choosing his seat, showing that he expects a change. Well, he is much more peaceable on that side of the House than he was when he was here.

Mr. BOWELL. He is older now.

Mr. TROW. I recollect when he occupied a seat on this side of the House, he was nearly always on his feet discussing matters morning, noon and night, especially at night. I hope that when he gets on this side of the House he will be more

peaceable than he has been in the past. However, he has not been wounded, apparently, in this contest. This has been a very long and tedious session, and it is, perhaps, out of place to make any lengthened remarks on this occasion. The *Hansard* reporters have done their work admirably this session.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TROW. They always do their work admirably. I do not think it is desirable to make further remarks. We expect to part in peace, as in fact we always do. We have had a great deal of trouble during this session. First, there was the death of Sir John Macdonald. He was a particular friend of mine; we were always on the best terms of friendship. I regret his death, probably as much as any member of the Cabinet or any member on the Government side of the House. You, hon. gentlemen opposite, have had your troubles all around, and it is expected that, after the wholesome lesson you have received, you will be good boys in future——

PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Harbour of Pictou, in Nova Scotia.

An Act to correct a clerical error in the Act fifty-third Victoria, Chapter eighty-one, intituled: "An Act respecting the Great North-West Central Railway Company."

An Act to provide for the marking of Deck and Load Lines.

An Act respecting the Shipping of Live Stock.

An Act to encourage the production of Beet-root Sugar.

An Act further to amend the "Exchequer Court Act."

An Act respecting the Inspection of Ships.

An Act further to amend "The Inland Revenue Act."

An Act respecting certain female offenders in the Province of Nova Scotia.

An Act respecting the Ontario Express and Transportation Company.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs.

An Act respecting the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company.

An Act to amend Chapter one hundred and thirty-five of the Revised Statutes, intituled: "An Act respecting the Supreme and Exchequer Courts."

An Act respecting the Rathbun Company.

An Act respecting the North Shore Section of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

An Act further to amend "The Dominion Elections Act."

An Act further to amend the Act fifty-second Victoria, Chapter four, intituled: "An Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies."

An Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories.

An Act to further amend "The Dominion Controverted Elections Act."

An Act to amend "The Railway Act."

An Act authorizing the transfer of certain public property to the Provincial Governments.

An Act further to amend "The Dominion Lands Act."

An Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of Railway therein mentioned.

An Act respecting Frauds upon the Government.

Then the Honourable The SPEAKER of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:—

The Commons of Canada have voted the Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill:—

"An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service," to which Bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words:—

In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the First Session of the Seventh Parliament of the Dominion with the following

SPEECH:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate,
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I desire to convey to you my high appreciation of the earnestness and assiduity which you have devoted to your Parliamentary duties during this protracted session.

I have also to express my sympathy in the regret which you and the whole Dominion must feel, and which I sincerely share, for the lamented loss of the late Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Sir John A. Macdonald, who died full of years and honours, in the midst of your deliberations; and I congratulate you and the country upon the moderation and patriotism which you manifested in that crisis, and which enabled the legislative business of the country to be continued without interruption.

An agreement was made in June last, between Great Britain and the United States of America, for the practical cessation of seal fishing in Behring's Sea during the past season, with a view to the protection of seal life, pending an investigation by experts, in which this country has taken part, in the question of the necessity of measures for preventing its extinction. The report of the experts has not yet been received, and the negotiations for the settlement of the questions which have arisen on the subject are proceeding, but are still incomplete.

I am pleased to observe that, in anticipation of a friendly conference with the Government of the United States, on the subject of the extension and development of our trade with that country, and other important matters, the provisions of the protocol of 1888, known as the *Modus vivendi*, have been extended.

The measures you have concurred in passing are important and useful. The reorganization of the Legislature of the North-West Territories and the readjustment and increase of its powers, are just tributes to the eminent capacity for self-government which that important and rapidly increasing section of Canada has manifested. The Acts for the improvement of the law respecting Elections will, I hope, be found beneficial, by simplifying procedure and facilitating the repression of corrupt practices. The measures respecting the cattle trade, the loading of ships,

the registration of trade marks and the Vice-Admiralty Courts will prove advantageous to trade, commerce and shipping. The enactments respecting the inspection of ships must prove of great value in the protection of the lives of persons employed upon them, while the Act respecting the foreshores of the Dominion and the obstruction of navigable waters will remove a possible source of dissension between this Government and the provinces.

Notwithstanding that the result of the Census shows a less important increase in population than was expected, it is satisfactory to observe the continuance of the general prosperity of the country. And the bountiful harvest with which Providence has blessed us this year, will give a fresh impetus to the settlement of the North-West, and to the enterprise and industries of the country generally.

It is gratifying to perceive that you have felt justified in reducing the duty upon sugar to the extent of about three millions of dollars, thus materially lessening the cost of an article of universal consumption, and that you have not judged it necessary to provide for replacing revenue, to the extent of more than half the reduction thus made. It is a further recommendation of this important measure, that while it largely reduces the cost of a necessary article of food, it provides for supplying the consequent loss of revenue by the imposition of duties on luxuries only.

The extensive frauds upon the Government by a group of contractors, and the irregularities of certain persons in the Civil Service, which have been discovered by investigations by your Committees are much to be regretted. The punishment with which many of them have already been visited, the steps which are to be taken with regard to others, and the operation of the statute you have passed for their repression in future will, I trust, have the effect of preventing their recurrence. And it is the intention of my Ministers to procure the issue of a Commission to investigate the organization of the Civil Service and report as to measures for its improvement.

The question of the restriction or prohibition of the liquor traffic has also been occupying the attention of my Ministers; and a Commission will issue during Recess to enquire into, and report upon, this important subject.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the liberal provision which you made for the requirements of the Public Service.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate,
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In taking leave of you for the present it is with an earnest desire for your happiness and prosperity in your several homes.

The SPEAKER of the Senate then said:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate, and
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It is HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Monday, the 9th day of November next, to be here held, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until Monday, the 9th day of November next.

The Parliament of the Dominion of Canada was then prorogued to the 9th day of November next.

INDEX.

FIRST SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1891.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C. P. R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Withdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italic and parentheses are those of the mover.

Adams, Mr. M., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Pelee Island Sub-Collector (M. for Cor., &c.) 1600.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2743 (ii).

Allan, Mr. H. W., *South Essex.*

Amherstburg Dry Dock (Ques.) 3259 (ii).

——— (M. for Ret.*) 3287 (ii).

Pelee Island Sub-Collector (M. for Cor., &c.) 1580 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4590 (iii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2981 (ii).

Allison, Mr. D. W., *Lennox.*

Elliott, G. M., Inspector of Gas (Ques.) 5576 (iii).

Napanee Public Buildings, Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 1272 (i), 2154 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (Two-rowed Barley) 1566 (i).

Canals—Income (Rideau) 5222 (iii).

Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4224 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4319; (Ont.) 6242; (Ottawa) 4486 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1690 (i), 4602 (iii); (remarks) 4800. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4575 (iii).

Veterans, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2925.

Volunteers of 1837-38, Land Grant (Ques.) 961 (i).

Amyot, Mr. G., *Bellechasse.*

Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for Com., 1763 (i).

——— Subsidies (Ques.) 5075 (iii).

Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4158; neg. (Y. 82, N. 99) 4212 (ii).

Bellechasse Election, Gazetting Member (Ques.) 112 (i).

——— (M. for Ret.) 187 (i).

Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4929 (iii).

Chicago Exhibition, Canada's Invitation (Ques.) 1577 (i).

Compulsory Voting (B. 53, 1°*) 266; 2° m., 1030, 1039 (i).

Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 45, 1°) 218 (i).

——— B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2366; in Com., 3651 (ii), 5355, 5604 (iii).

Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 134 (i).

Elections, uniform Time to Controvert (Ques.) 112 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 792 (i).

Amyot, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Franchise Act Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 314 (i).
Giguere, Capt. Claude, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 1266 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1166 (i).
Herchmer, Commsr., Enquiry into Conduct, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2922 (ii).
——— Cor. in Macleod *Gazette* (Ques.) 4293 (iii).
High Commissioner, on M. to adjn. Deb., 706 (i).
Immigrants into Canada, Number (Ques.) 5075 (iii)
Imperial Federation and High Commissioner (Ques.) 2153 (ii).
I. C. R., Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
——— Claims for Damages (Ques.) 1770 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors, Prohibition of Sale (Ques.) 961 (i).
Isle Verte P. O., Rep. of Enquiry (M. for copies*) 544 (i).
Kingston Dry Dock, original Plan (M. for copies*) 1579 (i).
——— Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3653 (ii).
——— Papers (Ques.) 1764 (i); (remarks) 3960 (ii).
——— P. O., Lessee of Box 524 (Ques.) 962 (i).
——— Lease of Boxes (Ques.) 1266 (i).
——— Postmaster's Rep. (M. for copies) 1578 (i).
——— on M. for copies, 2545 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c., on M. for copies, 3634 (ii).
Military Camp No. 7 (Ques.) 3264 (ii).
Military College Cadets, Diplomas, &c. (Ques.) 4297 (iii).
——— (Ques.) 3957 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost of Construction, &c., on M. for Ret., 966 (i).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O.C.'s, &c., 1020 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Com. on Res., 4753 (iii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3914 (ii).
Pelletier, H. H., emplymnt. by Militia Dept. (Ques.) 3258 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 285 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., Papers (remarks) 1851 (i).
——— CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5999 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Deb., 6026 (iii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1934 (i).
Quebec, West, Vacancy, on objection (Mr. *Laurier*) 4082 (ii).
Sick and Distressed Mariners (Ques.) 2145 (ii).

Amyot, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Printing and Stationery) 246 (i).
Dominion Police, 1557 (i).
Justice, Administration of (L. A. Audette) 1557 (i).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3722; (Maintenance, &c.) 3736; (Drill Pay, &c.) 4224 (ii); (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6182 (iii).
Pensions (Mounted Police, &c., Rebellion, 1885) 3662 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 1673, 1678 (i). *Income:* Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4552 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3857 (ii).
Three Rivers Piers, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. to adjn. Deb., 2060 (i).

Armstrong, Mr. J., *South Middlesex.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty B. 168 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 3971 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1807 (i).
Camilla and Whittington Mail Service (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5207 (iii).
Gov. General's Warrants, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4549 (iii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5518 (iii).
Lobo P.O., Change of Postmaster (M. for Pets., &c.*) 1579 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2949 (ii).
Montreal Customs, Defaulting Clerks (Ques.) 4675 (iii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3912 (ii).
Priv. and Elec. Com., distribution of Evidence (remarks) 5351 (iii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3144 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Haras Co.) 6180 (iii).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3537 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5169. Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5176 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5240 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 912 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4573 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1368, 2238 (ii).

Bain, Mr. T., *North Wentworth.*
Amber Deposits in N. W. T., Applicants (Ques.) 2518 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1790 (i).
Brampton Postmaster, Filling Vacancy (Ques.) 3259 (ii).

Bain, Mr. T.—*Continued.*
Dundas and Waterloo Macadamized Road (Ques.) 223 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3085 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Claims for Land Damages (Ques.) 3618 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6177 (iii).
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 941 (i).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5120; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5095; (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5083 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 4338 (iii).
Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3576 (ii).
Walker, Dr., Claim *re* Dundas, &c., Macadamized Road (M. for O.C.) 1058 (i).

Baker, Mr G. B., *Missisquoi.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 6201 (iii).

Barron, Mr. J. A., *North Victoria, Ont.*
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 892 (i).
Barry P. O., Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 2935 (ii).
——— Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
Beaverton Harbour Works, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 226 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2367 (ii); in Com., 5602, 5734, 6224 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 997 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3248 (ii), 5142; on M. for 3°, 5556 (iii).
Elections Act Amt. (B. 54, 1°) 266; 2° m., 1040.
Fenelon Falls, Lockmaster's Office (Ques.) 4673.
Fitzgerald, W., Fishery Officer (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. (B. 98, 1°) 738 (i).
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3086.
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1007 (i).
Galt P.O., Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 225.
Galway, Establishment of P. O. (M. for Ret.*) 736 (i).
Graham, J. R., Dismissal (M. for Ret.) 210 (i).
——— Ret. *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 3201 (ii).
Indian Reserve No. 6, Timber Cut (Ques.) 111 (i).
I.C.R., Rates for Clergymen, &c. (Ques.) 3261 (ii).
Kingston P.O., Rep. of Postmaster, on M. for copies, 2546 (ii).
Lindsay P.O., Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 225 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2949 (ii).
Mail Clerk, Lindsay and Haliburton, Resignation (Ques.) 4671 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4464 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5644 (iii).

Barron, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
Pub. Accts. Com., on presentation of 21st Rep (remarks) 4608 (iii).
P. O. Dept. (M.) to ref. Accts., &c., 2517 (ii).
Peterborough P.O., Name of Contractor (Ques.) 225 (i).
Railway Act Amt. (B. 103, 1°*) 891 (i); 2° m., 3303 (ii).
Reporters, Official, Accommodation (remarks) 1012 (i).
Saw Logs Cut in Disputed Territory (M. for Ret.*) 128 (i).
Scotch Granite, Increased Duty (Ques.) 335 (i).
Shawanakiskic's Indian Reserve (Ques.) 269 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 6135; in Com., 6141; on M. for 1° of B., 6143 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (St. Lawrence River and Canals 4124; (Trent) 4126 (ii). *Income* (Miscellaneous) 1668; (Trent Valley, Bridge at Hastings) 1665 (i).
Civil Government (Public Works) 409 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4080 (ii).
Fisheries (Behring Sea) 6268 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 948, 1560 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance) 3511 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 6266 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4289 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Litigation Expenses) 1709; (Printing Bureau) 1706 (i); (Strong, W. O., Gratuity to Widow) 6265 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 4363, 6243; (B.C.) 6252; (Ottawa) 4509; (Que.) 4344 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1691 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4601; (Kaministiquia River) 4529; (Ont.) 4575 (iii).
Territorial Accounts. (Surgeon General's salary) 6282 (iii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3439 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2560 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn. Hse., 2569 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal Works, Total Cost to 1892, 1929 (i).
——— Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 194, 197 (i).
——— (remarks) 214, 550, 993 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4467, 4773 (iii).
Wiarton Harbour Works, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 226 (i).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., *Berthier.*
Beet-Root Sugar, Cultivation, &c. (M. for Cor.* 545 (i).
——— Bounty B. 168 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 4466 (ii).
Connell, J., emplymnt. by Sorel Harbour Commissioners (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Dom. Electoral Lists, Revision (Ques.) 143 (i).
Electoral Divisions, N. W. T., Re-arrangement (Ques.) 221 (i).

Beausoliel, Mr. C.—*Continued.*
Fishing Licenses in Quebec Counties (M. for Stmnt.*) 145 (i).
——— System of Issuing (Ques.) 143 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1195 (i).
Jockes & Delorimier, Messrs., Stone Contractors (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Lake St. Peter, Fishery Districts (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
Lavallée, Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 2145, 2148 (ii).
Montreal P.O. Service (Ques.) 5077 (iii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O.C.'s, &c., 1026 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3945 (ii).
Ottawa Mail Service, Advertising (Ques.) 963 (i).
——— Advertising in *Le Canada* (M. for Ret.) 2540 (ii).
Personal Explanation, par. in *Empire* Newspaper (remarks) 3427 (ii).
Sorel Harbour Works, Employés (Ques.) 5077 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Que., salaries, &c.) 3514 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2680 (ii).

Béchard, Mr. F., *Iberville.*
Richelieu River Floods, H. F. Perley's Rep. (M. for copy*) 128 (i).
——— (Ques.) 336 (i).
St. John's, Que., Medical Officer (Ques.) 527 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2792 (ii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
[*See* SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy.]
Montreal and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 65, 1°*) 387 (i).
Private Bills, Presentation, Extension of Time (M.) 156 (i).
South-Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 46, 1°*) 238 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4107 (ii).

Bergin, Mr. D., *Cornwall and Stormont.*
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1005; in Com., 1978 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 932 (i).

Borden, Mr. F. W., *King's, N.S.*
Edgett's Landing, Ballast Wharf (Ques.) 3956 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3083 (ii).
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., on M. for Cor., 2538 (ii).
Kentville Postmaster, Suspension (Ques.) 221 (i).
Port George Pier, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2910 (ii).
Sawdust in LaHave River, on M. for Ret., 1951 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 4706, 4718; (salaries, &c.) 4721 (iii).

Borden, Mr. F. W.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Indians (N.B.) 4734 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4679 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4235 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4331. Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4596 (iii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4008 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2290 (ii).
West Indies Steamship Subsidies, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*, P.E.I.) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4423 (iii).

Bowell, Hon. M., *North Hastings.*
Admiral, Str., Services and Ownership, on M for Ret., 2157 (ii).
Advertising and Printing, in Com. of Sup., 500.
American Cheese shipped through Can. Ports (Ans.) 114 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1811 (i).
Bonding Foreign Fish (Ans.) 1265 (i).
C.P.R., North Shore Ry. Bonds (Ans.) 2522 (ii).
Canal Contracts, Tenders, &c., on M. for copies, 1940 (i).
——— Statistics (presented) 738 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 924 (i).
Caraquet Ry., Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 3614 (ii).
Cattle Quarantine Regulations (remarks) 806 (i).
Chambly Canal, Contract for spreading Stone (Ans.) 3959 (ii).
Cornwallis Valley Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ans.) 2153.
Cotton Sail Duck, Imports (Ans.) 142 (i).
Customs Collector, Annapolis Royal (Ans.) 270.
——— Seizures at Walkerton (Ans.) 3266 (ii).
——— Illegal Seizures (Ans.) 2521 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep. (Ms.) for Sel. Com., 7, 109 (i).
Dom. Aid to Rys., on M. for Ret., 1055 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3254 (ii); on M. for 3°, 5583 (iii).
Doucet, Louis, Dismissal (Ans.) 741 (i).
Govt. Rys., Expenditure on Capital Account (explanation) 4092 (ii).
——— Payments for Printing (Ans.) 3614 (ii).
Great North-West Central Ry., Engineer's Certificate (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
Guysborough Customs Collector, Superannuation (Ans.) 2520 (ii).
High Commissioner, on M. to adjn. Deb., 706 (i).
I. C. R. (B. 105, 1°) 959; 2° m., 1256; in Com., 1260 (i).
——— Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
——— Employés, Enquiry into Conduct, on M. for Ret., 1937 (i).
——— emplyt. of Walter Hogg (Ans.) 5407 (iii).
——— Labourers, Reduction of Pay (Ans.) 3266.

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*
I.C.R., McCully, S.W., Dismissal (Ans.) 3613 (ii).
——— Rates for Clergymen, &c. (Ans.) 3261 (ii).
——— Refreshment Contract (Ans.) 3617 (ii).
——— Stone for Langevin Block (Ans.) 1575 (i).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3659 (ii).
Langevin Block, Haulage of Stone (Ans.) 1768.
Liquor Seizures in Montmagny (Ans.) 209, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).
Lachine Canal, Côte St. Paul Drain, Tenders, on M. for Ret., 2158 (ii).
McNamara, N., Share Customs Seizures (Ans.) 3959 (ii).
Marie Eliza, Seizure and Sale (Ans.) 710 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1071 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Entry into B.C., on M. for Cor., 965 (i).
——— Importation of, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4099 (ii).
Montreal and Sorel Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 3615 (ii).
Montreal Custom House Employés, on M. for Ret., 3277 (ii).
——— Superannuation (Ans.) 3616 (ii).
——— Night Watchman (Ans.) 5406 (iii).
——— Irregularities (Ans.) 3953 (ii).
Munroe, Hugh, Claim for Damages, on M. for Ret., 2546 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 971 (i).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ans.) 2522; (prop. Res.) 3577 (ii); M. for Com. on Res., 4748 (iii).
N. S. Central Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 3960 (ii).
Napierville and St. Rémi Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 2544 (ii).
Orange Influence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1965 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 805 (i).
——— on M. for adjnmt., 3826 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1589 (i).
P. E. I. Ry., Dismissals (remarks) 4000 (ii).
——— Employés, Dismissal, on enquiry for Ret., 5088 (iii).
——— Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2164 (ii).
——— Train Service (Ans.) 1274 (i).
Polson Mfg. Co., Steel Plates, Imports (Ans.) 270.
Priv. and Elec. Com., Afternoon Sittings, on M., 1988 (1).
Public Accts. Com., on M. to ref. Accts. *re* Bourcier, 3950 (ii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1936 (i).
Ry. Act. Amt. (B. 175) 1° m., 6142; 1°, 6286 (iii).
Returns, on enquiry (remarks) 1991 (i), 2581 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Claims for Land Damages (Ans.) 3618 (ii).

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*
St. John Ry. Station, additional Property (Ans.) 739 (i).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening (Ans.) 1927 (i).
Scotch Granite, Increased Duty (Ans.) 335 (i).
Short Line Ry., New Route (Ans.) 3266 (ii).
Soucy, Eugene, Dismissal from I.C.R. (Ans.) 1274, 1927 (i).
Standing Committees (M.) to change names, 237.
——— Names substituted (M.) 1651 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. (B. 175) prop. Res., 6032; in Com., 6136, 6185; 1° of B., m., 6142; (M.) to re-com., 6217; 1° 6286 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Two-rowed Barley) 1566 (i).
Canals—Capital (Galops) 4107; (Grenville) 4141 (ii), 6198, 6298 (iii); (Lachine) 4102; (Murray) 4125; (Sault Ste. Marie) 4102 (ii), 5210 (iii); (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4121; (Rapide Plat) 4107; (Tay) 4143 (ii), 5221 (iii); (Trent) 4128. *Income* (Carillon) 4150 (ii); (Carillon and Grenville) 5222 (iii); (Chambly) 4146 (ii), 6200 (iii); (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i); (Rideau) 5222, 6304 (iii); (St. Ours Lock) 4148; (St. Ann's Lock) 4149 (ii); (St. Peter's) 5223 (iii); (Trent River) 4151; (Welland) 4145 (ii); (Welland, Pond at St. Catharines) 1666 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Murray) 1728 (i). Customs (B.C.) 5051 (iii); (Board of Customs, &c.) 5053, conc., 5419; (Chinese Immigration) 5056, conc., 5419; (Inspectors of Ports) 5052; (Laboratory) 5054; (N.S. and N.B.) 5023 (iii); (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1714 (i); (Ont.) 5042; (P.E.I.) 5025, conc., 5418; (Que.) 5030; (Revenue Cruiser) 6277; (Travelling Inspectors) conc., 5418 (iii); (Vacuum Oil Co., refund) 1721 (i). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 1736 (i), 4057 (ii).
Fisheries (N.S., salaries) conc., 4255 (iii)
Militia (Care and Maintenance) 3736 (ii); (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4287 (iii).
Penitentiaries (B.C) 924 (i).
Public Works — Income: Buildings (B. C.) 6252 (Ont.) 6240; (N. W. T.) conc., 5387. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 6257 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1661. Cape Breton (construction) 1656 (i), 3898 (ii); (Grand Narrows Bridge) 1658 (i); (Train Ferry) 3898 (ii). C. P. R. (construction) 1652 (i), conc., 4278 (iii). I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3854; (Halifax, warehouse) 3894 (ii). (Moncton, increased accommodation) 1653 (i); (New Glasgow, increased accommodation, 3882 (ii), 6197 (iii); (Rolling Stock) 1654 (i), 3882 (ii); (St. Charles Branch) 1655 (i), 3884 (ii); (St. John, additional accommodation) 1655 (i); ("Y" at Truro) 1655 (i). Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1658 (i), 6197 (iii). P.E.I. (Summerside Station, removal) 3898 (ii), conc., 4278; (Payment for expropriation) 6198 (iii). Short Line Ry. (Judgment of Court) 1658 (i).
Quarantine, conc., 5437 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C. 3682 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) conc., 6306 (iii).

Bowell, Hon. M. —*Continued.*
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. (prop. Res.) 6032 ; in Com. on Res., 6136 (iii).
Sugar (Raw) Imports (Ans.) 602 (i).
——— Quantity in Bond (Ans.) 740 (i).
Summerside Ry. Station (Ans.) 3263 (ii).
Tay Canal, Contracts for Extension (Ans.) 3262.
——— Expenditure, on M. for Ret., 3267 (ii).
——— Locks and Employés (Ans.) 3617 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3745 (ii).
——— Passage, Tonnage, &c., of Vessels (Ans.) 3260 (ii).
——— Tenders for Construction (Ans.) 3953 (ii).
——— Tenders for Extension (Ans.) 3956 (ii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 500 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3501 (ii).
Trade and Navigation Returns (presented) 104 (i).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2556 (ii).
Transcontinental Mail Service (Ans.) 6216 (iii).
Trent Valley Canal, Total Cost (Ans.) 1930 (i).
Walkerton, Seizure of Iron Bridge, &c. (Ans.) 3619 (ii).
——— Sub-Collector, Resignation (Ans.) 3266 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2027 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3205, 3233 (ii).
Welland Canal, on enquiry for Rets. (remarks) 3200 (ii).
Wild Fowl, Prohibition of Export (Ans.) 1769.
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry., on Order for Com. on prop. Res., 1254 (i).

Bowers, Mr. E. C., *Digby.*
Bay of Fundy Fisheries (M. for Ret.) 715 (i).
Centreville Breakwater, Repairs (Ques.) 962 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 568 (i).
Corn Meal, Abolition of Duty (Ques.) 143 (i).
Digby Postal Accommodation, insufficient (Ques.) 1264 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3183 (ii).
Meteghan Wharf, Digby Co. (Ques.) 530 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 974 (i).
Raquette Pier, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Sissiboo River, Dredging (Ques.) 1574 (i).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 3529 (ii), conc., 4268 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 3512; (maintenance) 3510 ; (salaries, &c.) 3509.
Public Works—Income : Buildings (N.S.) 4330. Dredging (Man.) 4648 (iii) ; (New Plant) 1693 (i) ; (repairs) 4646 (iii).
Railways—Capital : Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1659 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2781 (ii).

Brodeur, Mr. L. P., *Rouville.*
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4983 (iii).
Employés in Elections (Ques.) 221 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 791 (i).
Guévremont, Senator, Land purchased from (Ques.) 4671 (iii).
Helbronner, Mr. Jules, Amount paid (Ques.) 5407 (iii).
Isle Bizard Bridge (remarks) 5195 (iii).
Jacques Cartier Co., Public Works (Ques.) 4674 ; (remarks) 5014 (iii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 745, 802 (i).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 5407 (iii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6233 (iii).
Statutes, Distribution of (Ques.) 2522 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Extension of Time for Revision (Ques.) 2912 (ii).

Brown, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
Chambly Canal, Contract for spreading Stone (Ques.) 3959 (ii).
St. Lawrence Dredge (Ques.) 3952 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2880 (ii).

Brown, Mr. J., *Monck.*
Fishing Licenses in Grand River (Ques.) 709 (i).

Burnham, Mr. J., *East Peterborough.*
Military Districts Nos. 3 and 4, Brigade Major (M. for Cor.) 733 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4792 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Trent) 4134 (ii).

Burdett, Mr. S. B., *East Hastings.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 997 (i).
Frauds on Farmers Prevention (B. 42, 1°*) 206 ; 2° m., 1003 ; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1041 ; in Com., 1972 (i).
Hastings Co. Mail Service (M. for Ret.) 212 (i).
——— Public Works, Improvements (Ques.) 208.
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 1067 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income : Dredging (New Plant) 1690.
Trent Valley Canal, Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 194 (i).
——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 217 (i).

Cameron, Mr. H., *Inverness.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1842 (i).
I. C. R. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1257 ; in Com., 1262 (i).
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co. (M. for Cor.) 2522 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. H.—*Continued.*
Inverness Ry. and Mining Co.'s B. 136 (Mr. *Wilmot*) on M. for 2°, 2858 (ii).
Macdonald, Sir John A., Erection of Monument (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2171 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2896 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. M. C., *West Huron.*
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 893, 1090 (i).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup, 4177 (ii).
Bills, delay in Printing (remarks) 238 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Mail Service, Contractor (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
——— and Fort Macleod Mail Service (Ques.) 3256 (ii).
Census Returns, prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4885. (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5354, 5596, 5731 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5197, 5547 (iii).
Elections Act Amt. (B. 9, 1°) 107; 2° m., 1029.
Evidence in Criminal Cases (B. 11, 1°*) 129 (i); 2° m., 2955 (ii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1005; on Order for Com. (remarks) 1014.
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3089 (ii).
——— Act Repeal (B. 8, 1°) 106; Order for 2°, 206; 2° m., 295; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 302; agreed to (Y. 113, N. 84) 332 (i).
Goderich, St. Helen's, &c., Mail Service (Ques.) 3262 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
Indian Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1484 (i).
Indian Reservation, Sea Bird Island, B.C. (Ques.) 709 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3580 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, Coal Supply (Ques.) 3260.
Langevin Block, Payments on acct. of Contract (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
McPherson, Addison, Claims for Losses (Ques.) 3257 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1076 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member (prop. Res.) 4152 (ii).
——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com. (Amt.) 5612; neg. (Y. 74, N. 99) 5724 (iii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4463 (iii).
Orange Influence, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Charlton*) 1966 (i).

Cameron, Mr. M. C.—*Continued.*
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2161 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) Member for East Northumberland, 4085 (ii).
Public Works Dept., Contracts, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5824 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts Amt. B. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3589 (ii).
Supply:
Canals—Capital (Tay) 4143 (ii), 5221 (iii).
Civil Government (Public Works) 257 (i).
Fisheries (B.C., salaries, &c.) 3527 (ii).
Govt. of N.W.T. (contingencies) 1709 (i), 5067.
Indians (B.C.) 4802; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4731, 4810.
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 930 (i).
Miscellaneous (Litigation Expenses) 1707 (i).
Mounted Police, 1698 (i).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (repairs) 4641 (iii). Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1688 (i).
Tay Canal (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3738; neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779 (ii).
——— Contracts for Extension (Ques.) 3261 (ii).
——— Locks and Employés (Ques.) 3617 (ii).
——— Passage, Tonnage, &c., of Vessels (Ques.) 3259 (ii).
——— Tenders for Construction (Ques.) 3953 (ii).
——— Tenders for Extension (Ques.) 3956 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 1994 (i); in Com., 2206 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent, Ont.*
Battell, William, Employé Cobourg P.O. (Ques.) 3952 (ii).
Chatham P.O., Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3951 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5736 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5548 (iii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1977 (i).
I. C. R. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1263 (i).
Kaministiquia River, Dredging (M. for Ret.*) 146 (i).
——— (Ques.) 129, 1267 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4637 (iii).
River Thames, Bar at Mouth (Ques.) 1268 (i).
Supply:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 1567 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3544 (ii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 424 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5058 (iii); (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1717 (i); (Que.) 5039 (iii). Public Works (Telegraphs, P.E.I. and Mainland) 4668 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4076 (ii).
Indians (N.B.) 4735; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4815; (N.S.) 4631; (P.E.I.) 4735 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 517 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 949. (i).

Campbell, Mr. A—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4679 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4523. *Income:* Buildings (Ottawa) 4513. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4592; (Ont.) 4582, 6255. (Miscellaneous) 4661; (N.W.T.) 4445; (Surveys) 4662 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Cape Breton (construction) 3898. I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3873 (ii).
Tay Canal, Basin at Perth, Contract (Ques.) 4672 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3773 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2425 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2255 (ii).

Carpenter, Mr. F. M., *South Wentworth.*
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3091 (ii).
St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 61, 1°*) 387 (i).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P., K.C.M.G., *Rimouski.*
Armaments, Victoria Point (remarks) 6308 (iii).
Beaudry, Lieut.-Col., Commission (Ans.) 1766 (i).
Bridge at Quebec, O.C.'s, on M. for copies, 1046.
Cavalry School in Toronto (Ans.) 223 (i).
Commissions, Military Colleges, Permanent Corps (Ans.) 3960 (ii).
Garrison Club, Que., Lease of Lands (Ans.) 527 (i).
Hearn, J. G., emplymnt. by Militia Dept. (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
Infantry School, St. John's, Surgeon (Ans.) 3620.
Land Grants to Volunteers (B. 159) in Com. on Res., 3106; Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 3582 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c., on M. for copies, 3628 (ii).
Lundy's Lane Battle, Monument (Ans.) 3618 (ii).
McPherson, Addison, Claims for Losses (Ans.) 3257 (ii).
Military College, Kingston (Ans.) 3957 (ii).
——— Cadets, Diplomas, &c. (Ans.) 4297 (iii).
Military Camp No. 7 (Ans.) 3264 (ii).
——— Dist. No. 1, Location of Camp, on M. for Cor., 231 (i).
——— Nos. 3 and 4, Brigade Major, on M. for Cor., 733 (i).
——— Nos. 5 and 6, Paymaster (Ans.) 707 (i).
Militia Act Amt. (B. 174, 1°) 6126 (iii).
Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 135.
Militia Battalion (69th) No. 5 Co. (Ans.) 268 (i).
Pelletier, H. H., emplymnt. by Militia Dept. (Ans.) 3258 (ii).
Pensions for Permanent Corps (Ans.) 2908 (ii).
Prorogation (remarks) 6327 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6034 (iii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P.—*Continued.*
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Deb., 6025 (iii).
Rebellion, N.W.T., Scrip for Militia (prop. Res.) 634 (i).
Saddlery, 1st Reg. of Cavalry (Ans.) 198 (i).
Strike in Ottawa, &c., calling out Militia (remarks) 5555 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 499 (i).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3720; (Brigade Majors, salaries, &c.) 3700; (Care and Maintenance, &c.) 3734; (Clothing, &c.) 3700; (Drill Pay, &c.) 3730, 4225, 4233 (ii), conc., 4282 (iii); (Drill Instruction) 3729 (ii); (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6182 (iii); (Military College) 4237 (ii), conc., 4289 (iii); (Military Stores, &c.) 3717 (ii); (Monuments, Battlefields, Can.) conc., 4277 (iii); (Permanent Forces, Pay, &c.) 3738 (ii); (St. John's Gate, repairs) 1574 (i).
Miscellaneous (Commutations of Duties) 5084; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5086 (iii).
Pensions (Fenian Raid) 4660; (Mounted Police, &c.) 3667; (Rebellion, 1885) 3661; (Veterans, 1812) 3661 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (I.C.R.) 1743 (i).
Territorial Accounts, 1729 (i); (Surgeon General's salary) 6280, 6284 (iii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 499 (i).
Volunteers' Services in Nanaimo, in Com. of Sup., 1558 (i).
Volunteers of 1837-38, Land Grant (Ans.) 961 (i).
Wellington, B.C., Services of Militia (Ans.) 2147.

Carroll, Mr. H. G., *Kamouraska.*
Cacouna, Purchase of Timber for Wharf (Ques.) 158 (i).
I.C.R., Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis (M. for Ret.) 177 (i).

Cartwright, Sir R., K.C.M.G., *South Oxford.*
Address, on the, 35 (i).
Adjnmnt, Dom. Day (remarks) 1537 (i).
American Cattle slaughtered in Canada, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5210 (iii).
Armaments, Victoria Point (remarks) 6308 (iii).
Auditor General's Powers (remarks) 391 (i).
Bourgeois, G. A., payment to, on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 2361 (iii).
BUDGET, The (Ques.) 738, 953 (i).
——— (reply) 1232; (Amt.) 1252 (i); neg. (Y. 88, N. 114) 3082 (ii).
C. P. R., Arbitrators Award (remarks) 6129 (iii).
——— Section "B," Charges against P. M. G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5971 (iii).
Carleton Branch Ry. Sale B. 106 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 1992 (i).; in Com. on B., 3899.
Cattle Trade, Shipping of Live Stock B. (remarks) 957 (i).
Census Returns (Ques.) 130 (i).
——— Printing (remarks) 4465, 4534 (iii).

Cartwright, Sir R.—*Continued.*
Census (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup. 4829; neg. (Y. 81, N. 103) 5010 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com. on Res., 551; in Com., 558; on M. for 3°, 1253 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1033 (i).
Consolidated Audit Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3237 (ii).
Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditures (M. for Ret.*) 135 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2369 (ii); in Com., 5355, 5735 (iii).
Copyright, Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5020 (iii).
Criminal Law Codification B. 32 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 156 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 4829; on M. for Com., 5139 (iii).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Sel. Com., 109 (i).
Documents mentioned in Speech from Throne (Ques.) 157 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on on M. for 1°, 105 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5208; on M. for 3°, 5575.
Estimates, The (enquiry) 214 (i).
——— Suppl., delay (remarks) 5555 (iii).
Exports and Imports (M. for Ret.*) 135 (i).
Fishing Bounties, Claims, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 542 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1544 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4467 (iii).
——— (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4537; neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1120 (i).
——— Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 2668 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Deb., 705 (i).
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6291 (iii).
Indian Agent Chisholm, Charges against (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).
Iron Bounties Ret. (enquiry) 2580, 2668 (ii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3659 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4614 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 5487 (iii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3135 (ii).
London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. *Cockburn*) on M. for 2°, 190 (i).

Cartwright, Sir R.—*Continued.*
N.W.T., Representation of Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 1°, 1102 (i).
Orange Influence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1969 (i).
Order, Ques. of (remarks) 5330 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4659 (iii).
Pairing of Members, on M. to adjn., 3823 (ii).
Pictou Bank Winding-up B. 76 (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) on M. for 1°, 388; on M. for 2°, 547 (i).
P. O. and Dom. Savings Banks Deposits, on M. for Ret., 203 (i).
Priv. and Elec., Afternoon Sittings, on M., 1989 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1065 (i).
Pub. Accts. Com., on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 4089 (ii).
——— Sittings of Com. (remarks) 5014 (iii).
Public Works Dept., Papers (remarks) 991 (i).
Quarantine (U.S.) Regulations for Sheep, on ruling of Mr. Speaker, 744 (i).
Receipts and Expenditures (M. for Stmnt.) 213 (i)
Reciprocity Papers (remarks) 600 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3150 (ii).
Returns, on enquiry (remarks) 1991 (i).
Standing Committees, organization (enquiry) 199.
Standing Orders Com., Rep. *re* Rathbun Co. (remarks) 5012 (iii).
Sugar, Free List, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1931 (i).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3571 (ii).
Arts, &c. (Adam Brown, honorarium) 6174 (iii); (Census) 1569 (i); (Census and Statistics) 3534 (ii); (Jamaica Exhibition) 1568 (i).
Canals—Capital (Galops) 4108; (Lachine) 4102; (Murray) 4125 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 5210; (Tay) 5219 (iii). *Income* (Carillon) 4150 (ii); (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i); (Ste. Anne's Lock) 4149; (Welland) 4145 (ii); (Pond at St. Catharines) 1666 (i).
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 1755; (Public Debt, Commissions) 1748 (i).
Civil Government (Auditor General's Office) 1544; (High Commissioner) 411, contingencies, 431, 491, 1555; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 435; (Interior) 247; (Geological Survey) 410; (Justice) 242, (contingencies) 423; (Privy Council) contingencies, 433; (Public Works) 398, 408; (Railways and Canals) 408; (Sec. of State) 242.
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5167. Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5056 (iii); (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1714; (Yacht *Cruiser*) 1721 (i). Dom. Lands (salaries) 5189 (iii) Excise, 1724 (i). Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5171. Post Office (Mail Service) 4712, 6279. Public Works (Agency, B.C.) 4669; (Harbours, &c., repairs) 4665; (Slides and Booms, Dues) 4663 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1736 (i), 3853, 4057 (ii). Post Offices, 1744. Weights and Measures, 1726.
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4268; (N. S., salaries) conc., 4245 (iii).
Government of N. W. T., 5066 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 3575 (ii), 5224 (iii).

Cartwright, Sir R.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Indians (B.C.) 4800; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4736; (N. B.) 4732, 5059; (Ont., Que., &c.) 4727 (iii).

Justice, Administration of (Miscellaneous) 6170; conc., 6203 (iii).

Legislation: House of Common (Debates) 942 (i); (Indemnity) 6172 (iii); (Leather Trunks) 1562 (i).

Marine Hospitals, &c., conc., 4243 (iii).

Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3720; (Brigade Majors, salaries, &c.) 3699; (Drill Pay, &c.) 3730, 4214 (ii), conc., 4280 (iii); (Military College) 4236 (ii), conc., 4289 (iii); (Military Stores, &c.) 3717 (ii); (Monuments, Battlefields of Can.) conc., 4277 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Burrard Inlet Survey) 1705 (i); Old Records) 5124; (Printing Bureau, Plant) 5346.

Ocean and River Service (Que. Water Police) 3508 (ii).

Penitentiaries (B.C.) 919; (Kingston) 882; (Man.) 913 (i).

Pensions (Fenian Raid) 3660; (Rebellion, 1885) 3661; (Veterans, 1812) 3661 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4523 (ii); (Kingston Graving Dock) 1675 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) conc.) 6304; (Man.) 4441; (N.W.T.) 4445; (Ont.) 4331, 4362, 6244; (Ottawa) 4470, 4475; (P. E. I.) conc., 6305; (Que.) 4332. Slides and Booms, 4650, 6261. Dredging (New Plant) 4602. Experimental Farms, &c., 4655. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4572. Roads and Bridges (N.W.T.) 4607 (iii).

Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) conc., 4277, 6304.

Railways — Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1664. Cape Breton (construction) 1656. C. P. R. (construction) 1652; conc., 4278 (iii). I.C.R. (Moncton, accommodation at) 1653, conc., 1758; (St. Charles Branch) 1655 (i).

Steamboat Inspection, conc., 4243 (iii).

Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3675 (ii).

Territorial Accounts. (Surgeon General's salary) conc., 6306 (iii).

Unprovided Items, 1745 (i).

Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to for M. Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).

Telegrams, &c., in Com. of Sup., 499 (i).

Testimonials to Ministers (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3827 (ii).

——— (personal explanation) 3947 (ii).

Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3497 (ii).

Trade Relations with U. S., Papers (remarks) 2289 (ii).

Treaty Papers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 238, 906 (i).

Trent Valley Canal, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4468 (iii).

Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1605 (i).

U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 206 (i).

U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4012 (ii).

Washington Treaty, Papers (enquiry) 192 (i).

Cartwright, Sir R.—*Continued.*

Ways and Means—The Tariff (Amt.) to M. for Com. on Res., 1252 (i); neg. (Y. 88, N. 114) 3082 (ii).

——— in Com. on Res., 1253 (i), 4006 (ii).

——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3201, 3232 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt., 2023, 2037 (i).

——— on 2° of Res., 1853 (i).

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 1994 (i); in Com., 2205, 2229, 2237 (ii).

——— (remarks) 1852 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 549 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin.*

Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1779 (i).

Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4461 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5141, 5200, 5549 (iii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3092 (ii).

C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P.M.G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5975 (iii).

Census Returns (remarks) 3999, 4156 (ii), 4239 (iii).

Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5362, 5374, 5602, 5747 (iii).

Customs Acts Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5324 (iii).

Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4631 (iii).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2946 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary language, 5330 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of, par. in Toronto *Globe*, 4242 (iii).

——— *re* Cor. in London *Times*, 4249 (iii).

Quebec, West, Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 6309 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3531 (ii).

Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 494 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Customs (Mr. O'Meara's salary) 1720 (i). Dom. Lands (salaries) 5189. Excise (Distilleries, Extra Duty-pay) 5137; (salaries, &c.) 5128 (iii).

Indians (Ont., Que., &c.) conc., 5412 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (maintenance, &c.) 3510 (ii).

Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4228 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Can. Temp. Act) conc., 5426; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5092, 5101; (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5429 (iii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 4316; (Ont.) 4363; (Ottawa) 4471; (Que.) 4358. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4569 (iii).

Territorial Accounts. (Surgeon General's salary) 6280 (iii).

Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3446 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*
Trade Policy of the Govt.,on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3413 (ii).
Trade Relations with Foreign Countries, Address from Sen., on conc., 6322 (iii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2934 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4003 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2209, 2245, 2252 (ii).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A., *Terrebonne.*
Barber's, Mr., Claim (Ans.) 269, 270 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3966 (ii).
Bellechasse Election, Gazetting Member (Ans.) 111 (i).
——— on M. for Ret., 188 (i).
Bills, delay in Printing (remarks) 238 (1).
Brandon *Mail* in Public Departments, Number (Ans.) 3258 (ii).
Chicoutimi Election Return (Ans.) 142 (i).
Civil Service Examiners' Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
——— List of Can. (presented) 103 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 632 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5548; on M. for 3°, 5573
Dom. Electoral Lists, Revisibn (Ans.) 143 (i).
Election, last General, Recounts (Ans.) 142, 177.
Elections, uniform Time to Controvert (Ans.) 112 (i).
Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 738 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3089 (ii).
Helbronner, Mr. Jules, Amount paid (Ans.) 5407 (iii).
Langevin Block, Priv. and Elec. Com., Printing Evidence (remarks) 4000 (ii).
McLean, Roger & Co.'s Claim (Ans.) 269 (i).
Napierville and St. Rémi Ry. Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 2544 (ii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Com. on Res., 4759 (iii).
Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary Language, 5329.
Printing and Stationery Rep. (presented) 738 (i).
Printing Bureau, absence of Superintendent (remarks) 2437 (ii).
——— Type purchased (Ans.) 3620 (ii).
——— Regulations *re* Employés (Ans.) 3618 (ii).
——— Paper Contracts (Ans.) 529 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Tarte*) *re* Cor. in London *Times*, 4240 (iii).
Regina *Leader*, Printing and Advertising (Ans.) 4295, 4465 (iii).
Royal Commissions since Confederation (Ans.) 4297 (iii).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6237 (iii).
Secretary of State's Rep. (presented) 103 (i).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A.—*Continued.*
Smith & Ripley and Hon. J. A. Chapleau (remarks) 5404 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 534 (i).
Speaker, Election of Deputy (remarks) 388 (i).
Statutes, Distribution of (Ans.) 2522 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners) contingencies, 481; (Printing Bureau) contingencies, 479, 484; (Printing and Stationery) 243; (Sec. of State) 242 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Printing Bureau) 6253 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Expenses of Committees) 61 73 (iii).
Miscellaneous (*Canada Gazette*) conc.,5418; Printing Bureau, Plant) 5246; (Printing, &c.) conc., 5418 (iii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3846 (ii).
Type-setting Machines, Cost (Ans.) 271 (i).
Voters in Quebec District, Number (Ans.) 2910.
Voters' List, Cost of Revision (Ans.) 268 (i).
Votes and Proceedings, Translation (remarks) 389 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*
Address, on the, 77 (i).
Adjnmnt., Ascension Day (remarks) 111 (i).
——— Dom. Day (remarks) 1276 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1818 (i).
Calgary and Fort Macleod Mail Service (Ques.) 3256 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Mail Service, Contractor (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4858 (iii).
Customs Acts Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5303 (iii).
Customs Seizures, Illegal (Ques.) 2520 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2364; on M. to adjn. Hse., 2372 (ii); in Com., 5354, 5374 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 3, 1°) 104 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to recom., 5546 (iii).
——— B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 998 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 133 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 327 (i).
——— (B. 31, 1°*) 156; 2° m., 999, 1003 (i).
Goderich, St. Helen's, &c., Mail Service (Ques.) 3261 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4301 (iii).
High Commissioner (M. to adjn. Deb.) 705 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier* in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup. 808 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary, Coal Supply (Ques.) 3260 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys., B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. to conc. in Res., 4308; in Com., 4628 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5489, 5494 (iii).
Liquor License Permits, N.W.T. (M. for Reps., &c.*) 545 (i).
Lord's Day Observance (B. 2, 1°) 104; 2° m., 747 (i); 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 2360; in Com., 2936; on Order for Com., 3287 (ii).
McPherson, Addison, Claims for Losses (Ques.) 3257 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1072 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4298 (iii)
Order (Ques. of) *re* par. in Toronto *Mail*, 2962 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4659 (ii).
——— unparliamentary Language, 324 (i).
Printing Bureau, absence of Superintendent (remarks) 2438 (ii).
Priv. and Elec. Com., Afternoon Sittings, on M., 1988 (i).
Privilege (Ques.) par. in Toronto *Mail*, 2069 (i).
——— Orange Influence, 1964 (i).
Prohibition, on adjnmt. (remarks) 546 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3149 (ii).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3607 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3551 (ii).
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 1754 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 465, 491; (Interior) 249; (Printing Bureau) contingencies 442 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5057, conc., 5419; (Ont.) 5043. Public Works (Harbours, &c., repairs) 4666. Post Office (Mail Service) 4709 (iii).
Geological Survey, 4725; conc., 5411 (iii).
Government of N. W. T. (Well-boring Machines) conc., 5424 (iii).
Indians (B.C.) conc., 5415; (N.B.) 5060, conc., 5423; (N.W.T.) conc., 5415; (Ont., Que., &c.) 4729 (iii).
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 936 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 5350; (Grand Manan, N.B., and Mainland) 4678: (San Francisco and Victoria) 4703 (iii).
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 3711 (ii).
Miscellaneous (*Canada Gazette*) conc., 5417; (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5433 (iii).
Mounted Police, conc., 5415 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 4430; (N.W.T.) conc. (Amt.) 5387; (N.S.) 4314; (Ont.) 5348; (Ottawa) 4473, 4475, conc., 5401; (Repairs, &c.) 4469. Dredging (B.C.) 4650; (Que. and Ont.) 4647. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4559. Slides and Booms, 4652 (iii).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Quarantine, 5336 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3672
Tay Canal, Contracts for Extension (Ques.) 3261.
——— Expenditure (M. for Ret.) 3267 (ii).
——— Passage, Tonnage &c., of Vessels (Ques.) 3259 (ii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3848 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c. (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3428; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 3507 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1892 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3203 (ii).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., *Montmagny.*
Alert, Str., Captain's Name, &c. (Ques.) 1769 (i).
——— Examination of Commander (Ques.) 2913.
American Cattle for slaughter (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
Animals from U.S., Free Entry (Ques.) 129 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Examination (Ques.) 3621 (ii).
Bourgeois, G. A., Dr., P.O. Inspector, Retirement (M. for Ret.*) 2935 (ii).
——— Payment to (M.) to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 2361 (ii).
Chicoutimi Election Return (Ques.) 142 (i).
Doucet, Louis, Dismissal (Ques.) 741 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5551 (iii).
Eel Fishery at Rimouski (Ques.) 2907, 2913 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m.h., to M. for 2°, 785.
Fraserville P.O. Building, Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
I.C.R., Claim of Miss Lea Caron (Ques.) 209 (i).
——— Employés, Enquiry into Conduct (M. for Ret.) 1937 (i).
——— emplymnt. of Walter Hogg (Ques.) 5407.
——— Refreshment Contract (Ques.) 3617 (ii).
La Rivière du Sud, Dyke (Ques.) 601 (i).
Liquor Seizures in Montmagny (Ques.) 208, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 967 (i).
Printing Bureau, Regulations *re* Employés (Ques.) 3618 (ii).
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1935 (i).
Rouleau, F. F., Fishing Rights at Rimouski (M. for Ret.*) 2936 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Leather Supplies (Ques.) 2912 (ii).
Sheppard, W. A., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1266 (i).
Soucy, Eugène, Dismissal from I.C.R. (Ques.) 1274, 1927 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Que., salaries, &c.) 3518 (ii).

Choquette, Mr. P. A.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4559 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1660 (i).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor. 1632 (i).
Voters in Quebec Province, Number (Ques.) 2910.

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*
Customs Act. Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5321 (iii).
Hartley, H. E., Dismissal (M. for Cor.) 144 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2945 (ii).
P. O. Savings Banks, Interest (Ques.) 1577 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 375 (i).

Coatsworth, Mr. E., jun., *East Toronto.*
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3296 (ii).
Canadian Order of Home Circles incorp. (B. 81, 1°*) 524 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 286, 336 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5853.
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening (Ques.) 1927 (i).
Septennial Benevolent Society's incorp. (B. 83, 1°*) 524 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) conc., 5439 (iii).
Temperance Colonization Society (Ans.) 606 (i).

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland.*
Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 71, 1°*) 387 (i).
——— (B. 86, 1°*) 548 (i).
Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 90, 1°*) 549 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1009 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4152 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6177 (iii).

Cockburn, Mr G. R. R., *Centre Toronto.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1410 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1957 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1036 (i).
Empire Printing Co.'s (B. 28, 1°*) 156; 2° m., 191 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 777.

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R.—*Continued.*
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1142 (i).
London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s (B. 27, 1°*) 156; 2° m., 190 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in P.E.I. *Daily Examiner*, 1604 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Expenses of Committees) 6173.
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3727 (ii): (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6183 (iii).
Toronto Drill Shed, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 963 (i).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., &c., 1291, 1645 (i).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s B. 48 (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) on M. for 2°, 295 (i).

Colter, Mr. N. R., *Carleton, N.B.*
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 3578.

Corbould, Mr. G. E., *New Westminster.*
Address in answer to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 17 (i).
Burrard Inlet and Westminster Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 107, 1°*) 1011 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 925 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (B.C., salaries, &c.) 3528 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 925 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B. C.) 4451. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4594 (iii).

Corby, Mr. H., *West Hastings.*
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1007 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 746 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4797 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2421 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. John, *Victoria, N.B.*
Compounders License Fees (prop. Res.) 1064 (i); in Com., 3243, 3579 (ii).
Duguay, Jos., Exciseman, Suspension (Ans) 3254.
Fort Erie and Buffalo Ferry (Ans.) 1768 (i).
Excise Collector at Stratford (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
Fraudulent Marking (B. 140, 1°*) 2144 (i); in Com., 3583 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 103, in Com., 4300 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1176 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. (prop. Res.) 1064 (i); in Com., 3243, 3579; B. 116, 1°*, 1345; 2° and in Com., 3242; Res. conc. in and in Com., 3579 (ii).
——— Regulations *re* Tobacco (Ans.) 194 (i).
——— Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors, Analysis, on M. for Ret., 205 (i).
Lease of Building on Sparks St. (Ans.) 2518 (ii).
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. (B. 157, 1°) 3426; in Com., 3648 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. John—*Continued.*
Subsidies (Money) to Railways B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6140 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (Inland Revenue) 253 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5166. Culling Timber, 5159. Customs (P.E.I.) 5030. (Excise) Customs Collectors' Allowance) 5138 ; (Methylated Spirits) 5138 ; (Officers of Distilleries, &c.) 5136 ; (salaries, &c.) 5125. Inspection of Staples, 5165. Weights and Measures, &c., 5162 (iii).
Public Works-Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4475 (iii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3842 (ii).
——— on adjnnt. (remarks) 3948 (ii).
Weighers of Grain (B. 164) in Com., 4307 (iii).
Weights and Measures Rep. (presented) 103 (i).

Craig, Mr. T. D., *East Durham.*
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4979 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2617 (ii).

Curran, Mr. J. J., *Centre Montreal.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 16, 1°*) 155 (ii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s (B. 82, 1°*) 524 ; M. for Com., 1761 ; 3° m., 1957 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3084 (ii).
Fraudulent Marking Prevention B. 140 (Mr *Costigan*) in Com., 3583 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1183 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors, Analysis (M. for Ret.) 203 (i).
Montreal Custom House Employés, on M. for Ret., 3279 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 380 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6086 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Lachine) 4103 (ii). *Income :* (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (I. C. R. &c.) 4065 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings (Que.) 4345. Dredging (New Plant) 4604 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B. C.) 3677 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2032 (i).

Daly, Mr. T. M., *Selkirk.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1808 (i).
C. P. R., Souris Branch, O. C.'s, &c. (M. for copies*) 1938 (i).

Daly, Mr. T. M.—*Continued.*
Franchise Act Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 316 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1192 (i).
Great North-West Central Ry., Engineer's Certificate (Ques.) 2144 (ii).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 621 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4625, 5539 (iii).
Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 25, 1°*) 155 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3142 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3560 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4822 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 916 (i).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Man.) 4431 ; (N.W.T.) 5398 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co's. B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for Com. on Res., 1254 ; in Com. on Res., 1279, 1363 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1093 ; in Com., 1414 (i) ; in Com. on Res., 3101 (ii).
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1090 (i).
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
——— Dom. Day (remarks) 1541 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103 (i).
——— B. 113 (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) in Com., 1297 (i).
Arnoldi, J. R., Govtl. action (remarks) 3130 (ii)
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1958 (i).
Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 104 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1100 (i).
Bridge at Quebec and North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ques.) 525 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3298 (ii).
Canadian, West Indian and South American SS. Co., Subsidies (M. for Cor.*) 544 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com. on Res., 553 ; in Com., 559 ; on M. to conc. in Res., 636 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3651 (ii), 5597, 5727 (iii).
Criminal Law Codification B. 32 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 157 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1408 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
Divorce, Thomas Bristow Relief B. 133 (Mr. *O'Brien*) on M. for Com., 2551 (ii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4459 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 105 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3244 (ii); on M. for 3°, 5578, 5586 (iii).
Esquimalt, Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4049 (ii).
Female Offenders in N.S. B. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3596 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3157, 3163; on M. for 3°, 3239 (ii).
Fishermen's Safety (B. 114, 1°*) 1406 (i).
Fishery Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Tupper*) 1098 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 776 (i).
——— B. 31 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 1002 (i).
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3083.
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1005; in Com., 1974 (i).
Govt. Harbours, Piers, &c., B. 115 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3104 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1136 (i).
Halifax County Court Judges Salaries, on M. for Ret., 2547 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 698 (i).
I. C. R., additional Property accommodation, St. John (M. for Cor.*) 1578 (i).
——— Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3799 (ii).
——— McCully, S. W., Dismissal (Ques.) 3613 (ii).
——— B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1257; in Com., 1261 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res.. 5494 (iii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 972 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4155 (ii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4464 (iii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3922; in Com., 3928 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary Language, 4973 (iii).
Oyster Beds, Leases (Ques.) 3958, 5157 (ii).
Preventive Officer, Pownal Bay, Dismissal (Ques.) 4672 (iii).
Pictou Harbour Commissioners B. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3594, 3900 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Road-bed and Rails (M. for Ret.) 228.
——— Dismissals (remarks) 4000 (ii).
Priv. and Elec., 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) 800.

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
Priv. and Elec., Meetings of Com. (remarks) 983.
——— Afternoon Sittings (M.) 1988 (i).
——— 6th Rep. of Com. *re* Controverted Elections, on conc., 4827 (iii).
——— 7th Rep. of Com. (remarks) 5553 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt, 375 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1339 (i).
Provincial Govt's Property Transfer B. 11 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3988 (ii); in Com., 5751 (iii).
Public Accts. Com., on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1926 (i).
Public Works. Dept., Papers (remarks) 395 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5881; (Amt.) 5919; neg. (Y. 83, N. 104) 6124 (iii).
Quebec, West, Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 4084 (ii).
——— Ques. of Procedure, 4088 (ii).
St. John Ry. Station, additional Property (Ques.) 601, 739 (i).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 2666; in Com., 3600 (ii); on M. to conc. in Amts., 4466 (iii).
Ships' Safety, Legislation respecting (remarks) 218 (i).
——— B. 44 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1088, (i).
Stanley, Str., Trips between Mainland and P. E. I., on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 164 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1095 (i).
Strike in Ottawa, &c., calling out Militia (remarks) 5555 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Agriculture) 254; (Finance and Treasury Board) 250; (High Commissioner) 446, 453; (Inland Revenue) 253; (Indian Affairs) 1550, contingencies, 436; (Marine) contingencies, 441; (Public Works) 258, 262 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (P.E.I.) 5024, conc., 5418 (iii). Rys. (I. C. R., &c.) 4058 (ii). Post Office (Mail Service) 4707 (iii).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4259; (P. E. I., salaries) conc., 4256 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) conc., 5421; (Ont., Que., &c.) conc., 5414 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Sullivan, Hon. W. W., salary) 1556 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 4700; (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4689; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 4701; (St. John, Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5467, 5486 (ii).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3724; (Drill Pay) 3733 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5429; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5088 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4470; Dredging (repairs) 4642 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Maintenance) 3513 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3854, 3895; (St. John, additional accommodation) 3885; (St. Charles

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Branch) 3884. P.E.I. (Summerside station, removal) 3898 (ii), conc., 4278 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection conc., 4245 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 5080, 5591 (iii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2562; in Com., 2577 (ii).
Trade Policy of the Govt. on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3358 (ii).
Tunnel between P. E. I. and Mainland (Ques.) 208 (i).
——— (M. for Cor. &c.) 1277 (i).
——— Sir Douglas Fox's Rep. (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 232 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2029 (i).
West Indies Steamship Service (Ques.) 195 (i).
——— Manifest of Cargoes (M. for Ret.*) 205 (i).
——— Subsidies (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4373; neg. (Y. 82, N. 107) 4427 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119, (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for prop. Res., 1255; in Com., 2232 (ii).

Davis, Mr. D. W., *Alberta.*
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 56, 1°*) 334 (i).
Macleod Irrigation Co.'s incorp. (B. 52, 1°*) 266.
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3921; in Com., 3938 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com on Res., 3146 (ii).

Dawson, Mr. G. W., *Addington.*
Rideau Canal, Claims for Land Damages (Ques.) 3618 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Rideau) 5223 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 4249 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2485 (ii).

Delisle, Mr. A., *Portneuf.*
Beaudry, Lieut.-Col., Commission (Ques.) 1766 (i).
Bernier, Capt. J. E., Reps. of L. Langevin *re* (M. for copies*) 2935 (ii).
Cacouna, Purchase of Timber for Wharf, (Ques.) 158 (i).
Infantry School, St. John's, Surgeon (Ques.) 3620 (ii).
Intoxicating Liquors Smuggled into Quebec, Suits resulting (M. for Stmnt.*) 1062 (i).
Judges in Quebec, appointments (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Langevin, Mr. Laforce, emplymnt. on Quebec Harbour Works (Ques.) 1769 (i).

Delisle, Mr. A.—*Continued.*
Montreal Pilots, article in Montreal *Herald*, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6144 (iii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O. C.'s, 1019 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 804 (i).
Printing Paper Contracts (Ques.) 528 (i).
Quebec Graving Dock, Management (Ques.) 2149.
Queen's Counsel, conferring Titles (Ques.) 3263.
Revising Officers and late Elections (Ques.) 207.
St. Lawrence River, Deepening (Ques.) 207 (i).

Davidson, Mr. J. I., *South Ontario.*
SUPPLY:
Quarantine, 5342 (iii).

Davin, Mr. N. F., *West Assiniboia.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1412 (i).
American Cattle slaughtered in Canada (remarks) 4537 (iii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4208 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1821 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3297 (ii).
Commissions, Military College, Permanent Corps (Ques.) 3960 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1408 (i).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4459 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 108, 1°) 1010 (i).
——— B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 3996 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5764; in Com., 5770, 6227.
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 783.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4302 (iii).
Grant, J. J., case of, *re* Settlement (M. for Ret.) 3635 (ii).
Herchmer, Commissioner (Amt.) to M. on Order Paper, 711 (i).
——— Comptroller's Rep. (Ques.) 1274 (i), 2669 (ii).
——— Enquiry into Conduct (prop. Res.) 2913; wthdn., 2923 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 646 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T. (prop. Res.) 606 (i).
Immigration into N.W.T. (Ques.) 1269 (i).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3591 (ii).
Indian Dept., Regina, Estimates (M. for Ret.*) 2935 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4633 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5506 (iii).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*
Land Grants to Volunteers B. 159 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) in Com. on Res., 3108; on M. to conc. in Res., 3582 (ii).
Macdonald, Sir John, decease of (remarks) 887 (i).
Man. and Assiniboia Grand Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp (B. 129, 1°*) 1964 (i).
Mounted Police, N.W.T., Management (Ques.) 267 (i).
——— Newspaper article on Reform (Ques.) 1269.
Nelson, B.C., Postmaster's salary (Ques.) 2518.
N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. (B. 112, 1°) 1102 (i).
——— B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3902; in Com., 3930 (ii), 4298; on Sen. Amts., 6228.
Privilege (Ques.) par. in Toronto *Globe*, 4241.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6160 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. (B. 110, 1°) 1062 (i); 2° m., 3307 (ii).
Regina and South-Western Ry., Pet. *re* (M.) 799 (i).
Second Homesteads in N.W.T. (prop. Res.) wthdn., 3302 (ii).
Settlement of the N.W.T. (prop. Res.) wthdn., 2913 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5168. Dom. Lands (salaries) 5183 (iii). Customs (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1718 (i).
Government of N.W.T. (Library) 6277 (iii); (Translating *Gazette*) 1710 (i); (Well-boring Machines) conc., 5424 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5224 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 514 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 4448; conc., 5395, 6250 (iii); (Printing Bureau) 6254 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5097; (Medicine Hat Hospital) 6275; (Prohibition Commission) 6276 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1701 (i).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for to Com. of Sup., 3851 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3455 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2568 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2719 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1386 (i).

Denison, Mr. F. C., C.M.G., *West Toronto.*
Adjmnt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1542 (i).
——— (M.) to adjn. Hse., neg. (Y. 50, N. 72) 1579.
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1960 (i).
Cavalry School in Toronto (Ques.) 222 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 in Com., 5358 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3249 (ii).

Denison, Mr. F. C.—*Continued.*
Empire Printing and Publishing Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 28, 1°*) 156 (i).
Female Offenders in N. S. B. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3596 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 781 (i).
Imperial Postal Union, Two Cent Rate (Ques.) 131 (i).
Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s (B. 60, 1°*) 387 (i).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3111 (ii).
London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s (B. 27, 1°*) 156 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3537 (ii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 520.
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 1561. Senate (salaries, &c.) 939 (i).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3727; (Care and Maintenance, &c.) 3736; (Drill Instruction) 3730 (ii); (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4281; (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6183 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 6171 (iii).
Pensions (Mounted Police, &c., Rebellion, 1885) 3666 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont) conc., 5444 (iii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2930 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1381 (i).

Desjardins, Mr. A., *Hochelaga.*
Citizens Insurance Co.'s (B. 118, 1°*) 1403 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2372 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep., 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 548, 1200 (ii).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 1407 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com. (presented) 2289 (ii).
——— 4th Rep. of Com. (Ms.) to conc., 5941, 6286 (iii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 309 (i).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 121, 1°*) 1483 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 805 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings (Que.) 4352 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2773 (ii).

Desjardins, Mr. L. G., *L'Islet.*
Quebec Ry. and Bridge Co.'s (B. 87, 1°*) 548 (i).
Trade Policy of the Govt., on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 3309; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 77) 3425 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1995; (Amt. to Amt.) 2020 (i); wthdn., 2668 (ii).

Dewdney, Hon. E., *East Assiniboia.*
Amber Deposits in N.W.T., Applicants (Ans.) 2518 (ii).
Banff Springs Park and Reserve (Ans.) 3957 (ii).
B. C. Better Terms, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4098 (ii).
Cockburn Islands, Location Tickets (Ans.) 1271 (i)
Dingman, Indian Inspector and Agent Allen (Ans.) 1766 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 165, 1°) 3995 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5762; in Com., 5770, 6226 (iii).
Fort du Coteau du Lac, Lease (Ans.) 605 (i).
Electoral Divisions, N.W.T., Re-arrangement (Ans.) 221 (i).
Esquimalt, Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4022 (ii).
Georgian Bay Islands, Timber Cut (Ans.) 603 (i).
Geological Maps, Counties of N.S. (Ans.) 1011 (i).
—— Survey, Eastern Townships (Ans.) 198 (i).
Grant, J. J., Case of *re* Settlement, on M. for Ret., 3639 (ii).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 612 (i).
Indian Act Amt. (B. 144, 1°) 2203; in Com., 3591 (ii).
Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
—— Management (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1505 (i).
Indian Agent Allen, Traffic in Liquor (Ans.) 1264 (i).
—— Charges against (Ans.) 1928 (i), 3265 (ii).
—— Jones, Charges against (Ans.) 4674 (iii).
—— North Bruce, List of Charges (Ans.) 1273
—— Sutton West (Ans.) 961 (i).
—— Wiarton (Ans.) 603 (i).
Indian Reservation Sea Bird Island, B.C. (Ans.) 709 (i).
—— No. 6, Timber Cut (Ans.) 111 (i).
Indians in Antigonish, Medical Services, &c. (Ans.) 225 (i).
Intoxicating Liquors, Sale to Indians (Ans.) 271.
Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Jockes & Delorimier, Messrs., Stone Contractors (Ans.) 5677 (iii).
Keewatin, Str., Police Patrol Boat (Ans.) 4294.
Laidlow, Wm., Resignation, on M. for Ret., 1050 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. (B. 169) Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 4307; M. for Com., 4609; in Com., 4611; 2° m. 5434 (iii).
—— (B. 173) in Com. on Res., 5487, 5593; 1°* of B., 5727; 2° m., 6130 (iii).
Legal Services, Payments by Govt. (Ans.) 2907.
Liquor Sales to Indians in Bruce Co. (Ans.) 530 (i).
Man. School Act, Papers (remarks) 807 (i).
—— School Lands, Sale (Ans.) 1766 (i).
Mennonite Reserve, Man. (Ans.) 198 (i).
Mounted Police, Newspaper article on Reform (Ans.) 1270 (i).

Dewdney, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
N.W.T. Act Amt. (B. 126, 1°) 1760 (i); 2° m., 3902; in Com., 3931 (ii), 4298; on Sen. Amts., 6228 (iii).
—— Representation Act Amt. (B. 178, 1°) 6307; 2° m., 6325 (iii).
Ordnance Lands, Leases, Montreal (Ans.) 5409.
Papashase Indian Reserve, on M. for adjnmt. (remarks) 1404 (i).
Paspasckase Indian Reserve (Ans.) 3265 (ii).
Petroleum at Crow's Nest Pass (Ans.) 6285 (iii).
Quebec Skating Club, Transfer of Land (prop. Res.) 981 (i); in Com., 3584 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 68 (prop. Res.) 1200 (i); in Com. on Res., 3138 (ii).
Rideau Canal Reserve Lots (Ans.) 4296, 5408 (iii).
Settlers on Ry. Reserve, Vancouver, on M. for Ret., 1051 (i).
Shawanakiskic's Indian Reserve (Ans.) 269 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Indian Affairs) 249, 1547, contingencies, 435 (i); (Geological Survey) 410; (Interior) 248 (i), 6169 (iii); contingencies, 434 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5058. Dom. Lands (salaries) 5180; conc., 5435. Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5171. Public Works (Telegraphs, N. W. T.) 4668 (iii).
Geological Survey, 4725; conc., 5411 (iii).
Government of N. W. T. (Elections) 5066; (Library) 6276 (iii); (Schools) 1711; (Translating *Gazette*) 1710 (i); (Well-boring Machines) conc., 5425 (iii).
Indians (B.C.) 4801; (Caughnawaga School Teacher) 6273 (iii); (Green, T. D., salary) 1552; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4736, 4812; (N.B.) 4732, 5059, conc., 5419 (iii); (N.S., Medical Services) 1696 (i), (salaries) 4730, 6294 (iii); (Ont., Que., &c.) 1694 (i), 4727, conc., 5412 (iii); (N.W.T., late Mr. Payne) 1695; (Treaties) 1695 (i), conc., 5415; (P.E.I.) 4735 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5109 (iii); (Dufresne, J. I., D.L.S.) 1706 (i); (Govt. of Keewatin) 5084; (Lunatics, support of) 1709 (i), 5085; (Mounted Police, compensation) 5086 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1697 (i) 4817, 6274, 5415, conc., 5415 (iii).
Open Account (Seed Grain) 1729 (i).
Pensions (Harpur, G. H.) 1572 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 6251; (N.W.T.) conc., 5391, 6249 (iii); (Regina School) 1687 (i).
Unprovided Items, 1730 (i).
Temperance Colonization Society (Ans.) 606 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3438 (ii).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6158 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (prop. Res.) 549; Order for Com. on Res. (read) 1253; in Com. on Res., 1347, 1398; Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 1414; 2° m., 1994 (i); in Com., 2205, 2236, 2249 (ii).

Devlin, Mr. C. R., *Ottawa County.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3967, 3983 (ii).
Bright, J. B., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3263.
Commercial Treaty, England and France (Ques.) 3950 (ii).
Experimental Farm, Distribution of Bulletins (M. for Ret.*) 1579 (i).
Gatineau Point Wharf, Expenditure (Ques.) 604 (i).
Genest, S., Cosgrove, J., and Leduc, C., Resignations, &c. (M. for Cor.) 145 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1174 (i).
Hull Post Office, Tower Clock (Ques.) 222 (i).
Le Liévre and Ottawa Rivers, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 2522 (ii).
Man. School Acts (M. for Ret.) 116 (i).
——— Papers (enquiry) 807 (i).
——— Separate Schools, Papers (Ques.) 741 (i).
North Nation River Wharf, Construction (Ques.) 222 (i).
Ottawa Co. Postal Service (M. for Ret.) 229 (i).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., 1981; on M. to adjn. Hse., 1986 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 383 (i).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1948 (i).
Stratford Boys' Home, Govtl. Control (Ques.) 604 (i).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairying Industry) 3575 (ii); (Experimental Farm) 1567 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 491; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 439; Post Office) contingencies, 440; (Public Works) 397 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1717 (i).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4276 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 514 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists Revision) 948 (i).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 912 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Hull P. O.) 1685 (ii); (Man.) 4437. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4571 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3682 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2763 (ii).
——— par. in *La Patrie* (remarks) 2965 (ii).

Dickey, Mr. A. R., *Cumberland.*
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3295 (ii).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 563 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5357, 5380, 5603, 5727, 5739 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3098 (ii).

Dickey, Mr. A. R.—*Continued.*
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1920 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 690 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3807 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4632 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4153.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5919 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4068 (ii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4283 (iii).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4953.
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m.h., to M. for 2°, 788.
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 876 (i).

Dyer, Mr. E. A., *Brome.*
Newport Harbour Improvements, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6196 (iii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 804 (i).

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*
Victoria and North American Ry. Co.'s Ferry (B. 62, 1°*) 387 (i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., *West Ontario.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1092 (i).
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1421 (i).
Admiral, Str., Services and Ownership (M. for Rets.) 2157 (ii).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103; in Com., 1297 (i).
Allisonville Postmaster, Charges against (Ques.) 2152 (ii).
Berne Copyright Convention (Ques.) 1264 (i).
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P. M. G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5989 (iii).
Copyright Act, 1889 (Ques.) 335 (i).
——— Amt. B. 141 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2144 (i).
——— Imp. Legislation (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
——— Laws of Canada (M. for Cor.) 726 (i).
——— Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5014 (iii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1409 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 994 (i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—*Continued.*
Dom. Elections Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Esquimalt Graving Dock, Lengthening (Ques.) 530 (i).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks), 1525 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. (B. 4, 1°) 105; 2° m., 767, 795 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn Hse., 1145 (i).
Indian Lands Provincial Settlement B. 100 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1087 (i).
Lily, H. M. S., Rescue of Crew (M. for Papers, &c.) 1059 (i).
Priv. and Elec., 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) 800 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 1066 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6100 (iii).
——— Papers, &c. (enquiry) 219, 393.
——— on Ques. of Priv. (M.) to ref. Charges to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 155 (i).
Revising Officers' Instructions *re* Revision (Ques.) 5078 (iii).
Ships' Safety B. 44 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1088.
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 85 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1093 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Public Works) 255, 261, 406 (i).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 926 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2031 (i).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*
Member's Vote challenged, 3780 (ii).
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjmnt., 3823 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6175; (Haras Co.) 6180 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Public Works (Slide and Boom Dues) 4663 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2813 (ii).

Fairbairn, Mr. C., *South Victoria.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1799 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5577 (iii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 1°, 6144 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4601 (iii).

Fauvel, Mr. W. Le B., *Bonaventure.*
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for Com., 1764 (i).
Bonaventure Pier, Construction (Ques.) 335 (i).

Fauvel, Mr. W. Le B.—*Continued.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3185 (ii).
Fishing Licenses, Restigouche River (M. for Ret.) 3283 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost of Construction (M. for Ret.) 966 (i).
Salmon Net-Fishing, Licenses (Ques.) 2152 (ii).
——— Restigouche River (Ques.) 1268 (i).

Featherston, Mr. J., *Peel.*
Brampton Postmaster, Vacancy (Ques.) 3259 (ii).
Cattle on European Steamers (Ques.) 603 (i),
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3135; in Com., 3993 (ii).
——— (remarks), 957 (i).
SUPPLY:
Quarantine, 5337 (iii).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., *Leeds and Grenville.*
Adjmnt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1805 (i).
Pembroke Lumber Co.'s incorp. (B. 26, 1°*) 15t
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 457 (i).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6282. (iii).

Ferguson, Mr. J., *South Renfrew.*
Kingston and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 89, 1°*) 548 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B., *Yarmouth.*
Adjnmt., Queen's Birthday (Ques.) 157 (i).
Blizzard, Schooner, Rescue of Crew (M. for Cor.) 735 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 34, 1°) 193 (i); 2° m., 3288; in Com., 3293 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3650 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3186 (ii).
Fishery Bounty Cheques, Cost, &c., *re* (M. for Ret.) 180 (i).
——— (Ques.) 129 (i).
——— Claims, &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 537 (i).
——— Payments (M. for Stmnt.) 211 (i).
——— Inspector, Dist. No. 3, Resignation (Ques.) 130 (i).
Foreshores of Dom., Ownership (M. for Cor.) 178.
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 867 (i).
Indian Agent Chisholm, Charges against, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6147 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member (prop. Res.) 4462; (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 4533 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5687 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3934 (ii).

Flint, Mr. T. B.—*Continued*
Pictou Harbour Commissioners B. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3595 (ii).
P.O. Building Strathroy, Tenders (M. for copies*) 2935 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) on Division, June 22, 1484 (i).
——— East Northumberland, Charges against Member (prop. Res.) 4462 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1326 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 336 (i).
Returning Officer, Victoria, N.S. (M. for Cor.*) 2935 (ii).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1946, 2189 (i).
Seafreid, Schr., Reward to Captain (Ques.) 224 (i).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3601 (ii).
Stoney Island Breakwater (Ques.) 5408 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies 460; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 438 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5168. Customs (Que.) 5040. Excise (salaries, &c.) 5127; (Methylated Spirits) 5138. Post Office (Mail Service) 4717; (salaries, &c.) 4722 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4064 (ii). Weights, Measures, &c., 5163 (iii).
Government of N.W.T., 5067 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 4733; (N.S.) 6273; (P.E.I.) 4735 (iii); (T. D. Green, salary) 1552 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 947 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance) 3512
Mail Subsidies, &c. (St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5479 (ii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4285; (Monuments, Battlefields of Can.) 4277 (iii); (Permanent Forces, Pay, &c.) 3737 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Printing Bureau Plant) 1706 (i), 5346 (iii).
Mounted Police, 4824 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4451 (ii); (Miscellaneous) 4662; (N. W. T.) conc., 5389; (Ont.) 4371; (Ottawa) 4475. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4532, 6254 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1659 (i). I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3875 (ii).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6148 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2626 (ii).
West Indies Steamship Subsidies, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4405 (iii.)

Forbes, Mr. F. G., *Queen's, N.S.*
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 721 (i).
Cement Purchases by Govt. (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
Cornwallis Valley Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ques.) 2153.
Dorchester Penitentiary, Supplies (Ques.) 1928 (i).
Fishing Bounties paid in Queen's, N.S. (M. for Ret.) 734 (i).
——— on M. for Stmnt., 211 (i).

Forbes, Mr. F. G.—*Continued.*
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., on M. for Cor., 2538 (ii).
Liverpool and Annapolis Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ques.) 143, 601 (i).
Liverpool Postal Accommodation (Ques.) 1768 (i).
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjnmt., 3825 (ii).
Plate presented to Min. of Public Works, Duty paid (Ques.) 2912 (ii).
Quebec Colonization Lottery (Ques.) 2154 (ii).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1950 (i).
Smith & Ripley and Hon. J. A. Chapleau (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4266 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5283 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 5063 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool, &c. or St. John, &c.) 4688 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4326; (Ont.) 4364 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1691 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4594 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3864 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2884 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1384 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *King's, N.B.*
Address, on The, 56 (i).
Adjnmt. St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin* 1410 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. (M.) 1103 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 126 (i).
Auditor Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry., Subsidies (Ans.) 5075 (iii).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty provision B. 168 (prop. Res.) 3427, 3961; in Com., 3963, 3983 (ii); Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 4300 (iii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1828 (i).
BUDGET, THE (remarks) 738, 953, 959 (i).
——— (Annual Stmnt.) 1200 (i).
Cape Breton Ry., Station Masters' Duties (Ans.) 4677 (iii).
Carleton Branch Ry. Sale B. 158 (prop. Res.) 1992 (i); Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 3579 (ii).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 550 (i).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4845.
Cement Purchases by Govt. (Ans.) 4675 (iii).
Civil Service Employés, Payments (Ans.) 2906.
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry Co.'s B. 97 (prop. Res.) 441, 550; M. for Com. on Res., 550; Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 636 (i).
Commercial Treaty, England and France (Ans.) 3951 (ii), 4670 (iii).
Consolidated Rev. and Audit Act Amt. (B. 137, 1°*) 1989; in Com., 3236 (ii).
Corn Meal, Abolition of Duty (Ans.) 143 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
Customs Act Amt. (B. 156, 1°) 3254 (ii); 2° m., 4829; M. for Com. on Res., 5139 (iii).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 1407 (i).
Deptl. Files, Destruction (Ans.) 4157 (ii).
——— Pay Sheets (Ans.) 2520 (ii).
Elliott, G. M., Appmnt. as Gas Inspector (Ans.) 5076 (iii).
ESTIMATES, THE (remarks) 214 (i).
——— (presented) 227 (i).
——— Suppl., 1891 (presented) 799 (i).
——— Suppl., 1892 (presented) 5589 (iii).
——— further Suppl., 1892 (presented) 6289 (iii).
Fenelon Falls Lockmaster (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
——— Lockmaster's Office (Ans.) 4673 (iii).
Gov. Gen's. Warrants (presented) 103 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4542 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on adjnmt. (remarks) 1101 (i).
Heney, John, Payment of Canal Tolls (Ans.) 4676 (iii).
High Commissioner, Sums Paid (Ans.) 224 (i).
——— Fiscal Year 1890 (Ans.) 176 (i).
Indemnity to Senators and Members (M.) 6290.
Iron Bounties, on enquiry for Ret., 2580, 2668.
Maple Sugar, Bounty for Production (Ans.) 1576.
Montreal Customs, defaulting Clerks (Ans.) 4675.
Murray Canal, Officials employed (Ans.) 4675.
Mercantile Agencies, Legislation Regulating (Ans.) 144 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6194 (iii).
Newspaper paragraphs, personal explanation objected to, 3427 (ii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (prop. Res.) 3577.
Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 4658 (iii).
——— Superannuation, in Com. of Sup., 3671 (ii).
——— Unparliamentary Expressions, 1341 (i).
Pictou Bank Winding-up B. 76 (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) on M. for 2°, 548 (i).
Porter, David, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6231 (iii).
P. O. Savings Banks, Interest (Ans.) 1577 (i).
Preventive Officer, Pownal Bay, Dismissal (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
Private Bills Reps., Extension of Time (M.) 3738.
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (Amt.) to Amt., 1313; agreed to (Y. 107, N. 88) 1344 (i).
——— Mr. Scriver's Speech (remarks) 2204.
——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 545 (1).
Public Accts. Com., Meetings, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1713 (i).
——— on M. to refer Accts. of Bourcier, 3948 (ii).
——— Sittings of Com., on M., 5014 (iii).
Public Accounts (presented) 103 (i).
Public Debt, Sinking Fund (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 4675.
Quebec Harbour Commissioner's, Interest Acct. (Ans.) 270 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
Reciprocity, Canada and Spain (Ans.) 3619 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Tolls Collected (Ans.) 4676 (iii).
——— Tolls Refunded (Ans.) 4676 (iii).
Robitaille, C. N., Payment to (Ans.) 4673 (iii).
Subsidies (Ry.) to Provinces (Ans.) 603 (i).
Supplies for Public Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4101 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6174 (iii).
Arts, &c. (Census) 1569 (i); (Census and Statistics) 3533 (ii); (Health Statistics) 6173 (iii); (Seldon's Claim) 1569 (i).
Canals—Income (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i).
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 1754; (Printing, Advertising, &c.) 1756; (Public Debt, Commissions) 1749; (Savings Banks) 1748 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 254; (Auditor Gen.'s Office) 1545 (i), 6167 (iii); (Customs) 254; (Finance and Treasury Board) 250; (Fisheries) 255; (Geological Survey) 410; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 240, contingencies, 433; (High Commissioner) 411, 1732 (i), 6167 (iii), contingencies, 442, 451; (Indian Affairs) 249, 1548, contingencies, 438; (Inland Revenue) 253; (Interior) 247; (Justice) 241; (Marine) 255; (Post Office) 254; (Printing and Stationery) 243, contingencies, 442, 484; (Privy Council Office) 241, contingencies, 433, 1556 (i), 6168 (iii); (Public Works) 397; (Sec. of State) 242 (i), 6167 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Excise, 1724 (i). Rys. (I.C. R.) 3853 (ii), conc., 1758 (i). Public Work (Agency, B.C.) 4669. Harbours, &c. (Repairs) 4665. Land and Cable Telegraphs, 4668. Slide and Boom Dues, 4663. Telegraphs (B.C.) 4669; (N.W.T.) 4668; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 4668 (iii). Weights and Measures, 1725 (i).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4274 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Debates) 943; (Voters' Lists) 1560, 1734. Library (salaries) 945. Senate (salaries, &c.) 930 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 4700, 5349; (Canso, Arichat, &c.) 4702; (Grand Manan, N.B. and Mainland) 4678; (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4679; (Magdalen Islands) 4678; (San Francisco and Victoria) 4703; (St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5458 (iii).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3727 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Can. Temp. Act) 5086, conc., 5426; (C.A.R., Hon. Thos. White's Funeral) 6276; (Chief Justice Palmer, allowance) 6276; (Commercial Agencies) 5108, conc., 5428; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5086, 5103; (Historical, &c., Map of Can.) 6261; (Old Records) 5084, 512; (Prohibition Commission) 6276; (Returns, preparation) 5107; (Royal Society's Proceedings) 5123; (Strong, W. O., Gratuity to Widow) 6264; (Govt. of Keewatin) 5084 (iii); (Gliddon, Wm., payment) 1706 (i).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 926 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kingston Graving Dock) 1678 (i). (Cape Tormentine) 4522. *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 4451, 6251; (Man.) 4429, 5348; (N.W.T.) 4441, 6248; (N.S.) 4514; (Ont.) 4331, 4362, 6239; (Ottawa) 4470, 4474, 4522, 4663, conc., 5401; (P. E. I.) conc., 6305; (Printing Bureau) 6253: (Que.) 4332, 6201, 6210, conc., 5385; (Repairs, &c.) 4469. Dredging (B.C.) 4649: (Man.)

Foster, Hon G. E.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
4647; (Ont. and Que.) 4646; (New Plant) 4602; (Repairs) 4640. Experimental Farms, &c., 4653. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4593; (Generally) 4595, conc., 5402; (Man.) 4591; (N.S.) 4530; (Ont.) 4559, 5265, conc., 5438; (P.E.I.) 4532; (Que.) 4552; (Miscellaneous) 4657. Roads and Bridges (Ont.) 4607; Slides and Booms, 4650, 6261. Surveys, &c., 4662 (iii).
Quarantine, conc., 6304 (iii).
Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (construction) conc., 4278 (iii); (remarks) 1651 (i).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3672, 3695 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6280 (iii).
Unprovided Items, 1745 (i).
Supply (B. 127) 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1853 (i).
——— (B. 167, 1°*) 4297 (iii).
——— (B. 177) Res. in Com., 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 6307 (iii).
Tay Canal, Basin at Perth, Contract (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 500 (i).
Trade Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3376 (ii).
Trade Relations with Empire, Mess. from Sen. (M.) 6216 (iii).
——— Foreign Countries, Address from Sen. M. to conc., 6309 (iii).
——— U. S., Papers (remarks) 2289 (ii).
——— West Indies (remarks) 4608 (iii).
Treaty, Commercial, England and France (Ans.) 3951 (ii), 4670 (iii).
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1647 (i).
——— (Ans.) 208, 227 (i).
——— Sir Douglas Fox's Rep. (Ans.) 4294 (iii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4011 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2021 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Deb., 2065 (i).
——— M. to conc. in Res., 1434 (i); 3201, 3232.
——— in Com. on Res., 1252, 1853 (i); 4001 (ii); 4297, 6307 (iii).
——— (prop. Res.) for Com., 102 (i).
West Indies Steamship Service (Ans.) 195 (i).
——— Subsidies, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4394.
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for Com. on Res., 1254 (i); in Com., 2229; M. to conc. in Amts., 2290 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1539 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113 (Mr. *Mc Dougald, Pictou*) in Com., 1297 (i).
Breakwaters in Guysborough County (Ques.) 1012.
Cape Breton and N.S. Ry. accommodation (M. for Cor.) 177 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Continued.*
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 560 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2369 (ii); in Com., 5744 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 998 (i).
East River, Deepening (Ques.) 1011 (i).
Female Offenders in N.S. B. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3599 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3171 (ii).
Fishery Laws, Fines for Violating, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 189 (i).
——— Overseer, Guysborough, Salary (Ques.) 5403.
Fishing Bounty paid in Guyborough Co. (M. for Ret.*) 232 (i).
Geological Maps, Counties of N.S. (Ques.) 1011.
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1159 (i).
Guysborough Customs Collector, Superannuation (Ques.) 2520 (ii).
Halifax City Market Property (Ques.) 1770 (i).
——— County Court, Judges' Salary (M. for Cor.) 2547 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 838 (i).
Indians in Antigonish, &c., Medical Services (Ques.) 224 (i).
——— Guysborough, &c., Supplies (M. for List*) 232 (i).
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., on M. for Cor., 2536 (ii).
——— County Rys., Subsidies (Ques.) 2911 (ii).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3811 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1072 (i).
McLeod, Mr., of Port Mulgrave (remarks) 2289.
Mermerly, Barque, Rescue of Crew (M. for Cor.) 712 (i).
Munroe, Hugh, Claim for Damages (M. for Ret.) 2546 (ii).
Oxford and Pictou Mail Service (Ques.) 1768 (i).
Pictou Harbour Commissioners B. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3594 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2167 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 277; on adjnmt. (remarks) 545, 1343 (i).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1952.
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3602 (ii).
Short Line Ry., New Route (Ques.) 3266 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3548 (ii).
Agriculture (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).
Civil Government (Public Works) 265 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5166. Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5066 (iii);

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
(Douglas, Mr., additional salary) 1724 (i); (Ont.) 5049. Dom. Lands (salaries) 5181 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1737 (i), 4062 (ii). Post Office (Mail Service) 4715 (iii).
Fisheries (N.S., salaries) conc., 4245 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5229 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 5061; (N.S.) 4729 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 508; (L. A. Audette) 1557 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 949, 1560, 1735.
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Canso, Arichat, &c.) 4702; (San Francisco and Victoria) 4704 (iii).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3721; (Clothing, &c.) 3711 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5116; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5089 (iii).
Railways.—Capital: Cape Breton (Train Ferry) 3898. I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3862; (New Glasgow, increased accommodation) 3882 (ii).
Public Works—Income Buildings (B.C.) 4451; (Que.) 4335. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4530.
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3756 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2573 (ii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4014 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2842 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1390 (i).

Fréchette, Mr. L. J. Côté (*alias*), *Megantic.*
Geological Survey, Eastern Townships (Ques.) 198 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 745 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. to conc. in Res., 6142 (iii).
Voters' Lists, Extension of Time for Revision (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3070 (ii).

Frémont, Mr. J. J. T., *Quebec County.*
Admiralty Courts, Colonial (Ques.) 5777 (iii).
Bridge at Quebec, Construction (Ques.) 2912 (ii).
C. P. R., North Shore Ry. Bonds (Ques.) 2521.
Criminal Law B., Fees *re* Drafting (Ques.) 3260.
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4462 (iii).
I. C. R., Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c. (M. for copies) 3621 (ii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ques.) 527 (i).
——— on M. for copies of O. C.'s, &c., 1018 (i).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
Sick and Distressed Mariners, 2145 (ii).
Sillery Seigniory and Huron Indians of Lorette (Ques.) 604 (i).

Gauthier, Mr. J., *L'Assomption.*
Hurteau, Mr. Hilaire, employment by Gvot. (Ques.) 529 (i).
Inland Revenue Regulations *re* Tobacco (Ques.) 194 (i).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland*
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4205 (ii).
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 70, 1°*) 387 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 in Com., 5372, 5737 (ii).
Crystal Beach and Point Abino Customs Officers (M. for Cor.*) 1579 (i).
Fort Erie and Buffalo Ferry (Ques.) 1768 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N. W. T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 628 (i).
Johnston, Samuel, Dismissal as Preventive Officer (M. for Ret.*) 2935 (ii).
Kingston P. O., Rep. of Postmaster (M. for copies) 2545 (ii).
Lundy's Lane Battle, Monument (Ques.) 3618 (ii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5664 (iii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Niagara Falls, &c. (Ques.) 1275, 1767 (i).
Returns (enquiry) 1991 (i), 2581 (ii).
Toronto Harbour Works, Contractors, &c. (Ques.) 2518 (ii).
Welland Canal, Extra Employés (M. for Cor., &c.) 229 (i).
——— Rets. (enquiry) 3200 (ii).
Whirlpool Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 58, 1°*) 334 (i).

Gibson, Mr. W., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4196 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Empire*, 3200 (ii).
St. Catharines and Merriton Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 88, 1°*) 548 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Carillon) 4150 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 5211 (iii); (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4112 (ii). *Income:* (Carillon and Grenville) 5222 (iii).
Public Works—Capital: Kingston Graving Dock, 1670 (i). *Income:* Buildings (Ottawa) 4497 (iii).
Quarantine, 5337 (iii).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3750 (ii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).
Welland Canal, Surplus Water (M. for Ret.) 963 (i).
——— Turning Basin (Ques.) 270 (i).

Gillies, Mr. J. A., *Richmond, N.S.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1422 (i).

Gillies, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
Fisheries Protection Service, Cape Breton (Ques.) 527 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 842 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic (M.) to adjn. Deb., agreed to (Y. 98, N. 90) 385 (i).

Gillmor, Mr. A H., *Charlotte.*
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 723 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3973 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1801 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 566 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com.. 3174 (ii).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3813 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2561 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Purchase of Property (Ques.) 1268 (i).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4270 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 5063 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5265 (iii).
Weldford P. O., Conduct of Business (Ques.) 2151 (ii).

Girouard, Mr. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P. M. G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5984 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member (M.) to Print Evidence, 4835 (iii).
Priv. and Elec., 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 799.
——— Afternoon Sittings (M.) 197, 1987 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com. conc. in, 2360 (ii).
——— 6th Rep. of Com. *re* Controverted Elections (M.) to conc., 4825 (iii).
——— 7th Rep. of Com. (presented) 5553 (iii).
——— 4th Rep. of Com. *re* Thomas McGreevy, &c. (presented) 3738 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS (M.) to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5778; agreed to (Y. 101, N. 86) 6126 (iii).
——— Papers (remarks) 988 (i).
Quebec, West, Rep. of sub-Com. on Priv. and Elec., (presented) 4747 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works: Buildings (Que.) 4334 (ii).
Justice—Administration of (Judges' salaries) 515.

Godbout, Mr. J., *Beauce.*
Maple Sugar, Bounty for Production (Ques.) 1576 (i).
Quebec Central Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ques.) 4675 (iii).

Gordon, Mr. D. W., *Vancouver Island.*
Behring Sea Seal Fisheries, Imp. Legislation (Ques.) 959 (i).
Chinese Immigrants into Can. (M. for Ret.*) 1578 (i).

Gordon, Mr. D. W.—*Continued.*
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4046 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4452. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4594 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (San Francisco and Victoria) 4703 (iii).
Wellington, Cost, &c., of Militia (M. for Cor., &c.) 145 (i).
——— Services of Militia (Ques.) 2146 (ii).

Grieve, Mr. J. N., *North Perth.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1774 (i).
Listowell P. O. and Custom House (Ques.) 601 (i).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis.*
Revising Officer, Rimouski (Ques.) 741 (i).
Sheppard, W. A., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1266 (i).
Sillery Seigniory and Huron Indians of Lorette (Ques.) 604 (i).
Soucy, Eugène, Dismissal from I. C. R. (Ques.) 1274 (i).
Statutes, Distribution (Ques.) 2522 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 4346. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4556 (iii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Advertising Ottawa Mail Service (Ans.) 963 (i).
—— on M. for Ret., 2541 (ii).
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Allisonville Postmaster, Charges against (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
American Cattle for Slaughter (Ans.) 5776 (iii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5210 (iii).
——— (remarks) 4536 (iii).
Atlantic Mail Service (Ans.) 1765 (i).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4200 (ii).
Brampton Postmaster, Filling Vacancy (Ans.) 3259 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Mail Service, Contractor (Ans.) 3255 (ii).
——— and Fort Macleod Mail Service (Ans.) 3257.
C. P. R., Section "B," on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5943 (iii).
——— Statutory Declaration (read) 6127 (iii).
Camilla and Whittington Mail Service (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
Cattle on European Steamers (Ans.) 604 (i).
Census Commissioner Jones (Ans.) 1274 (i).
——— Receipt of Returns (Ans.) 130 (i).
——— (presented) 4608 (iii).
——— Corrected copy (presented) 4705 (iii).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4992 (iii).
——— (remarks) 3999, 4156 (ii), 4239 (iii).
Chicago Exhibition, Canada's Invitation (Ans.) 1577 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*
Coaticook P. O., Coal Contract (Ans.) 6216 (iii).
Copyright, Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5022 (iii).
Cross Point and Gaspé Basin Mail Service (Ans.) 114 (i).
——— and Paspebiac Mail Service (Ans.) 113 (i).
Digby, Insufficient Postal Accommodation (Ans). 1264 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt to M. for Com. of Sup., 4054 (ii).
Experimental Farm, Central, Expenditure (Ans). 1576 (i).
——— Horses (Ans.) 739 (i).
——— on enquiry for Ret., 3200 (ii).
——— Rep. of Director (presented) 104 (i).
Galt Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 1264 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1172 (i).
Goderich, St. Helen's, &c., Mail Service (Ans.) 3262 (ii).
Hastings Co. Mail Service, on M. for Ret., 213 (i).
High Commissioner for Can., Rep., &c. (presented) 104 (i).
Holstein Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 1766, 1929 (i).
Hurteau, Mr. Hilaire, emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 530 (i).
Immigrants into Canada, Number (Ans.) 5075.
Immigration to N.W.T. (Ans.) 1269 (i).
Imperial Postal Union, Two cent Rate (Ques.) 131.
Indian Agent Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6148 (ii).
International Abattoir Co. (Ans.) 3615 (ii).
Inverness Co. Ry., Subsidies (Ans.) 2911 (ii).
Kentville Postmaster, Suspension (Ans.) 221 (i).
Kingston P. O., Lessee of Box 524 (Ans.) 962 (i).
——— Lease of Boxes (Ans.) 1266 (i).
——— Rep. of Postmaster, on M. for copies, 2545 (ii).
Laberge, Mr., emplymnt. by P. O. Dept., Que. Div. (Ans.) 3955 (ii).
Labour Statistics, Bureau (Ans.) 3615 (ii).
——— Establishment of Bureau, on M. for Cor., 202 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5522, 5610 (iii).
Letter Postage, Reduction (Ans.) 129 (i).
Lyster Postmaster, Resignation (Ans.) 3958 (ii).
Mail Clerk, Lindsay and Haliburton, Resignation (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
Mail Service, B.C. (Ans.) 4294 (iii).
Medical Inspection, Trans-Atlantic Steamers (Ans.) 2906 (ii).
Montreal Letter Box Service Contract (Ans.) 3615, 3954 (ii).
——— P. O. Service (Ans.) 5077 (iii).
Nelson, B.C., Postmaster's Salary (Ans.) 2518 (ii).
Ottawa Co. Postal Service, on M. for Ret., 230.

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*
Ottawa Mail Service Advertising (Ans.) 963 (i).
——— in *Le Canada*, on M. for Ret., 2541 (ii).
Oxford and Pictou Mail Service (Ans.) 1768 (i).
Plate presented to Min. of Pub. Works, Duty paid (Ans.) 2912 (ii).
Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Postmasters' Salaries, Niagara Falls, &c. (Ans.) 1275, 1767 (i).
P. O. and Dom. Savings Banks Deposits, on M. for Ret., 202, 210 (i).
P. O.'s, Rural, Opening and Closing (Ans.) 2912.
Quarantine Officer at Rimouski (Ans.) 3616 (ii).
Quarantine (U.S.) Regulations for Sheep, &c. (Ans.) 605; (remarks) 744, 961 (i).
Quebec P. O., Sunday Closing (Ans.) 1765 (i).
Registered Letter Fee, Reduction (Ans.) 143 (i).
Registration Stamps, Revenue (Ans.) 158 (i).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 5407.
Stallions at Experimental Farm (Ans.) 739 (i).
——— on enquiry for Ret., 3200 (ii).
Stanley, Str., Trips between Mainland and P.E.I., on M. for Ret., 171 (i).
Stratford Home for Boys, Govtl. Control (Ans.) 604 (i).
Steam Fans on Cattle Ships (Ans.) 1275 (i).
Summerside Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 3955.
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census) 1569 (i); (Census and Statistics) 3531 (ii); (Jamaica Exhibition) 1568 (i).
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 1562 (i), 3574 (ii); (Experimental Farms) 1567 (i), 3555 (ii); (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).
Canals—Capital (Tay) 4144 (ii), 5220 (iii).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 254; (Post Office) 254 (i), 6166 (iii), contingencies, 440 (i); (P.O. and Finance) contingencies, 432 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 1744 (i), 6279; (Mail Service) 4705; (Miscellaneous) 4725; (salaries, &c.) 4720 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (P. E. I. and Mainland) 4702; (San Francisco and Victoria) 4703 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5119 (iii).
Public Works—Capital: Kingston Graving Dock, 1674 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 6252; (Man.) 4429; (Que.) 4336. Experimental Farms, &c., 4654 (iii).
Quarantine, 5336, conc., 5437; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3576, conc., 4277, (iii); (Vaccination) 1570 (i).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3672 (ii).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3759 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4798 (iii).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., &c., 1290 (i).
Weldford P. O., Conduct of Business (Ans.) 2151.
Yamaska, East, Post Office, Closing (Ans.) 2153.

Hargraft, Mr. J., *West Northumberland.*
Battell, William, Employé Cobourg P. O. (Ques.) 3952 (ii).

Hargraft, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5561 (iii).
Lakeport Harbour of Refuge, Construction (Ques.) 207 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 232 (i).
Murray Canal, Officials employed (Ques.) 4675.
Cobourg Harbour Works, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5335 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4574 (iii).

Harwood, Mr. H. S., *Vaudreuil.*
Vaudreuil, Construction of Wharf (Ques.) 335 (i).

Hazen, Mr. J. D., *St. John, N.B., City and Co.*
Address in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 8 (i).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 718 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 564 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1038 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1150 (i).
I. C. R. Labourers, Reduction of Pay (Ques.) 3266 (ii).
——— Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2953 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5271 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4692 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4221 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, warehouse) 3894; (St. John, additional accommodation) 3887.

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5564 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3092 (ii).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co. and C.P.R. Co.'s (B 66, 1°*) 387 (i).
SUPPLY :
Miscellaneous (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5083 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3013 (ii).

Hyman, Mr. C. S., *London.*
Adjmnt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1413 (ii).
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s (B. 63, 1°*) 387 (i).
Military District No. 1, Location of Camp (M. for Cor.) 231 (i).
Saddlery, 1st Reg., Cavalry (Ques.) 198 (i).
Steam Boiler and Plate Glass Ins. Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 50, 1°*) 266 (i).
Strathroy P.O., Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3262 (ii).

Hyman, Mr. C. S.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 445, 458 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 4716; (salaries, &c.) 4719 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 516.
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 3732; (Military Stores, &c.) 3718 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4454; (Man.) 4439; (N.W.T.) 4444; (Que.) 4359 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2581 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*
Car-Coupling Accidents (prop. Res.) 3643 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5551 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3095 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2950 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1597 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for 2°, 3305 (ii).
Returning Officer, East Elgin, Accounts (M. for Cor.*) 1579 (i).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3609 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5264 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (St. John, increased accommodation) 3888 (ii).

Innes, Mr. J., *South Wellington.*
Canadians Abroad, Distressed (Ques.) 2149 (ii).
Letter Postage, Reduction (Ques.) 129 (i).
Maclean, Roger & Co.'s Claim (Ques.) 269 (i).
SUPPLY :
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5056; (P.E.I.) 5029 (iii).

Ives, Mr. W. B., *Sherbrooke.*
Adjnmt. for Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1958 (i).
Division, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4462 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 104 (i).
Montreal and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 29, 1°*) 156 (i).
Public Works Dept., Papers (remarks) 989 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6135, 6141 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (Printing and Stationery) 245; (Public Works) 264 (i).
Militia (Kilted Battalion, Toronto) 6183 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2375 (ii).

Jamieson, Mr. J., *North Lanark.*
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3293 (ii).
Ottawa and Parry Sound Ry. Co., &c. (B. 96, 1°*) 600 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3092 (ii)
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic (prop. Res.) 271 (i).
——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 545 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1312 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., 1298 (i).

Joncas, Mr. L. Z., *Gaspé.*
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for Com., 1763; on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1959 (i).
Cross Point and Gaspé Basin Mail Service (Ques.) 113 (i).
——— and Paspebiac Mail Service (Ques.) 113 (i).
Govt. Rys., Payments for Printing (Ques.) 3614.
Pairing of Members, 4213 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Le Monde*, 1346 (i).
Sessional Clerks in H. of C. (M.for Stmnt.*) 544.

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1536 (i).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 725 (i).
Blizzard, Schooner, Rescue of Crew, on M. for Cor., 735 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5319 (iii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3174 (ii).
Fishery Bounty, in Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Tupper*) 1097 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act (M. for Cor.) 3267 (ii).
——— Suspension (Ques.) 113 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6188.
Sawdust in La Have River (M. for Ret.) 1942, 2201 (i).
SUPPLY :
Indians (N.B.) 5065 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4284 (iii).
Public Works : Buildings (Que.) 4336 (iii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E., *Halifax.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1540 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 125 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5322 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1162 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
I.C. Ry. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1259.
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1080 (i).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 2199.
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6179 (iii).
Indians (N.B.) 5062 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Laboratory) 5054 (iii). Railways (I.C.R., &c.) 4076 (ii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Mail Subsidies (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4680 (iii).
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1629 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2822 (ii).
West Indies Steamship Subsidies, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4417(iii).

King, Mr. G. G., *Queen's, N.B.*
Edgett's Landing, Ballast Wharf (Ques.) 3956.
SUPPLY :
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5277 (iii).
Collection of Revenues : Railways (I.C.R., &c.) 4063 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2122 (ii).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A., *Frontenac.*
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 892 (i).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4190 (ii).
C. P. R. Co.'s Act (1889) Amt. (B. 74, 1°) 387 (i).
——— (B. 75, 1°*) 387 (1).
——— Telegraph Lines (B. 21, 1°*) 155; 2° m., 189 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5731 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5152 (iii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3657 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1071 (i).
New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 37, 1°*) 206 (i).
New Brunswick Ry. Co. and C.P.R. Co.'s (B. 69, 1°*) 387 (i).
Ontario and New York Bridge Co., M. to suspend Rule, 286 (i).
——— incorp. (B. 93, 1°*) 549 (i).
Order (Ques. of) Newspaper Reps., 2963 (ii).
Quebec, West, Vacany, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 4084 (ii).
Rathbun Co.'s (B. 171, 1°*) 5013 (iii).
Rideau Canal, High Water (M. for Ret.) 711 (i).
St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 20) 2° m., 189 (i).
Standard Time (M. for Ret.) 209 (i).
Standing Orders Com., on Rep. *re* Rathbun Co. (remarks) 5012 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6221 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3721; (Drill Pay, &c.) 4225 (ii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 909 (i).
Veterans of 1837-38 (prop. Res.) 2923 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey.*
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 (i).
Ballot Boxes, J. R. Arnoldi's Rep. (M. for copy) 201 (i).
Beaverton Dock, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 708 (i).
Cablegrams per Reuter's Agency (Ques.) 4296.
Chippewa Indians, Charge against Agent (Ques.) 3264 (ii).
Civil Servants in Elections (Ques.) 1765 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2366; on M. to adjn. Hse., 2370 (ii); in Com., 5378 (iii).
Dingman, Indian Inspector, and Agent Allen, (Ques.) 1766 (i).
Dom. Aid to Rys., on M. for Ret., 1056 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 105 (i).
——— B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 1°, 106; on M. for 2°, 999 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5145, 5207; on M. for 3°, 5585 (iii).
Election, last General, Recounts (Ques.) 142, 177 (i).
——— Senators as Candidates (Ques.) 1577 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c. (M. for Ret.) 131 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 781.
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3090.
——— Year of Passing, &c. (Ques.) 961, 1267 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4306 (iii).
Heney, John, Payment of Canal Tolls (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
High Commissioner, Sums Paid, Fiscal Year 1890 (Ques.) 176, 223 (i).
Holstein, Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 1766, 1929 (i).
Indian Affairs, Management (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
Indian Agent Allen, Traffic in Liquor (Ques.) 1264 (i).
——— North Bruce, List of Charges (Ques.) 530, 1272 (i).
——— Jones, Charges against (Ques.) 4673 (iii).
Intoxicating Liquors, Sale to Indians (Ques.) 270 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1°, 4209 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5505 (iii).
Lease of Building on Sparks St. (Ques.) 2518 (ii).
Liquor Sales to Indians in Bruce Co. (Ques.) 530.
New England Paper Co. (Ques.) 1767 (i).
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjmnt., 3827 (ii).
Port Arthur Breakwater, Contract (Ques.) 602 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1331 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Functions (remarks) 4240 (iii).
Public Expenditure, Rets. (enquiry) 4158 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Public Works in Electoral Dists., Expenditure (M. for Ret.) 1061 (i).
Registered Letter Fee, Reduction (Ques.) 143 (i).
Registration Stamps, Revenue (Ques.) 158 (i).
Returns (enquiry) 2581, 4158 (ii).
Rideau Canal Reserve Lots (Ques.) 4296 (iii).
——— Tolls Collected and Refunded (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
Royal Commissions since Confederation (Ques.) 4297 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 1563; (Experimental Farms) 1568 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3537 (ii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 411, contingencies, 443, 471, 495 (i); (Rys. and Canals) 6169 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Douglas, Mr., additional salary) 1723; (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1717 (i); (Ont.) 5044. Excise (salaries, &c.) 5130 (iii). Weights and Measures, &c., 1726 (i), 5165 (iii).
Dominion Police, 1557 (i).
Indians (B.C.) 4802 (iii); (N.S., Medical Services) 1696; (T. D. Green, salary) 1554 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, &c.) 946; (Voters' Lists) 946, 1562 (i).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5106 (iii); (Litigation Expenses) 1708 (i); (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5084 (iii); (Printing Bureau) 1706 (i); (Returns, preparation) 5107.
Mounted Police, 4818 (iii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 919, 925; (Man.) 918 (i).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 4322; (Ont.) 4366, 4370; (Ottawa) 4474; (Printing Bureau) 6253; (Que.) 4338, 6203 (iii); (Walkerton P.O.) 1686 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4564, 4566 (iii).
Quarantine, 1570 (i).
Votes polled, last General Election (M. for Ret.*) 128 (i).
Walkerton Public Buildings, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 267 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2461 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2235 (ii).
Wood Supply, Ottawa Public Buildings, Contractor (Ques.) 4295 (iii).

Langelier, Mr. F., *Quebec Centre.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1731 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1961 (i).
Bridge at Quebec (Ques.) 525 (i).
——— O. C.'s (M. for copies) 1041 (i).
——— Rep. of Engineers *re* Survey, on M. for copy, 1053 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 633 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 848 (i).
Laberge, Mr., emplymnt. by P. O. Dept., Que. Div. (Ques.) 3954 (ii).

Langelier, Mr. F.—*Continued.*
Marie Eliza, Schr., Seizure and Sale (Ques.) 710.
——— (M. for Cor., &c.*) 1478 (i).
Medical Inspection, Trans-Atlantic Steamers (Ques.) 2906 (ii).
Montreal Custom House Employés, on M. for Ret., 3282 (ii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ques.) 525 (i).
——— (M. for O.C.'s) 974, 1022 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Com. on Res., 4767 (iii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 744, 802 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1065 (i).
Quarantine Officer at Rimouski (Ques.) 3616 (ii).
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1937 (i).
——— P. O., Sunday Closing (Ques.) 1765 (i).
Queen's Bench, Que., Appmnt. of Chief Justice (remarks) 5195 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts Amt. B. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 5591.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Public Works) 258 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Que.) 5033 (iii); Rys. (I.C.R.) 1742 (i).
Indians (Ont., Que., &c.) 1694.
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4553 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. to conc. in Res., 3208.

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L., K.C.M.G., *Richelieu and Three Rivers.*
Adjnmt., Corpus Christie (M.) 523 (i).
——— Dom. Day (remarks) 1537 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
——— Queen's Birthday (M.) 386 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul (M.) 1409 (i).
——— Sir John Macdonald's Funeral (M.) 888 (i).
Amhertsburg Dry Dock (Ans.) 3259 (ii).
Annapolis Public Buildings (Ans.) 529 (i).
Arnoldi, J. R., Govtl. Action (remarks) 3130 (ii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) (Amt.) to Amt. to M. for 3°, 1963 (i).
Beaverton Dock, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 708 (i).
——— Harbour Works, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 226 (i).
Belle Creek Breakwater, P.E.I. (Ans.) 1271 (i).
Barry P.O. Building, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3255.
Big Bay Wharf, Expenditure, &c., on Work (Ans.) 1929 (i).
Black River Improvements (Ans.) 739, 740 (i).
Bonaventure Pier, Construction (Ans.) 335 (i).
Boucherville Wharf, Contractor (Ans.) 1265 (i).
Brae Harbour Breakwater, Completion (Ans.) 1274 (i).
——— Tenders (Ans.) 208 (i).
Breakwaters in Guysborough County (Ans.) 1012.
Bridge at Quebec (Ans.) 525 (i).
——— Construction (Ans.) 2912 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—*Continued.*
Bridge at Quebec, Bright, J. B., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3264 (ii).
Cacouna, Purchase of Timber for Wharf (Ans.) 158 (i).
C. P. R., L'Avenir Branch (remarks) 198 (i).
Cascumpec Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 1765 (i), 2151 (ii).
Cement Purchases by Govt. (Ans.) 2521 (ii).
Centreville Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 962.
Civil Service, Regulations *re* Meals, &c. (Ans.) 3258 (ii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Monopoly (Ans.) 222 (i).
Documents promised in Speech from Throne (Ans.) 157 (i).
Dredging, &c., Black River (Ans.) 739, 740 (i).
Dundas and Waterloo Macadamized Road (Ans.) 223 (i).
East River, N.S., Deepening (Ans.) 1011 (i).
Elections in 1891, Senators as Candidates (Ans.) 1577 (i).
Esquimalt Graving Dock, Advts. for Tenders, &c., on M. for copies, 1933 (i).
——— Amount paid Larkin & Co. (Ans.) 270.
——— Lengthening (Ans.) 530 (i).
Finance Dept., New Safe, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 130 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Order for 2°, 206 (i).
Fraserville P. O. Building, Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 3255 (ii).
Galt P. O., Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 226.
Gatineau Point Wharf, Expenditure (Ans.) 604.
Giguère, Capt. Claude, emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1266 (i).
Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays (M.) 2668, 3576 (ii).
——— Wednesdays (M.) 1730 (i).
——— Thursdays (M.) 1004 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1126 (i).
Halifax City Market Property (Ans.) 1770 (i).
Hastings Co. Public Works, Improvements (Ans.) 208 (i).
High Commissioner, on M. to adjn. Deb., 705 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (M.) to adjn. Deb., agreed to (Y. 87, N. 73) 629 (i).
Hull Post Office, Tower Clock (Ans.) 222 (i).
Imperial Federation and High Commissioner (Ans.) 2154 (ii).
I. C. R., Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis, on M. for Ret., 177 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2144 (ii).
Jennings, Mr., Engineer, Appmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2522 (ii).
Kaministiquia River, Dredging (Ans) 129, 1267.
Kingston Graving Dock, Papers (Ans.) 1765 (i)
Knowlton's Landing, Wharf (Ans.) 1770 (i).
Lakeport Harbour of Refuge, Construction (Ans.) 207 (i).
Langevin Block, Construction (Ans.) 1575 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—*Continued.*
Langevin Block, Papers (remarks) 992 (i).
——— Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1267 (i).
Langevin, Mr. Laforce, emplymnt. on Quebec Harbour Works (Ans.) 1769 (i).
La Rivière du Sud, Dyke (Ans.) 601 (i).
Le Liévre and Ottawa Rivers, Dredging (Ans.) 2522 (ii).
Library of Parliament, Joint Com. (M.) 156 (i).
Lindsay P. O., Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 225 (i).
——— Public Buildings (Ans.) 268 (i).
Listowell P. O. and Custom House (Ans.) 602 (i).
Liverpool and Annapolis Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 601 (i).
——— Postal Accommodation (Ans.) 1768 (i)
Macdonald, Sir John, Decease (remarks) 883 (i).
——— Adjmnt. for Funeral (M.) 888 (i).
——— Public Funeral (M.) 884 (i).
——— Erection of Monument (Ans.) 2148 (ii).
——— Illness (announced) 599 ; (remarks) 631, 707 (i).
Major's Hill Park, Tenders (Ans.) 605 (i).
Man. Separate Schools, Papers, &c. (Ans.)741 (i).
Meteghan Wharf, Digby Co. (Ans.) 531 (i).
Miminegash Breakwater, Tenders for new Works (Ans.) 130 (i).
Ministerial Changes, Stmnt. by Hon. Mr. Abbott (read) 891 (i).
——— (remarks) 1013 (i).
Napanee Public Buildings (Ans.) 2154 (ii).
——— Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 1271 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 966 (i).
North Nation River Wharf, Construction (Ans.) 222 (i).
North Saskatchewan River Improvements (Ans.) 1576 (i).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (Ans.) 526 (i).
——— on M. for copies of O. C.'s, &c., 1017 (i).
Ottawa Co. P. O. at Buckingham, on M. for Ret., 230 (i).
Parliament Buildings, Metal Pillars (Ans.) 1273.
Peterborough P. O., Name of Contractor (Ans.) 225 (i).
Pinet Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 226 (i).
Port Arthur Breakwater, Contract (Ans.) 602 (i).
Port George Pier, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2911 (ii).
Prince Edward, Dredge (Ans.) 1765 (i).
Printing, Joint Com. (M.) 156 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 828, 1483 (i).
——— Pets. (M.) 128 (i).
——— Reps., 2203, 3308 (ii).
Prohibition, on adjnmt. (remarks) 545 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Tarte) 153 (i).
—— Papers (remarks) 219, 394, 746, 988, 1850 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Employés, on enquiry for Ret., 3200 (ii).
Public Works in Electoral Dists., Expenditures, on M. for Ret., 1062 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—*Continued.*
Quebec Eastern Ry. Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 1936 (i).
Quebec Graving Dock, Management (Ans.) 2150.
Quebec Harbour Commission, Chief Engineer (Ans.) 527, 602 (i).
Raquette Pier, N.S., Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1575.
Red Point Pier, P.E.I. (Ans.) 1271 (i).
Red River Surveys, Reps. (Ans.) 1012 (i).
Reporters, Official, better Accommodation (remarks) 1013 (i).
Returns, on enquiry (remarks) 1062 (ii), 2581 (iii).
Revising Officers and late Elections (Ans.) 208 (i).
Richelieu River Floods (Ans.) 336 (i).
River Thames, Bar at Mouth (Ans.) 1268 (i).
St. Jean Deschaillons Shoals, on M. for Cor., 1053 (i).
St. John Ry. Station, additional Property (Ans.) 601 (i).
St. Lawrence River, Canal on North Shore (Ans.) 176 (i).
——— Deepening (Ans.) 207 (i).
St. Pierre, Pierre, emplymnt. as Slide-Master (Ans.) 603 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Purchase of Property (Ans.) 1268 (i).
Sissiboo River, Dredging (Ans.) 1574 (i).
Speaker, Election of Deputy (M.) 388 (i).
Strathroy P. O., Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 3263 (ii).
Summerside Harbour, Dredging (Ans.) 3258 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Income (Miscellaneous) 1668 (i).
Civil Government (Public Works) 255, 397 (i).
Public Works—Capital. Harbours and Rivers (Kingston Graving Dock) 1669, 1680; (Ship Channel, Montreal and Quebec) 1668. *Income:* Buildings (Man.) 1687; (N. W. T.) 1687; (Ont.) 1686 (i). Dredging (New Plant) 1690. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1688 (i).
Telegraph Companies, Legislation *re* Directors (Ans.) 144 (i).
Toronto Drill Shed, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 963 (i).
——— Harbour Works, Contractors, &c. (Ans.) 2519 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 194, 197, 216 (i).
Vaudreuil, Construction of Wharf (Ans.) 335 (i).
Walker, Dr., Claim *re* Dundas, &c., Macadamized Road, on M. for O.C., 1058 (i).
Walkerton P.O., Contract for Fittings (Ans.) 962 (i).
——— Tenders (Ans.) 267 (i).
——— Caretaker (Ans.) 1271 (i).
——— Completion (Ans.) 335 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff (M.) to adjn. Deb., 2060 (i).
West Point Wharf, Engineer's Rep. (Ans.) 269.
Wiarton Harbour Works, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 226 (i).
Wood Islands Breakwater, P.E.I. (Ans.) 1271 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher*.
Debates, Official Rep., 1st Rep. of Com. (M. to conc.) 632 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5201 (iii).
French Language in Man. (M. for Cor.) 114 (i).
Mennonite Reserve, Man. (Ques.) 198 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3912 (ii).
——— Representation Acts Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 6325 (iii).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s (B. 77, 1°*) 441
Private Bills Reps., Extension of Time (M.) 2961
Separate Schools in Man., Abolition (M. for Cor.) 115 (i).
SUPPLY :
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5093 (iii)

Laurier, Hon. Wilfred, *East Quebec*.
Address, on The, 19 (i).
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1104 (i).
Arnoldi, J. R , Govtl. Action (remarks) 3129 (ii).
Atlantic Mail Service (M. for Cor.) 124 (i).
Bridge at Quebec, Surveys, Rep. of Engineers (M. for copies) 1053 (i).
Campbellton P. O., Pets. *re* Establishment (M. for copies) 544 (i).
C.P.R., Section "B," Charges against P.M.G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5954 (iii).
——— on Statutory Declaration (remarks) 6129.
Caraquet Ry., Receipts and Expenditure (Ques.) 3614 (ii).
Carleton Branch Ry. Sale B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 1992 (i).
Cattle Trade, Shipping of Live Stock B. (remarks) 958 (i).
Chicoutimi, Representation, Ret. Officer's Rep. (remarks) 7 (i).
Commercial Treaty, England and France (remarks) 3951 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3649 (ii), 5355, 5382.
Copyright, Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5020 (iii).
Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Sel. Com. (remarks) 7 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 1407.
——— 4th Rep. of Com., 5941.
Desmarteau's, Jos., Claims for Improvements (M. for Ret.) 2155 (ii).
Disallowance of Provincial Acts, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6296 (iii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4461 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5141, 5156, 5197 ; on M. for 3°, 5560 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 6227 (iii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued*.
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4016 (ii) ; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 4056 (ii).
Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 11 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 2961 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3084 (ii).
Frauds on the Govt. Prevention B. 172 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 6280, 6289 (iii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4300 (iii).
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 2668, 3576 (ii).
——— Wednesdays, 1730 (i).
——— Saturdays, 6127 (iii).
Govt. Policy, on adjmnt. (remarks) 1100 (i).
——— (M.) to adjn. Hse., 1105 ; neg. (Y. 83, N. 103) 1198 (i).
Grant, J. J., case of, *re* Settlement, on M. for Ret., 3641 (ii).
Herchmer, Commsr., Enquiry into Conduct, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2920 (ii).
High Commsr. (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com., of Sup., 570 ; neg. (Y. 79, N. 100) 881 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Deb., 705 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 618 ; on M. to adjn. deb. (remarks) 629.
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6290 (iii).
Indian Agent Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6147 (iii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3657 (ii).
Kingston P. O., Rep. of Postmaster, on M. for copies, 2546 (ii).
Lamontagne, Leda, Extradition (Ques.) 3619 (ii).
——— Pet. for Discharge (Ques.) 2907 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5503, 5593 (iii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3112 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c., on M. for copies, 3631 (ii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3133 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 4773 (iii).
Macdonald, Sir John, Illness (remarks) 600, 631 (i).
——— Decease (remarks) 884 (i).
Ministerial Changes (remarks) 888, 959, 1013 (i).
Minister of Public Works, rumoured Resignation (remarks) 3653 (ii).
——— Resignation (remarks) 4213 (ii), 5075 (iii).
Montreal Custom House Employés, on M. for Ret., 3279 (ii).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6193 (iii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O.C.'s, &c., 1014 (i).
——— B. 170 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4752, 4766, 4772 ; in Com. on B. 5081 ; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 5410 (iii).

Laurier, Sir Wilfred--*Continued.*
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4154.
——— Sel. Com.'s Rep. (remarks) 5553 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Sen. Amts., 6228 (iii).
——— Representation Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 6327.
Order (Ques. of) Public Works Dept., Papers, 984, 990 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 805 (i).
P.O.'s, Rural, Opening and Closing (Ques.) 2912.
P.E.I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2167 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Absence of Superintendent (enquiry) 2375, 2437 (ii).
——— Type Purchased (Ques.) 3619 (ii).
Priv. and Elec. Com., afternoon Sittings, on M., 1988 (i).
——— on 7th Rep. of Com. (remarks) 5553 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1321.
——— on adjmnt. (remarks) 545 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1065 (i).
Public Accts. Com., on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1925 (i).
——— on M. to refer Accts. *re* Bourcier, 3949 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec. (Amt.) to adjn. Deb., neg. (Y. 29, N. 36) 6025 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6034 (iii).
——— Papers (Ques. of Priv.) 984, 990, 1849 (i).
Quebec Garrison Club, Lease of Lands (Ques.) 527 (i).
Quebec, West, Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (objection) 4081 (ii).
——— (remarks) 6309 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 1°, 6287 (iii).
Reciprocity, Canada and Spain (Ques.) 3619 (ii).
——— Papers (enquiry) 600 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com on Res., 3139 (ii).
Settlers on Ry. Reserve, Vancouver (M. for Ret.) 1051 (i). *See* "Esquimalt."
Soulanges Canal, Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 535 (i).
Speaker, Election of (remarks) 2 (i)
——— (remarks) 388 (i).
Strike in Ottawa, calling out Militia, &c. (remarks) 5555 (iii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6136 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Grenville, Goodwin's Claim) 6199. *Income* (Chambly) 6200 ; (Grenville, Goodwin's Claim) 6297 (iii).

Laurier, Sir Wilfred—*Continued.*
SUPPLY--*Continued.*
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 493 (i) ; (Post Office) 6166 ; (Printing and Stationery) 6166 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) conc., 5419 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1742 (i).
Fisheries (Que., salaries, &c.) 3519 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 4804 ; (Ont., Que. &c.) conc., 5411, 5414 (iii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 4700, 5349 ; (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4686 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5110 ; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5094, 5100 ; (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5432 ; (Historical, &c., Map of Canada) 6264 (iii).
Mounted Police, 4822, 6274 ; conc., 5416 (iii).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 1674, 1683 (i). *Income*—Buildings (N.W.T.) conc., 5388, 5394 ; (Que.) 6239, conc., 5386. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4555 (iii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6280, 6305 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3584 ; in Com., 3588 ; on M. for 3°, 3649 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 5079, 5590 (iii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3839 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2566 (ii).
Trade Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3313.
Trade Relations with Foreign Countries, Address from Sen., on M. to conc., 6314 (iii).
Treaty, Commercial, England and France (remarks) 3951 (ii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4015 (ii).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6164 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2020, 2064 (i).
Wellington, B.C., Services of Militia (remarks) 2147 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for Com. on Res., 1254 (i) ; in Com., 2205, 2224 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. J., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Black River Improvements (Ques.) 739 (i).
C.P.R., L'Avenir Branch (Ques.) 197, 220 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 35, 1°) 194 (i).
Census Commissioner Jones (Ques.) 1274 (i).
Dredging, &c., Black River (Ans.) 740 (i).
Garrison Club, Quebec, Lease of Lands (Ques. 527 (i).
Medical Inspection, Trans-Atlantic Steamers (Ques.) 2906 (ii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 745 (i).

Lavergne. Mr. J.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4557 (iii).
Votes and Proceedings, Translation (remarks) 199, 391 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2713 (ii).

Leduc, Mr. J. H., *Nicolet.*
Boisvert, George, Appmnt. as Fishery Officer (M. for Cor.*) 2935 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2875 (ii).

Legris, Mr. J. H., *Maskinongé.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3051 (ii).

Lépine, Mr. A. T., *East Montreal.*
Judges in Montreal District (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
Labour Statistics, Bureau (Ques.) 3615 (ii).
——— Establishment of Bureau (M. for Cor.) 201
Military Districts Nos. 5 and 6, Paymaster (Ques.) 707 (i).
Montreal Custom House Employés (M. for Ret.) 3275 (ii).
Montreal P.O., Letter Box Service, Contract (Ques.) 3615 (ii).
Queen's Bench, Que., Appmnt. of Judges, salaries (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
——— Vacancy (Ques.) 3620 (ii).
Sorel and St. John's Militia Camp Pay Roll (M. for copies*) 1062 (i).
Type-setting Machines, Cost (Ques.) 271 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F., *West Lambton.*
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1104 (i).
Annapolis Public Buildings (Ques.) 529 (i).
——— Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 544 (i).
Bremner's Claim for Furs (Ques.) 1268 (i).
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P.M.G. (prop. Res.) 5852, 5942 (iii).
Cement Purchases by Govt. (Ques.) 2521 (ii).
Cockburn Islands, Location Tickets (Ques.) 1271.
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 995 (i).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1513 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1180 (i).
Kaministiquia Harbour, Dredging (remarks) 600.
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5524 (iii).
Langevin Block, Papers (remarks) 992 (i).
Lindsay Public Buildings (Ques.) 268 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1067 ; in Com., 1073.
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 969 (i).
Pound-Net Licenses, Lake Huron (Ques.) 142, 529 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*
Pound-Net Licenses, Lake St. Clair (Ques.) 198, 223
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., 1306 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Receipts (Ques.) 2905 (ii).
——— Tolls, &c. (Ques.) 3620 (ii).
——— Mr. Plummer's Services (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2552 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4494.
Senécal, André (M.) summoning to Bar of House, 4533 (iii).
——— (M.) Speaker's Warrant for Arrest, 4748.
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2252 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A., G.C.B., *Kingston.*
Address, on The, 29 (i).
Address to Her Majesty, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 227 (i).
Adjmnt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 ; (M.) 111 (i).
Animals from U.S., Free Entry (Ans.) 129 (i).
C. P. R., L'Avenir Branch (Ans.) 220 (i).
Chicoutimi Representation, Ret. Officer's Rep. (remarks) 7 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*), on M. for 1°, 105 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 133 (i).
Employés in Elections (Ans.) 221 (i).
Hartley, H. E., Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 145 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 111 (i).
Liverpool and Annapolis Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 143 (i).
Ministerial Explanation, on adjmnt. (remarks) 237 (i).
Mounted Police, Comptroller's Rep. (presented) 237 (i).
——— Management (Ans.) 267 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°*) 5 (i).
P. E. I. Ry. Road-bed and Rails, on M. for Ret., 229 (i).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 104 (i).
Speaker, The (M.) nominating Peter White, Esq., 1 (i).
Speech from the Throne, consdn. (M.) 6 (i).
Standing Committees (M.) 6 (i).
——— (M.) Com. to prepare Lists, 29 (i).
——— Rep. of Sp. Com. (Lists presented) 135 ; conc. in, 140 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 426 ; contingencies, 431 ; (Public Works) 261, 401 ; (Railways and Canals) 408 (i).
Welland Canal, Extra Employés, on M. for Cor., 229 (i).
——— Turning Basin (Ans.) 270 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., *King's, P.E.I.*
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1644 (i).
SUPPLY :
Collection of Revenues: Public Works (Telegraphs, P. E. I. and Mainland) 4668 (iii).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4260; (P. E. I., salaries) conc., 4257 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4596 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. H. J., *Winnipeg.*
Assiniboine River Water Power (B. 91, 1°*) 549.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4300 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5280 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 917 (i).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 48, 1*°) 238; 2° m., 295 (i).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1400 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., *East Huron.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1539 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3300 (ii).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup. 5001.
Coal Monopoly, B. C., in Com. of Sup., 922 (i).
Man. School Lands, Sale (Ques.) 1766 (i).
North Saskatchewan River Improvements (Ques.) 1576 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 346 (i).
Quarantine (U. S.) Regulations, Sheep, &c. (Ques.) 960 (i).
Subsidies (Ry.) to Provinces (Ques.) 603 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 1568 (i); (Two-rowed Barley) 1565 (i).
Quarantine (Vaccination) 1750 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 444.
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands (conc.) 5433.
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 922 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) conc., 5401. Harbours and Rivers (Generally) conc., 5402 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B. C.) 3691 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2070 (ii).

Macdonell, Mr. G., *Algoma.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5158; on M. for 3°, 5579.
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1526 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr *Dewdney*) in Com., 3946 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., 1603.
——— on M. to adjn. Hse., 1984 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 1563 (i).

Macdonell, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 5218 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 951 (i).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4222 (ii).
Pensions (Mounted Police, &c., Rebellion 1885) 3667 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4524 (iii).
Unparliamentary Language, wthdn., 3780 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3040 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1383 (i).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H., *Saskatchewan.*
Buffalo Lake and Battleford Ry. Coal and Iron Co.'s incorp. (B. 57, 1°*) 334 (i).
Homestead (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 621 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3910; in Com., 3928 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3477 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2218 (ii).

Mackintosh, Mr. C. H., *Ottawa City.*
Anglo-Canadian Electric Storage and Supply Co.'s incorp. (B. 92, 1°*) 549 (i); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 2551 (ii).
Atikokan Iron Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 55, 1°*) 333 (i).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4898 (iii).
E. B. Eddy Manufacturing Co.'s (B. 23, 1°*) 155.
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 589 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2937 (ii).
McKay Milling Co.'s (B. 24, 1°*) 155 (i).
Personal Explanation, par. in *L'Electeur* (remarks) 5351 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquor on prop. Res. (Amt.) 344 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3458 (ii).

McAlister, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1961 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against, P.M.G. on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5958 (iii).
Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 47, 1°*) 238 (i).
Collingwood Harbour, Dredging, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6195 (iii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147, in Com., 5352, 5374, 5595, 5727 (iii).

McCarthy, Mr. D.—*Continued.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5197 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. (B. 33, 1°) 174 (i).
Provincial Govts. Transfer of Property B. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5752 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6064; (Amt. to Amt.) 6085; neg. (Y. 2, N. 184) 6122 (iii).

McDonald, Mr. J. A., *Victoria, N.S.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1426 (i).
Farmers' Bank of Rustico (B. 40, 1°*) 206 (i).
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2169 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2787 (ii).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton.*
Canadian Sealers Captured, attention of Govt. directed to Rep., 5554 (iii).
Cape Breton Ry., Station Masters' Duties (Ques.) 4677 (iii).

McDougald, Mr. J., *Pictou.*
Albion Mines Savings Bank B., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1104; (B. 113, 1°*) 1105; in Com., 1297 (i).
Mermerly, Barque, Rescue of Crew, on M. for Ret., 714 (i).
Pictou Bank Winding-up (B. 76, 1°) 388; 2° m., 547 (i).

McGreevy, Hon. T., *West Quebec.*
Public Works Dept., Contracts, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Tarte*) 154 (i).

McGregor, Mr. W., *North Essex.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5155 (iii).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3592 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5529 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 1567 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Que.) 5040. Post Office (salaries, &c.) 4724 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.) 4073 (ii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 3732 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4585 (iii).
Quarantine, 5341 (iii).

McKay, Mr. A., *Hamilton.*
Wild Fowl, Prohibition of Export (Ques.) 1769.
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 6279 (ii).

McLean, Mr. J., *King's, P.E.I.*
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1605 (i).

McLennan, Mr. R. R., *Glengarry.*
Central Counties Ry. (B. 38, 1°*) 206 (i).
Pensions for Permanent Corps (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, Canal on North Shore (Ques.) 175 (i).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2931 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2438 (ii).

McLeod, Mr. E., *St. John, N.B., City.*
Controverted Elections Act. Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5371, 5382, 5602 (iii).
Geological Survey, Field Service (M. for Ret.*) 544 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3814 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4691 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3895; (St. John, additional accommodation) 3885 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*
American Cattle, Slaughter in Can., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1781 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1037 (i).
Experimental Farm, Central, Expenditure (Ques.) 1576 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1007 (i).
Horses, Entire, Experimental Farms (M. for Cor., &c.*) 739, 1579 (i).
——— (enquiry for Ret.) 3200 (ii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3134; in Com., 3992 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., 1310 (i).
Stallions at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 739 (i).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 1562 (i), 3574 (ii), 6176 (iii); (Experimental Farms) 1566 (i), 3552 (ii); (Haras Company) 6179 (iii); (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3544 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (salaries, &c.) 4725 (iii).
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5251 (iii).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 4814 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 1560 (i).
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 3710 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) conc., 5401 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 4606. Experimental Farms, &c., 4652. Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4597 (iii),
Quarantine, 5338 (iii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2557 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2400 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2242 (ii).

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*
Advertising, in Com. of Sup., 500 (i).
Banff Springs Park and Reserve (Ques.) 3957 (ii).
Beet-Root Sugar, Bounty for Production, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3427 (ii).
Camilla and Whittington Mail Service (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
Civil Service Employés, Payments (Ques.) 2906.
Civil Servants, Regulations *re* Meals, &c. (Ques.) 3258 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2365 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5312 (iii).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 1407 (i).
Deptl. Pay Sheets (Ques.) 2520 (ii).
Divorce, Thomas Bristow Relief B. 133 (Mr. *O'Brien*) on M. for Com., 2551 (ii).
Dom. Aid to Rys. (M. for Ret.) 1053 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3246 (ii), 5158, 5207, 5551; on M. for 3°, 5581 (iii).
——— B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 999 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 134 (i).
Finance Dept., New Safe, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 130(i)
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3091 (ii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1006 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4302 (iii).
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M.(Mr. *Foster*) 6293 (iii).
I. C. Ry. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1258; in Com., 1262 (i).
——— Elevators, Cost of Construction (M. for Ret.*) 135 (i).
Labour, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
Laidlow, Wm., Resignation, &c. (M. for Ret.) 1048 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. to conc. in Res., 4307 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5497, 5608 (iii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3126 (ii).
Mail Service, B.C. (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
Major's Hill Park, Tenders (Ques.) 605 (i).
Montreal Custom House, Defaulting Clerks (Ques.) 4675 (iii).
——— Employés, Superannuation (Ques.) 3616.
——— on M. for Ret., 3281 (ii).
——— Irregularities (Ques.) 3953 (ii).
——— Night Watchman (Ques.) 5406 (iii).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Montreal P. O. Letter Boxes, Collecting Contract (Ques.) 3953 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Sir *John Thompson*) Unparliamentary Language, 1334 (i).
Ordnance Lands, Montreal, Leases (Ques.) 5409.
Parliament Buildings, Metal Pillars (Ques.) 1273.
Pelee Island, Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1598 (i).
Postmasters of Dom., Contingent Expenses (M. for Ret.*) 128 (i).
Potatoes Exported from Canada (M. for Ret.*) 544 (i).
P. O. and Dom. Savings Banks Deposits (M. for Ret.) 202, 210 (i).
Prohibition, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 144 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Employés (enquiry for Ret., 3200 (ii).
Public Works, Employés' Names, Duties, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1579 (i).
——— (enquiry for Ret.) 3653 (ii).
Quarantine (U.S.) Regulations for Sheep, &c. (remarks) 742 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 43, 1°) 217, 1029 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 6135; in Com., 6137, 6185 (iii).
Sugar (Raw) Imports (Ques.) 602 (i).
——— Quantity in Bond (Ques.) 740 (i).

SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3558 (ii); (Two-rowed Barley) 1565 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3545 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 5217; (Tay) 5221 (iii); (Trent) 4138 (ii). *Income* (Carillon and Grenville) 5222, 6296 (iii); (Miscellaneous) 1667 (i); (Rideau) 5222 (iii).
Charges of Management (Public Debt, Commissions) 1754; (Savings Banks) 1748 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 6169 (iii); (Civil Service Examiners) contingencies 481; (Finance and Treasury Board) 252; (High Commissioner) 421, contingencies, 431, 449, 466, 476, 1733 (i), 6167 (iii); (Indian Affairs) 249 (i); (Interior) 6169 (iii); (Justice) 241; (Marine) 255; (P.O. and Finance) contingencies, 432; (Printing and Stationery) 247; (Public Works) 400; (Railways and Canals) 409 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5170. Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5056; (Inspectors of Ports) 5052; (Laboratory) 5054; (Ont.) 5049; (Que.) 5030. Culling Timber, 5159. Dom. Lands, 5179. Excise (Customs Collectors' allowance) 5137; (salaries, &c.) 5125. Inspection of Staples, 5165. Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5172 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1742 (i), 4065 (ii). Weights and Measures 5161 (iii).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4278 (iii); (N.W. T., salaries, &c.) 3527 (ii); (Ont., salaries) 3514 (ii).
Government of N. W. T. (Translating *Gazette*) 1711.
Legislation: House of Commons (contingencies) 941; (Voters' Lists) 952, 1735. (Serjeant-at-Arms' Estimates) 943. Senate Salaries, &c.) 929 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Concluded.*
Immigration (European Agents' salaries) conc., 4276 (iii).
Indians (B.C.) 4805; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4812 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 518 (i); (Miscellaneous) 6170 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5108; (Commutation of Duties) 5084; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5087, 5104; (Govt. of Keewatin) 5081; (Old Records) 5084, 5124; (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5081 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1697 (i), 4817 (iii.)
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 919; (Man.) 914; (Regina Gaol) 928; (St. Vincent de Paul) 909 (i).
Public Works, Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4451, 6252; (Man.) 4429; (N.W.T.) 4445, 6249; (N.S.) 4314; (Ont,) 5224, 6239, 6241; (Ottawa) 4472, 4486; (Printing Bureau) 6253; (Que.) 4333, 6201, conc., 5385 (iii); (Regina School) 1687 (i); (Repairs, &c.) 4469. Dredging (Man.) 4648; (New Plant) 4605; (Ont. and Que.) 4646; (Repairs) 4640. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4564; (Que.) 4555 (iii).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 1678; C. B. Ry. (construction, &c.) 1656; (Grand Narrows Bridge, &c.) 1658 (i).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (accomodation at St. John) 1655 (i); (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3855 (ii); (Rolling Stock) 1654 (i), 3882 (ii); ("Y" at Truro) 1655. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction) 1658 (i).
Steamboat Inspection, 3513 (ii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3673, 3688 (ii).
Tarte-McGreevy Enquiry, Counsel (Ques.) 1575 (remarks) 1930 (i).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3776 (ii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 500 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3433 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2558 (ii).
Transcontinental Mail Service (Ques.) 6216 (iii).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1633 (i).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6153 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2336 (ii).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3204, 3231 (ii).
——— in Com. on Res., 4006 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119, (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1375 (i); in Com. on B., 2215, 2250, 2257 (ii).

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1542 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3969, 3978 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1802 (i).
Chatsworth, Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 130, 1°*), 1927 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A.—*Continued.*
Dredging in North Bruce, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6197 (iii).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1527 (i).
Indian Agent Allen, Charges against (Ques.) 1928 (i).
——— (remarks) 1298 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3913 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Vote on Prohibition, 1543 (i).
Porter, David, Claim, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6231 (iii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., to prop. Res., 1304 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1343 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 359 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6115 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3535 (ii).
Civil Government (Public Works) 405 (i).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 3531 (ii).
Indians (N.B.) conc., 5422 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Historical, &c., Map of Canada) 6262 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 6257 (iii).
U.S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4015 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. to conc. in Res., 3216 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2802 (ii).

Madill, Mr. F., *North Ontario.*
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2372 (ii).
Oshawa Ry. and Navigation Co.'s (B. 123, 1°*) 1574 (i).
Porter, David, Claim, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6229 (iii).

Mara, Mr. J. A., *Yale.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1543 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1277 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4044 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Expenditures (M. for Ret.*) 232 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2939 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Entry into B.C. (M. for Cor.) 965 (i).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3558 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 4801 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (B.C.) 4650. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4593 (iii).
Vancouver Dock and Shipbuilding Co.'s incorp. (B. 51, 1°*) 266 (i).

Marshall, Mr. J. H., *East Middlesex.*
American Cattle slaughtered in Canada (remarks) 4537 (iii).
——— Cheese shipped through Can. Ports (Ques.) 114 (i).
——— (M. for Cor.*) 205 (i).

Masson, Mr. J., *North Grey.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1538 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1412 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 998 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1979; on M. for 2°, 1008 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5672 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 4338. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4565 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2305 (ii).

Mignault, Mr. R. M. S., *Yamaska.*
Duguay, Jos., Exciseman, Suspension (Ques.) 3254 (ii).
Yamaska, East, Post Office, Closing (Ques.) 2153.

Mills, Hon. D., *Bothwell.*
Address, on The, 64 (i).
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 (i).
——— Dom. Day (remarks) 1537 (i).
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1419, 1731 (i).
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 893, 1090 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113 (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) in Com., 1297 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service (M. for Cor.) 124 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3961, 3977 (ii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for Com., 1763 (i).
Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 104 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1099 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1835 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3296 (ii).
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P. M. G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5962 (iii).
Census, Receipt of Returns (Ques.) 130 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4963 (iii).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1034 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2365 (ii); in Com., 5376, 5598, 5729, 6224 (iii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Corbin, J. S., Patent Relief B. 30 (Mr. *Reid*) on M. for 2°, 294 (i).
Criminal Law, Codification B. 32 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 157 (i).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 1408 (i).
Deptl. Files, Destruction (Ques.) 4157 (ii).
Division, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4456 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3246 (ii), 5587; on M. to recom., 5545; on M. for 3°, 5570 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 5763 (iii).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 132 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4038 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3176; on M. for 3°, 3237 (ii).
Fishing Bounties, Claims, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 543 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 771.
——— Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 305 (i).
——— Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3089 (ii).
Frauds on the Government Prevention B. 172 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 5751 (iii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4301 (iii).
Gov. Genl's. Warrants, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1545, (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1128 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 682 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 625 (i).
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6294 (iii).
Indian Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1503 (i).
——— Agent Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6147 (iii).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3787, 3792 (ii).
Jennings, Mr., Engineer, Appmnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2522 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. to conc. in Res., 4309; in Com. on B., 4617, 4638 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5493; on M. for 2°, 6133 (iii).
——— Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3121 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2937 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1068 (i).

Ministerial Changes (remarks) 890 (i).

——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 237 (i).

Motions allowed to Stand (remarks) 1932 (i).

Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6193 (iii).

Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4156 (ii).

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3924; in Com., 3927 (ii), 4298 (iii).

Orange Influence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1971 (i).

Order, Ques. of (Sir *John Thompson*) Unparliamentary Language, 1333 (i).

——— on M. to adjn. Hse., 2370 (ii).

Petroleum at Crow's Nest Pass (Ques.) 6285 (iii).

Pictou Harbour Commissioners B. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3900 (ii).

P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2173 (ii).

Priv. and Elec. Com., afternoon Sittings, on M., 1989 (i).

——— 6th Rep. *re* Controverted Elections, on conc., 4826 (iii).

Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 358 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1328 (i).

Provincial Govts., Transfer of Property B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3990 (i); in Com., 5755, 6223 (iii).

Public Accts. Com., on M. to ref. Accts. *re* Boucier, 3949 (ii).

——— on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1926 (i).

Quebec Skating Club, Conveyance of Lands B. 160 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3984 (ii).

Quebec, West, Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 4083 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for 2°, 3305 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Tolls, &c. (Ques.) 3620 (ii).

Ships' Inspection Act Amt. Bill 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 4312 (iii).

Speaker, Election of Deputy (remarks) 388 (i).

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6218 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 1568; (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).

Arts, &c. (Health Statistics) 6174 (iii).

Canals—Capital (Grenville) 4141; (Tay) 4144 (ii).

Civil Government (Agriculture) 254; (Auditor Gen's. Office) 1545 (i), 6167 (iii); (High Commissioner) 429, contingencies, 445; (Finance and Treasury Board) 252; (Fisheries) 255; (Inland Revenue) 253; (Interior) 248 (i), 6169 (iii), contingencies, 434; (Marine) contingencies, 441; (Printing Bureau) contingencies, 442; (Public Works) 263, 399; (Sec. of State) 242 (i.)

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Collection of Revenues: Customs (Ont.) 5847 (iii); (Douglas, Mr., additional salary) 1722; (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1719 (i). Post Office (Mail Service) 4705 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R.) 1742 (i), 4071 (ii). Weights and Measures, 1726 (i).

Dominion Police, 1558 (i).

Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 1711; (contingencies) 1709 (i).

Indians (T. D. Green's salary) 1552 (i); (N.B.) 5063 (iii); N.W.T. (Treaties) 1695 (i).

Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 509.

Legislation: House of Commons (Expenses of Committees) 6173; (Indemnity) 6172 (iii); (Voters' Lists) 946, 1560. Senate (salaries, &c.) 936 (i).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4681; (Magdalen Islands) 4678; (St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5450, 5482; (San Francisco and Victoria) 4704 (iii).

Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4225 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5431 (iii); (Litigation Expenses) 1708; (Lunatics, Support of) 1709 (i).

Mounted Police, 1701 (i).

Penitentiaries (Man.) 915 (i), 6171 (iii).

Public Works—Capital: (Kingston Graving Dock) 1676 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 6251; (Man.) 4437; (N.W.T.) 6249; (N.S.) 4316; (Ottawa) 4476; (Que.) 4334, 6205. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4564, 6254 (iii).

Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (construction) 1653 (i); I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3869 (ii).

Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3696 (ii).

Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6284 (iii).

Unprovided Items, 1747 (i).

Tarte-McGreevy Enquiry, Counsel (remarks) 1930 (i).

Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).

Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2558; on M. to adjn. Hse., 2564 (ii).

Trade Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).

Trade Relations with Foreign Countries, on M. to conc. in Address from Sen., 6319 (ii).

——— West Indies, Papers (remarks) 2289 (ii).

Treaty Papers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 239 (i).

Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 4781 (iii).

U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 234 (i).

U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4016 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2025 (i).

——— on M. to adjn. Deb., 2067 (i).

——— in Com. on Res., 4002 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1373, 1392 (i); in Com. on B., 2225, 2235, 2248; on Sen. Amts., 3985 (ii).

Mills, Mr. J. B., *Annapolis.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1423 (i).
Customs Collector, Annapolis Royal (Ques.) 270.
Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 124, 1°*) 1574 (i).
Militia Battalion (69th) No. 5 Co. (Ques.) 268 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Cor., 3268 (ii).
Private Bills Reps. (M.) to suspend Rule, 1987 (i).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1944 (i).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John or Halifax) 4688 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1664 (i).

Moncrieff, Mr. G., *East Lambton.*
London Life Insurance Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 135, 1°*) 1989 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2497 (ii).

Monet, Mr. D., *Napierville.*
Elections in Napierville (Ques.) 1577 (i).
Montreal and Sorel Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 3614 (ii).
Napierville and St. Remi Ry., Subsidy (M. for Ret.) 2541 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Leather Supplies (Ques.) 2912 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2872 (ii).

Montague, Mr. W. H., *Haldimand.*
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 1276 (i).
Caledonia Dam, Grand River, Construction (M. for Ret.*) 3287 (ii).
——— Drill Shed, Repairs (M. for Cor., &c.*) 3287 (ii).
Canada and Michigan Tunnel Co.'s (B. 19, 1°*) 155; 2° m., 189 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3246 (ii).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 134 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3090 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1194 (i).
Grand River, Improvement of Navigation, Engineers' Reps. (M. for copies) 2155 (ii).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 18, 1°*) 155 (i).
Order (Ques. of) on Ways and Means, 2474 (ii).
Pairing of Members, 4213 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. to adjn. Hse., 1984 (i).

Montague, Mr. W. H.—*Continued.*
Personal Explanation, Error in Official Rep., 1991.
Railway Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for 2°, 3305 (ii).
St. Clair River Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 17, 1°*) 155 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures, 1727 (i).
Miscellaneous (Printing Bureau) 1706 (i),
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4596. Roads and Bridges (Ont.) 4606 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3676 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) M. to adjn. Deb. 1482; Deb. rsmd., 1854 (i).

Mousseau, Mr. J. O., *Soulanges.*
Coteau Landing Wharf, Monopoly (Ques.) 222 (i)
Fort du Coteau du Lac, Lease (Ques.) 604 (i).
Hearn, J. G., emplymnt. by Militia Dept. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).
St. Lawrence Dredge (Ques.) 3952 (ii).
Soulanges Canal, Expenditure (M. for Stmnt.) 532 (i).
——— Reps. of Engineers (M. for copies*) 1578.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4113 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4557 (iii).

Mulock, Mr. W., *North York, Ont.*
Adjnmt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1539 (i).
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1433 (i).
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. 113, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1104 (i).
Alliston, Conflagration (remarks) 192 (i).
Anglo-Canadian Electric Storage Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. *Mackintosh*) on Sen. Amts., 2551 (ii).
Arnoldi, J. R., Govtl. Action (remarks) 3130 (ii).
Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 124 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1765 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3965 (ii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry (prop. Res.) 1771, 1805, 1825, 1834, 1846 (i); neg. (Y. 80, N. 100) 1847 (i).
Bourgeois, G. A., Payment to, on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 2361 (ii).
Caraquet Ry., Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 3614 (ii).
Cattle Export Trade of Canada (remarks) 737 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s Bill 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 569 (i).
Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act (B. 139, 1°) 2140 (i); (remarks) 2552 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5356, 5574, 5382, 5594, 5727, 6225 (iii).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
Customs Seizures, Illegal (Ques.) 2520 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5586 (iii).
Dom. Notes, Circulation, Redemption, &c. (M. for Stmnt.*) 1578 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 134 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4025 (ii).
Govt., Formation of (Ques.) 1578 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants (M. for Ret.*) 232 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4546 (iii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Indemnity to Senators and Members, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6291 (iii).
Indian Agent at Sutton West (Ques.) 961 (i).
Indian Lands Provincial Settlements B. 100 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1087 (i).
I. C. Ry. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1260 (i).
——— Stone Carried for Langevin Block (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Keewatin, Str., Govtl. Service (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3658 (ii).
——— P.O., Rep. of Postmaster, on M. for copies, 2546 (ii).
Land Grants to Volunteers B. 159 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) in Com. on Res., 3117 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4535 (iii).
——— in Com., 4609, 5541 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5490, 5593, 5610; on M. for 2°, 6130 (iii).
Langevin Block, Construction (Ques.) 1575 (i).
——— Haulage of Stone (Ques.) 1768 (i).
——— Ottawa, Advts. for Tenders (M. for copies) 531 (i).
——— Papers (enquiry) 737, 992 (i).
——— Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1267 (i).
London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. *Cockburn*) on M. for 2°, 190 (i).
Manchester Ship Canal, T. Munro's Rep. (M. for copy*) 1579 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1078 (i).
Militia Act Amt. (B. 7, 1°) 106 (i).
Mining Machinery, Importation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4099.
North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for copies of O. C.'s, &c., 1024 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3930 (ii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5708 (iii).
Order (Ques. of) Ry. Subsidies, 6136 (iii).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
Order, Ques. of (Sir *John Thompson*) Unparliamentary Language, 1333 (i).
Porter, David, Claim, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6233 (iii).
Pub. Accts Com. Meetings, in Com. of Sup., 1712.
——— on M. to Print Evidence, 2374, 4000 (ii).
——— Witnesses on Oath (M.) 1345 (i).
Public Debt, Sinking Fund (Ques.) 2152 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt. to M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 6119 (iii).
——— Papers (enquiry) 746 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3139 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Two-rowed Barley) 1564 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3550 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Galops) 4108; (Grenville) 4141; (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4119; (Sault Ste. Marie) 4102; (Tay) 4143; (Trent) 4140. *Income* (Carillon) 4150; (Chambly) 4147; (Grenville, Godwin's Claim) 6298; (Ste. Anne's Lock) 4149; (St. Ours Lock) 4148; (Welland) 4145 (ii).
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 1755; (Public Debt, Commissions) 1750 (i).
Civil Government (Auditor Gen.'s Office) 1545; (High Commissioner) contingencies, 447, 455, 472, 490; (Indian Affairs) 1547; (Printing Bureau) contingencies, 486 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Douglas, Mr., additional salary) 1724 (i). Post Office, 6279 (iii). Public Works, 1729 (i); (Agency, B.C.) 4669; (Harbours, &c., repairs) 4666. Slides and Booms (Dues) 4663 (iii). I. C. R. 1740 (i), 4059 (ii). Weights and Measures, 1726 (i).
Dominion Police, 511 (i).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 1712 (i).
Indians (T. D. Green, salary) 1553; (N.W.T., late Mr. Payne) 1695; (Ont., Que., &c.) 1694 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 507; (Masters, C. H., drafting Criminal Law) 1559. (Miscellaneous) 506; (Vice-Admiralty Court) 511 (i).
Legislation: House of Commous (contingencies) 942; (Voters' Lists) 950, 1559. Library (Grant) 945. Senate (salaries, &c.) 929 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 6268 (iii).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3726; (Clothing, &c.) 3700; (Drill Instruction) 3729 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5432; (Printing Bureau, Plant) 5346; (Strong, W. O., gratuity to Widow) 6264 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1705 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Collision SS. *Alert* and Schr. *Scylla*) 6266 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 910, 1559; (Man.) 918; (St. Vincent de Paul) 907 (i).
Pensions (Harpur, G. H.) 1572.
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 1669, 1683 (i). *Income:* Buildings (Man.) 4430; N.W.T., 4447; (Ont.) 6239; (Ottawa) 4480; (Printing Bureau) 6253 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 4604; (Repairs) 4642. Experimental Farms, &c., 4654. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4593; (Ont.) 4560, 6258, conc., 5438.

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
(Miscellaneous) 4656; (National Art Gallery) 4663. Roads and Bridges (Ont.) 4607. Surveys, &c., 4662 (iii).
Quarantine, 5338; conc., 5437 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1665 (i). I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3858, 3876, 3897 (ii); (St. Charles Branch) 1655 (i); (St. John, increased accommodation) 3894 (ii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3675 (ii).
Territorial Accounts, 6280; (Surgeon General's salary) 6281, conc., 6305 (iii).
Unprovided Items, 1746 (i).
Ships' Safety B. 44 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1089 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6140; on M. for 1°, 6144; in Com., 6187, 6217 (iii).
Sugar, Free Entry, Order for Com. on Res. (read) 1931 (i).
Sutton West, Indian Agent, Expenses *re* Investigation (M. for Ret.*) 145 (i).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3769 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2574 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Revision, Cost (Ques.) 268 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2033 (i).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 2256 (ii).

Murray, Mr. T., Pontiac.
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5582 (iii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Empire*, 806 (i).
Rapide Plat Canal, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 544 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3030 (ii).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., Muskoka.
American Cattle in Can., Slaughter, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4468, 4536 (iii).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1778 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 2369 (ii); in Com., 5379.
Divorce, Thomas Bristow Relief (B. 133, 1°) 1937 (i); M. for Com., 2550 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5158, 5551; on M. for 3°, 5563 (iii).
Female Offenders in N. S. B. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3597 (ii).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1522 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3098 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1135 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E.—*Continued.*
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 627 (i).
Land Grant to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4630 (iii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3905; in Com., 4298 (iii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5722 (iii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 278 (i).
Provincial Accounts Settlement B. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1066 (i).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3608 (ii).
Standing Orders Com., Rep. *re* Rathbun Co. (remarks) 5012 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (B. C., salaries) 3528 (ii).
Indians (N.B.) conc., 5423 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4214; (Clothing, &c.) 3713.
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 4319; (Ont.) 4370; (Que.) 4360; Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4578 (iii)
Quarantine, conc, 5435 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3869 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2039 (i).
——— on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2479 (ii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., *Laval.*
American Cattle in Can., Slaughter, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 36, 52 (ii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4456 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. Bill 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5196 (iii).
Indemnity to Members and Senators, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6292 (iii).
I. C. R Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3787 (ii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3106 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) adjnmts., 6027, 6031 (iii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 631 (i).
Quebec, West, Vacancy (Ques. of Order) on Issue of Writ, 4083 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (contingencies) 942 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4561 (iii).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2062 (i).

Paterson, Mr. W., *South Brant.*
Budget, The (Ques.) 953, 959 (i).
Compounders' License Fees, in Com. on Res., 3243.
Customs Act. Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 5284; neg. (Y. 78, N. 102) 5335 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) in Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 779.
Fraudulent Marking Prevention B. 140 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3583 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 851 (i).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3590 (ii).
Indian Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1507 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 3243; in Com., 3579 (ii).
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjnmt., 3826 (ii).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1594 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6187 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, &c. (Census) 1569 (i); (Census and Statistics) 3531 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Grenville, Goodwin's Claim) 6199 (iii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 411, 421, contingencies, 431, 443, 469, 491; (Indian Affairs) 1549, contingencies, 435; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 432; (Public Works) 256.
Indians (T. D. Green, salary) 1552 (i); (B.C.) conc., 5415; (Ont., Que., &c.) conc., 5413 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 949. Senate (salaries, &c.) 938 (i).
Militia (Care and Maintenance, &c.) 3734; (Drill Pay, &c.) 4231 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) conc., 5427; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) conc., 5427 (iii).
Public Works—Income (Que.) 6203 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3672 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3484.
Treaty Papers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 240 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1458 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3202, 3211, 3233.
——— in Com. on Res., 4005 (ii).

Patterson, Mr. W. A., *Colchester.*
SUPPLY:
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) conc., 4284 (iii).

Perry, Mr. S. F., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Brae Harbour Breakwater, Completion (Ques.) 1274 (i).
——— Tenders (Ques.) 208 (i).
Cascumpec Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 1765 (i), 2151 (ii).
Fishery Bounty Cheques, Costs, &c., on M. for Ret., 185 (i).
——— Wardens, Appmts., (Ques.) 5409 (iii).

Perry, Mr. F. S.—*Continued.*
Miminigash Breakwater (Ques.) 3959 (ii), 4296.
——— Tenders for new Works (Ques.) 130 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 968 (i).
Oyster Beds, Leases (Ques.) 3958 (ii).
Piers, Wharves and Breakwaters, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3951 (ii).
Prince Edward, Dredge (Ques.) 1765 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Dismissals (remarks) 4000 (ii).
——— Employés, Dismissal (enquiry for Ret.) 4087 (ii).
——— Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal (M. for Cor.) 2158 (ii).
——— Train Service (Ques. 1274 (i).
Stanley, Str., Trips, Mainland and P. E. I. (M. for Ret.) 158, 172 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1929 (i).
Summerside Harbour, Dredging (Ques.) 3258 (ii).
——— Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 3955 (ii).
——— Ry. Station (Ques.) 3263 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (salaries, &c.) 4722 (iii).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) conc., 4264 (iii); (P.E.I., salaries, &c.) 3524 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (Repairs) 4643; Harbours and Rivers (Generally) 4598; (P.E.I.) 4532 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B. C.) 3670 (ii).
Tignish Breakwater, Wharfage Dues (Ques.) 130, 708 (i).
——— Harbour Master (Ques.) 3259 (ii), 4673 (iii).
Tunnel, P.E.I. and Mainland (Ques.) 208 (i).
——— Papers (remarks) 1413 (i).
——— on M. for Cor., 1618 (i).
West Point Wharf Engineer's Rep. (Ques.) 269 (i).

Prefontaine, Mr. R., *Chambly.*
Boucherville Wharf, Contractor (Ques.) 1265 (i).
Lachine Canal, Côte St. Paul Drain, Tenders (M. for copies) 2157 (ii).
Maurice, Mr. Jos. A., &c., Claim for Expropriation (M. for Ret.*) 2174 (ii).
Vaudreuil and Boucherville Wharves, Expenditure, &c. (M. for Stmnt.*) 2548 (ii).

Prior, Mr. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1412 (i).
Adjutant General, Dep., Military District No. 11 (M. for Reps.*) 736 (i).
Better Terms, B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4093 (ii).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 922 (i)
Petroleum at Crow's Nest Pass (remarks) 6285.
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 68, 1°*) 387 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: (B.C.) 4451. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4592 (iii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 922 (i).

Prior, Mr. E. C.—*Continued.*
Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Ry. Co.'s (B. 67, 1°*) 387 (i).

Proulx, Mr. I., *Prescott.*
St. Pierre, Pierre, emplymnt. as Slide Master (Ques.) 603 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3076 (ii).

Putnam, Mr. A., *Hants.*
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3604 (ii).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.*
Corbin, Jay Spencer, Patent Relief (B. 30, 1°*) 156 ; 2° m., 294 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 4 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1980 (i).

Rider, Mr. T. B., *Stanstead.*
Coaticook P.O., Coal Contract (Ques.) 6216 (iii).
Commercial Treaty, England and France (remarks) 3950 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 4670 (iii).
Knowlton's Landing, Wharf (Ques.) 1770 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2610 (ii).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., *Lotbinière.*
American Cattle for Slaughter (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry., Subsidies (Ques.) 5075 (iii).
Connell, J., emplymnt. by Sorel Harbour Board (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Duguay, Jos., Exciseman, Suspension (Ques.) 3254 (ii).
Fraserville P.O. Building, Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3255 (ii).
Immigrants into Canada, Number (Ques.) 5075.
Jockes & Delorimier, Messrs., Stone Contractors (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Judges in Quebec, Appmnts. (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Laberge, Mr., emplymnt. by P. O. Dept., Que. Div. (Ques.) 3954 (ii).
Lyster Postmaster, Resignation (Ques.) 3958 (ii).
Montreal P. O. Service (Ques.) 5077 (iii).
Quebec P. O., Sunday Closing (Ques.) 1765 (i).
Ste. Croix Lighthouse Keeper, Resignation, &c. (M. for Ret.) 173 (i).
St. Jean Deschaillons, Shoals (M. for Cor.) 1053.
Sorel Harbour Works, Employés (Ques.) 5077 (iii).

Robillard, Mr. H., *Ottawa City.*
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply, 3445 (ii).

Roome, Mr. W. F., *North Middlesex.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1409 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1275 (i).
Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 3300 (ii).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3593 (ii).

Roome, Mr. W. F.—*Continued.*
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Mackintosh*) to prop. Res., 345 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6174 (iii).

Ross, Mr. A. W., *Lisgar.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 1806 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 5773 (iii).
Red River Surveys, Reps. (Ques.) 1012 (i).
Rocky Mountain Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. (B. 125, 1°*) 1757 (i).
SUPPLY :
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 926 ; (Man.) 917 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2596 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1374,1379 (i).

Rowand, Mr. J., *West Bruce.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1799 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3572 (ii).

Ryckman, Mr. S. S., *Hamilton.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2882 (ii).

Savard, Mr. P. V., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Chicoutimi Election Ret. (Ques.) 142 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1196 (i).

Scriver, Mr. J., *Huntingdon.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 3967 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Sel. Com., 109 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 5565 (iii).
Personal Explanation *re* Speech on Prohibition, 2204 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1323 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 3575 (ii), 6176 (iii).
Canals—Capital (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 4120 (ii).
Civil Government (Auditor Gen.'s Office) 6167 (iii).
Indians (Caughnawaga School Teacher) 6272; (Ont., Que., &c.) conc., 5413 (iii).
Legislation : Library (Grant) 945 (i).
Miscellaneous (Prohibition Commission) 6276 ; (Strong, W. O., Gratuity to Widow) 6265 (iii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 6170 (iii).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ottawa) 4471, 4475 ; (Que.) 4337. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4556 (iii).
Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3576 (ii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6280 (iii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2928 (ii).

Semple, Mr. A., *Centre Wellington.*
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5740 (iii).
Galt Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 1263 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2731 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1395 (i).

Skinner, Mr. C. N., *St. John, N.B., City and Co.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction B. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1430 (i).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 720 (i).
C. P. R., Section "B," Charges against P.M.G., on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5967 (iii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 in Com., 5364 (iii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1979 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1191 (i).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3819 (ii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, Com.'s Rep. (remarks) 5554 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5701 (iii).
——— Rep. of Sel. Com. (presented) 5487 (iii).
——— (M.) to conc., 5612; conc. in (Y. 98, N. 75) 5725 (iii).
Provincial Govts., Transfer of Property B. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5759 (iii).
Salisbury Harbour Ry. Co.'s (B. 120, 1°*) 1453 (i).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 6138 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5256 (iii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 3897; (St. John, increased accommodation) 3886 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2860 (ii).

Smith, Sir D. A., K.C.M.G., *West Montreal.*
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 446 (i).

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Brant.*
Banff Springs Park and Reserve (Ques.) 3957 (ii).
Barber's, Mr., Claim (Ques.) 269 (i).
Big Bay Wharf, Expenditure, &c., on Work (Ques.) 1929 (i).
——— Repairs (M. for Ret.) 232 (i).
Fishery Protection, Georgian Bay (Ques.) 220 (i)
——— Supplies (Ques.) 221 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 544 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Timber Cut (Ques.) 603 (i)
Indian Agent at Wiarton (Ques.) 603 (i).
Letter Postage, Reduction (Ques.) 129 (i)).

Somerville, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Montreal P.O., Letter Boxes Collecting Contract (Ques.) 3953 (ii).
N. S. Central Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 3960 (ii).
Owen Sound Harbour, Improvements (Ques.) 3960 (ii).
Public Accts. Com., Accts. *re* Boucier (M.) to ref. 3948 (ii).
——— Interior Dept. (M.) to ref. Cheques, &c., 2203 (ii).
——— on M. to rescind Order of House, 1926 (i).
——— Meetings, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1713 (i).
Polson Mfng. Co., Steel Plate Imports (Ques.) 270 (i).
Rideau Canal, Ordnance Land, Sale (Ques.) 5408 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farms) 3560 (ii).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3549 (ii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 442, 483, 498; (Interior) 249; (Printing and Stationery) 243; (Printing Bureau) contingencies, 478 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 5171 (iii). Customs (O'Meara, Mr., additional salary) 1714 (i). Excise (salaries, &c.) 1725 (i), 5125. Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5173.
Government of N. W. T. (Translating *Gazette*) 1710.
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, &c.) 946; (Voters' Lists, Revision) 953. Senate (salaries, &c.) 931 (i).
Militia (Armouries, &c.) 3721; (Clothing, &c.) 3703; (Military Stores, &c.) 3719 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5087 (iii); (Gliddon, Wm., payment) 1705; (Printing Bureau) 1706 (i); (Returns, preparation) 5107; (Royal Society's Proceedings) 5123 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1704 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 6245: (Ottawa) 4492, 4513; (Que.) 4339 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1691. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1688 (i).
Tay Canal, Tenders for Construction, &c. (Ques.) 3953, 3956 (ii).
Telegrams, in Com. of Sup., 498 (i).
Veterans, 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2926 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. PETER WHITE) *North Renfrew.*
Address to Her Majesty, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 227 (i).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries (remarks) 716 (i).
Bills, Royal Assent, Coms. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office (read) 1990 (i), 3098 (ii), 4534 (iii).
Bourgeois, G. A., Payment to, on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 2461 (ii).
Cattle Trade, Shipping of Live Stock B. (remarks) 958 (i).
Commons, The, Privileges claimed in Senate, 4 (i)
Connolly, Michael, Books of Firm delivered (notification) 954 (i).
——— Ordered to appear before Bar of House, 895 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Controverted Election (Halton) Judgment, 5 (i).
——— Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (remarks) 2366 (ii); in Com., 5740 (iii).
Divisions, Procedure, Members' Votes (remarks) 4455 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3245 (ii), 5143 (iii).
Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 11 (ruling) 2961 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3083 (ii).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1972 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4300 (iii).
Indian Agent Allen (remarks) 1298 (i).
——— Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (ruling) 6147 (iii).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 111 (i), 2144 (ii).
Interruptions by Members (remarks) 2069 (i), 2395, 2707 (ii).
Kingston Graving Dock, on M. for Com. of Sup. (ruling) 3657 (ii).
——— Papers (remarks) 636 (i).
Library of Parliament, Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Macdonald, Sir John, Decease, draping Chamber (remarks) 883 (i).
Member, New, notification of Return, 7 (i).
Members not Voting (remarks) 331 (i).
Members' Private Motions, Procedure (remarks) 127 (l).
Member's Vote challenged (ruling) 4428 (iii).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 111, 227, 550, 736, 799, 1199 (i), 2144 (ii), 5589, 6289 (iii).
Ministerial Stmnts. (remarks) 1013 (i).
Monuments, Battlefields of Canada, on conc. (ruling) 4278 (iii).
Newspaper Reps., incorrect, Reading ruled out of Order, 2962 (ii).
Orange Influence (remarks) 1965; (ruling) 1971 (i).
Order, Ques. of, on adjnmts. (ruling) 6027, 6032.
——— (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2371 (ii).
——— (Sir *John Thompson*) *re* Second Homesteads, 616 (i).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 631 (i).
Printing Bureau, Absence of Superintendent (remarks) 2438 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Davin*) *re* par. in Toronto *Globe*, 4242 (iii).
——— Member for East Northumberland (remarks) 4087 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Tarte*) *re* Cor. in London *Times*, 4239 (iii).
Prohibition, on adjmnt. (remarks) 546, 1332, 1341 (i).
——— on personal Explanation (remarks) 1543 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 6309 (iii).
Provincial Govts., Transfer of Property B. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5753 (iii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Public Accts. Com., Functions (ruling) 4241 (iii).
——— on M. to ref. Accts. (ruling) 3949 (ii).
——— on M. to rescind Order of Hse. (ruling) 1925 (i).
——— Printing Evidence (ruling) 2374 (ii).
——— Witnesses on Oath (ruling) 2516 (ii).
Public Works Dept., Papers (remarks) 987, 991 (i)
Quarantine (U.S.) Regulations for Sheep, &c. (remarks) 743 (i).
Quebec, West, Issue of Writ (notification) 4081 (ii), 5014, 6309 (iii).
——— Order for Attendance of Member (read) 4001 (ii).
——— Rep. of Dep. Serjeant-at-Arms (read) 4152 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on Member speaking twice, 3306 (ii).
Sawdust in La Have River (remarks) 2201 (ii).
Serjeant-at-Arms, Deputy, Appmnt. (notification) 3995 (ii).
Speaker, Election as (acknowledgement) 4 (i).
Speech from the Throne (rep.) 5 (i).
Sugar, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (ruling) 1931 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands (salaries) 5190. Weights and Measures &c., 5163 (iii).
Fisheries (Behring Sea, remarks) 6268 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Clerk of Crown) 6172 (iii), (contingencies) 942 (i); (Expenses of Committees) 6173 (iii); (Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates) 943; (salaries, &c.) 941 (i).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) on conc. (remarks) 5432; (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5082 (iii).
Mounted Police, on conc. (remarks) 5416 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T., remarks) 5389, 5392, 5397, 5401; (Ont.) 4367; (Ottawa) 4514. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4571. Slides and Booms, 4650 (iii).
Trade Relations with Empire, Mess. from Sen., 6216 (iii).
Trent Valley Canal, on adjnmt. (remarks) 215 (i).
Unparliamentary Language, 2026 (i), 3780 (ii), 4973 (iii).
West Indies Steamship Service (remarks) 195 (i).

Speaker, Deputy (MR. J. G. H. BERGERON) *Beauharnois.*
High Commissioner's Office, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 493 (i).
Members called to Order, 1554 (i), 3671 (ii), 4658, 6214 (iii).
Order, Ques. of (ruling) 5330 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4659 (iii).
——— Ry. Subsidies, on Res. (ruling) 6136 (iii).
North Shore Ry. Debentures (remarks) 4758 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Collction of Revenues: Customs (remarks) 1718, 1720 (ii).
Militia (remarks) 6182 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4562, 6260; (Que.) 4556; 4658 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff (remarks) 2040 (i).

Spohn, Mr. P. H., *East Simcoe.*
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Trent) 4136 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 6260 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3002 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1349 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Atlantic Cattle Trade Regulations (Ques.) 2148.
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1787 (i).
Cattle Trade, Shipping of Live Stock (remarks) 958 (i).
Census Returns, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4875(iii).
Commercial Agencies, &c., Regulations (B. 109, 1°*) 1011 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1037 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2370 (ii); in Com., 5733 (iii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4451 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5146 (iii).
Fishery Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1523 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 1002 (i).
——— B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 787 (i).
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3097.
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1006 (i).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1187 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 627 (i).
International Abattoir Co. (Ques.) 3615 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4627 (iii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3109 (ii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3135 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 3919 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic (M.) to adjn. Deb., neg. (Y. 65, N. 74) 362 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Auditor Gen.'s Office Accts. (M.) to ref., 2743 (ii).
——— Kingston Graving Dock, Printing Evidence (M.) 3621 (ii).
——— Cor., &c., *re* Kingston Graving Dock, &c. (M.) 3199 (ii).
——— 21st Rep. (presented) 4608 (iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*
Public Accts. Com., on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1926 (i).
——— P.O. Deptl. salaries (M.) to ref., 2666 (ii).
Quarantine (U.S.) for Sheep, &c. (Ques.) 605 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3154 (ii).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3611 (ii).
Steam Fans on Cattle Ships (Ques.) 1275 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 1563 (i), 6176 (iii); (Experimental Farms) 1567; (Two-rowed Barley) 1565 (i).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3542 (ii); (Health Statistics) 6174 (iii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 420 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands (salaries) 5179. Excise (Methylated Spirits) 5138 (iii).
Immigration (salaries) 5245 (iii).
Indians (T. D. Green, salary) 1555 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 513.
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 932 (i).
Mounted Police, 4825 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 912 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 6239; (Ottawa) 4509; (Que.) 6212 (iii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3461 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2555 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn. House, 2565 (ii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2927 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2687 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Bill 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1380 (i).

Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz-W., *Halifax.*
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1795 (i).
Cape Breton and N. S. Ry. accommodation, on M. for Cor., 178 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1036 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5292 (iii).
Personal Explanation *re* Blue Ribbon Twine, 2936 (ii).
Ships' Inspection B. 49 (M. *Tupper*) in Com., 3609 (ii).
Ships' Safety B. 44 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3099.
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 3530 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 4321; (Ont.) 4365.
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation at) 3867 (ii).
U. S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4013 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2040 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3206 (ii).

Stevenson, Mr. J., *West Peterborough.*
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (Trent) 4135 (ii),
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4787 (iii).

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford.*
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5737 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5198 (iii).
Ont. Express and Transportation Co.'s (B. 151) Rule suspended and 1°* of B., 2905 ; 2° m., 3230.
Pairing of Members (remarks) 805 (i).
South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 73, 1°*) 387 (i).
SUPPLY :
Geological Survey, 4726 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4219 (ii).
Public Works—Income (Que.) 6203 (iii).

Tarte, Mr. J. I., *Montmorency.*
Admiral, Str., Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 128.
——— Services and Ownership (M. for Ret.) 2157.
Esquimalt Graving Dock, Advts. for Tenders, &c. (M. for copies) 1932 (i).
——— Amount paid Larkin & Co. (Ques.) 270 (i).
——— Tenders, &c. (M. for copies) 1937 (i).
Kingston Graving Dock, Papers (remarks) 635 (i).
——— Tenders (M. for copies*) 127 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Cor. in London *Times*, 4239 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5791, 6122 (iii).
——— Papers (remarks) 986, 1850 (i).
——— (Ques. of Priv.) 146 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Chief Engineer (Ques.) 527, 602 (i).
——— Commissioners' Interest Acct. (Ques.) 270.
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (Public Works) 256 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*
Adjmnt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1536 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1276 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition (B. 6, 1°) 106 ; Order for 2°, 200 (i).
Can. Land and Investment Co.'s (B. 79, 1°*) 524.
Can. Power Co.'s (B. 41, 1°*) 206 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5738 (iii).
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 94, 1°*) 549 (i).
Macdonald, Sir John, Erection of Monument (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1084 (i).
Members not Voting (remarks) 331, 631, 800, 1199, (i), 3822, 4213, (ii), 5011 (iii).
———Votes challenged, 3780 (ii), 4428 (iii).
Mercantile Agencies, Legislation regulating (Ques.) 144 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G—*Continued.*
Order, Ques. of, Newspaper Reps. (M.) to adjn. Hse., 2963 (ii).
Pairing of Members (remarks) 631, 800 (i).
——— on M. for adjnmt., 3822 (ii).
Peterborough, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 72, 1°*) 387 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) Pairing of Members, 800 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic (Amt.) to Amt. to prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 355 ; neg. (Y. 7, N. 185) 1312 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Evidence *re* Langevin Block, 3948 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 20, 1°*) 155 (i).
Shuswap and Okanagon Ry. Co. and C. P. R. Co.'s (B. 78, 1°*) 441 (i).
Standing Orders Com., Rep. *re* Rathbun Co. (presented) 5012 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4500.
Telegraph Co.'s, Legislation *re* Directors (Ques.) 144 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 80, 1°*) 524 (i).

Temple, Mr. T., *York, N. B.*
Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5155 (iii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J., K.C.M.G., *Antigonish.*
Adjmnt., Queen's Birthday (Ans.) 157 (i).
Administration of Justice (B. 14, 1°) 141 ; 2° m. and in Com., 892, 1089 (i).
Admiralty Courts, Colonial (Ans.) 5778 (iii).
——— Local Judges' salaries (prop. Res.) 1849 (i).
——— Jurisdiction in Canada, Provision (B. 13, 1°) 141 ; 2° m., 1093 ; in Com., 1417, 1731 (i).
——— (B. 153) in Com. on Res., 3100 ; 1°* of B., 3102 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 6 (Mr. *Taylor*) on Order for 2°, 200 (i).
American Cattle slaughtered in Canada, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Auditor Gen.'s Functions (remarks) 392 (i).
Bancroft Tender *re* Kingston Graving Dock, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4170 (ii).
Battell, Wm., employé Cobourg P. O. (Ans.) 3952 (ii).
Berne Copyright Convention (Ans.) 1265 (i).
Bills of Exchange Act Amt. (B. 104, 1°*) 954 ; in Com., 1099 (i), 3138 (ii).
Bourgeois, G. A., payment to, on M. to ref. Accts. to Pub. Accts. Com. (objection) 2361 (ii).
Bremner's Claim for Furs (Ans.) 1268 (i).
Cablegrams per Reuter's Agency (Ans.) 4296 (iii).
C. P. R. Arbitrators' Award (remarks) 6129 (iii).
——— Section "B," Charges against P.M.G., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5945 ; (Amt.) 5994 ; agreed to (Y. 102, N. 78) 5998 (iii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Canal Contracts, Tenders, &c., on M. for copies, 1941 (i).
Carleton Branch Ry. (prop. Res.) 1413 (i).
Chatham P. O., Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 3951 (ii).
Civil Servants in Elections (Ans.) 1765 (i).
Coal Monopoly, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Cobourg Harbour Works, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5336 (iii).
Compulsory Voting B. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1031 (i).
Connell, J., emplymnt. by Sorel Harbour Board (Ans.) 5076 (iii).
Connolly, Michael, Books of Firm (M.) to produce, 906 (i).
——— (M.) to appear before Bar of House, 806 (i).
——— (M.) Order to appear before Bar postponed, 891 (i).
——— (M.) to read Rep. of Sub-Com. on Priv. and Elec., 895 (i).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 147, 1°) 2363; in Com., 3649 (ii), 5352, 5375, 5594, 5729 (ii).
Copyright Act Amt. (B. 141, 1°) 2144 (ii); 3° m., 3244 (ii).
——— Address to Her Majesty, 6287 (iii).
——— Act, 1889 (Ans.) 335 (i).
——— Berne Convention (Ans.) 1265 (i).
——— Imperial Legislation (Ans.) 4674 (iii).
——— Laws of Canada, on M. for Cor., 728 (i).
——— Legislation respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5017 (iii).
Corbin, J. S., Patent Relief B. 30 (Mr. *Reid*) on M. for 2°, 294 (i).
Criminal Law, Codification (B. 32, 1°) 156 (i).
——— Fees *re* Drafting B. (Ans.) 3260 (ii).
Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5941 (iii).
Deptl. Files, Destruction (remarks) 4157 (ii).
Desmarteau's, Jos., Claims for Improvements, on M. for Ret., 2156 (ii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4457 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 2°, 996; (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 999 (i).
——— (B. 146, 1°) 2363; in Com., 3246 (ii); 5140, 5196, 5470, 5547, 5587; M. to recom., 5544; 3° m., 5556 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 6228 (iii).
Dorchester Penitentiary, Supplies (Ans.) 1928 (i).
Edgett's Landing, Ballast Wharf (Ans.) 3956 (ii).
Elections Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 1029 (i).
Elections in Napierville (Ans.) 1577 (i).
Election Returns, Date of Declaration, &c., on M. for Ret., 134 (i).
Esquimalt Settlers' Grievances, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 4029 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 11 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 2958 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 117, 1°*) 1345 (i); in Com., 3646, 3902 (ii).
Female Offenders in N. S. (B. 143, 1°*) 2203; in Com., 3596 (ii).
Foreshores of Dom. Ownership, on M. for Cor., 179 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 769; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 771; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 798 (i).
——— B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 302; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 305; agreed to (Y. 112, N. 85) 330 (ii).
——— B. 31 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 3 m. h., 1001 (i).
——— (B. 145, 1°) 2361; in Com., 3082 (ii).
——— Year of Passing, &c. (Ans.) 962, 1267 (i).
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) on M. for 2°, 1005; on Order for Com. (remarks) 1014; in Com., 1976 (i).
Frauds upon the Govt. Prevention (B. 172, 1°*) 5582; 2° m., 5751; in Com., 6237, 6289 (iii).
Grain Weighers Provision (B. 164, 1°*) 3983 (ii).
Grant, J. J., Case of *re* Settlement, on M. for Ret., 3643 (ii).
Great North-West Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 162) 1°*, 3950 (ii).
Govt. Business (M.) precedence on Saturdays 6127
——— on M. to take in Wednesdays, 1731 (i).
Govt., Formation of (Ans.) 1578 (i).
Govt. Policy, on adjnmt. (remarks) 1101 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1113.
Herchmer, Commissioner, Comptroller's Rep. (Ans.) 1574, 2669 (ii).
——— Cor. *re* Macleod *Gazette* (Ans.) 4293 (iii).
——— Enquiry into Conduct, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2919 (ii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 573 (i).
Homsteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 623 (i).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3593 (ii).
——— Agent Chisholm, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6147 (iii).
——— Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1498 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3582 (ii).
Inspection Act Amt (B. 163, 1°*) 3983 (ii).
Intoxicating Liquors, Prohibition of Sale (Ans.) 961 (i).
I. C. R., Claims for Damages (Ans.) 1770 (i).
——— Claims of Miss Lea Caron (Ans.) 209 (i).
——— Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3787 (ii).
Isle Bizard Bridge (Ans.) 5195 (iii).
Jacques Cartier Co., Public Works (Ans.) 4674.
——— (remarks) 5014 (iii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Judges in Quebec, Appmnts. (Ans.) 5076 (iii).
——— Montreal District (Ans.) 2909 (ii).
Judges in Provincial Courts (B. 158) in Com. on Res., 3100 ; 1°* of B., 3102 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, Coal Supply (Ans.) 3260.
Kingston Graving Dock, Papers (remarks) 3961.
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 3657 (iii).
Labour, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 4674 (iii).
Lamontagne, Leda, Extradition (Ans.) 3619 (ii).
——— Pets. for Discharge (Ans.) 2907 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4536 ; in Com., 4612, 5538 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5527 (iii).
Land Grants to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 3113 (ii).
Landslide at Quebec, O. C.'s, &c., on M. for copies, 3632 (ii).
Langevin Block, Payments on account of Contract (Ans.) 5776 (iii).
Live Stock Shipping B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) 2° m. and in Com., 3991, 3993 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) M. to refer to Sel. Com., 766 (i); in Com., 2940 ; on Order for Com., 3287 (ii).
Macdonald, Sir John, Illness and Govt. Business (remarks) 711 (i).
McLeod, Mr., Port Mulgrave (remarks) 2289 (ii).
Man. School Act, Papers (remarks) 807 (i).
Miminigash Breakwater (Ans.) 3959 (ii), 4296 (iii).
Ministerial Changes (remarks) 890 (i).
Minister of Public Works, rumoured Resignation (remarks) 3653, 4213 (ii).
——— Resignation (announcement) 5074 (iii).
Motions allowed to Stand (remarks) 1932 (i).
New England Paper Co. (Ans.) 1767 (i).
North Shore Ry. Debentures B. 170 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4748, 4770 ; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4829 ; on M. for 3°, 5410 (iii).
——— on M. for copies of O. C.'s, 981 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4154 (ii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4463 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3925 (ii), 4298 (iii).
——— Representation Acts Amt. (B. 148, 1°) 2373 (ii).
Ont. Express and Transportation Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 2°, 3230 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 4659 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) on M. to adjn. Hse., 2371 (ii).
——— Newspaper Reps., 2964 (ii).
——— Second Homesteads, 616 (i).
——— Unparliamentary Language, 1332 (i).
Owen Sound Harbour, Improvements (Ans.) 3960.
Pairing of Members, on M. for adjnmt., 3824.
Patent Act Amt. (B. 142, 1°) 2144 (i).
Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 129 (i).
Piers, Wharves, &c., P.E.I., Repairs, &c. (Ans). 3952 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Priv. and Elec. Com., Afternoon Sittings, on M., 1989 (i).
——— distribution of Evidence (remarks) 5352.
——— 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) 799 (i).
——— 6th Rep. of Com. *re* Controverted Elections, on conc., 4828 (iii).
——— on 7th Rep. (remarks) 5553 (iii).
——— Meetings of Com. (remarks) 984, 990 (i).
Privilege, Member for East Northumberland, Charges against, 4087 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1335 (i).
——— Order for consdn. of Res. postponed, 993.
Provincial Acts, Costs *re* Testing Validity (Ans.) 112 (i).
Provincial Accounts (Indian Lands) Settlement (B. 100, 1°*) 807 ; in Com., 1087 (i).
——— Settlement (B. 99, 1°*) 807 ; 2° m., 1065 ; in Com., 1066 (i).
Provincial Govts. Transfer of Property (B. 111, 1°) 1101 (i) ; 2° m., 3985 (ii) ; in Com., 5752 (iii).
Pub. Accts. Com., on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com of Sup., 4091 (ii).
——— on M. to ref. Accts. *re* Bourcier, 3949 (ii).
——— on Printing Evidence, 2375 (ii).
Public Expenditure, on enquiry for Rets., 4158.
Public Works Dept., Contracts, 4th Rep. of Com. *re* Thomas McGreevy (remarks) 3738 (ii).
Quebec Colonization Lottery (Ans.) 2154 (ii).
Quebec Skating Club, Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 3649 ; 2° m., 3984 (ii).
Quebec West, Expulsion of Member (M.) 6285 (iii)
——— (M.) to Issue Writ, 6286 (iii).
——— (M.) Member to attend Hse., 3827 (ii).
——— (M.) to Arrest, 4001 (ii).
——— Vacancy, on Issue of Writ (remarks) 4082 (ii), 6309 (iii).
Queen's Bench, Que., Appmnt. of Chief Justice (remarks) 5196 (iii).
——— Judges' salaries (Ans.) 5406 (iii).
——— Vacancy (Ans.) 3620 (ii).
Queen's Counsel, conferring Titles (Ans.) 3263.
Ry. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for 2°, 3304 (ii).
Rathbun Co., Rep. of Standing Orders Com., 5012 (iii).
Reciprocity, Papers respecting (remarks) 550, 600 (i).
Revising Officers, Instruction *re* Revision (Ans.) 5079 (iii).
Revising Officer, Rimouski (Ans.) 741 (i).
St Lawrence Dredge (Ans.) 3952 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Leather Supplies (Ans.) 2912 (ii).
Senécal, André, service of Writ to appear at Bar (Ques.) 4747 (iii).
Sheppard, W. A., emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1266 (i).
Sillery Seigniory and Huron Indians of Lorette (Ans.) 604 (i).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Smith & Ripley and Hon. J. A. Chapleau (Ans.) 5404 (iii).
Sorel Harbour Works, employés (Ans.) 5077 (iii).
Stoney Island Breakwater, Contractor (Ans.) 5408
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6219 (iii).
——— (prop. Res.) 3308 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Income : Grenville (Goodwin's Claim) 6296 (iii).
Civil Government (Justice) contingencies, 434, 1547 (i).
Collection of Revenues : Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5172 (iii). Public Works, 1728. Weights and Measures, 1727 (i).
Dominion Police, 512, 1557 (i).
Indians (N.B.) 5063, conc., 5422 (iii)
Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 507 ; (L. A. Audette) 1557 ; (J. Dingwell, Legal services) 1559 ; (Masters, C. H., drafting Criminal Law) 1559 ; (Miscellaneous) 506, 1556 (i), 6170, conc., 6303 (iii) ; (Sullivan, Hon. W. T., salary, 1556 ; (Vice-Admiralty Court) 510 (i).
Legislation : House of Commons (Indemnity) 6172 (iii) ; (Voters' Lists, Revision) 946 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Campbellton and Gaspé) 5350 ; (St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c.) conc., 5472 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5114 (iii) ; (Litigation Expenses) 1707 (i) ; (Old Records) 5084, 5124 (iii) ; (Wm. Gliddon, payment) 1706 (i).
Mounted Police, 4818 (iii).
Penitentiaries (B. C.) 919 ; (Dorchester) 1558 ; (Kingston) 882 ; (Man.) 913 (i), 6171 (iii) ; (Regina Gaol) 928 ; (St. Vincent de Paul) 907 (i), 6170 (iii).
Public Works—Capital : Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4529. *Income :* Buildings (Man.) 4443 ; (N.W.T.) 4443, 6248, conc., 5389 ; (Ottawa) 4510 (Ont.) 4579 (iii). Dredging (New Plant) 1691 (i). Slides and Booms, 6261 (iii).
Railways—Capital : Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1659. C.P.R. (construction) 1653 (i). I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accomodation) 3862.
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) conc., 6305 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. (B. 138, 1°) 1990 (i) ; 2° m., 3584 ; in Com., 3588 ; 3° m., 3649 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 5079, 5590 (iii).
Tarte-McGreevy Enquiry, Counsel (Ans.) 1575.
——— (remarks) 1930 (i).
Testimonials to Ministers, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3835 (ii).
Three Rivers Piers, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 5777 (iii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3488 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2563 ; in Com., 2578 (ii).
Trade Extension, &c., U.S., Canada and Newfoundland, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 736.
Trade Relations with Foreign Countries, Address from Sen., on M. to conc., 6317 (iii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Trade Relations with U.S., Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1199 (i).
Trade Marks and Industrial Designs Act Amt. (B. 101, 1°*) 807 (i).
Treaty Papers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 238, 906 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4467 (iii).
U.S. Fishing Vessels B. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 235 (i).
U.S. Treaty with Cuba, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4012 (ii).
Veterans of 1837-38, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 3287 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Extension of Time for Revision (Ans.) 2908, 2912 (ii).
Washington Treaty Papers (remarks) 192 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2024, 2063 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3201 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on Order for Com. on Res., 1255 (i) ; on Sen. Amts., 3984 (ii).
Wood Supply, Ottawa Public Buildings, Contractor (Ans.) 4295 (iii).

Tisdale, Mr. D., *South Norfolk.*
Frauds Prevention B. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*) in Com., 1975 (i).
G. T. Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 36, 1°*) 206 (i).
High Commissioner, on M. to adjn. Deb., 705 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 851 (i).
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 620 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4622 (iii).
Maritime Chemical Pulp Co.'s (B. 39, 1°*) 206 (i).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, Sittings of Com. (M.) 4670 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3931 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in Ottawa *Free Press*, 5384 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5236 (iii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3447 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2034 (i).

Trow, Mr. J., *South Perth.*
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 111 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1413 (i).
Annapolis Public Buildings (Ques.) 529 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Curran*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to M. for 3°, 1961 (i).

Trow, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 64, 1°*) 387 (i).
Berne Copyright Convention (Ques.) 1264 (i).
Boucherville Wharf, Contractor (Ques.) 1265 (i).
Canal Contracts, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies) 1938 (i).
Civil Service Employés, Payments (Ques.) 2906.
Commercial Treaty, England and France (Ques.) 4760 (iii).
Copyright, Imp. Legislation (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
Divisions, Members' Votes, on Procedure (remarks) 4455 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5145; on M. to recom., 5546 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 5773 (iii).
Elliott, G. M., Appmnt. as Gas Inspector (Ques.) 5076 (iii).
Fenelon Falls, Lockmaster's Office (Ques.) 4673.
Fitzgerald, W., Fishery Officer (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4302 (iii).
Guévremont, Senator, Land purchased from (Ques.) 4671 (iii).
Guysborough Fishery Overseer, salary (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Helbronner, Mr. Jules, Amount paid (Ques.) 5407 (iii).
Heney, John, Payment of Canal Tolls (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
Indian Agent Jones, Charges against (Ques.) 4673.
Jacques Cartier Co., Public Works (Ques.) 4674.
Keewatin, Str., Govtl. Service (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
Knowlton's Landing, Wharf (Ques.) 1770 (i).
Labour, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 4674 (iii).
Lake St. Peter, Fishery Districts (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
Lake Temiscamingue Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 22, 1°*) 155 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4611 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5514 (iii).
Lavallée, Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 2145, 2148 (ii).
Legal Services, Payments by Govt. (Ques.) 2907.
Lindsay and Haliburton Mail Clerk, Resignation (Ques.) 4671 (iii).
Liquor Seizures in Montmagny (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 3134 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2939 (ii).
Members not Voting (remarks) 331, 804, 1199 (i); 3426 (ii).
Meteghan Wharf, Digby Co. (Ques.) 530 (i).
Military College Cadets, Diplomas, &c. (Ques.) 4297 (iii).
Montreal Custom House, Night Watchman (Ques.) 5406 (iii).
Murray Canal Employés (Ques.) 4675 (iii).

Trow, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Napanee Public Buildings (Ques.) 2154 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3946 (ii).
Ont. and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s (B. 102, 1°*) 891.
Ont. Municipalities, Deputation to Govt. (remarks) 389 (i).
Ordnance Lands, Montreal, Leases (Ques.) 5409.
Pairing of Members (remarks) 804 (i).
Pound Net Licenses, Lake Huron (Ques.) 529 (i).
Printing Bureau, Type purchased (Ques.) 3619 (ii).
Priv. and Elec. Com., afternoon Sittings, on M., 1989 (i).
Prorogation (remarks) 6327 (iii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co., Subsidy (Ques.) 4675 (iii).
Regina *Leader*, Advertising and Printing (remarks) 4465 (iii).
——— (Ques.) 4295 (iii).
Rideau Canal, Tolls Collected and Refunded (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
Robitaille, C. N., Payment (Ques.) 4673 (iii).
St. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 5407 (iii).
Sault Ste Marie Wharf, Mr. Plummer's Services (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Stoney Island Breakwater, Contractor (Ques.) 5408 (iii).
Smith & Ripley and Hon. J. A. Chapleau (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6176 (iii).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3548 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 5219 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Chinese Immigration) 5058. Dom. Lands (salaries) 5182. Post Office (Mail Service) 4719; (salaries, &c.) 4720.
Government of N.W.T. (Well-boring Machines) conc., 5426 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 513.
Indians (B. C.) 4803; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4814; (N.B.) 4734 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Clerk of Crown) 6172 (iii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4223 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 5112; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 5086; (Parliamentary Documents, distribution) 5082 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1698 (i).
Penitentiaries (salaries, &c.) 928 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4524 (iii). Kingston Graving Dock, 1680 (i). *Income:* Buildings (N.W.T.) conc., 5394; (N.W.T) 6249 (iii).
Superannuation (allowance, W. Wallace, B.C.) 3673 (ii).
Tay Canal, Basin at Perth, Contract (Ques.) 4672 (iii).
Weldford P. O., Conduct of Business (Ques.) 2151 (ii).

Truax, Mr. R., *East Bruce.*
Customs Seizures at Walkerton (Ques.) 3266 (ii).
Excise Collector at Stratford (Ques.) 5078 (iii).
Legal Services, Payments by Govt. (Ques.) 2907.

Truax, Mr. R.—*Continued.*
McNamara, N., Share Customs Seizures (Ques.) 3959 (ii).
Regina *Leader*, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 4295 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Ont.) 5044 (ii).
Walkerton P. O., Contract for Fittings (Ques.) 962 (i).
——— Public Buildings, Caretaker (Ques.) 1271.
——— Completion (Ques.) 335 (i).
——— Public Works (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
——— Seizure of Iron Bridge, &c. (Ques.) 3619.
——— Sub-Collector, Resignation (Ques.) 3266 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. C. H., *Pictou.*
Alert, Str., Captain's Name, &c. (Ans.) 1769.
——— Examination of Commander (Ans.) 2913.
Atlantic Cattle Trade Regulations (Ans.) 2149 (ii).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 722 (i).
Behring Sea Seal Fisheries, Imperial Legislation (Ans.) 960 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Examination (Ans.) 3621 (ii.)
Canadians Abroad, Distressed (Ans.) 2149 (ii).
Canadian Sealers Captured, Rep. respecting 5554 (iii).
Cattle (Export) Trade of Canada (remarks) 738 (i).
——— Rep. of Evidence (presented) 103 (i).
——— Shipping of Live Stock (remarks) 957.
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. on Res., 554 (i).
Deck and Load Lines Marking provision (B. 106, 1°) 954; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1256 (i); in Com., 3583 (ii); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 4773 (iii).
Deck Loads, Rep. of Evidence (presented) 103 (i).
Eel Fishery at Rimouski Ans.) 2907, 2913 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 122) prop. Res. and in Com., 1095; 1° of B., 1483 (i); in Com., 3158, 3165; 3° m., 3237 (ii).
Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 129 (i).
Fishery Bounty Cheques (Ans.) 129 (i).
——— Costs, &c., *re* Distribution, on M. for Ret., 182 (i).
——— Claims, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 541 (i).
——— Payments, on M. for Stmnt., 211 (i).
——— Inspector, District No. 3, Resignation (Ans.) 130 (i).
——— Laws, Enforcement, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1528 (i).
——— Protection Service, Georgian Bay (Ans.) 220 (i).
——— Cape Breton (Ans.) 527 (i).
——— Supplies (Ans.) 221 (i).
——— Overseer, Guysborough, salary (Ans.) 5403.
——— Wardens, Appmnts. (Ans.) 5409 (iii).
Fishing Licenses in Grand River (Ans.) 710 (i).
——— Restigouche River, on M. for Ret., 3284.
——— System of Issuiug (Ans.) 143 (i).
Fitzgerald, W., Fishery Officer (Ans.) 5405 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 775 (i).

Tupper, Hon. C. H.—*Continued.*
Govt. Harbours, Piers, &c., Act Amt. (B. 115, 1°*) 1263 (i); 2° m. and in Com., 3104 (ii).
Govt. Policy, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1131 (i).
Graham, J. R., Dismissal, on M. for Ret., 211 (i).
——— Ret *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 320 (ii).
Guévremont, Senator, Land purchased from (Ans.) 4671 (iii).
High Commissioner, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 584, 659 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 3802 (ii).
Lake St. Peter Fishery Districts (Ans.) 2148 (ii).
Lavallée, Fishery Overseer (Ans.) 2146, 2148 (ii).
Lily, H. M. S., Rescue of Crew, on M. for Papers, &c., 1061 (i).
Live Stock Shipment B. 154 (prop. Res.) 1200 (i); in Com. and 1°* of B., 3130 (ii); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 4772 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt (B. 12 1°) 140; 2° m., 1066; in Com., 1068 (i), 3102.
Marine Deptl. Rep. (presented) 103 (i).
Meridian Reckoning Time (B. 166, 1°) 4237 (iii).
Mermerly, Barque, Rescue of Crew, on M. for Ret., 713 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. (B. 95, 1°) 549; in Com., 1099; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1992 (i).
Montreal Pilots, on M. for Com. of Sup., re-6146 (iii.)
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 966 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6192 (iii).
——— on M. for Cor., 3267 (ii).
——— Suspension (Ans.) 113 (i).
Oyster Beds, Leases (Ans.) 3958; (remarks) 4158 (ii).
Pictou Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. (B. 150, 1°) 2667; in Com., 3594, 3899 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2167 (ii).
Public Accts. Com., Functions (remarks) 4240.
Pound-Nets, Licenses (Ans.) 143 (i).
——— Lake Huron (Ans.) 529 (i).
——— Lake St. Clair (Ans.) 198, 223 (i).
Ste. Croix Lighthouse Keeper, Resignation, on M. for Ret., 174 (i).
St. John, P.Q., Medical Examiner (Ans.) 527 (i).
Salmon Net-Fishing Licenses (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
——— Restigouche River (Ans.) 1269 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Mr. Plummer's Services (Ans.) 1576 (i).
——— Receipts (Ans.) 2905 (ii).
——— Tolls, &c. (Ans.) 3620 (ii).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 1953 (i).
——— Deb. rsmd., 2175 (ii).
Sea Fisheries Development (B. 152) prop. Res., 549 (i); conc. in and 1° of B., 3100; 2°* m., 3593.

Tupper, Hon. C. H.—*Continued.*
Seigfreid, Schooner, reward to Captain (Ans.) 224.
Ships' Inspection (B. 149, 1°) 2666; in Com., 3600 (ii), 4310; M. to conc. in Amts., 4466 (iii).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. (B. 44, 1°) 218 (remarks) 219; in Com., 1088 (i), 3099 (ii).
Sick and Distressed Mariners (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
Standard Time, on M. for Ret., 209 (i).
Stanley, Str., Trips, Mainland and P.E.I. (Ans.) 1929 (i).
——— on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 166 (i).
Steamboat Inspection, &c., Reps. (presented) 103.
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 85, 1°) 524; in Com., 1094 (i); on Sen. Amts., 3901 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Experimental Farm) 3555 (ii).
Civil Government (Marine) 6166 (iii), contingencies, 440 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Yacht *Cruiser*) 1721 (i). Rys. (I. C. R., &c.) 4073 (ii).
Fisheries (Behring Sea) 6268 (iii); (B. C., salaries) 3527 (ii), contingencies, 1547 (i); (Fish-breeding) 3529, conc., 4261; (Man.) 3525; (N.B.) 3523, (N.W.T.) 3527 (ii); (N.S.) conc., 4245 (iii); (Ont.) 3514 (ii); (P.E.I.) conc., 4258 (iii); (Que.) 3517 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 3512; (Maintenance, &c.) 3510; (salaries, &c.) 3509 (ii), 6267 (iii).
Marine Hospitals, &c., conc., 4243 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Burrard Inlet Survey) 1705 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Collision S.S. *Alert* and Schr. *Scylla*) 6265 (iii); (Maintenance, &c.) 3513; (Quebec Water Police) 3508; (Tidal Observations) 3509 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 4320. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 6259 (iii).
Railways—Capital: Annapolis and Digby (construction) 1660 (i). I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation at) 3866, 3871 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection 3513 (ii), conc., 4243 (iii).
Tignish Breakwater, Wharfage Dues (Ans.) 130, 708 (i).
——— Harbour Master (Ans.) 3259 (ii).
——— Harbour Master's Rep. (Ans.) 4673 (iii).
Trade Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3333 (ii).
U.S. Fishing Vessels (B. 10, 1°) 108; 2° m., 206; 3° m., 232 (i).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe.*
Alliston, Conflagration (remarks) 192 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 4219 (ii).
Public Works—Income (Que.) 6205 (iii).
Territorial Accounts (Surgeon General's salary) 6280, conc., 6306 (iii).

Vaillancourt, Mr. C. E., *Dorchester.*
Quebec Eastern Ry., Subsidy (M. for Ret.) 1934.

Wallace, Mr. N. C., *West York, Ont.*
Adjmnt., Dom. Day (remarks) 1541 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1783 (i).

Wallace, Mr. N. C.—*Continued.*
Construction Co. (Incorporated) of Can. incorp. (B. 128, 1°*) 1927 (i).
Divorce, Adam Russworm Relief (B. 131, 1°*) 1927 (i); 2° on div. and 3° agreed to (Y. 89, N. 23) 2549 (ii).
——— Isabel Tapley Relief (B. 134, 1°*) 1927 (i).
——— Mahala Ellis Relief (B. 132, 1°*) 1926 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 1002 (i).
Judges in Montreal District (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3942 (ii).
Orange Influence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1967 (i).
Personal Explanation, par. in *Toronto Mail*, 2962.
Public Accts. Com. (M.) to rescind Order of Hse., 1925 (i).
——— (M.) Printing Evidence, 2374 (ii).
——— (M.) Witnesses on Oath, 2516 (ii).
——— (Ms.) to ref. Printing Bureau, &c., Accts., 2905, 3308 (ii).
——— (M.) Printing Evidence *re* J. R. Arnoldi, 3308 (ii).
——— (M.) P. O. Dept., Printing Evidence, 3513.
——— (M.) Ret. *re* Kingston Graving Dock, to ref., 3576 (ii).
——— (M.) Bourcier & Co.'s Accts., 4085 (ii).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s (B. 84, 1°*) 524 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Minor Revenues (Ordnance Lands) 5176 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Judges' salaries) 521.
Public Works—Income (Man.) 4432 (iii).
Temperance Colonization Society (Ques.) 606 (i).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3480 (ii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. (B. 15, 1°) 142 (i); 2° m., 2552; on M. to adjn. Hse., 2570 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Extension of Time for Revision (Ques.) 2908 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2107 (ii).
——— par. in Toronto *Mail* (remarks) 2964 (ii).

Watson, Mr. R., *Marquette.*
Adjnmt., St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1413 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1784 (i).
Brandon *Mail* in Public Departments, Number (Ques.) 3257 (ii).
Disallowance of Man. Local Acts (M. for Cor.) 544, 545 (i).
Dom. Aid to Rys., on M. for Ret., 1057 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3247 (ii), 5548 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 5771 (iii).

Watson, Mr. R.—*Continued.*
Fishing in Lake Winnipeg (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 774 (i).
——— Repeal B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 323.
Homesteads (Second) N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 619 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. B. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4620, 5538 (iii).
——— B. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 5491 (iii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3932 (ii).
Papashase Indian Reserve, on M. for adjmnt. (remarks) 1403 (i).
Paspasckase Indian Reserve (Ques.) 3265 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. to prop. Res., 372 (i).
Provincial Acts, Costs *re* Testing Validity (Ques.) 112 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 3140 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Dairy Industry) 6175 (iii).
Arts, &c. (Census and Statistics) 3545 (ii); (Health Statistics) 6174 (iii).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 5219 (iii).
Civil Government (Indian Affairs) 249 (i); (Interior) 6169 (iii).
Collection of Revenues: Dom. Lands (salaries) 5132 (iii). Rys. (I.C.R., &c.,) 4074 (ii).
Fisheries (Man.) 3524 (ii).
Government of N. W. T., 5072 (iii); (Schools) 1712.
Immigration (salaries, &c.) 5259 (iii).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 4737, 4814 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 952 (i).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 3731, 4235; (Military College) 4237 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Dufresne, Mr. J. I., D.L.S.) 1707 (i); (Govt. of Keewatin) 5085; (Lunatics in Keewatin) 5085 (iii).
Mounted Police, 1705 (i), 4817, 6274 (iii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 913, 1714 (i), 6171 (iii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 4526. *Income:* Buildings (Man.) 4429; (N.W.T.) 4449; (N.S.) 4315; (Ont.) 4367; (Ottawa) 4488; (Que.) 4332. Dredging, (Man.) 4647. Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 4591 (iii.)
Territorial Accounts, 1729 (i); (Surgeon General's salary) 6281 (iii).
Tay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3751 (ii).
Timber Licenses, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).
Walrond Ranche and Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6161 (iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3057 (ii).

Watson, Mr. R.—*Continued.*
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1371, 1379 (i); in Com. on B., 2221, 2253 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. R. C., *Albert.*
Administration of Justice B. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1091 (i).
Farmers' Bank of Rustico (M.) to place on Order Paper, 1101 (i).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3780 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Geological Survey) 410 (i).)
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1435 (i).

Welsh, Mr. W., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Belle Creek Breakwater (Ques.) 1270 (i).
Binding Twine, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1824 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. on Res., 556; in Com., 560 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 973 (i).
New London, &c., Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 226 (i).
Red Point Pier (Ques.) 1271 (i).
Ships' Inspection Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 4310 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Que.) 5040 (iii).
Legislation: Senate (salaries, &c.) 930 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 4682 (iii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 4473.
Trent Valley Canal, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., of Sup. (remarks) 4719 (iii).
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1638 (i).
——— Sir Douglas Fox's Rep. (Ques.) 4294 (iii).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 1397 (i).
Wood Islands Breakwater (Ques.) 1271 (i).

White, Mr. N. W., *Shelburne.*
Bonding Foreign Fish (Ques.) 1265 (i).
Cotton Sail Duck, Imports at Halifax (M. for Ret.*) 174 (i).
——— (Ques.) 142 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3183 (ii).
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., on M. for Cor., 2539 (ii).
Newfoundland Bait Act, on M. for Cor., 3273 (ii).
Northumberland, East, Charges against Member, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 5636 (iii).
Sawdust in La Have River, on M. for Ret., 2197 (ii).

White, Mr. N. W.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Legislation : House of Commons (Voters' Lists, Revision) 947 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2669 (ii)

White, Mr. R. S., *Cardwell.*
Ont. Municipalities' Deputation and Montreal *Gazette* (remarks) 389 (i).
Pelee Island Sub-Collector, on M. for Cor., &c., 1602 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works : Buildings (Que.) 4353 (iii).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2562 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2965 (ii).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., jun., *Sunbury.*
Inverness Ry. and Mining Co.'s (B. 136, 1°*) 1989 (i) ; 2° m., 2858 (ii).

Wood, Mr. J. F., *Brockville.*
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 109 (i).
Companies' Clauses Act Amt. (B. 49, 1°*) 238 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 5, 1°) 105 ; 2° m., 994 (i).
——— B. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 5157, 5200 ; on M. for 3°, 5568 (iii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m h., to M. for 28, 778.
——— (B. 59, 1°) 334 ; 2° m., 1041 (i).
——— B. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3085.
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com. 6186 (iii).

Wood, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Capital : Kingston Graving Dock, 1677 (i).

Wood, Mr. J., *Westmoreland.*
Adjnmt., Ascension Day (remarks) 110 (i).
——— Holidays (remarks) 1276 (i).
——— St. Peter and St. Paul, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1411 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 568 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for 3°, 5309 (iii).
I. C. R. Management, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3815 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Messrs. Saunders and Muttart, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2161 (ii).
Public Accts. Com., on M. to rescind Order of Hse., 1926 (i).
——— (M.) Printing Evidence, 5013 (iii).
——— (M.) Accts., &c., *re* Toronto Harbour, 5013.
——— (M.) Accts., &c., *re* W. I. Bradley, 5013 (iii)
——— (M.) Sittings of Com., 5014 (iii).
Ships' Inspection B. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 3607 (ii).
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1641 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2260 (ii).
——— on M. to conc. in Res., 3212 (ii).

Yeo, Mr. J., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Tunnel, P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 1634 (i).

INDEX.—PART II.

SUBJECTS.

ABBOTT, HON. MR., AND FORMATION OF GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).

ACCIDENTS ON I. C. R., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1770 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 209 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).

ACCOUNT, OPEN: in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).

Accounts, Settlement. *See* "PROVINCIAL."

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY, ACKNOWLEDGMENT: Mes. from His Ex., 227 (i).

——— IN ANSWER TO HIS EX'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Hazen*) 8; seconded (Mr. *Corbould*) 17 (i).

ADJOURNMENT, CORPUS CHRISTI: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 523 (i).

——— DOM. DAY: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*, &c.) 1536 (i).

——— M. to adjn. (Mr. *Denison*), neg. (Y. 50, N. 72) 1579 (i).

——— HOLIDAYS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*, &c.) 1275.

——— QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 157 (i).

——— M. (Sir *Hector Largevin*) 386 (i).

——— SIR JOHN MACDONALD'S FUNERAL: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 888 (i).

——— ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1409 (i).

ADJUTANT GEN., DEP., MIL. DIST. NO. 11: M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

Administration of Justice B. No. 14 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 141; 2°* and in Com., 892, 1089; 3°*, 1093 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 28.)

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. *See* "JUSTICE."

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *John Macdonald*). 1°*, 5 (i) (*pro forma*).

"ADMIRAL" (STEAMBOAT), SUBSIDY, CONTRACT, &C.: M. for O. C.'s, &c.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 128 (i).

——— O. C.'s *re* SERVICES, CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 2157 (ii).

Admiralty Jurisdiction Provision B. No. 13 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 141; 2°, 1093; in Com., 1414, 1731; in Com. and 3°*, 1854 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

ADMIRALTY COURTS, PROCLAMATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 5776 (iii).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 5166 (iii).

ADVERTISING ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF OTTAWA MAILS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 963 (i).

——— IN *Le Canada*: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2540 (ii).

AGENCIES (MERCANTILE) LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 144 (i).

AGENCY, PUBLIC WORKS, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 4669 (iii).

AGRICULTURE, &C.:

CANADIANS (DISTRESSED) ABROAD, RELIEF: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 2149 (ii).

CATTLE TRADE (ATLANTIC) REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2148 (ii).

——— QUARANTINE REGULATIONS: (Mr. *Bowell*) 806.

——— SHIPPING LIVE STOCK: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 957 (i).

——— VESSELS AND STEAM FANS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1275 (i),

——— *See* "AMERICAN."

CHEESE (AMERICAN) SHIPPED THROUGH CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 114(i).

——— M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Marshall*) 205 (i).

DEPTL. REPORT: presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 103 (ii).

HIGH COMMISSIONER AND IMPERIAL FEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2153 (ii).

——— SUMS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 176, 223 (i).

IMMIGRATION AGENT SHEPPARD: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1266 (i).

——— INTO CANADA, TOTAL NUMBER DURING DECADE: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5075 (iii).

——— INTO N.W.T., MEMORIAL OF LEG. ASSEMBLY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1269 (i).

——— EMPLYMT. OF MR. HURTEAU: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 529 (i).

INTERNATIONAL ABATTOIR CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).

MERCANTILE AGENCIES, LEGISLATION REGULATING: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 144 (i).

QUARANTINE OFFICER AT RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3616 (ii).

QUEBEC COLONIZATION LOTTERY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2154 (ii).

TRANS-ATLANTIC STEAMERS, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2906 (ii).

UNITED STATES QUARANTINE REGULATIONS *re* LAMBS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 960 (i).

[*See* "ARTS," &c., "COPYRIGHT," "EXPERIMENTAL FARMS," "IMMIGRATION," "SUPPLY," &c.

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, AID TO: conc., 5413 (iii).

AGRICULTURE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 254 (i), 6169 (iii).

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1757 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 77.)

ALBERTA RY., PAYMENT OF LABOURERS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3956 (ii).

ALBINO POINT, CUSTOMS OFFICER: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *German*) 1579 (i).

Albion Mines Savings Bank B. No. 113 (Mr. *Macdougald, Pictou*). M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103; wthdn. and 1°, 1105; 2°*, Rule suspended and in Com., 1297; 3°*, 1298 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 112.)

"ALERT" AND SCHR. "SCYLLA," CLAIMS *re* COLLISION: in Com. of Sup., 6265 (iii).

—— EXAMINATION OF CAPT. BERNIER AS COMMANDER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3621 (ii).

—— EXAMINATION OF CAPTAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (ii).

—— APPOINTMENT OF CAPTAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1769 (i).

Alien Contract Labour Prohibition B. No. 6 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 106; wthdn., 200 (i).

ALLEN, INDIAN AGENT, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1264 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1298, 1928 (i).

ALLISONVILLE POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2153 (ii).

ALLISTON CONFLAGRATION: Remarks on adjnmt., 192

AMBER DEPOSITS IN N. W., APPLICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 2518 (ii).

AMERICAN CATTLE FOR SLAUGHTER IN CANADA, IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 5776 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *O'Brien*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4468, 4536; (Mr. *McMillan*) 5209 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5209 (iii).

AMERICAN CHEESE SHIPPED THROUGH CAN.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Marshall*) 205 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 114 (i).

AMERICAN QUARANTINE REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 742 (i).

AMHERSTBURG DRY DOCK: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 3287 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i), 3259 (ii).

ANALYSIS OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 203 (i).

ANALYST, DOM., OCCUPATION OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2518 (ii).

Anglo-Can. Electric Storage and Supply Co.'s incorp. B. No. 92 (Mr. *Mackintosh*). 1°*, 549; 2°*, 983; in Com. and 3°*, 1964 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 128.)

ANIMALS FROM U. S., FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 129 (i).

ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY RY., CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1659 (i).

ANNAPOLIS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 529 (i).

—— M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 544 (i).

ANNAPOLIS ROYAL CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 270 (i).

ANNUITIES AND COMMUTATIONS (INDIANS): in Com. of Sup., 4736 (iii).

ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 224 (i).

ARBITRATION *re* PROVINCIAL ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 6275 (iii).

ARMOURIES, CARE OF ARMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3720 (ii).

ARMY AND NAVY, IMPORTS FOR USE: in Com. of Sup., 5084 (iii).

ARNOLDI, J. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on adjnmt., 3129 (ii).

—— REP. *re* BALLOT BOXES: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 201 (i).

—— *See* "PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM." "BALLOT BOXES."

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 953, 1562 (i), 3531 (ii), 6174 (iii).

ARTS AND STATISTICS:

CANAL STATISTICS: Rep. presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 738.

CHICAGO EXHIBITION, INVITATION TO CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1577 (i).

JONES, W. E., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1274 (i).

LABOUR STATISTICS, ESTABLISHMENT OF BUREAU: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lépine*) 201 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).

VOTES ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1881 AND 1891: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).

VOTERS, PROVINCE OF QUE., TOTAL NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2910 (i).

[*See* "AGRICULTURE," "CENSUS," "SUPPLY," &C.]

Assiniboia River. *See* "WINNIPEG."

Atikokan Iron Range Co.'s incorp. B. No. 65 (Mr. *Mackintosh*). 1°*, 333; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 61.)

ATKINSON, J. H. C., APPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier* 124 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1765 (i).

ATLANTIC CATTLE TRADE, REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2148 (ii).

AUDET, A. A., AND COLONIZATION LOTTERY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2154 (ii).

Audit Act. *See* "CONSOLIDATED."

AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i), 6167 (iii).

—— POWERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 391 (i).

—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).

—— *See* "PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM."

Baie des Chaleurs Ry Co.'s B. No. 82 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 524; 2°*, 579; M. for Com., 1761; in Com. and rep., 1764; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to recom., 1957; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to ref. back to Ry. Com., agreed to, 1963; again in Com. and 3°*, 2174(ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 97.)

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5075 (iii).

BAIT ACT, NEWFOUNDLAND, SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 113 (i).

BALLOT BOXES, J. R. ARNOLDI'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 201 (i).

BANCROFT'S TENDER *re* GRAVING DOCK: Amt. (Mr. *Amyot*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4158; neg. (Y. 82, N. 99) 4212 (ii).

BANDMASTER, 69TH BATT., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).

BANFF HOT SPRINGS, SURVEY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5108 (iii).

—— PARK AND RESERVE, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3957 (ii).

BANKING AND COMMERCE COM. *See* "COMMITTEES."

BARBER, MR., CLAIM *re* PAPER CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 269 (i).

BARLEY, TWO-ROWED, DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).

BARRIE P. O., ADVTS. FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Barron*) 2935 (ii).

—— CONTRACTOR'S NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 3255 (ii).

BARTLETT, J. H., WINDING CLOCK, OTTAWA P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 6279 (iii).

BATTELL, WILLIAM, EMPLYMT. AS CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 3952 (ii).

BAYFIELD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 6254 (iii).

BAY OF FUNDY FISHERIES: M. for Ret., &c. (Mr. *Bowers*) 715 (i).

BAY OF QUINTÉ, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).

BEACON HILL PARK (B.C.) MAGAZINE, &c.: M. for Reps., &c.,* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

BEAUDRY, LIEUT.-COL. A., CANCELLATION OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1767 (i).

BEAVERTON DOCK, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 708 (i).

—— CONTRACTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 4575 (iii).

BEDARD, CHAS., REVISING OFFICER FOR NAPIERVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).

Beet-Root Sugar Bounty Provision B. No. 168 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 3427; in Com., 3961 (ii); rep. and 1°* of B., 4300; 2° and in Com., 4466; 3°*, 4534 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BEET-ROOT SUGAR, CULTIVATION AND MANUFACTURE: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 545 (i).

BEHRING SEA SEAL FISHERY, CLOSE SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 959 (i).

—— COST OF EXPERTS: in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iii).

BELLECHASSE ELECTION, GAZETTING MEMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).

—— M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Amyot*) 187 (i).

BELLE CREEK BREAKWATER, P.E.I., REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Walsh*) 1270 (i).

BELLEVILLE HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4572 (iii).

Benevolent Society. *See* "SEPTENNIAL."

BERGERON, MR. J. G. H. Appointment. as Dep. Speaker: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 388 (i).

Berlin and Can. Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. *Trow*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

BERNE COPYRIGHT CONVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1264 (i).

BERNIER, CAPT. J. E., REPS. AGAINST BY L. LANGEVIN: M. for copies* (Mr. *Delisle*) 2935 (ii).

BIG BAY WHARF REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1929 (i).

—— EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 232 (i).

BILLS, DELAY IN PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 238 (i).

Bills of Exchange Act (1890) Amt. B. No. 104 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 954; 2°* and in Com., 1099 (i), 3137; 3°*, 3138 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 1434, 2076 (i), 3208 (ii), 4534, 4613, 6329 (ii).

—— COM. FROM GOV. GEN. SEC.'S OFFICE: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1990 (i), 3098 (ii), 4534, 6309 (ii).

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *John Macdonald.*)
1°*, 5; *pro formâ* (i).

BILL (No. 2) To secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°, 104; 2° m., 747; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 766 (i); in Com., 2936; Order for Com. read, 3287 (ii).

BILL (No. 3) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°, 104 (i).

BILL (No. 4) To amend the Electoral Franchise Act.—(Mr. *Edgar.*)
1°, 105; 2° m., 767; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 771; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 798 (i).

BILL (No. 5) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)
1°, 105; 2° m., 994; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 999 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 6) To prohibit the importation and migration of Foreigners and Aliens under contract or agreement, to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 106; wthdn., 200 (i).

BILL (No. 7) To amend the Militia Act.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 106 (i).

BILL (No. 8) To repeal Chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled an Act respecting the Electoral Franchise, and all amendments thereto.—(Mr. *Cameron, Huron.*)
1°, 106; Order for 2°, 206; 2° m., 295; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 305; agreed to (Y. 112, N. 85) 330; 2° neg. (Y. 113, N. 84) 332 (i).

BILL (No. 9) To amend the Acts respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. *Cameron, Huron.*)
1°, 107 (i); 2° and ref. to Com. on B. 5, 1029; Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 10) Respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States of America.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 108; 2° and in Com., 206; 3°, 232 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)

BILL (No. 11) For the further amendment of the Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases.—(Mr. *Cameron, Huron.*)
1°*, 129 (i); 2°, 2955 (ii).

BILL (No. 12) Further to amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 140; 2°, 1066; in Com., 1067 (i), 3102; 3°*, 3104 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 41.)

BILL (No. 13) To provide for the exercise of Admiralty Jurisdiction within Canada in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 141; 2°, 1093; in Com., 1414, 1731; in Com. and 3°*, 1854 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 29.)

BILL (No. 14) With respect to certain matters affect the Administration of Justice.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 141; 2°* and in Com., 892, 1089; 3°*, 1093 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 28.)

BILL (No. 15) To amend the Act for the prevention and suppression of Combinations in restraint of Trade.—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°, 142 (i); 2° m., 2552; 2°, 2576; in Com., 2577 (ii)

BILL (No. 16) To amend the Acts relating to the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1757 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 77.)

BILL (No. 17) Respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 102.)

BILL (No. 18) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 105.)

BILL (No. 19) Respecting the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°*, 155; 2°, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 103.)

BILL (No. 20) Respecting the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 155; 2°, 189 (i).

BILL (No. 21) To confer certain powers on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with its Telegraph business, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 155; 2°, 189 (i).

BILL (No. 22) Respecting the Lake Temiscamingue Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. *Trow.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 94.)

BILL (No. 23) Respecting the E. B. Eddy Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to the E. B. Eddy Company.—(Mr. *Mackintosh.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 123.)

BILL (No. 24) To incorporate the McKay Milling Company.—(Mr. *Mackintosh.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 125.)

BILL (No. 25) To amend the Act to incorporate the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 79.)

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Pembroke Lumber Company.—(Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds.*)
1°*, 156; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 121.)

BILL (No. 27) To authorize the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company, Limited, to issue debenture stock.—(Mr. *Cockburn.*)
1°*, 156; 2°, 190; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 114.)

BILL (No. 28) To amend the Act to incorporate the *Empire* Printing and Publishing Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Cockburn.*)
1°*, 156; 2°, 191; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 130.)

BILL (No. 29) To incorporate the Montreal and Atlantic Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Ives.*)
1°*, 156; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 68.)

BILL (No. 30) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of J. Spencer Corbin.—(Mr. *Reid.*)
1°*, 156; 2°, 294 (i); M. for Com., 2174; in Com. and 3°*, 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 131.)

BILL (No. 31) To amend the Electoral Franchise Act, Chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 156; 2° m., 999; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 3 m. h., 1001; agreed to, 1003 (i).

BILL (No. 32) Respecting the Criminal Law.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 156 (i).

BILL (No. 33) To amend the North-West Territories Act.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 174 (i).

BILL (No. 34) To amend the Canada Temperance Amendment Act, 1888.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°, 193 (i); Order for 2° read., 2580; 2°, 3288; in Com., 3292 (ii).

BILL (No. 35) In further amendment of the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Lavergne.*)
1°, 193 (i).

BILL (No. 36) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 69.)

BILL (No. 37) To amend the Act respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 99.)

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *McLennan.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 89.)

BILL (No. 39) Respecting the Maritime Chemical Pulp Company, Limited, and to change the name

thereof to the Maritime Sulphite Fibre Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 124.)

BILL (No. 40) Respecting the Farmers' Bank of Rustico.—(Mr. *Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; M. for consdn. after Private Bills, 1101; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 113.)

BILL (No. 41) Respecting the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 126.)

BILL (No. 42) To prevent frauds on Farmers in the sale of Seed Grain and other articles.—(Mr. *Burdett.*)
1°*, 206; 2°, 1003; Order for Com. read, 1014; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1041; in Com., 1972 (i).

BILL (No. 43) Further to amend Chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes, entitled An Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Mc Mullen.*)
1°, 217; 2°, 1029; in Com. and 3°*, 1297 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 21.)

BILL (No. 44) To amend Chapter 77 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 217; 2°*, 1087; in Com., 1088 (i); Order for 3° dschgd., in Com. and 3°*, 3099 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 45) To amend The Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. *Amyot.*)
1°, 217; 2°*, 1030 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 46) Respecting the South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergeron.*)
1°*, 238; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)

BILL (No. 47) To amend an Act to incorporate the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 238; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1199 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 84.)

BILL (No. 48) To incorporate the Western Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg.*)
1°*, 238; 20, 295; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54 55 *Vic.*, *c.* 115.)

BILL (No. 49) To amend Chapter 118 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, known as the Companies' Clauses Act.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)
1°, 238 (i).

BILL (No. 50) To incorporate the Steam-Boiler and Plate Glass Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Hyman.*)
1°*, 266; 2°*, 412; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 118.)

BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Vancouver Dock and Ship-Building Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 266; 2°*, 412; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 129.)

BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Macleod Irrigation Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 266; 2°*, 412 (i); in Com., 2097; 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 109.)

BILL (No. 53) To make Voting compulsory.—(Mr. *Amyot.*)
1°*, 266; 2° m., 1030; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to adjn. deb., 1031; agreed to, 1040 (i).

BILL (No. 54) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Barron*).
1°, 266; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1040 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Atikokan Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mackintosh.*)
1°*, 333; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 56) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 334; 2°*, 413 (i).

BILL (No. 57) To incorporate the Buffalo Lake and Battleford Railway Coal and Iron Company.—(Mr. *Macdowall.*)
1°*, 334; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 59.)

BILL (No. 58) To incorporate the Whirlpool Bridge Company.—(Mr. *German.*)
1°*, 334; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i).

BILL (No. 59) Further to amend the Electoral Franchise Act.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)
1°, 334; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1041 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

BILL (No. 60) respecting the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company and to change the name thereof to the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Denison.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 579; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)

BILL (No. 61) Respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Railway Company.—(Mr. *Carpenter.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 546; in Com. and 3°*, 1964 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 87.)

BILL (No. 62) To enable the Victoria and North American Railway Company to run a Ferry between Becher Bay, in British Columbia, and a point in the Straits of Fuca, within the United States of America.—(Mr. *Earle.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 101.)

BILL (No. 63) Respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hyman.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 547 (i).

BILL (No. 64) Respecting the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Trow.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

BILL (No. 65) Respecting the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergeron.*)
1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 96.)

BILL (No. 66) To confirm a Lease made between the Guelph Junction Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.--(Mr. *Henderson.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 73.)

BILL (No. 67) Respecting the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.—(Mr. *Prior.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 75.)

BILL (No. 68) To amend the Act to incorporate the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Prior.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 76.)

BILL (No. 69) To confirm an Indenture made between the New Brunswick Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 74.)

BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. *German.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 65.)

BILL (No. 71) To incorporate the Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 387 ()).

BILL (No. 72) To incorporate the Peterborough, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 63.)

BILL (No. 73) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 92.)

BILL (No. 74) Further to amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1889.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 71.)

BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 70.)

BILL (No. 76) To amend an Act to authorize and provide for the Winding-up of the Pictou Bank.—(Mr. *McDougald, Pictou.*)
1°*, 388 ; 2°, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 111.)

BILL (No. 77) Respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. *LaRivière.*)
1°*, 441 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com., 1603 ; 3°*, 1957 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 82.)

BILL (No. 78) To confirm an agreement between the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to confer further powers on the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 441 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 72.)

BILL (No. 79) Respecting the Canadian Land and Investment Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 119.)

BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 86.)

BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Order of Canadian Home Circles.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; wthdn., 1760 (i).

BILL (No. 82) Respecting the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; M. for Com., 1761 ; in Com. and rep., 1764 ; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Cockburn*) to recom., 1957 ; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to ref. back to Ry. Com., agreed to, 1963 ; again in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 97.)

BILL (No. 83) Respecting the Septennial Benevolent Society.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 (i).

BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 78.)

BILL (No. 85) Further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 524 ; 2°* and in Com., 1093 (i) ; 3°*, 3100 ; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 3901 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 39.)

BILL (No. 86) To incorporate the Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cochrane.*)
1°*, 548 ; 2°*, 600 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i), (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 64.)

BILL (No. 87) to revive and amend the Charter of the Quebec Bridge Company. -- (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet.*)
1°*, 548 ; 2°*, 982 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 107.)

BILL (No. 88) To incorporate the St. Catharines and Merriton Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°*, 548 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1756 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 104.)

BILL (No. 89) To incorporate the Kingston and Pontiac Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 548 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 66.)

BILL (No. 90) To amend the Act to incorporate the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company,—(Mr. *Cochrane.*)
1°*, 549 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 90.)

BILL (No. 91) To amend the Act to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg.*)
1°*, 549 ; 2°*, 983 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c, 108.)

BILL (No. 92) To incorporate the Anglo-Canadian Electric Storage and Supply Company.—(Mr. *Mackintosh.*)
1°*, 549; 2°*, 983; in Com. and 3°*, 1964 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 128.)

BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Ontario and New York Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 549; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 67.)

BILL (No. 94) Respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 549; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 95.)

BILL (No. 95) Further to amend the Act 36 Vic., Chapter 61, respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 549; 2°*, 1098; in Com. and 3°*, 1099 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 53.)

BILL (No. 96) To confirm a Deed of amalgamation between the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company and the Ottawa, Arnprior and Renfrew Railway Company.—(Mr. *Jamieson.*)
1°*, 600; 2°*, 828; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 93.)

BILL (No. 97) To amend the Acts respecting the granting of a Subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 441; M. for Com., 550; in Com., 558; conc. in and 1° of B., 636; 2° and in Com., 1087; 3°, 1253 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 12.)

BILL (No. 98) Further to amend the Electoral Franchise Act.—(Mr. *Barron.*)
1°, 738 (i).

BILL (No. 99) Respecting the Settlement of Accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and between the said Provinces—(E) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 807; 2°, 1064; in Com. and 3°*, 1065 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 6.)

BILL (No. 100) For the Settlement of certain questions between the Governments of Canada and Ontario, respecting Indian Lands—(A) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 807; 2° and in Com., 1087 (i); 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 101) To amend the Act respecting Trade Marks and Industrial Designs—(F) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 807; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1099 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 35.)

BILL (No. 102) Respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°*, 891; 2°*, 983; in Com., and 3°*, 1963 (i.) (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 120.)

BILL (No. 103) Further to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Barron.*)
1°*, 891 (i); 2° m., 3303 (ii).

BILL (No. 104) To amend the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890—(B) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 954; 2°* and in Com., 1099 (i), 3137; 3°*, 3138 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILL (No. 105) Respecting the Intercolonial Railway. (Mr. *Bowell.*)
1°, 959; 2° m., 1256; 2° and in Com., 1260 (i); 3°*, 3130 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 50.)

BILL (No. 106) To provide for the marking of Deck and Load Lines.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 954; 2°, 1256 (i); in Com., 3583; 3°*, 3899 (ii); Sen. Amt. conc. in, 4773 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 40.)

BILL (No. 107) To incorporate the Burrard Inlet and Westminster Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Corbould.*)
1°*, 1011; 2°*, 1087; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

BILL (No. 108) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 1010 (i); Order for 2° read, 3307 (ii).

BILL (No. 109) To regulate Private Detective, Financial and Commercial Agencies and Corporations.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°*, 1011 (i).

BILL (No. 110) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 1062 (i); 2°, 3307 (ii).

BILL (No. 111) To authorize the transfer of certain Public Property to the Provincial Governments.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 1101 (i); 2°, 3985 (ii); in Com., 5751, 6223; 3°*, 6224 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 112) Further to amend the North-West Territories Representation Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 1101 (i).

BILL (No. 113) To continue the Acts respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank.—(Mr. *McDougald, Pictou.*)
M. (Mr. *Foster*) to introd., 1103; wthdn. and 1°, 1105; 2°*, Rule suspended and B. in Com., 1297; 3°*, 1298 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 112.)

BILL (No. 114) For better securing the Safety of certain Fishermen—(G) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°*, 1406 (i).

BILL (No. 115) To amend the Act respecting Government Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°*, 1263 (i); 2° and in Com., 3104; 3°*, 3105 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 52.)

BILL (No. 116) Further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
Res. prop., 1221; in Com., 1253 (i), 4001 (ii); conc. in and ref. to Com. on B., 4299 (ii); 1°* of B., 1345 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3242, 3579; Order for 3° dschgd., 4008 (iii); again in Com., 4299; 3°*, 4465 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 46.)

BILL (No. 117) Further to amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 1345 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3646, 3902; 3°*, 3902 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)

BILL (No. 118) Respecting the Citizens' Insurance Company—(H) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga.*)
1°*, 1403 ; 2°*, 1434 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2465 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 116.)

BILL (No. 119) Respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
Res. prop., 549 ; Order for Com. read, 1253 ; in Com., 1347 ; conc. in and 1°* of B., 1414 ; 2° m., 1994 (i) ; 2°* and in Com., 2205 ; Amts. conc. in and 3°*, 2289 ; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 3984 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 81.)

BILL (No. 120) Respecting the Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company.—(Mr. *Skinner.*)
1°*, 1483 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 100.)

BILL (No. 121) To amend an Act to incorporate the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 1483 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 106.)

BILL (No. 122) To further amend the Fisheries Act Chap. 95 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 1483 (i) ; 2°* and in Com., 3157 ; 3° m., 3237 ; 3° on a div., 3242 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

BILL (No. 123) To revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Oshawa Railway and Navigation Company, and to change the name thereof to the Oshawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Madill.*)
1°*, 1574 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 91.)

BILL (No. 124) Further to amend an Act to incorporate the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 1574 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 98.)

BILL (No. 125) To incorporate the Rocky Mountain Railway and Coal Company—(M) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Ross, Lisgar.*)
1°*, 1757 ; M. for 2°, 1848 ; 2°*, 1964 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)

BILL (No. 126) To amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°, 1760 (i) ; 2° m., 3902 ; 2° and in Com., 3925, 4297 (ii) ; 3°*, 4299 ; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 6228 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 22.)

BILL (No. 127) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1891, and the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. in Com., rep. conc. in, 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 1853 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 128) To incorporate the Incorporated Construction Company—(L) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 1927 (i) ; 2°*, 2097 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 127.)

BILL (No. 129) To incorporate the Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Railway Company—(Q) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Darin.*)
1°*, 1964 (i) ; 2°*, 2097 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)

BILL (No. 130) To incorporate the Chatsworth, Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Railway Company—(N) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *McNeill.*)
1°*, 1927 ; 2° m., 1989 (i) ; 2°*, 2097 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 62.)

BILL (No. 131) For the relief of Adam Russworm (C) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 1927 (i) ; 2° on a div., 2174 ; in Com., and 3° agreed to (Y. 89, N. 23) 2549 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 134.)

BILL (No. 132) For the relief of Mahala Ellis—(I) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 1926 ; 2° m., 1989 (i) ; 2° on a div., 2175 ; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 133.)

BILL (No. 133) For the relief of Thomas Bristow—(J) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *O'Brien.*)
1°*, 1927 (i) ; 2° on a div., 2175 ; M. for Com., 2550 ; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 132.)

BILL (No. 134) For the relief of Isabel Tapley—(K) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1°*, 1927 (i) ; 2° on a div., 2175 ; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 135.)

BILL (No. 135) Further to amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Moncrieff.*)
1°*, 1989 (i) ; 2°*, 2097 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2859 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 117.)

BILL (No. 136) To incorporate the Inverness Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Wilmot.*)
1°*, 1989 (i) ; 2°*. 2321 ; M. for Com., 2858 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2859 (ii).

BILL (No. 137) To amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 1989 (i) ; 2°* and in Com., 3236 ; 3°*, 3237 (ii.) (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 138) To amend Chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Supreme and Exchequer Courts.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 1990 (i) ; 2°, 3584 ; in Com., 3588 ; 3° m., 3649 ; 3°*, 3984 (ii) ; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 5079 ; conc. in, 5590 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 139) In further amendment of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 2140 (i).

BILL (No. 140) In restraint of Fraudulent Marking.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 2144 ; 2°* and in Com., 3583 ; 3°*, 3646 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 141) To amend the Copyright Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2144 ; 2°* in Com. and 3°, 3244 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 142) To amend the Patent Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2144; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3244 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)

BILL (No. 143) Respecting certain Female Offenders in the Province of Nova Scotia—(R) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 2203; 2°* and in Com., 3595 (ii); 3°*, 5139 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 55.)

BILL (No. 144) Further to amend the Indian Act, Chapter 43 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°, 2203; 2°* and in Com., 3590; 3°*, 3593 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 30.)

BILL (No. 145) Further to amend the Electoral Franchise Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2336; 2°* and in Com., 3082; 3°*, 3098 (ii) (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

BILL (No. 146) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2337; 2°* and in Com., 3244 (ii), 5139, 5196; Order for 3° dschgd. and recom., 5544; 3° m., 5556; recom. and 3°, 5587 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 19.)

BILL (No. 147) Further to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2337; 2°*, 3649; in Com., 3649 (ii), 5352, 5374, 5594, 5727, 6224; 3°*, 6226 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 20.)

BILL (No. 148) Further to amend the North-West Territories Representation Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 2373; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3157 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 56.)

BILL (No. 149) Respecting the Inspection of Ships.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 2666; 2°* and in Com., 3600, 4310 (ii); M. to conc. in Amts. made in Com. of Whole, 4466; conc. in and 3°*, 4467 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 37.)

BILL (No. 150) To amend the Acts respecting the Harbour of Pictou, in Nova Scotia.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 2667; 2° and in Com., 3594; 3°*, 3961 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 54.)

BILL (No. 151) Respecting the Ontario Express and Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
Rules, &c., suspended and 1° of B., 2905; 2° m., 3230; 2°, 3593 (ii); in Com. and 3°*, 4256 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 110.)

BILL (No. 152) To amend Chapter 96 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, to encourage the development of the Sea Fisheries and the building of Fishing Vessels.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 549; in Com., 1095 (i); conc. in and 1°* of B., 3100; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3593 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 153) Further to amend Chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
Res. prop., 1849 (i); in Com., 3100; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3102; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3157 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 27.)

BILL (No. 154) Respecting the Shipping of Live Stock.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 1200 (i); in Com., conc. in and 1° of B., 3130; 2°, 3991; in Com., 3992; 3°*, 3995 (ii); Sen. Amt. conc. in, 4772 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 155) To amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 1221; in Com., 1253 (i); consdn. of Res., 3201; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3236 (ii); 2°, 4829; in Com., 5139; 3° m., 5284; Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 5284; neg. (Y. 78, N. 102) 5334; 3°, 5335 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 45.)

BILL (No. 156) Further to amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 3254; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3649 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 44.)

BILL (No. 157) To amend the Petroleum Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 3462; 2°* and in Com., 3648; 3°*, 3649 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 49.)

BILL (No. 158) to authorize the Sale of the Carleton, City of Saint John, Branch Railroad.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 1413; M. for Com., 1992; in Com., 1993 (i); conc. in and 1°* of B., 3579; 2°* and in Com., 3899; 3°*, 3961 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)

BILL (No. 159) To make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-West.—(Sir *Adolphe Caron.*)
Res. prop., 634 (i); in Com. 3105; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3582; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3902 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

BILL (No. 160) To authorize the conveyance to the Quebec Skating Club of certain Lands in the City of Quebec.—(Sir *John Thompson*).
Res. prop., 891 (i); in Com. 3584; 1°* of B., 3649; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3984 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

BILL (No. 161) In relation to the unlawful disinterment of dead bodies—(P) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 4825 (iii).

BILL (No. 162) To correct a clerical error in the Act 53 Victoria, Chapter 81, respecting the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 3950 (ii); 2°* in Com. and 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 80.)

BILL (No. 163) Further to amend the General Inspection Act—(S) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 3983 (ii); 2°* and in Com., 4300; 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 48.)

BILL (No. 164) To make further provision respecting Weighers of Grain—(T) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 3983 (ii); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 47.)

BILL (No. 165) To further amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)

1°, 3995; 2° m., 5762; 2° and in Com., 5770 6226; 3°*, 6228. (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 166) Respecting the Reckoning of Time.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 4237 (iii).

BILL (No. 167) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 4297; 2°* and 3°*, 4373 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 2.)

BILL (No. 168) To encourage the production of Beet Reet Sugar.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 3427; in Com., 3961 (ii); rep. and 1°* of B., 4300; 2° and in Com., 4466 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 169) Further to amend the Act 52 Victoria, Chapter 4, to authorize the granting of Subsidies in Land to Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
Res. prop., 1200 (i); in Com., 3138 (ii); recom., 4307; rep. and 1°* of B., 4309; 2°, 4534; in Com., 4609, 5538; 3°*, 5590 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 9.)

BILL (No. 170) Respecting the North Shore section of the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
Res. prop., 3577 (ii); in Com., 4748; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4829; 2°* and in Com., 5081; 3° m., 5410; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to recom., 5410; neg. on a div. and 3°, 5411 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 171) Respecting the Rathbun Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
Rules 49 and 51 suspended, 5012; 1°* of B., 5013; 2°*, 5075; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5374 (iii) (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 122.)

BILL (No. 172) Respecting Frauds upon the Government—(U) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 5589; 2°, 5751; in Com., 6289, 6327; 3°*, 6327 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

BILL (No. 173) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in Land to certain Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
Res. prop., 3308 (iii); in Com., 5487, 5593, 5607; conc. in and 1°* of B., 5727; 2° m., 6130; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 6134 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)

BILL (No. 174) To amend Chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes respecting the Militia and Defence.—(Sir *Adolphe Caron.*)
1°, 6126 (iii).

BILL (No. 175) To authorize the payment of Subsidies in aid of the construction of lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Bowell.*)
Res. prop., 6032; in Com., 6135; conc. in and 1° of B., 6142; 2°* and in Com., 6185, 6217; 3°*, 6223 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)

BILL (No. 176) To amend the Railway Acts.—(Mr. *Bowell.*)
1°, 6286; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 6287 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

BILL (No. 177) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. in Com., rep., conc. in, 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 6307, (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 178) To further amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°, 6307; 2°, 6326 (iii).

BINDING TWINE AND FREE LIST: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1771; neg. (Y. 80, N. 100) 1847 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Grieve*) 1774; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1776; (Mr. *Casey*) 1779; (Mr. *McMillan*) 1781; Mr. *Wallace*) 1783; (Mr. *Watson*) 1784; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1787; (Mr. *Bain*) 1790; (Mr. *Stairs*) 1795; (Mr. *Fairbairn*) 1799; (Mr. *Rowand*) 1799; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1801: (Mr. *McNeill*) 1802; (Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds*) 1805; (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 1806; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1807; (Mr. *Daly*) 1808; (Mr. *Bowell*) 1811; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1818; (Mr. *Davin*) 1821; (Mr. *Welsh*) 1824; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1825; (Mr. *Foster*) 1828; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1835; (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 1842 (i).

BLACK RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, ARTHABASKA CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 740 (i).

—— DRUMMOND CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 739 (i).

"BLIZZARD," SCHOONER, RESCUE OF CREW: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).

—— REWARDS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).

Body Snatching. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."

BOISVERT, GEO., APPMNT. AS FISHERY OFFICER, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leduc*) 2935 (ii).

BONAVENTURE PIER, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 335 (i).

BONDING OF FOREIGN FISH: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 1265 (i).

BOUCHERVILLE WHARF, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1265 (i).

BOUCHIER, GEO. L., AND CAPT. GIGUERE, REP. *re* DREDGING ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

BOURGEOIS, DR. G. A., P. O. INSPECTOR, RETIREMENT: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2935 (ii).

BOUNTIES, FISHERY, PAID IN GUYSBOROUGH CO.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).

—— PAID IN QUEEN'S, N.S.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 734 (i).

BOUNTY CHEQUES, FISHERY, COSTS, &C., *re* DISTRIBUTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Flint*) 180 (i).

—— BY PROVINCES, &C., &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 537 (i).

—— CHEQUES, DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 129 (i).

—— PAYMENTS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 211 (i).

BOUNTY ON PRODUCTION, &C., OF MAPLE SUGAR: Ques. (Mr. *Godbout*) 1576 (i).

BOURINOT, J. G., Commissioner to Administer Oaths, 1 (i).

BRAE BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208, 1274 (i).

BRAMPTON POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 3259 (ii).

BRANDON "MAIL" IN PUBLIC DEPTS., NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3257 (ii).

BRANDON P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 4429, 5348 (iii).

BRANTFORD DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 4362 (iii).

BREAKWATERS, GUYSBOROUGH CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).

——— P.E.I., IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

——— WHARFAGE DUES, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).

BREMNER'S CLAIM FOR FURS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1268 (i).

BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2912 (ii).

——— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).

——— M. for Engineer's Rep. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1053 (i).

——— M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 104 (i).

Bridge Companies. *See* "MONTREAL AND QUEBEC."

BRIGADE MAJORS' SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii).

BRIGHT, J. B., EMPLYMNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 3263 (ii).

Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 387 (i).

——— **B. No. 86** (Mr. *Cochrane*). 1°*, 548; 2°*, 600; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 64.)

Bristow, Thomas. *See* "DIVORCE."

B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 56 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 334; 2°*, 413 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

ADJUTANT GEN. (DEP.) MIL. DIST. NO. 11: M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

B. C. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4294 (iii).

BEACON HILL PARK MAGAZINE, &C.: M. for Reps., &c.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

BEHRING'S SEA SEAL FISHERY, CLOSE SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 9594i).

——— SEALERS CAPTURED BY RUSSIANS: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 5554 (iii).

——— COST OF EXPERTS: in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iii).

BURRARD INLET SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

"C" BATTERY SERVICES AT WELLINGTON: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).

CHINESE IMMIGRATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 1578 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 5056; conc., 5419 (iii).

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, TENDERS FOR CAISSON, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i).

——— REP. *re* LENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 530 (i).

——— SUMS PAID ON ACCT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).

——— TENDERS, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1937 (i).

LARKIN, CONNOLLY & CO., *re* ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).

MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY INTO B.C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 965 (i).

NELSON, P.O., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2521 (ii).

PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 919 (i).

RAILWAY LANDS, VANCOUVER ISLAND, REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Continued.*

TENDER FOR CAISSON, ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i).

VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. RESERVE, REPS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

VICTORIA DRILL HALL, for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736(i).

WELLINGTON, MILITARY AID TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).

——— MILITIA, PAYMENTS FOR ACTIVE SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 2146 (ii).

[*See* "P.O.," "PUB. WORKS," "SUPPLY," &C.]

BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6185 (iii).

BROWN, MR. ADAM, HONORARIUM: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iii).

BRUCE COUNTY INDIANS, SALE OF LIQUOR TO: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530, 1272 (i).

BRYDGES, LATE C. J., AND NORTH SASKATCHEWAN IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).

BUCKINGHAM P.O., CONSTRUCTION: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).

BUDGET, THE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on adjmnt., 738, 953 (i).

——— Annual Stmnt. (Mr. *Foster*) 1200 (i).

——— Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1224 i).

——— *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."

Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 70 (Mr. *German*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*., 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 65.)

Buffalo Lake and Battleford Ry., Coal and Iron Co.'s incorp. B. No. 57 (Mr. *Macdowall*). 1°*, 334; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 59.)

BUREAU OF LABOUR STATISTICS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lépine*) 201 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).

BURRARD INLET SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

Burrard Inlet and Westminster Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 107 (Mr. *Corbould*). 1°*, 1011; 2°*, 1087; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*, &c.) 109 (i)

——— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 711 (i).

——— *See* "GOVT. BUSINESS."

CABLEGRAMS, REUTER'S AGENCY, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4296 (iii).

CAÇOUNA, TIMBER FOR WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158 (i).

CALEDONIA DAM, GRAND RIVER, RECONSTRUCTION M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).

——— DRILL SHED, REPAIRS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).

CALGARY AND EDMONTON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3255 (ii).

——— AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3256 (i).

CAMILLA AND WHITTINGTON MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2151 (ii).

CAMP AT ST. JOHN AND SOREL, PAY ROLL: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lépine*) 1062 (i).

CAMP, MILITARY DISTRICT No. 1 : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Hyman*) 231 (i).

CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4700, 5349 (iii).

—— P. O., INVERNESS CO., ESTABLISHMENT, PETS., &c. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 544 (i).

CAN. ATLANTIC RY. CO., FUNERAL TRAIN : in Com. of Sup., 6276 (iii).

"CANADA GAZETTE" : conc., 5417 (iii).

Can. and Michigan Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 19 (Mr. *Montague*). 1°*, 155 ; 2°, 189 ; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 103.)

Can. Temp. Act (1888) Amt. B. No. 34 (Mr. *Flint*). 1°, 193 (i) ; Order for 2° read, 2580 ; 2°, 3288 ; in Com., 3292 (ii).

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. No. 35 (Mr. *Laveryne*). 1°, 193 (i).

CAN. TEMP. ACT : in Com. of Sup., 5086 ; conc., 5426 (iii).

CANADIANS (DISTRESSED) ABROAD, RELIEF : Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 2149 (i).

Can. Land and Investment Co.'s B. No. 79 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 119.)

Can. Order of Home Circles B. No. 81 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 524 ; 2°*, 579 ; wthdn., 1760 (i).

C.P.R. Co.'s Act (1889) Amt. B. No. 74 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 71.)

C.P.R. Co.'s B. No. 75 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)

C.P.R. Co.'s Telegraphs B. No. 21 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 155 ; 2°, 189 (i).

C.P.R.—Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s Lease B. No. 66 (Mr. *Henderson*). 1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 73.)

C.P.R.—New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. No. 69 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 74.)

C.P.R.—North Shore Ry. Debentures B. No. 170 (Sir *John Thompson*). Res. prop., 3577 (ii) ; in Com., 4748 ; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4829 ; 2°* and in Com., 5081 ; 3° m., 5410 ; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to recom., 5410 ; neg. on a div. and 3°, 5411 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 11.)

C. P. R.—Shuswap and Okanagon Ry. Co.'s Agreement B. No. 78 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 441 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 72.)

C.P.R. Co.'s ADDITIONAL LAND SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3308 (ii).

—— ARBITRATORS' AWARD : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6129 (iii).

—— CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup. 1652 (i), 3821 (ii).

—— MAIL SERVICE, 1890-91 : in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i).

C.P.R., SECTION "B" CONTRACT, CHARGES AGAINST P. M. G. : Notice of Stmnt., 5852 (iii).

—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5942 ; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 5945 ; agreed to (Y. 102, N. 78) 5997 (iii).

Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 5954 ; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 5958 ; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 5962 ; (Mr. *Skinner*) 5967 ; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5971 ; (Mr. *Casey*) 5975 ; (Mr. *Girouard*) 5984 ; (Mr. *Edgar*) 5989 ; (Mr. *Lister*) 5993 (iii).

—— Statutory Declaration read (Mr. *Haggart*) 6127 (iii).

—— SOURIS BRANCH, O. C.'s GRANTING AID : M. for copies* (Mr. *Daly*) 1938 (i).

Can. Power Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. *Montague*). 1°*, 206 ; 2°*, 220 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 126.)

CAN. SEALERS, CAPTURED BY RUSSIAN AUTHORITIES : Remarks (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 5554 (iii).

CAN., WEST INDIAN AND SOUTH AMERICAN SS. CO., SUBSIDIES : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 544.

CANALS :

CANAL CONTRACTS, ENLARGEMENT OR CONSTRUCTION : M. for copies (Mr. *Trow*) 1938 (i).

CANAL (NEW) NORTH SHORE OF ST. LAWRENCE : Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*) 175 (i).

CANAL STATISTICS : presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 738 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL, CONTRACT FOR SPREADING STONE : Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3959 (ii).

In Com. of Sup., 1665 (i), 4102, 4145, 5210, 5222, 6198.

LACHINE CANAL, SPECIFICATIONS, TENDERS, &c., *re* DRAIN : M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2157 (ii).

MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL, THOS. MUNRO'S REP. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1579 (i).

MURRAY CANAL, OFFICIALS EMPLOYED : Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 4675 (iii).

RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, TENDERS, &c. : M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Murray*) 544 (i).

RIDEAU CANAL, DAMAGES TO LAND : Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3618 (ii).

—— KINGSTON AND JONES' FALLS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 711 (i).

—— ORDNANCE LANDS, SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).

—— RESERVE, LOTS OCCUPIED BY JOHN HENEY : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4296 (iii).

—— TOLLS COLLECTED AND REFUNDED : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4675 (iii).

ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, DEEPENING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1927 (i).

SOULANGES CANAL, EXPENDITURE, REPS., &c. : M. for Stmnt., &c. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 532 (i).

—— ENGINEER'S REPS. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Mousseau*) 1578 (i).

TAY CANAL, BASIN AT PERTH, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 4672 (iii).

—— CONSTRUCTION : on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) 3738 ; neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779 (ii).

—— NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉS : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3617 (ii).

—— TENDERS FOR EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3261, 3952, 3956 (ii).

—— VESSELS PASSED THROUGH, NUMBER : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3259 (ii).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL, COMMISSIONER'S REP. : Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 194, 550 (i).

CANALS—*Continued.*
TRENT VALLEY CANAL, COST OF LOCKS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1929 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4467, 4773 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) on adjnmt., 214 (i).
WELLAND CANAL EMPLOYES, EXTRA : M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *German*) 229, 3200 (ii).
—— TURNING BASIN : Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 270 (i).
—— USE OF SURPLUS WATER : M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Gibson*) 963 (i).
[*See* "PUBLIC WORKS," "SUPPLY."]
CANSO, ARICHAT, &c., AND PORT MULGRAVE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4702.
CAOUETTE, J. B., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c. : M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544 (i).
CAPE BRETON AND N. S. RY. ACCOMMODATION : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).
CAPE BRETON RY., CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT : in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i), 3898 (ii).
—— STATION MASTERS' DUTIES : Ques. (Mr. *Mc Dougall*) 4677 (iii).
CAPE TRAVERSE WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 1758 (i).
CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 4522.
CARAQUET RY., RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3614 (ii).
CARILLON AND GRENVILLE CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 4150 (ii), 5222 (iii).
CARLETON BRANCH RY., PAPER *re* SALE : Mess. from His Ex., 550 (i).
Carleton Branch Ry. Sale B. No. 158 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 1413 ; M. for Com., 1992 ; in Com., 1993 (i) ; Res. conc. in and 1°*, of B., 3579 ; 2°*, and in Com., 3899 ; 3°*, 3961 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)
CARLETON PLACE P.O. : in Com. of Sup., 4362 (iii).
CARON, MISS LEA, INDEMNITY FOR ACCIDENT : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 209 (i).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765, 2151 (i).
CASE, H. N., LATE POSTMASTER AT HAMILTON : in Com. of Sup., 6279 (iii).
CATTLE DISEASES AND SHEEP SCAB : in Com. of Sup., 5336 ; conc., 5435 (iii).
—— EXPORT TRADE OF CANADA : Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on adjnmt., 737 (i).
—— FROM U.S., FREE ENTRY : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 129 (i).
—— QUARANTINE REGULATIONS : Remarks (Mr. *Bowell*) 806 (i).
—— conc., 5435 (iii).
—— SHIPPING LIVE STOCK : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 957 (i),
—— **Shipping.** *See* "LIVE STOCK."
—— TRADE (ATLANTIC) REGULATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2148 (i).
—— VESSELS AND STEAM FANS : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1275 (i).
—— *See* "AMERICAN."
CAVALRY SCHOOL, TORONTO : Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 222 (i).
CAVALRY, 1ST REGT. : Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
"C" BATTERY (B.C.) BARRACKS : M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
—— SERVICES AT WELLINGTON, B. C. : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).
CEMENT PURCHASES BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2521 (ii) ; (Mr. *Forbes*) 4674 (iii).
CENSUS, THE : Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com. of Sup. 4829 ; neg. (Y. 81, N. 103) 5010 (iii).
Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 4845 ; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4858 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4875 ; (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4885 ; (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 4898 ; (Mr. *Amyot*) 4929 ; (Mr. *Dupont*) 4953 ; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4963 ; (Mr. *Craig*) 4979 ; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4983 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4992 ; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 5001 (iii).
—— COMMISSIONER JONES : Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1274 (i).
—— 1881 AND 1891, VOTES ACCORDING TO POPULATION, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).
—— RETURNS : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 130 (i), 4465, 4534 (iii).
—— (Mr. *Casey*) 3999 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i), 3531 (ii).
—— *See* "AGRICULTURE," "IMMIGRATION."
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *McLennan*). 1°*, 206 ; 2°*, 220 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)
CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM, BULLETINS, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 1579 (i).
—— ENTIRE HORSES : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Mc Millan*) 1579 (i).
—— EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1576 (i).
CENTREVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER, REP. *re* REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 962 (i).
Certificates. *See* "MASTERS AND MATES."
CHAMBLY CANAL, CONTRACT FOR SPREADING STONE : Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3959 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 4146 (ii), 6200 (iii).
CHAPLEAU, ST. O., Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 1 (i)
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 1748 (i)
CHARLEBOIS & CO., AMOUNT PAID ON LANGEVIN BLOCK : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1575 (i).
CHATHAM P O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3951 (ii).
—— N. B., in Com. of Sup., 4331 (iii).
Chatsworth, Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 130 (Mr. *McNeill*). 1°*, 1927 ; 2° m., 1989 (i) ; 2°*, 2097 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 62.)
CHAUDIÈRE RENTS, COLLECTION : in Com. of Sup., 1728 (i).
CHEESE (AMERICAN) SHIPPED THROUGH CANADA : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Marshall*) 205 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 114 (i).
CHEVALIER, DR. E. N., DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Bechard*) 527 (i).
CHICAGO EXHIBITION, INVITATION TO CANADA : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1577 (i).
CHICOUTIMI ELECTION RETURN : Ques. (Mr. *Savard*) 142 (i).

CHICOUTIMI REPRESENTATION, RET. OFFICER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 7 (i).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s (Subsidy) Acts Amt. B. No. 97 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 441; M. for Com., 550; in Com., 558; conc. in and 1° of B., 636; 2° and in Com., 1087; 3°, 1253 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 12.)

CHINESE IMMIGRATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 1578 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 5056; conc., 5419 (iii).

CHIPPEWA INDIANS, LETTER TO SIR JOHN MACDONALD *re* IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3264.

CIGARS AND TOBACCO, LAW *re* CULTIVATION: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).

Citizens' Ins. Co.'s B. No. 118 (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*). 1°*, 1403; 2°*, 1434 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2465 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 116.)

CITY MARKET HALIFAX, PROPERTY, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1770 (i).

CIVIL GOVERNMENT: in Com. of Sup., 240, 397, 1544, 1732 (i), 6166 (iii).

CIVIL SERVICE, DEPTL. PAY SHEETS: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 2520, 2906 (ii).

——— EXAMINERS' REP.: Presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS AND ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 221 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1765 (i).

——— RECESS FOR LUNCH, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3258 (ii).

CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: in Com. of Sup., 6172.

CLOTHING AND GREAT COATS, MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 3700 (ii).

——— MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 4822; conc., 5416 (iii).

COATICOOK P. O., COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 6216 (iii).

COBOURG HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4559 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Hargraft*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5335 (ii).

Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 90 (Mr. *Cochrane*). 1°*, 549; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 90.)

COBOURG P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4363 (iii).

COCKBURN ISLAND LOCATION TICKETS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1271 (i).

COLLECTION OF REVENUES. *See* "SUPPLY."

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS, PAYMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 5137 (iii).

Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt B. No. 47 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 238; 2°*, 294; in Com and 3°*, 1199 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 84.)

Colonial Courts. *See* "ADMIRALTY."

Combinations. *See* "TRADE."

Commercial Agencies. *See* "PRIVATE DETECTIVE."

COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5108; conc., 5427 (iii).

COMMERCIAL TREATY, ENGLAND AND FRANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3950 (ii), 4670 (iii).

COMMITTEES:

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION: List of Members, 139 (i).

BANKING AND COMMERCE: List of Members, 139 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Bowell*) 7 (i).

——— 1ST REP.: presented (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 1200 (i).

——— 2ND REP.: presented (Mr. *Desjardins*) 548 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to conc., 632 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *Desjardins*) to conc., 1407 (i).

——— 3RD REP.: presented (Mr. *Desjardins*) 2289.

——— 4TH REP.: Translators, &c.: M. (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) to conc., 5941, 6286 (iii).

EXPIRING LAWS: List of Members, 136 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 156 (i).

NORTHUMBERLAND, EAST. *See* general heading.

PRINTING: List of Members, 138 (i).

——— JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 156 (i).

——— 9TH AND 10TH REPS.: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to conc., 6286 (iii).

PRIVATE BILLS, MISCELLANEOUS: List of Members, 137 (i).

——— *See* general heading.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: List of Members, 135.

——— *See* general heading and "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS."

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: List of Members, 138 (i).

——— *See* general heading.

SELECT STANDING: prop. M. (Sir *John Macdonald*) 6 (i).

——— REP. presented (Sir *John Macdonald*) 135 (i).

——— SUBSTITUTION OF NAMES: M. (Mr. *Bowell*) 237 (i).

STANDING ORDERS: List of Members, 138 (i).

Companies' Clauses Act (*Chap.* 118, *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 49** (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°, 238 (i).

Compulsory Voting B. No. 53 (Mr. *Amyot*). 1°*, 266; 2° m., 1030; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to adjn. deb., 1031 (i).

CONCURRENCE, 1758 (i), 5411, 6303 (iii).

CONNOLLY, M., BOOKS OF FIRM: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to produce, 906 (i).

——— ORDER TO ATTEND AT BAR OF HOUSE: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 806 (i).

——— ORDER FOR ATTENDANCE AT BAR: postponed, 891; in attendance, and Rep. of Sub. Com. on Priv. and Elec. read, 895 (i).

CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135, 213 (i).

Consolidated Revenue and Audit Acts Amt. B. No. 137 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 1989 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3237 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 16.)

——— **B. No. 139** (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 2140 (i).

Construction Company. *See* "INCORPORATED."

CONTINGENCIES, DEPTL.: in Com. of Sup., 431, 1544, 1732 (i), 6167 (iii).

CONTRACTS. *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT."

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, TIME LIMIT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).
——— HALTON: Judgment, 5 (i).

Controverted Elections. *See* "DOMINION."

Copyright Act Amt B. No. 141 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2144; 2°*, in Com., and 3°, 3244 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

COPYRIGHT ACT (1889) ENFORCEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 335 (i).
——— ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) conc. in, 6287 (iii).
——— BERNE CONVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1264.
——— IMPERIAL LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4674 (iii).
——— LAWS OF CAN.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Edgar*) 726.
——— Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5014 (ii).

Corbin, J. Spencer, Patent Relief B. No. 30 (Mr. *Reid*). 1°*, 156; 2°, 294 (i); M. for Com., 2174; in Com. and 3°*, 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 131.)

CORN MEAL, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 143 (i).
CORNWALLIS VALLEY RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2153 (ii).
COSGROVE, JOHN, RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).
COSTELLO, M., MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5406 (iii).
COTEAU LANDING WHARF AND SHEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 222 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4557 (iii).
COTTON SAIL DUCK, IMPORTS AT HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 142 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 174 (i).
COUNSEL, TARTE-MCGREEVY ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1575 (i).
COUNTRY SAVINGS BANKS, N.B., N.S., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1748 (i).
COWAN, THOS., POSTMASTER AT GALT: Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).
CULLERS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i), 5159.

CUSTOMS:
ALBINO POINT CUSTOMS OFFICER: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *German*) 1579 (i).
ANNAPOLIS ROYAL CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 270 (i).
CATTLE FROM U. S., FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 129 (i), 5776 (iii).
——— IMPORTS FOR SLAUGHTER: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).
——— *See* "AMERICAN."
CHEESE (AMERICAN) SHIPPED THROUGH CAN.; Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 114 (i).
——— M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Marshall*) 205 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 1578 (i).
CORN MEAL, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 143.
COSTELLO, MICHAEL, MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5406 (iii).
COTTON SAIL DUCK, IMPORTS AT HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 142 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 174 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Continued.*
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135 (i).
EXPORT CATTLE TRADE, REP. OF EVIDENCE: Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
FISH, BONDING OF FOREIGN: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 1265 (i).
FOWL, WILD, PROHIBITION OF EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. *McKay*) 1769 (i).
GRANITE, SCOTCH, INCREASE OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 335 (i).
GUYSBOROUGH CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2524 (ii).
IRON BOUNTIES PAID, ENQUIRY FOR RET. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2580, 2668 (ii).
JOHNSTON, SAML., DISMISSAL FROM CUSTOMS SERVICE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *German*) 2935 (ii).
LIQUOR, ILLEGAL SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 208, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).
MCRAE, JAMES, DISMISSAL AS PREVENTIVE OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).
MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY INTO B.C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 965 (i).
——— IMPORTATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4099 (ii).
MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3275 (ii).
——— IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii), 4675 (iii).
——— SUPERANNUATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3616 (ii).
PELÉE ISLAND, SUB-COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i).
——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).
PLATE PRESENTED TO MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS, DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2912 (ii).
POLSON MANUFACTURING CO., IMPORTS OF STEEL PLATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 270 (i).
POTATOES EXPORTED FROM CANADA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 544 (i).
POWNAL BAY PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).
ROBITAILLE, C. N., PAYMENT FROM CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4673 (iii).
SEIZURES, ILLEGAL: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2520 (ii).
SMUGGLING IN QUEBEC, SUITS, JUDGMENTS, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Delisle*) 1062 (i).
STEEL PLATES, &c., FREE IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 270 (i).
SUGAR (RAW) IN BOND: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 740.
SUGAR DUTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1931 (ii).
——— *See* "CUSTOMS ACT AMT. B."
WALKERTON, CUSTOMS SEIZURES, SHARE OF CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3268, 3959 (ii).
——— SEIZURE OF IRON BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3619 (ii).
——— SUB-COLLECTOR, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266 (ii).
WILD FOWL, PROHIBITION OF EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. *McKay*) 1769 (i).

[*See* "TARIFF," "SUPPLY," "WAYS AND MEANS," &c.]

Customs Acts Amt. B. No. 155 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 1221; in Com., 1253 (i); consdn. of Res., 3201; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3236 (ii); 2°, 4829; in Com., 5139; 3° m., 5284; Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) Sugar Duties, 5284; neg. (Y. 78, N. 102) 5334; 3°, 5335 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 45.)

Customs Acts Amt. B. No. 156 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 3254; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3649 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 44.)

CRIBBIN'S POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4530 (iii).

Criminal Law Amt. B. No. 32 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 156 (i).

Criminal Law Amt. (Body Snatching) B. No. 161 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 4825 (iii).

Criminal Law Amt. (Evidence in Criminal Cases) B. No. 11 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 129 (i); 2°, 2955 (ii).

CRIMINAL LAW BILL, PAYMENT FOR DRAFTING: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3260 (ii).

CROSS POINT AND GASPÉ BASIN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).

—— AND PASPEBIAC MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).

CROWN TIMBER AGENT, NEW WESTMINSTER: in Com. of Sup., 5189 (iii).

"CRUISER," MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1714, 1721 (i).

CRYSTAL BEACH AND POINT ALBINO CUSTOMS OFFICERS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *German*) 1579 (i).

DAIRYING INTERESTS AND EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i), 3574 (ii), 6174 (iii).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL, PUBLICATION: in Com. of Sup., 942 (i).

—— *See* "COMMITTEES."

DEBENTURES, NORTH SHORE RY.: M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 974; deb. resmd., 1014 (i).

—— *See* "NORTH SHORE RY."

Deck and Load Lines Provision B. No. 106 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 954; 2°, 1256 (i); in Com., 3583; 3°*, 3899 (ii); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4773 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 40.)

DECK LOADS, REP. OF EVIDENCE: presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).

DEPTL. PAY SHEETS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2520, 2906 (ii).

DESMARTEAU'S, JOS., CLAIM, PET. OF RIGHT: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2155 (ii).

Detective Corporations. *See* "PRIVATE."

DETECTIVE (CUSTOMS) SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5053.

DIGBY, NEW PIER AT RAQUETTE: in Com. of Sup., 4532 (iii).

DIGBY, N.S., POSTAL ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1264 (i).

DINGMAN, INDIAN INSPECTOR, ENQUIRY *re* AGENT ALLEN: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766 (i).

DINGWELL, J., PROF. SERVICES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1559 (i).

DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. ACT *re* DISEASES OF ANIMALS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 545 (i).

—— *re* INSTITUTIONS, &C., TRANSACTING BUSINESS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr, *Watson*) 544 (i).

—— PROVINCIAL ACTS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6296 (iii).

DISPUTED TERRITORY (ONT.) TIMBER CUT, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).

DISTILLERIES, &C., EXTRA DUTY PAY TO OFFICERS: in Com. of Sup., 5136 (iii).

DISTRESSED CANADIANS ABROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 2149 (ii).

DIVISIONS:

BINDING TWINE AND FREE LIST: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1771: neg. (Y. 80, N. 100) 1847 (i).

C. P. R, SECTION "B" CONTRACT, CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER GENERAL: prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 5942; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 5945; agreed to (Y. 102, N. 78) 5997 (iii).

CENSUS OF THE DOM.: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4829; neg. (Y. 81, N. 103) 5010 (iii).

CUSTOMS ACT AMT. B. 155 (Mr. *Bowell*): on M. for 3*, Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) Sugar Duties, 5284; neg. (Y. 78, N. 102) 5334 (iii).

DIVORCE (ADAM RUSSWORM) B. 131 (Mr. *Wallace*): 3° agreed to (Y. 89, N. 23) 2549 (ii).

DOMINION DAY: M. (Mr. *Denison*) to adjn. Hse., neg. (Y. 50, N. 72) 1579 (i).

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY. BELT, SETTLERS GRIEVANCES: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 4016; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 4056 (ii).

FRANCHISE ACT AMT. B. 4 (Mr. *Edgar*): on M. for 2°, Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 769; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 797 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT REPEAL B. 8 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*): on M. for 2°, Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., agreed to (Y. 112, N. 85) 330; Main M., as amended, agreed to (Y. 113, N. 84), 332 (i).

GOVT. POLICY: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., neg. (Y. 83, N. 103) 1198 (i).

GOV. GENERAL'S WARRANTS: on M. for Com. of Sup. Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4537; neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551 (iii).

HIGH COMMISSIONER AND LATE ELECTIONS: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 570; neg. (Y. 79, N. 100) 880 (i).

HOMESTEADS (SECOND) N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 606; M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to adjn. deb., agreed to (Y. 87, N. 73) 629 (i).

NORTHUMBERLAND EAST, CHARGES AGAINST MEMBER: on M. (Mr. *Skinner*) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Sel. Com., Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) Minority Rep., 5612; neg. (Y. 74, N. 99) 5724; Majority Rep. agreed to (Y. 98, N. 75) 5725 (iii).

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*), Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt. neg. (Y. 7, N. 185) 1312; Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt. agreed to (Y. 107, N. 88) 1344 (i).

—— M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn. deb., neg. (Y. 65, N. 74) 362; M. (Mr. *Gillies*) to adjn. deb., agreed to (Y. 98, N. 80) 385 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 5778; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 5919; neg. (Y. 83, N. 104) 6124; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to Amt., 6085; neg. (Y. 2, N. 184) 6121; Rep. conc. in (Y. 101, N. 86) 6126 (iii).

—— M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. deb., neg. (Y. 29, N. 36) 6026 (iii).

TAY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3738; neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779 (ii).

TIMBER LICENSES, &C.: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3428; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 3506 (ii).

TRADE POLICY OF THE GOVT.: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) 3309; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 77) 3425 (ii).

DIVISIONS—*Continued.*
WAYS AND MEANS: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to conc. in Res., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 88, N. 114) 3081 (ii).
Divorce (Bristow, Thomas) B. No. 133 (Mr. *O'Brien*). 1°*, 1927 (i); 2° on a div., 2175; M. for Com., 2550; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 132.)
Divorce (Ellis, Mahala) B. No. 132 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 1926; M. for 2°, 1989 (i); 2° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 133.)
Divorce (Russworm, Adam) B. No. 131 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 1927 (i); 2° on a div., 2174; in Com. and 3° agreed to (Y. 89, N. 23) 2549 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 134.)
Divorce (Tapley, Isabel) B. No. 134 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 1927 (i); 2° on a div., 2175; in Com. and 3° on a div., 2551 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 135.)
DOCUMENTS MENTIONED IN SPEECH FROM THRONE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 157 (i).
DOM. AID TO RAILWAYS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1053 (i).
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 147 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2337; 2°*, 3649; in Com., 3649 (ii), 5352, 5374, 5594, 5727, 6224; 3°*, 6226 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 20.)
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 45 (Mr. *Amyot*). 1°, 217; 2°*, 1030 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).
DOM. DAY, ADJNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1536 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Denison*) to adjn. House, neg. (Y. 50, N. 72) 1579 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (*Chap.* 8 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 3** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 104 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (*Chap.* 8 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 5** (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°, 105: 2° m., 994; 2° and ref to Sel. Com., 999 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act (*Chap.* 8 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 54** (Mr. *Barron*). 1°, 266; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1040 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 146 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2337; 2°* and in Com., 3244 (ii), 5139, 5196; Order for 3° dschgd. and recom., 5544; 3° m., 5556; recom. and 3°, 5587 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 19.)
——— *See* "ELECTIONS."
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 108 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 1010 (i); Order for 2° read, 3307 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 165 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°*, 3995 (ii); 2° m., 5762; 2° and in Com., 5770, 6226; 3°*, 6228 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 24.)
DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 5179, 6279; conc., 5433 (iii).
DOM. NOTES IN CIRCULATION, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).
——— ISSUE AND REDEMPTION: in Com. of Sup., 1754 (i).
DOM. NOTES, PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 1755 (i).
DOM. POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 511, 1557 (i).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 910, 1558 (i).
——— SUPPLIES, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1928 (i).
DOUCET, LOUIS, DISMISSAL FROM I. C. R. SHOPS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 741 (i).
DOUGLAS, JAMES, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, TORONTO: in Com. of Sup., 1714 (i).
DREDGING DU LOUP RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158 (i).
——— KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1267 (i).
——— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell* 129 (i).
——— PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i), 4640, 5222.
——— SISSIBOO RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers* 1574 (i).
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS."
DRILL INSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 3729, 4214 (ii).
DRILL SHED, TORONTO, CONTRACT FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 963 (i).
DUFRESNE, J. L., COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 1706 (i).
DUGUAY, JOSEPH, EMPLYMT. AS EXCISEMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 3254 (ii).
DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 223 (i).
——— M. for O.C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).
EASTERN TOWNSHIPS, GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Frechette*) 198 (i).
EAST RIVER, N.S., DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1011 (i).
Eddy, E. B., Mnfg. Co.'s B. No. 23 (Mr. *Mackintosh*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 123.)
EDGETT'S LANDING, BALLAST WHARF, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *King*) 3956 (ii).
EEL FISHERIES, RIMOUSKI, DESTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2907, 2913 (ii).
ELECTION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i).
ELECTIONS (1891) RECOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 142, 177 (i).
——— RETURNS TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 131 (i).
——— VOTES POLLED, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).
——— BELLECHASSE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Amyot*) 187 (i).
——— GAZETTING MEMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112.
Elections Act. *See* "DOMINION."
Elections Acts Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 107; 2° m., 1029 (i); Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).
ELECTIONS AND PUBLIC EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 221 (i).
——— CONTROVERTED, TIME LIMIT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).
——— SENATORS AS CANDIDATES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1578 (i).
ELECTORAL DIVISIONS IN N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 221 (i).
Electoral Franchise. *See* "FRANCHISE."

ELECTORAL LISTS (DOM.) REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 946 (i).

ELECTRIC LIGHT, MONTREAL P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 4347 (iii).

Electric Storage. *See* "ANGLO-CANADIAN."

ELEVATORS ON I. C. R.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 135 (i).

ELGIN (EAST) RET. OFFICER'S ACCOUNT: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1579 (i).

ELLIOTT, GEO. M., APPOINTMENT AS GAS INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).

Ellis, Mahala. *See* "DIVORCE."

"Empire" Printing and Publishing Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 28 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1°*, 156; 2°, 191; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 130.)

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, REP. *re* LENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 530 (i).

—— SUMS PAID ON ACCT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270.

—— TENDERS FOR CAISSON, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i)

—— TENDERS, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1937 (i).

See "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS."

ESTIMATES, THE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on Adjnmt. 214 (i).

—— 1891-92: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 227 (i).

—— SUPPL., 1891: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 799 (i).

—— SUPPL.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 5555 (iii).

—— Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 5589 (iii).

—— SUPPL., FURTHER, 1891-92: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 6289 (iii).

Evidence in Criminal Cases. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. No. 117 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 1345 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3646, 3902; 3°*, 3902 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)

EXCHEQUER COURT: in Com. of Sup., 507, 1557 (i).

—— *See* "SUPREME."

EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 1724 (i), 5125 (iii).

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (CENTRAL) BULLETINS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 1579 (i).

—— BUILDINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4652 (iii).

—— EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1576 (i).

—— M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *McMillan*) 1579 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mara*) 232 (i).

—— STALLIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 739 (i).

—— PAPERS *re* Horses: Remarks (Mr. *McMillan*) 3200 (ii).

—— REP. OF DIRECTOR, &C.: Presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 104 (i).

EXPENDITURE FOR PUBLIC WORKS SINCE CONFEDN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1061 (i).

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135 (i).

EXPORT CATTLE TRADE, REP. OF EVIDENCE: Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).

EXPORT OF POTATOES FROM CANADA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 544 (i).

FABRE, HECTOR, SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5086; conc., 5427 (iii).

Farmers' Bank of Rustico B. No. 40 (Mr. *Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.*) 1°*, 206; 2°*, 220; M. for consdn. after Priv. B.'s, 1101; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 113.)

FEDERAL AID TO RYS.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1053 (i).

Female Offenders in Nova Scotia B. No. 143 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 2203, 2°* and in Com., 3595 (ii); 3°*, 5139 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 55.)

FENELON FALLS, LOCKMASTER'S HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 4673 (iii).

FENIAN RAID, PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3660 (ii).

Ferry, International. *See* "VICTORIA."

FINANCE:

AUDITOR GENERAL'S POWERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 391 (i).

CABLEGRAMS, REUTER'S AGENCY, AMOUNT PAID: Ques; (Mr. *Lankerkin*) 4296 (iii).

CONSOLIDATED FUND: RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135, 213 (i).

DEBENTURES, NORTH SHORE RY.: M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 974; deb. rsmd., 1014 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Fremont*) 527 (i).

—— LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2521 (i).

DEPTL. PAY SHEETS: Ques. (Mr, *McMillan*) 2520, 2906 (ii).

DOM. NOTES IN CIRCULATION, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).

FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).

GOVERNOR GEN.'S WARRANTS, DETAILS OF EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 232 (i).

—— on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4537; neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551 (iii).

—— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4467 (iii).

P. O. SAVINGS BANKS, INTEREST ON DEPOSITS: Ques. (Mr. *Christie*) 1577 (i).

PUBLIC DEBT AND SINKING FUND, TRUSTEES: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2152 (ii).

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE, ENQUIRY FOR RET.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4158 (ii).

QUE. HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, INTEREST OWING: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).

QUE. RY. BRIDGE AND NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).

SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 202, 210 (i),

[*See* "BUDGET," "ESTIMATES," "SUPPLY," &C.]

Financial Corporations. *See* "PRIVATE DETECTIVE."

FINES FOR VIOLATING FISHERY LAWS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 189 (i).

FISHERIES:

BAY OF FUNDY FISHERIES: M. for Ret., &c. (Mr. *Bowers*) 715 (i).

BEHRING'S SEA, SEAL FISHERY, CLOSE SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 959 (i).

—— SEALERS CAPTURED BY RUSSIANS: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 5354 (iii).

BOISVERT, GEO., APPMNT. AS FISHERY OFFICER, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leduc*) 2935 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Continued.*

BOUNTIES, FISHERY, PAID IN GUYSBOROUGH Co. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).

—— PAID IN QUEEN'S Co., N.S. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 734 (i).

BOUNTY CLAIMS BY PROVINCES, &C. : M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 537 (i).

—— CHEQUES, DISTRIBUTION : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 129 (i).

—— COSTS, &C., *re* DISTRIBUTION : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Flint*) 180 (i).

—— M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 211 (i).

EEL FISHERY, RIMOUSKI, DESTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2907, 2913 (ii).

FINES FOR VIOLATING FISHERY LAWS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 189 (i).

FISH-BREEDING : in Com. of Sup., 3529 (ii).

FISHERY LAWS, ENFORCEMENT : Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).

FISHERY INSPECTOR, DIST. No. 3, N.S., RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 130 (i).

FISHERY OVERSEER, GUYSBOROUGH, SALARY PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 5403 (iii)

LAKE ST. PETER FISHING DIVISION : Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2148 (ii).

LAVALLÉE, N., FISHERY OVERSEER, APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145, 2148 (ii).

LICENSES, BONAVENTURE Co. : Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (ii).

—— CONTINUATION OF SYSTEM : Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).

—— GRAND RIVER : Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Monck*) 709.

—— GRANTED IN QUEBEC : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 145 (i).

—— POUND NETS : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223, 529 (i).

—— RESTIGOUCHE RIVER : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 3283 (ii).

FISHERY PROTECTION, CAPE BRETON : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 527 (i).

—— GEORGIAN BAY : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 220(i).

—— SUPPLIES : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 544.

—— Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 221 (i).

—— WARDENS, P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii).

—— APPOINTMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 5409 (iii).

FISH, FOREIGN, REGULATIONS *re* BONDING : Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 1265 (i).

FITZGERALD, FISHERY OFFICER, PETERBOROUGH Co. : ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 5405 (iii).

MCLEOD, MR., CHARGES AGAINST : Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 2171, 2289 (ii).

OYSTER BEDS, LEASING, P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4157 (ii).

ROULEAU, F. F., FISHING RIGHTS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 2936 (ii).

SALMON NET FISHING ON RESTIGOUCHE : Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1268 (i).

[*See* "NEWFOUNDLAND," "SUPPLY," &c.]

Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 122 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°*, 1483 (i) ; 2°* and in Com., 3157 ; 3° m., 3237 ; 3° on a div., 3242 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

FISHERIES DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 255, 1547 (i).

Fisheries Development. *See* "SEA FISHERIES."

FISHERIES INSPECTORS' REPS. : Presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 738 (i).

FISHERIES : in Com. of Sup., 3514 (ii), 6268 (iii).

Fishermen's Safety B. No. 114 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°*, 1406 (i).

Fishing Vessels. *See* "U. S."

FITZGERALD, G. W., FISHERY OFFICER, PETERBOROUGH Co. : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 5405 (iii).

Foreshores. *See* "PROVINCIAL GOVTS., B. III."

FORESHORES, &C., OF THE DOM., OWNERSHIP : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 178.

FORT ERIE AND BUFFALO FERRY : Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1768 (i).

FOWL, WILD, PROHIBITION OF EXPORT : Ques. (Mr. *McKay*) 1769 (i).

FOX, SIR DOUGLAS, ESTIMATES *re* SUBMARINE TUNNEL : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT, 1885 : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 961, 1267 (i).

Franchise Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 4** (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°, 105 ; 2° m., 767 ; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m.h., 769 ; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 798 (i).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 771 ; (Mr. *Watson*) 774 ; (Mr. *Tupper*) 775 ; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 776 ; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 777 ; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 778 ; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 779 ; (Mr. *Denison*) 781 ; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 781 ; (Mr. *Davin*) 783 ; (Mr. *Choquette*) 785 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 787 ; (Mr. *Dupont*) 788 ; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 791 ; (Mr. *Amyot*) 792 ; (Mr. *Edgar*) 795 (i).

Franchise Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 8** (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 106 ; Order for 2°, 206 ; 2° m, 295 ; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m.h., 305 ; agreed to (Y. 112, N. 85) 330 ; 2° neg. (Y. 113, N. 84) 332 (i).

Franchise Act (*Chap.* 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 31** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 156 ; 2° m., 999 ; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 3 m. h., 1001 ; agreed to, 1003 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. No. 59 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°, 334 ; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1041 (i) ; Order for Com. dschgd., 2936 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. No. 98 (Mr. *Barron*) 1°, 738 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. No. 145 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2336 ; 2°* and in Com., 3082 ; 3°*, 3098 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

FRANKUM, J., PENSION : in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).

FRASER RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 4594 (iii).

FRASERVILLE P. O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3255 (ii).

Frauds on Farmers Prevention B. No. 42 (Mr. *Burdett*). 1°*, 206 ; 2°, 1003 ; Order for Com. read, 1014 ; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1041 ; in Com., 1972 (i).

Frauds upon the Government B. No. 172 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 5589 ; 2°, 5751 ; in Com., 6289, 6327 ; 3°*, 6327 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

Fraudulent Marking Prevention B. No. 140 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 2144 ; 2°* and in Com., 3583 ; 3°*, 3646 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

FRENCH LANGUAGE IN MAN., ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 114 (i).
FULLERTON, AUGUSTUS, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 270 (i).
GALOPS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4107 (i).
GALT POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).
GALT P. O., CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).
GALWAY P.O., ESTABLISHMENT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).
GARRISON CLUB, QUEBEC, LANDS LEASED: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 527 (i).
GAS, ELECTRIC LIGHT, &C., OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4512 (iii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 163 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 3983 (ii); 2°* and in Com., 4300; 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 48.)
GENEST, SAMUEL, RESIGNATION, &C.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).
GEOLOGICAL MAPS, MARITIME PROVINCES: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1101 (i).
—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
—— EASTERN TOWNSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. *Fréchette*) 198
—— EXPENDITURE IN FIELD WORK: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McLeod*) 544 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 410 (i), 4725; conc., 5411 (iii).
GEORGIAN BAY, FISHERY PROTECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 220 (i).
—— REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 4574.
GIGUERE, CAPT. CLAUDE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).
GLIDDON, WM., SPECIAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i.)
GOODWIN, LATE JAS., CLAIMS OF HEIRS: in Com. of Sup., 6198, 6296 (iii).
GOVT. BUSINESS: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) precedence on Thursdays, 1064 (i).
—— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) Wednesdays, 1730.
—— Ms. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) Mondays, 2668, 3576 (ii).
—— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Saturday sittings, 6127 (iii).
GOVT., FORMATION AFTER SIR JOHN MACDONALD'S DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).
GOVT. OFFICIALS AND RECENT ELECTIONS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580 (i).
GOVT. OF N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i), 5066, 5424, 6276 (iii).
Govt. Piers. *See* "HARBOURS."
GOVT. POLICY: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. House, 1105; neg. (Y. 83, N. 103) 1198 (i).
Deb. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1113; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1120; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1126; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1128; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1131; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1135; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1136; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1142; (Mr. *Edgar*) 1145; (Mr. *Hazen*) 1150; (Mr. *Fraser*) 1159; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1162; (Mr. *Amyot*) 1166; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1172; (Mr. *Devlin*) 1174; (Mr. *Costigan*) 1176; (Mr. *Lister*) 1180; (Mr. *Curran*) 1183; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1187; (Mr. *Skinner*) 1191; (Mr. *Daly*) 1192; (Mr. *Montague*) 1194; (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 1195; (Mr. *Savard*) 1196 (i).
GOVT. POLICY: Ans. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 959, 1013 (i).
GOVT. SAVINGS BANKS, DEPOSITS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 202, 210 (i).
GOVT. STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
GOV. GEN'S SECRETARY'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 240, 433 (i).
—— WARRANTS, DETAILS OF EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 232 (i).
—— Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4467; Amt., 4537; neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551 (ii).
GRAHAM, J. R., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 210 (i).
—— Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 3200 (ii).
Grain. *See* "WEIGHERS."
GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
GRAND RIVER FISHING LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Monck*) 709 (i).
—— IRON BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4606 (iii).
—— NAVIGATION, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Montague*) 2155 (ii).
GRAND MANAN, N.B., AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4678 (iii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. No. 36 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 206; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 69.)
GRANITE, SCOTCH, INCREASE OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 335 (i).
GRANT, J. J., ENTRY FOR DOM. LANDS, N.W.T.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Davin*) 3635 (ii).
GRAVING DOCKS. *See* "ESQUIMALT," "LÉVIS" AND "KINGSTON."
GREAT BRITAIN AND CAN. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1765 (i).
Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B No. 124 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 1574; 2°*, 1757 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 98.)
GREAT EASTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6032; in Com., 6136 (iii).
Great North-West Central Ry. Co.'s Correction B. No. 162 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 3950 (ii); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 80.)
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATES: Ques. (Mr. *Daly*) 2144 (i).
GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4141 (ii), 6198(iii).
GROSSE ISLAND QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4332 (iii).
Guelph Junction Ry. *See* "C.P.R."
GUÉVREMONT, HON. SENATOR, PURCHASE OF LAND FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4671 (iii).
GUYSBOROUGH CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2520 (ii).
—— FISHERY OVERSEER, SALARY PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 5403 (iii).
HARAS NATIONAL CO.: in Com. of Sup., 6179 (iii).
HALIFAX COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INCREASE OF SALARY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2547 (ii).

HALIFAX SUFFERANCE WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3894 (ii).
HALL, W. H., CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 4151 (ii).
HALTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment, 5 (i).
HAMILTON P. O., ADDITIONAL CARRIERS: in Com. of Sup., 6279 (iii).
HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I., IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).
HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS (QUE.), INTEREST OWING GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).
——— *See* "QUEBEC."
HARBOURS, DOCKS AND SLIDES, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4665 (iii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4530, 4552, 4954, 5438, 6254 (iii).
Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters (Govt.) Act Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°*, 1263 (i); 2° and in Com., 3104; 3°*, 3105 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 52.)
HARPUR, H. G., PENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1572 (i).
HARTLEY, H. E., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Christie*) 144 (i).
HARTNEY, H., Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1.
HASTING COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).
——— PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).
HEARN, J. G., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 5078 (iii).
HEATING BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4474.
HELBRONNER, JULES, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).
HERCHMER, L. W., REP. OF DEPT. *re* ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 267, 1574 (i).
——— COMPT. WHITE'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2669 (ii).
——— ENQUIRY INTO CONDUCT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2913; wthdn., 2923 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) *re* Res., 711 (i).
HERCHMER, LIEUT.-COL. WM., LETTER FROM C. E. D. WOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4292 (iii).
HIGH COMMISSIONER AND LATE ELECTIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 570; deb. rsmd., 636, 807; neg. (Y. 79, N. 100) 880 (i).
Deb. (Sir *John Thompson*) 573; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 579; (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 589; (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 636; (Mr. *Davin*) 646; (Mr. *Mulock*) 653; (Mr. *Tupper*) 659; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 682; (Mr. *Dickey*) 690; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 698; (Mr. *Charlton*) 808; (Mr. *Kenny*) 817; (Mr. *Fraser*) 828; (Mr. *Gillies*) 842; (Mr. *Langelier*) 848; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 851; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 851; (Mr. *Skinner*) 861; (Mr. *Flint*) 867; (Mr, *Dupont*) 876 (i).
——— AND IMPERIAL FEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2153 (ii).
——— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 411, 431, 1555, 1732 (i), 6167 (iii).
——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 104 (i).
——— SUMS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 176, 223.
HOLSTEIN POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766, 1929 (i).
Home Circles. *See* "CANADIAN ORDER."
HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR'S SALARIES: conc., 5433 (iii).
HOMESTEADS (SECOND) N. W. T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 606; M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to adjn. deb. agreed to (Y. 87, N. 73) 629 (i).
——— deb. rsmd. and M. wthdn., 3302 (ii).
HORSES, CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1579 (i), 3200 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 739 (i).
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Hazen*) 8; seconded (Mr. *Corbould*) 17 (i).
ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY, ACKNOWLEDGMENT: Mess. from His Ex., 227 (i).
ARNOLDI, J. R., REP. *re* BALLOT BOXES: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 201 (i).
BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 1434, 2076 (i), 3238 (ii), 4613, 6329 (iii).
BILLS, DELAY IN PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 238 (i).
BOURINOT, J. G.: Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1 (i).
CHAPLEAU, ST. O.: Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 1 (i),
CHICOUTIMI, REPRESENTATION, RET. OFFICER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 7 (i).
COMMITTEES. *See* general heading.
IN COM. OF SUP., 941, 1559, 1734 (i), 6172 (ii).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS (HALTON): Judgment 5 (i).
DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP. *See* "COMMITTEES."
DIVISIONS, MEMBERS VOTES: (Mr. *Speaker's* ruling), 4455 (iii).
GOVT. BUSINESS: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) precedence on Mondays, 2668, 3576 (ii).
——— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) precedence on Wednesdays, 1730 (i).
——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Saturday Sittings 6127 (iii).
——— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) precedence on Thursdays, 1064 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 711 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*, &c.) 109 (i).
GOVT. POLICY: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 1105; neg. (Y. 83, N. 103) 1198 (i).
——— Ans. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1013 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 959 (i).
HALTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment, 5 (i).
HARTNEY, H.: Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1.
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Sir *John Macdonald*) 111 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex., presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2144 (ii).
MACDONALD, SIR JOHN: Illness announced (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 599 (i).
——— Bulletin read (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 707 (i).
——— DECEASE, PUBLIC FUNERAL: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1883 (i).
——— DRAPING CHAMBER: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 883 (i).
MACDONELL, D. W.: Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1 (i).
MEMBER, NEW: Savard, Mr. Paul V., 7 (i).
MESS. FROM HIS EX., 111, 227, 550, 1199 (i), 2144 (ii), 5589 (iii).
MILEAGE, MEMBERS. *See* "SENATE."
MINISTERIAL EXPLANATION: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 237 (i).
MINISTRY, NEW: Stmnt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 891.
GOVERNMENT, FORMATION AFTER SIR JOHN MACDONALD'S DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1578 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Continued.*
MOTIONS ALLOWED TO STAND: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1932 (ii).
MOTIONS, PRIVATE MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 127 (i).
NORTHUMBERLAND, EAST. *See* general heading.
ORDER, QUES. OF. *See* "ORDER."
PAIRING OF MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor, &c.*) 331, 386, 631, 742, 800, 1199 (i), 3226 (ii), 4488 (iii).
PARLIAMENT, 7th: Opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 6329,
PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: 1543, 1991 (i), 2204, 2936, 2964, 3427, 3822, 3947 (ii), 5331 (iii). *See* "ORDER."
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS. *See* general heading.
PRIVILEGE. *See* "ORDER," &c.
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM. *See* general heading.
QUEBEC, WEST. *See* general heading.
ROULEAU, F. F.; Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1 (i).
SAVARD, MR. PAUL V., MEMBER FOR CHICOUTIMI; Notification of Ret. (Mr. *Speaker*) 7 (i).
SELECT STANDING COMS. *See* "COMMITTEES."
SENATORS AND MEMBERS, INDEMNITY: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6290 (iii).
SENÉCAL, ANDRÉ: M. (Mr. *Lister*) Ordering attendance at Bar of Hse., 4533 (iii).
—— Order for attendance before Bar read, 4747 (iii).
SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, DEP.: Appmnt. announced (Mr. *Speaker*) 3995 (ii).
SESSIONAL CLERKS EMPLOYED BY HOUSE: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Joncas*) 544 (i).
SPEAKER, ELECTION: M. (Sir *John Macdonald*) 1 (i).
—— DEPUTY, ELECTION: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 388 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 5 (i).
—— DOCUMENTS MENTIONED: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 157 (i),
—— Prorogation, 6330 (iii).
TESTIMONIALS TO MINISTERS: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3827 (ii).
VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Lavergne*) 199, 391 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Chapleau*) 389 (i).
WHITE, PETER, ESQ., ELECTION AS SPEAKER: M. (Sir *John Macdonald*) 1 (i).
[*See* "SECRETARY OF STATE," "SUPPLY," &c.]
HULL P. O. CLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1685 (i).
HURTEAU, MR. HILAIRE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 529 (i).
ILLEGAL CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2520 (ii).
IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup.
Deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5224; (Mr. *Davin*) 5224; (Mr. *Fraser*) 5229; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 5236; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 5240; (Mr. *Sproule*) 5245; (Mr. *Dawson*) 5249; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 5251; (Mr. *Skinner*) 5256; (Mr. *Watson*) 5259; (Mr. *Ingram*) 5264; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 5265; (Mr. *Hazen*) 5271; (Mr. *King*) 5277; (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 5280; (Mr. *Forbes*) 5283 (iii).
IMMIGRATION AGENT SHEPPARD: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1266 (i).
—— EMPLYMT. OF MR. HURTEAU: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 529 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 3579, 4800, 5224; conc., 4514.
IMMIGRATION, TOTAL NUMBER DURING DECADE: Ques. *Amyot*) 5075 (i).
—— INTO N.W.T., MEMORIAL OF LEG. ASSEMBLY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1269 (i).
IMPERIAL FEDERATION AND HIGH COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2153 (ii).
IMPERIAL POSTAL UNION: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 131.
Incorporated Construction Co.'s incorp. B. No. 128 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 1927 (i); 2°*, 2097; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 127.)
Indian Act (*Chap.* 43 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No 144** (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 2203; 2°* and in Com., 3590; 3°*, 3593 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 30.)
Indian Lands Settlement B. No. 100 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 807; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic. c.* 5.)
INDIANTOWN BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).
INDIANS:
ALLEN, INDIAN AGENT, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1264, 1272 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1298, 1928 (i).
ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 224 (i).
BRUCE COUNTY INDIANS, SALE OF LIQUOR TO: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530 (i).
—— LIST OF CHARGES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1272 (i).
CHIPPEWA INDIANS, LETTER TO SIR JOHN MACDONALD *re* IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3264 (ii).
CHISHOLM, INDIAN AGENT: Remarks (Mr. *Flint*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6147 (iii).
DINGMAN, INDIAN INSPECTOR, ENQUIRY *re* AGENT ALLEN: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1484 (i).
—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i), 4727, 5059, 6272; conc., 4515, 5411, 5419 (iii).
JONES, INDIAN AGENT, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4673 (iii).
LIQUOR SALES TO INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530, 1264 (i).
PAPASHASE INDIAN RESERVE: Remarks (Mr. *Watson, &c.*) on adjnmt., 1403 i).
PASPASCKASE INDIAN RESERVE, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3265 (ii).
REGINA, INDIAN DEPTL. ESTIMATES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2935 (ii).
RESERVE NO. 6, TIMBER CUT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).
SEA BIRD ISLAND INDIAN RESERVATION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 709 (i).
SHAWANAKISKIC INDIANS, BOUNTY UNDER TREATY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 209 (i).
SUTTON, WEST, INDIAN AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 961 (i).
—— COST OF INVESTIGATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 145 (i).
SUPPLIES, &c., PURCHASED FOR INDIANS IN N.S.: M. for List, &c.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY," &C.]
Industrial Designs. *See* "TRADE MARKS."

INGLIS, BANDMASTER, 69TH BATT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 116 (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 1221; in Com., 1253 (i), 4001 (ii); conc. in and ref. to Com. on B., 4299 (iii); 1°* of B., 1345 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3242, 3579; Order for 3° dschgd., 4008 (ii); again in Com., 4299; 3°*, 4465 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 46.)

INLAND REVENUE :

ANALYST, DOM., OCCUPATION OF BUILDING : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2518 (ii).

CIGARS AND TOBACCO, LAW *re* CULTIVATORS : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).

DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 103 (i).

DUGUAY, JOSEPH, EMPLYMT. AS EXCISEMAN : Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 3254 (ii).

INLAND REVENUE REGULATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194; in Com. of Sup., 252 (i).

NAPANEE GAS INSPECTOR, APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).

STRATFORD EXCISE COLLECTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 5078 (iii).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES FEES : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).

[*See* "COLLECTION OF REVENUES" under "SUPPLY."]

INSPECTORS OF PORTS : in Com. of Sup., 5052; conc., 5418 (iii).

Inspection. *See* "GENERAL," "PETROLEUM," "SHIPS," &c.

INSPECTION OF STAPLES : in Com. of Sup., 5165 (iii).

I. C. R. B. 105 (Mr. *Bowell*). 1°, 959; 2° m., 1256; 2° and in Com., 1260 (i); 3°*, 3130 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 50.)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY :

CARON, MISS LEA, CLAIMS : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 209 (i).

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1770 (i).

CONTRACT FOR REFRESHMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3617 (ii).

EMPLOYÉS, ENQUIRY AT ST. FLAVIE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1937. (i).

HOGG, WALTER : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 5407 (iii).

HALIFAX, INCREASED RY. ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 3857 (ii).

IN COM. OF SUP., 1653, 1758 (i), 3857, 4057 (ii), 6197 (iii).

LANGEVIN BLOCK, STONE HAULAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1768 (i)).

MCCULLY, S. W., EMPLYMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3613 (ii).

MANAGEMENT ; Remarks (Messrs. *Weldon*, Sir *John Thompson*, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3780 (ii).

RATES FOR CLERGYMEN : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 3261.

REDUCTION OF LABOURERS' PAY : Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 3266 (ii).

ST. JOHN, ADDITIONAL PROPERTY : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1578 (i).

ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS, ACCIDENT : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2145 (ii).

TRANS-CONTINENTAL MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 6216 (iii).

[*See* "RYS.," "SUPPLY," &c.]

INTEREST, COMPUTING : in Com. of Sup., 432 (i).

—— 1 PER CENT. COMMISSION : in Com. of Sup., 1748 (i).

—— ON DEPOSITS IN P. O. SAVINGS BANKS : Ques. (Mr. *Christie*) 1577 (i).

INTERIOR :

AMBER DEPOSITS IN N. W., APPLICATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 2518 (ii).

BANFF SPRINGS PARK AND RESERVE, TOTAL COST : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3957 (ii).

COCKBURN ISLAND LOCATION TICKETS : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1271 (i).

DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Devdney*) 103 (i).

HOMESTEADS (SECOND) N. W. T. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 606; M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to adjn. deb., 629 (i); deb. rsmd. and M. wthdn., 3302.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS : Ques. (Mr. *Fréchette*) 193 (i).

—— EXPENDITURE IN FIELD WORK : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McLeod*) 544 (i).

—— MAPS, MARITIME PROVINCES : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1101 (i).

GRANT, J. J., ENTRY FOR DOM. LANDS, N.W.T. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Davin*) 3635 (ii).

IN COM. OF SUP., 247, 433 (i), 6169 (iii).

MANITOBA SCHOOL LANDS : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1766 (i).

MENNONITE RESERVE, MAN. : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 198 (i).

N. W. T. SETTLEMENT, prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) wthdn., 2913 (ii).

ORDNANCE LANDS, MONTREAL CITY, LEASES : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5409 (iii).

—— RIDEAU CANAL, SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).

QUEBEC GARRISON CLUB, LANDS LEASED : Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 527 (i).

RAILWAY LANDS, VANCOUVER ISLAND, REPS. : M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

RED RIVER SURVEYS, COST : Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 1012 (i),

SCHOOL LANDS, MAN., SALES : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1766 (i).

TIMBER CUT ON INDIAN RESERVE NO. 6 : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).

—— CUT IN DISPUTED TERRITORY ; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).

VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. RESERVE, REPS., &C. : M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

[*See* "INDIANS," "SUPPLY," &c.]

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION : Mess. from His Ex. : Presented (Sir *John Macdonald*) 111 (i).

—— Mess. from His Ex. : Presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2144 (ii).

INTERNATIONAL ABATTOIR CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).

INTOXICATING LIQUORS, ANALYSIS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 203 (i).

—— INTO QUEBEC : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Delisle*) 1062 (i).

—— LEGISLATION *re* WHOLESALE SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 961 (i).

—— SALE TO INDIANS : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530 (i).

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 2522 (ii).

—— SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).

Inverness and Victoria Ry. and Mining Co.'s incorp. B. No. 136 (Mr. *Wilmot*). 1°*, 1989 (i); 2°*, 2321; M. for Com., 2858; in Com. and 3°*, 2859 (ii).

IRON BOUNTIES PAID: Enquiry for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2580, 2668 (ii).
ISLE VERTE P.O., CAOUETTE'S ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544 (i).
ISLE BIZARD BRIDGE: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5014, 5195 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4674 (iii).
JAMAICA EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 1568 (i).
JENNINGS, MR., APPOINTMENT BY GOVT. AS CHIEF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 2522 (ii).
JOCKES AND DELORIMIER, ARREARS OF ROYALTY: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5076 (iii).
JOHNSTON, S., DISMISSAL FROM CUSTOMS SERVICE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *German*) 2935 (ii).
JONES, W. E., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1274 (i).
JUDGES IN PROVINCE OF QUEBEC, APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 5076, 5405 (iii).
——— MONTREAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 2908.
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 511 (i).
——— *See* "QUEEN'S BENCH."
Judges. *See* "PROVINCIAL COURTS."
JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 506, 1556 (i), 6169; conc., 6303 (iii).
JUSTICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 241, 433, 1547 (i).
Justice. *See* "ADMINISTRATION."
JUSTICE:
ADMIRALTY COURTS, PROCLAMATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 5776 (iii).
BREMNER'S CLAIM FOR FURS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1268 (i).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, TIME LIMIT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).
COUNSEL, TARTE-MCGREEVY ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1575, 1930 (i).
CRIMINAL LAW BILL, PAYMENT FOR DRAFTING: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3260 (ii).
DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. ACT *re* INSTITUTIONS, &C., TRANSACTING BUSINESS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 544 (i).
——— ACT *re* DISEASES OF ANIMALS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 545 (i).
——— PROVINCIAL ACTS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6296 (iii).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY SUPPLIES, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1928 (i).
HALIFAX COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INCREASE OF SALARY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2547 (ii).
JUDGES, MONTREAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 2908 (ii).
——— IN PROV. OF QUEBEC, SALARIES AND APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 5405 (iii).
——— APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 5076 (iii).
LAMONTAGNE, LÉDA, PETS. *re* DISCHARGE: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2907 (ii).
——— EXTRADITION: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3619 (ii).
LEGAL SERVICES, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).
MAN. SCHOOL QUESTION: Remarks (Mr. *Devlin*) 807.
NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT. *See* general heading.
PROVINCIAL ACTS, TESTING VALIDITY: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 112 (i).
QUEEN'S BENCH, QUEBEC, DEATH OF CHIEF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3620 (ii), 5405 (iii).
JUSTICE—*Continued.*
QUEEN'S BENCH: Remarks (Mr. *Langelier*) 5195 (iii).
QUEEN'S COUNSEL, CONFERRING TITLE; Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3263 (ii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY, SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 2912 (ii).
SCHOOL ACTS OF MAN.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 116 (i).
SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MAN., ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 115 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY," &c.]
KAMINISTIQUIA HARBOUR, RETURN *re* DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 600 (i).
——— PAYMENTS FOR DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1267 (i).
——— TENDERS FOR DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 129 (i).
——— TURNING BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 4523 (iii).
KEEWATIN, GOVT. OF, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5084 (iii).
"KEEWATIN," POLICE PATROL BOAT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4294 (iii).
KENTVILLE, N.S., POSTMASTER, SUSPENSION: Ques: (Mr. *Borden*) 221 (i).
KILTED BATTALION, TORONTO: in Com. of Sup., 6182.
Kingston and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°ˣ, 548; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, ORIGINAL PLAN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Amyot*) 1579 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).
——— Notice of prop. Res. (Mr. *Tarte*) 635 (i).
——— PAPERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1764 (i).
——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1848 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3653 (ii).
——— TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 128.
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS."
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4559 (iii).
——— MILLS, SURVEY ABOVE: in Com. of Sup., 1666.
——— PENITENTIARY, COAL SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*, *Huron*) 3260 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 882, 908 (i).
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT."
KINGSTON, P. O., LESSEE OF BOX 524: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 962, 1266 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1578 (i).
——— REP. OF POSTMASTER, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 2545 (ii).
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 94 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 549; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 95.)
——— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
KNOWLTON'S LANDING, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1770 (i).
LABERGE, MR., ASST. POSTMASTER, QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3954 (ii).
LABORATORY, CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 5054 (iii).
LABOUR, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 4674 (iii).
Labour Prohibition. *See* "ALIEN."

LABOUR STATISTICAL BUREAU, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lépine*) 201 (i).
LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4102 (ii).
——— SPECIFICATIONS, TENDERS, &c., *re* DRAIN: M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2157 (ii).
LACHINE P.O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4332 (iii).
LACHANCE, CAPT., EXAMINATION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (ii).
LA HAVE RIVER, N.S. *See* "SAWDUST."
LAIDLOW, WM. (N.W.M.P.) RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1048 (i).
Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 60 (Mr. *Denison*). 1°*. 387; 2°*, 579; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)
LAKEPORT HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets. &c.* (Mr. *Hargraft*) 232 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 207 (i).
LAKE ST. CLAIR, POUND NET LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223 (i).
LAKE ST. PETER FISHING DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2148 (ii).
Lake Témiscamingue Colonization Ry. Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. *Trow*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 94.)
LAMONTAGNE, LÉDA, EXTRADITION: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3619 (ii).
——— PETS., *re* DISCHARGE: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2907 (ii).
LAMOUREAUX BROS.' CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 4147.
Land Grants to Rys. Act Amt. B. No. 169 (Mr. *Dewdney*). Res. prop., 1200 (i); in Com., 3138 (ii); recom., 4307; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4309; 2°, 4534; in Com., 4609, 5538; 3°*, 5590 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 9.)
Land Grants to Ry. Co.'s Authorization B. No. 173 (Mr. *Dewdney*). Res. prop., 3308; in Com., 5487, 5593, 5607; conc. in and 1°* of B., 5727; 2° m., 6130; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 6134 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)
Land Grants to Militia Provision B. No. 159 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*). Res. prop., 634 (i); in Com., 3105; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3582; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3902 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)
LANDSLIDE AT QUEBEC: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3621 (ii).
LANGEVIN BLOCK, DISTRIBUTION OF EVIDENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 4000 (ii).
——— ADVTS. FOR TENDERS, &c.: M. for copies, &c. (Mr. *Mulock*) 531 (i).
——— TOTAL EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1267, 1575 (i).
——— PAYMENTS TO SEPT. 1st, 1891: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 5776 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on adjmnt., 737 (i).
——— STONE HAULED OVER I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1768 (i).
LANGEVIN, LAFORCE, CERTIFICATE AS C. E.: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1769 (i).
LANGEVIN, LAFORCE, REPS. AGAINST CAPT. J. E. BERNIER: M. for copies* (Mr. *Delisle*) 2935 (ii).
——— SERVICES *re* LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 4338 (iii).
L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4530 (iii).
L'AVENIR BRANCH OF C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).
LARKIN, CONNOLLY & Co., *re* ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS," &c.
LAVALLÉE, N., FISHING IN RICHELIEU COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145, 2148 (ii).
LEASE OF BUILDING, SPARKS ST.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2518 (ii).
LEATHER TRUNKS FOR MEMBERS: in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).
"LE CANADA," ADVERTISING OTTAWA MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2540 (ii).
LEDUC, CHARLES, RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).
LEGAL SERVICES, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907.
LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 941, 1559, 1734 (i), 6172 (iii).
LE LIÈVRE AND OTTAWA RIVERS, DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).
LETHBRIDGE CUSTOM HOUSE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iii).
LETTER POSTAGE, CHANGE IN RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 129 (i).
LETTERS, REGISTRATION FEE, REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 143 (i).
LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4552 (iii).
——— MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).
——— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT."
LEWIS, LIEUT.-COL., VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Burnham*) 733 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 156 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 945 (i).
LICENSES (FISHING) CONTINUATION OF SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).
——— GRANTED IN QUEBEC: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 145 (i).
——— RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 3283 (ii).
——— POUND NETS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 228, 529 (i).
——— SALMON FISHING, BONAVENTURE CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (ii).
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii), 6266 (iii).
"LILY," H.M.S., RESCUE OF CREW: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1059 (i).
LINDSAY P.O., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COMPLETION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 268 (i).
LIQUOR, ILLEGAL SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 208 741 (i), 2148 (ii).

LIQUOR PERMITS IN N.W.T., REPS., &c.: M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 545 (i).

LIQUOR SALES TO INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530, 1264 (i).

LITIGATED MATTERS, COSTS: in Com. of Sup., 1707 (i), 5107 (iii).

LITTLE CURRENT IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4573 (iii).

LITTLE NATION RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iii).

LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 143 (i).

LIVERPOOL, N. S., P. O. ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1768 (i).

LIVERPOOL OR LONDON AND ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4679 (iii).

Live Stock Shipping B. No. 154 (Mr. *Tupper*). Res. prop., 1200 (i); in Com., conc. in and 1°* of B., 3130; 2°, 3991; in Com., 3992; 3°*, 3995 (ii); Sen. Amt. conc. in, 4772 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 36.)

LIVE STOCK AND SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 4738 (iii).

LOBO P.O., CHANGE OF POSTMASTER: M. for Pets.* (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1579 (i).

LOGAN'S FARM AND DESMARTEAU'S CLAIM, PET. OF RIGHT: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2155 (ii).

London and Can. Loan and Agency Co.'s B. No. 27 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1°*, 156; 2°, 190; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 114.)

London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 63 (Mr. *Hyman*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547 (i).

London Life Ins. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 135 (Mr. *Moncrieff*). 1°*, 1989 (i); 2°*, 2097; in Com. and 3°*, 2859 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 117.)

Lord's Day Observance B. No. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 104; 2°m., 747; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 766 (i); in Com., 2936; Order for Com. read, 3287 (ii).

LUNATICS IN KEEWATIN, SUPPORT: in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i), 5085 (iii).

LUNDY'S LANE, COMMEMORATION OF BATTLE: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 3618 (ii).

LUNENBURG P. O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6201 (iii).

LYSTER, POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 3958 (ii).

MACDONALD, SIR JOHN: Illness announced (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 599 (i).

——— Bulletin read (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 707 (i).

——— DECEASE, PUBLIC FUNERAL: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 883 (i).

——— MONUMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2148 (i).

MACDONELL, D. W.: Commissioner to Administer Oaths, 1 (i).

MACDONELL, MR., M.P., SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 6172 (iii).

MACKENZIE AND PEACE RIVERS INDIAN TREATY: in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).

Macleod Irrigation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 52 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 266; 2°*, 412 (i); in Com., 2097; 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 109.)

MACPHERSON, ADDISON, CLAIMS FOR LOSSES THROUGH REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3257.

MCARTHUR, WM., APPOINTMENT AS MAIL CLERK: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 4671 (iii).

MCCORMICK, F. B., REMOVAL AND REINSTATEMENT: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).

McKay Milling Co.'s incorp. B. No. 24 (Mr. *Mackintosh*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 214; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 125.)

MCLEAN, ROGER & CO.'S CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 269 (i).

MCLEOD, MR., CHARGES AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 2171, 2289 (ii).

MCMAHON, CHAS. W., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

MCRAE, JAMES, DISMISSAL AS PREVENTIVE OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4678 (iii).

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4678, 5349, 5450 (iii).

MAJOR'S HILL PARK, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4520 (iii).

Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Ry. Co's. incorp. B. No. 129 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°*, 1964 (i); 2°*, 2097; in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)

MAN. SOUTH-WESTERN COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3308 (ii).

MANITOBA:

BRANDON "MAIL" IN PUBLIC DEPTS., NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3257 (ii).

DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. ACT *re* DISEASES OF ANIMALS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 545 (i).

——— ACT *re* INSTITUTIONS, &c., TRANSACTING BUSINESS: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 544 (i).

FRENCH LANGUAGE IN MAN., ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 114 (i).

INSANE ASYLUM: in Com. of Sup., 5072 (iii).

MAN. SOUTH-WESTERN COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3308 (ii).

MENNONITE RESERVE, MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 198 (i).

PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 913 (i), 6171 (iii).

PAPASHASE INDIAN RESERVE: Remarks (Mr. *Watson*) on adjnmt., 1403 (i).

PASPASCKASE INDIAN RESERVE, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3265 (ii).

RED RIVER SURVEYS, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 1012 (i)

SCHOOL ACTS: M. for Pets., &c, (Mr. *Devlin*) 116 (i).

SCHOOL LANDS, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1766 (i).

SCHOOL QUESTION, PAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 741, 807 (i).

SEPARATE SCHOOLS, ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 115 (i).

——— M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 116 (i).

SOURIS BRANCH, C. P. R., O. C.'S GRANTING AID: M. for copies* (Mr. *Daly*) 1938 (i).

[*See* "INTERIOR," "PUB. WORKS," "SUPPLY."]

MAPLE SUGAR, BOUNTY ON PRODUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Godbout*) 1576 (i).

MAP OF DOM., HISTORICAL AND TOPOGRAPHICAL: in Com. of Sup., 6261 (ii).

"MARIE ELIZA," SCH., SEIZURE AND SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 710 (i).

"MARIE ELIZA," M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 1578 (i).
MARINE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 255, 440 (i), 6166 (iii).
MARINE DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103.
MARINERS, RELIEF OF SICK AND DISTRESSED : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
MARITIME PROVINCES, GEOLOGICAL MAPS : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1011 (i).

Maritime Sulphite Fibre Co.'s B. No. 39 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 206 ; 2°*, 220 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 124.)

MARINE :
"ALERT," STEAMER, APPOINTMENT OF CAPTAIN : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1769 (i).
—— EXAMINATION OF CAPTAIN : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (ii).
—— EXAMINATION OF CAPT. BERNIER AS COMMANDER : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3621 (ii).
"BLIZZARD," SCH., RESCUE OF CREW : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).
—— REWARDS : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).
DECK LOADS, REP. OF EVIDENCE : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
FORT ERIE AND BUFFALO FERRY : Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1768 (i).
GRAND RIVER NAVIGATION, ENGINEER'S REPS. : M. for copies (Mr. *Montague*) 2155 (ii).
LACHANCE, CAPT., EXAMINATION : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (ii).
"LILLY" H.M.S., RESCUE OF CREW : M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1059 (i).
"MARIE ELIZA," SCH., SEIZURE AND SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 710 (i).
—— M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 1578 (i).
MARINERS, RELIEF OF SICK AND DISTRESSED : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
"MERMERLY" BARQUE, WRECK, REWARDS TO CREW : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 712 (i).
MONTREAL PILOTS : Remarks (Mr. *Delisle*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6144 (iii).
STE. CROIX LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, RESIGNATION : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER NAVIGATION, IMPROVMENT OF : Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
SAWDUST DEPOSITS IN LA HAVE RIVER : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).
"SEIGFREID," SCH., REWARDS TO CAPT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).
—— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).
SHIPS' SAFETY, LEGISLATION RESPECTING : Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 218 (i).
SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS, REFIEF : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
"STANLEY," STR., TRIPS BETWEEN P.E.I. AND MAINLAND : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 158 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1929 (i).
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, &C., &C., DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
THURBER, LIEUT.-COL., RESIGNATION AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER : M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY," &c.]

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. No. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 140 ; 2°, 1066 ; in Com., 1067 (i), 3102 ; 3°*, 3104 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)

MASTERS, C. H., DRAFTING CRIMINAL LAW, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1559 (i).
MASON, JNO., CARPENTER, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 6279 (iii).
MAURICE, JOS. A., AND JULIE FOURNIER, CLAIMS, &c. : M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2174 (ii).
MEDICINE HAT IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iii).

Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 25 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°*, 155 ; 2°*, 189 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 79.)

MEMBER, NEW : Savard, Mr. Paul V., 7 (i).
MENNONITE RESERVE, MAN. : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 198 (i).

Meridian Time. *See* "RECKONING."

MERCANTILE AGENCIES, LEGISLATION REGULATING : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 144 (i).
"MERMERLY" BARQUE, WRECK, REWARDS TO CREW : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 712 (i).

MESSAGES FROM HIS EX. :
CARLETON BRANCH RY., SALE, 550 (i).
ESTIMATES, THE, for 1891-92, 227 (i).
—— Suppl., 1890-91, 799 (i).
—— Suppl., 1891-92, 5589 (iii).
—— Further Suppl., 6289 (iii).
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, 111 (i)), 2144 (ii).
TRADE RELATIONS WITH U. S. AND NEWFOUNDLAND, 726, 1199 (i).

METEGHAN WHARF, REP. *re* REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 530 (i).
METAL PILLARS FOR PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1273 (i).
METHYLATED SPIRITS, COST OF SUPPLY : in Com. of Sup., 5138 (iii).
MILEAGE, MEMBERS. *See* "SENATE."

Militia Act Amt. B. No. 7 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 106 (i).

Militia and Defence Act (*Chap.* 41 *Revised Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 174** (Sir *Adolphe Caron*). 1°, 6126 (iii).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE :
ADJUTANT GEN., DEP., MIL. DIST. NO. 11 : M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
BEACON HILL PARK (B.C.), MAGAZINE, &C. : M. for Reps., &c.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
BEAUDRY, LIEUT. COL. A., CANCELLATION OF COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1767 (i).
"C" BATTERY, SERVICES AT WELLINGTON, B.C. : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).
—— BARRACKS : M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
CAMP AT ST. JOHN'S and SOREL, PAY ROLL : M. for copies* (Mr. *Lépine*) 1062 (i).
—— DISTRICT NO. 1 : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Hyman*) 231 (i).
—— DISTRICT NO. 7, SELECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3264 (ii).
CAVALRY, 1ST REGT. : Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
—— SCHOOL, TORONTO : Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 222 (i).
DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 135 (i).
HEARN, J. G., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 5078 (iii).
INGLIS, BANDMASTER, 69TH BATT : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE—*Continued.*
IN COM. OF SUP., 1573 (i), 3699, 3717, 4214, 4236 (ii), 6182, 6245 (iii).
LEWIS, LIEUT.-COL., VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Burnham*) 733 (i).
LUNDY'S LANE, COMMEMORATION OF BATTLE: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 3618 (ii).
MACPHERSON, ADDISON, CLAIMS FOR LOSSES THROUGH REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3257.
MILITARY COLLEGE GRADUATES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3957 (ii).
—— CADETS ENTERED SINCE FOUNDATION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 4297 (iii).
—— COMMISSIONS TO GRADUATES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3960 (ii).
PAYMASTER, MIL. DISTS. NOS. 5 AND 6: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 707 (i).
PELLETIER, H. H., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3258 (ii).
PENSIONS, PERMANENT CORPS, &c., SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*) 2908 (ii).
PROPERTIES, CARE AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3734 (ii).
REBELLION OF 1837-38, LAND GRANTS TO VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 961 (i).
SADDLERY, 1ST REGT. OF CAVALRY: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
SCHOOL OF INFANTRY, ST. JOHN, SURGEON: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3620 (ii).
STORES: in Com. of Sup., 3717 (ii).
STRIKE IN OTTAWA AND VICINITY, CALLING OUT MILITIA: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 5555 (iii).
VETERANS OF 1837-38, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2923, 3287 (ii).
WELLINGTON, B.C., MILITARY AID TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).
—— PAYMENTS FOR ACTIVE SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 2146 (ii).
WHITMAN, CAPT. C. W. S., APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).
WINNIPEG MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4444 (iii).

MIMINIGASH BREAKWATER, WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 4532.
—— PET. OF FISHERMEN, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4296 (iii).
—— PROGRESS OF WORK: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3959.
MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY INTO B. C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 965 (i).
MINISTERIAL EXPLANATION: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 237 (i).
MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS, RUMOURED RESIGNATION: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3653 (ii).
—— RESIGNATION: Announced (Sir *John Thompson*) 5074 (iii).
MINISTRY, NEW: Stmnt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 891.
MINOR REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 5171 (iii).
MISCELLANEOUS JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 506, 1556 (i); conc., 6303, 6169 (iii).
MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i), 5081, 5346, 5417, 6261; conc., 5426 (iii).
Modus Vivendi. *See* "U. S."
MONCTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1653 (i), 3882 (ii).

Montreal and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Ives*). 1°*, 156; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
—— AND SOREL RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3614 (ii).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 121 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 1483; 2°*, 1757 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
MONTREAL AND MILE END, &c., MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).
—— CUSTOMS HOUSE EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3275 (ii).
—— IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii), 4675 (iii).
—— SUPERANNUATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3616.
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. No. 95 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 549; 2°*, 1098; in Com. and 3°*, 1099 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
Montreal and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 65 (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
—— PILOTS: Remarks (Mr. *Delisle*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6144 (iii).
—— P. O. LETTER BOX CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii).
MONUMENT OF SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2148 (ii).
MOTIONS ALLOWED TO STAND: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1932 (i).
—— PRIVATE MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 127 (i).

MOUNTED POLICE:
BUILDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4448 (iii).
COMPENSATION TO MEMBERS: in Com. of Sup., 5086; conc., 5427 (iii).
HERCHMER, L. W., REP. OF DEPTL. ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 267, 1574 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) *re* Res., 711 (i).
—— COMPT. WHITE'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1574 (i), 2669 (ii).
—— ENQUIRY INTO CONDUCT: prop. Res, (Mr. *Davin*) 2913; wthdn., 2923 (ii).
DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 237 (i).
HERCHMER, LIEUT. COL. WM., LETTER FROM C. E. D. WOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4292 (iii).
IN COM. OF SUP., 1697 (i), 4817, 6274; conc., 5415, 5427 (iii).
"KEEWATIN," POLICE PATROL BOAT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4294 (iii).
LAIDLOW, WM., RESIGNATION, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1048 (i).
PRESS ARTICLE *re* REFORM: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1269.
MULGRAVE AND POINT TUPPER TRAIN FERRY: in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
MUNRO, THOS., REP. *re* MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1579 (i).
MUNROE, HUGH, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2546 (ii).
MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1728 (i), 4125 (ii).

MURRAY CANAL, OFFICIALS EMPLOYED: Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 4675 (iii).
MUTTART, MR., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).
NAPANEE GAS INSPECTOR, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).
——— P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 6242 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 1272 (i), 2154 (ii).
NAPIERVILLE AND ST. REMI RY. SUBSIDY, PETS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Monet*) 2541 (ii).
NAPIERVILLE ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).
NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 4663 (iii).
NAVIGABLE RIVERS, OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3508 (ii).
NAVIGATION, IMPROVEMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4533.
NELSON, B. C., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2521 (ii).
New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 37 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 266; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 99.)
——— *See* "C. P. R."
NEW CARLISLE WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 966 (i).
NEW ENGLAND PAPER CO., PURCHASES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1767 (i).
NEWFOUNLAND BAIT ACT, SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 113 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3267 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6188 (iii).
——— TRADE RELATIONS: Mess. from His. Ex., 736, 1199 (i).
NEW GLASGOW, INCREASED RY. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii), 6197 (iii).
NEW HARBOUR, &c., N.S., BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).
NEW LONDON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 18 (Mr. *Montague*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 105.)
NORTH NATION RIVER, WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).
NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).
NORTH SHORE RY., DEBENTURES, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2521 (ii).
——— M. for O.C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 974; deb. rsmd., 1014 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525, 527 (i).
North Shore Ry. *See* "C. P. R."
NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:
ALBERTA RY., PAYMENT OF LABOURERS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3956 (ii).
AMBER DEPOSITS, APPLICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 2518 (ii).
BANFF SPRINGS PARK AND RESERVE, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3957 (ii).
NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Continued.*
BREMNER'S CLAIM FOR FURS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1268 (i).
BRYDGES, LATE C. J., AND NORTH SASKATCHEWAN IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).
CALGARY AND EDMONTON MAIL SERVICE; Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3255 (ii).
——— AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3256 (ii).
ELECTORAL DIVISIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 221.
GRANT, J. J., ENTRY FOR DOM. LANDS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Davin*) 3635 (ii).
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATES: Ques. (Mr. *Daly*) 2144 (ii).
HERCHMER, COMMISSIONER. *See* general heading.
IMMIGRATION, MEMORIALS OF LEG. ASSEMBLY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1269 (i).
INDIAN DEPTL. ESTIMATES, REGINA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2935 (ii).
"KEEWATIN," POLICE PATROL BOAT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4294 (iii).
LIQUOR PERMITS IN N.W.T., REPS., &c.: M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 545 (i).
MACPHERSON, ADDISON, CLAIMS FOR LOSSES THROUGH REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3257 (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE. *See* general heading.
NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).
REGINA "LEADER", PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 4295 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 4465 (iii).
SETTLEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) wthdn., 2913.
See "GOVERNMENT."
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. No. 33 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 174 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. No. 178 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 6307; 2°, 6326 (iii).
N.W.T. Acts Amt. B. No. 126 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 1760 (i); 2° m., 3902; 2° and in Com., 3925 (ii), 4297; 3°*, 4299; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 6228 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 22.)
N.W.T. Representation Act Ant. B. No. 112 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 1101 (i).
N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. No. 148 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2373; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3157 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 56.)
NORTHUMBERLAND, EAST, CHARGES AGAINST MEMBER: Stmnt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 4085 (ii)
——— Formal Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 4462 (iii).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. *Flint*) 4533 (iii).
——— SITTINGS OF SEL. COM.: M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 4670.
——— PRINTING EVIDENCE, 4825 (iii).
——— 2ND REP. OF SEL. COM.: presented (Mr. *Skinner*) 5487 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 5553 (iii).
——— 2ND REP. OF SEL. COM.: M. (Mr. *Skinner*) to conc., 5612; Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 5612; neg. (Y. 74, N. 99) 5724; Rep. conc. in (Y. 98, N. 75) 5725 (iii).
Deb. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 5636; (Mr. *Barron*) 5644; (Mr. *German*) 5664; (Mr. *Masson*) 5672: (Mr. *Flint*) 5687; (Mr. *Skinner*) 5701; (Mr. *Mulock*) 5708; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 5722 (iii).

NOVA SCOTIA :
ANNAPOLIS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDER AND CONTRACTS : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 529 (i).
—— M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 544 (i).
ANNAPOLIS ROYAL CUSTOMS COLLECTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 270 (i).
ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH INDIANS : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 224 (i).
BANDMASTER, 69TH BATT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i),
BAY OF FUNDY FISHERIES : M. for Ret., &c. (Mr. *Bowers*) 715 (i).
" BLIZZARD," SCH., RESCUE OF CREW, REWARDS : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).
BOUNTIES, FISHERY, PAID IN GUYSBOROUGH CO. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).
—— PAID IN QUEEN'S : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 734 (i).
BREAKWATERS, GUYSBOROUGH CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i),
CAMPBELLTON P.O., ESTABLISHMENT, PETS., &C. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 544 (i).
CAPE BRETON AND N.S. RY. ACCOMMODATION : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).
—— STATION MASTERS' DUTIES : Ques. (Mr. *Mc Dougall, C.B.*) 4677 (iii).
CENTREVILLE BREAKWATER, REP. *re* REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 962 (i).
HALIFAX CITY MARKET PROPERTY, SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1770 (i).
COSGROVE, JOHN, RESIGNATION, &C. : M. for Cor. &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).
COTTON SAIL DUCK, IMPORTS AT HALIFAX : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 174 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 142 (i).
DIGBY POSTAL ACCOMMODATION : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1264 (i).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY SUPPLIES, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1928 (i).
EAST RIVER, DEEPENING : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1011.
FINES FOR VIOLATING FISHERY LAWS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 189 (i).
FISHERY INSPECTOR, DIST. NO. 3, RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 130 (i).
FISHERY PROTECTION, CAPE BRETON : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 527 (i).
FORESHORES, &C., OF THE DOM., OWNERSHIP : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 178 (i).
FULLERTON, AUGUSTUS, SUPERANNUATION : Ques. (Mr. *White, Annapolis*) 270 (i).
GUYSBOROUGH CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, SUPERANNUATION : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2520 (ii).
—— FISHERY OVERSEER, SALARY PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 5403 (iii).
HALIFAX COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INCREASE OF SALARY : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2547 (ii).
INDIANS IN ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 224 (i).
INGLIS, BANDMASTER OF 69TH BAT. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 2522 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).
KENTVILLE POSTMASTER, SUSPENSION : Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 221 (i).
LAHAVE RIVER, SAWDUST DEPOSITS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).
LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 143 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Continued.*
LIVERPOOL P. O. ACCOMMODATION : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1768 (i).
METEGHAN WHARF, REP. *re* REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 530 (i).
MUNROE, HUGH, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2546 (ii).
NEW HARBOUR, &C., BREAKWATERS : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).
NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).
OXFORD AND PICTOU MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1768 (i).
PORT GEORGE PIER, TENDERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 2910 (ii).
RAQUETTE PIER, CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1575 (i).
RYS. IN INVERNESS CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).
RETURNING OFFICER FOR VICTORIA, APPOINTMENT : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).
"SEIGFREID," SCHOONER, REWARD TO CAPTAIN, &C. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).
SHORT LINE RAILWAY, NEW ROUTE : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3266 (ii).
SISSIBOO RIVER, DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1574 (i).
SUPPLIES, &C., PURCHASED FOR INDIANS IN N.S. : M. for List, &c.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).
STONY ISLAND BREAKWATER, AMOUNTS PAID, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 5408 (iii).
WHITMAN, CAPT C. W. S., APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY," &C.]
Oaths of Office. *See* "ADMINISTRATION."
OCEAN MAIL SERVICE : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 124 (i).
OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 3508 (ii), 6265 (iii).
OKA INDIANS, REMOVAL TO GIBSON : in Com. of Sup., 4728 (ii) ; conc., 5411 (iii).
Okanagon Ry. Co. *See* "C. P. R."
OLD MAN'S RIVER, FORT MACLEOD, FREE BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 4607 (iii).
OLD RECORDS, CLASSIFICATION : in Com. of Sup., 5084, 5124 (iii).
O'MEARA, D. D., ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, QUE. : in Com. of Sup., 1714 (i).
Ont. Express and Transportation Co.'s B. No. 151 (Mr. *Sutherland*). Rules, &c., suspended and 1° of B., 2905 ; 2° m., 3230 ; 2°, 3593 (ii) ; in Com. and 3°*, 4256 (iii). (54-55 Vic., c. 110.)
ONT. MUNICIPALITIES, DEPUTATION, COR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE" : Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 389 (i).
Ont. and New York Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 93 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 549 ; 2°*, 601 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 1604 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 67.)
Ont. and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. No. 102 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 891 ; 2°*, 983 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 120.)
Ont. and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 77 (Mr. *LaRivière*). 1°*, 441 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com., 1603 ; 3°*, 1957 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 82.)
ONTARIO :
ALBINO POINT, CUSTOMS OFFICERS : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *German*) 1579 (i).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

ALLEN, INDIAN AGENT, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1264 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1298, 1928 (i).
ALLISONVILLE POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2153 (ii).
AMHERSTBURG DRY DOCK: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 3287 (ii).
——— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 3259 (ii).
ATKINSON, J. H. C., APPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).
BARRIE P. O., ADVTS. FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Barron*) 2935 (ii).
——— CONTRACTOR'S NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 3255.
BATTELL, WILLIAM, EMPLYMT. AS CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 3952 (ii).
BAY OF QUINTE, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).
BEAVERTON DOCK, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 708 (i).
——— HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).
BIG BAY WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1929 (i).
——— EXPENDITURE; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 232 (i).
BRAMPTON POSTMASTER, VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 3259 (ii).
BRUCE COUNTY INDIANS, SALE OF LIQUOR TO: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 1272 (i).
CALEDONIA DAM, GRAND RIVER, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).
——— DRILL SHED, REPAIRS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).
CAMILLA AND WHITTINGTON MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2151 (ii).
CAMP, MILITIA DISTRICT NO. 1: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Hyman*) 231 (i).
CAVALRY, 1ST REGT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
——— SCHOOL, TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 222 (i).
CHARLEBOIS & CO., AMOUNT PAID ON LANGEVIN BLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1575 (i).
CHATHAM POST OFFICE, CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3931 (ii).
CHIPPEWA INDIANS, LETTER TO SIR JOHN MACDONALD *re* IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3264.
COCKBURN ISLAND LOCATION TICKETS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1271 (i).
COWAN, THOS., POSTMASTER AT GALT: Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).
DINGMAN, INDIAN INSPECTOR, ENQUIRY *re* AGENT ALLEN: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766 (i).
DISPUTED TERRITORY (ONT.), TIMBER CUT, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).
DRILL SHED, TORONTO, CONTRACT FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 963 (i).
DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD; M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bain*), 223 (i).
ELGIN (EAST) ELECTORAL DIST., RET. OF OFFICER'S ACCOUNT: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1579.
ELLIOTT, GEO. M., APPOINTMENT AS GAS INSPEDTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (CENTRAL) BULLETINS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 1579 (i).
——— *See* general heading.
FENELON FALLS, LOCKMASTER'S HOUSE: Ques, (Mr. *Barron*) 4673 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

FISHERY PROTECTION, GEORGIAN BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 220 (i).
——— SUPPLIES; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 544.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 221 (i).
FITZGERALD, FISHERY OFFICER, PETERBOROUGH CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 5405 (iii).
FORT ERIE AND BUFFALO FERRY: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1768 (i).
GALT POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).
GALT P. O., CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).
GALWAY P. O., ESTABLISHMENT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).
GRAHAM, J. R., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 210 (i).
GRAND RIVER FISHING LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Monck*) 709 (i).
——— NAVIGATION, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Montague*) 2155 (ii).
GRAVING DOCK. *See* "KINGSTON."
HASTINGS CO., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).
——— MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212.
HOLSTEIN POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766, 1929 (i).
ILLEGAL CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2520 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS, NORTH BRUCE, LIST OF CHARGES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1272 (i).
INDIAN AGENT ALLEN, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1264 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1298, 1928 (i).
——— AGENT AT SUTTON, WEST; Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 961 (i).
——— COST OF INVESTIGATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 145 (i).
——— AGENT JONES, CHARGES AGAINST; Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4673 (iii).
——— RESERVE NO. 6, TIMBER CUT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).
INTERNATIONAL ABATTOIR CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3615 (ii).
JOHNSTON, SAML., DISMISSAL FROM CUSTOMS SERVICE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *German*) 2935 (ii).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, PAYMENTS FOR DREDGING: Ques (Mr. *Campbell*) 1267 (i).
——— TENDERS FOR DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 129 (i).
KINGSTON DRY DOCK, ORIGINAL PLAN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Amyot*) 1579 (i),
——— PAPERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1764 (i).
——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1848 (i).
——— TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 128.
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, COAL SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3260 (i).
KINGSTON P.O., LESSEES OF BOXES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1578 (i).
——— LESSEE OF BOX 524: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 962 (i).
——— LETTER BOXES, LEASES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).
——— REP. OF POSTMASTER, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 2545 (ii).
LAKEPORT HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets. &c.* (Mr. *Hargraft*) 232 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 207 (i).
LANGEVIN BLOCK. *See* "PUBLIC WORKS."
LEGAL SERVICES, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907.

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

LEWIS, LIEUT.-COL., VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Burnham*) 733 (i).

LICENSES FOR POUND NETS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223, 238, 529 (i).

LINDSAY, P. O., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225.

——— COMPLETION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 268 (i).

LIQUOR SALES TO INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 270, 530, 1264 (i).

LOBO P. O., CHANGE OF POSTMASTER: M. for Pets.* (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1579 (i).

LUNDY'S LANE, COMMEMORATION OF BATTLE: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 3618 (ii).

MCARTHUR, WM., APPOINTMENT AS MAIL CLERK: Ques. (Mr *Barron*) 4671 (iii).

MCCORMICK, F. B., REMOVAL AND REINSTATEMENT: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (ii).

MCMAHON, CHAS. W., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Ret * (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

MILITIA. *See* general heading.

NAPANEE, GAS INSPECTOR, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 5076 (iii).

——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 2154 (ii).

——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 1272 (i).

ORDNANCE LANDS, RIDEAU CANAL, SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).

OWEN SOUND HARBOUR, CHANGES IN SPECIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, METAL PILLARS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1273 (i).

PELEE ISLAND, SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i).

PETERBOROUGH POST OFFICE CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).

PLUMMER, M., SERVICES AT SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (i), 2905 (ii).

POUND NET LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223, 238, 529 (i).

QUINTÉ, BAY OF, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 201 (i).

RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Murray*) 544 (i).

REBELLION OF 1837-38, LAND GRANTS TO VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 961 (i).

REED AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).

RIDEAU CANAL. *See* "CANALS,"

SADDLERY, 1ST REGT. OF CAVALRY: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).

ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, DEEPENING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1927 (i).

SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF, MR. PLUMMER'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (ii).

——— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1268 (i).

——— RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2905 (ii).

——— RETURN OF FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3620 (ii).

SHAW & SHAW, LEGAL SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).

SHAWANAKISKIC INDIANS, BOUNTY UNDER TREATY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 269 (i).

STRATFORD, EXCISE COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 5078 (iii).

STRATHROY P.O. BUILDING, TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).

——— CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 3262

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

SUTTON, WEST, INDIAN AGENT, COST OF INVESTIGATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 145 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 961 (i).

TAY CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

THAMES RIVER, REMOVAL OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1268 (i).

TIMBER CUT, &C., IN DISPUTED TERRITORY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).

——— ON INDIAN RESERVE NO. 6: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).

TORONTO DRILL SHED, CONTRACTS FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 964 (i).

TURNING BASIN, WELLAND CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 270 (i).

WALKER, DR., CLAIM: M. for O. C., &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).

WALKERTON CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266 (ii).

——— P. O., CONTRACT FOR FITTING: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 963 (i).

——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 1271 (i).

——— CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Traux*) 2151 (ii).

——— HEATING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 335 (i).

——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 267 (i).

——— SEIZURE OF IRON BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3619 (ii).

——— SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266 (ii).

WIARTON HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).

WELLAND CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

WILSON, JAS., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE:

ORDER:

COBOURG HARBOUR, IN COM. OF SUP.: Reference by Mr. *Mulock* to a past deb. questioned by Mr. *Foster*. Ruled (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) out of Order, 4658 (iii).

CUSTOMS ACT AMT. (SUGAR DUTIES): Member called to Order for using unparliamentary language and referring to matters connected with Committees outside the House. Ruled (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) out of Order, 5330 (iii).

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. 147: On M. to adjn. deb. on 1°, Member called to Order by Mr. *Mills* (*Bothwell*) for imputing improper motives to previous speaker *re* conduct of certain returning officers, 2370. Mr. *Speaker's* ruling, and remarks wthdn., 2371 (ii).

FRANCHISE ACT REPEAL B. 8: On 2°, Member called to Order for using unparliamentary language, the same wthdn., 324 (i).

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS: Raising discussions; intervention of Mr. *Speaker* calling for the Orders of the Day, 1013 (i).

NEWSPAPER REPORTS, INCORRECT: Reading of same ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 2962 (ii).

NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: Member requested by Mr. *Deputy Speaker* to confine himself to question before the Chair, 4757 (iii).

PROHIBITION DEB.: Unparliamentary expressions. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that Member who uses them must withdraw same absolutely and without qualification, 1332, 1334 1341 (i).

P. E. I. RY., IN COM. OF SUP.: Member's remarks checked, by Mr. *Deputy Speaker*, in referring to a past deb., 3671 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—*Continued.*
ORDER—*Continued.*
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM., SITTINGS, &c.: Remarks of Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) called in question by Sir *John Thompson*, 984; on M. for adjmnt., Mr. *Speaker* drew Member's attention to the fact that he was not speaking to the subject, 987; further remarks by Mr. *Speaker*, 991 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., ACCTS. *re* BOURCIER: on M. (Mr. *Somerville*) to ref. to Com., objection taken by Mr. *Foster*, notice not having been given; objection sustained by Mr. *Speaker* and M. ruled out of Order, 3949 (ii).
—— ACCTS. *re* P. O. DEPT.: M. (Mr. *Barron*) to ref. objected to; ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 2517 (ii).
—— PRINTING EVIDENCE *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK: M. (Mr. *Mulock*) objected to by Mr. *Wallace*. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that same can only be put by unanimous consent of the House, 2375 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to rescind Order of House, *re* Witnesses under Oath, objected to by Mr. *Laurier* and same sustained by Mr. *Speaker*, no notice being given, 1925 (i), 2517 (ii).
REGINA "LEADER," AMOUNTS PAID: Toronto *Globe's* statement, culled from Auditor Gen.'s Rep., repudiated by Mr. *Davin*, 4241; speaking disrespectfully of a Member of another branch of the Legislature ruled out of Order and withdrawal requested by Mr. *Speaker*, 4242 (iii).
SECOND HOMESTEADS, RELEVANCY OF DEB.: Objection taken by Sir *John Thompson* to Member introducing private business transactions into deb. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) subject-matter introduced not relevant, 616 (i).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL: Reference to previous deb. ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 215 (i).
WEST INDIES SS. SUBSIDIES: Members addressing the House should not make insinuations (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 4974 (iii).
—— Discussion ruled out of Order; M. to adjn. should be made before Member can make a speech (Mr. *Speaker*) 195.
PRIVILEGE:
BINDING TWINE DEB.: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Stairs*) correction of speech, 2936 (ii).
CIRCULAR ADDRESSED TO INDIANS: Publication of same repudiated by the Member for Haldimand, 2474. Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 2475 (ii).
DEBATES, OFFICIAL: Personal Explanation *re* incorrect rep. of speech on the Budget, 1991 (i).
FEDERAL AND QUEBEC POLITICS: Article in *L'Electeur* and Mr. Mackintosh's visit to Montreal; personal explanation (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 5351 (iii).
LIBERAL MEETING (ALLEGED) IN MONTREAL: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Beausoleil*) *re* telegram forwarded to Toronto *Empire* newspaper, 3427.
MONTREAL PILOTS: Cor. in Montreal *Herald*, *re* grounding of ship *Trobique*, read by Mr. *Delisle*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6144 (iii).
NORTHUMBERLAND, EAST, CHARGES AGAINST MEMBER: Formal statement, Mr. *Cameron* (*Huron*) read, 4085; cannot be entered upon the Journals unless a motion is made (Mr. *Speaker*) 4087 (ii).
—— REP. OF SEL. COM.: Rep. in Ottawa *Free Press*, *re* Investigation. Remarks (Mr. *Skinner*) 5384 (iii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—*Continued.*
PRIVILEGE—*Continued.*
ORANGE INFLUENCE: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) *re* statement made in House and contradicted by the Minister of Customs; extract from *Globe* of 1883 read, 1964 (i).
—— (Mr. *Wallace*) *re* report of speech in Toronto *Mail*, 2962; reference to incorrect report of remarks not made in the House, ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) not in Order, 2962; authority quoted, 2963 (ii).
PAIRING OF MEMBERS: Alleged breaking denied (Mr. *Colter*) and attention of the House drawn to offensive newspaper articles in Ottawa *Citizen* and Montreal *Gazette*, 3578 (ii).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Edwards*) Remarks, and Letter from Mr. *Ross* (*Lisgar*) read, 3822 (ii).
PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE; Report published in the Toronto *Mail*, misstatement corrected by Mr. *Charlton*, 2069 (i).
PROHIBITION DEB.: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Scriver*) *re* Speech and quotations made, 2204 (ii).
REUTER'S AGENCY AND DESPATCH IN LONDON "TIMES": Truthfulness denied by Mr. *Tarte*, 4239. Quoting from paper of proceedings that did not occur in the House not a question of privilege; only statements by newspapers respecting proceedings of the House is a Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Speaker*) 4239 (iii).
ROOM PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Murray*) *re* paragraph in Toronto *Empire* reflecting on the Member for Pontiac, 806 (i).
TESTIMONIALS TO MINISTERS: Personal Explanation (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Minister of Inland Revenue not referred to in remarks, 3974 (ii).
TUNNEL, P.E.I., AND MAINLAND: Cor. in Charlottetown *Daily Examiner* taken exception to by Mr. *Cockburn*, and rights and privileges of Members claimed from Mr. *Speaker*, 1604 (i).
VOTE ON TRADE, SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT'S AMT.: paragraph *re* Refusal, as published in Toronto *Empire*, denied, 3200 (ii).
WANT OF CONFIDENCE VOTE (ALLEGED): Remarks (Mr. *Joncas*) on article in *Le Monde* newspaper, 1346 (i).
PROCEDURE:
ADJOURNMENTS: Mr. *Laurier* having moved the adjnmt. of the deb. subsequently moved the adjnmt. of the House, at which objection was taken by Mr. *Ouimet* as to regularity of procedure. Objection ruled by Mr. *Speaker* to be well taken and M. to adjn. the House wthdn., 6027 (iii).
ALLEN, INDIAN AGENT: Questions put to Ministers on Orders of the Day being called not being questions of urgency ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 1298 (i).
CHISHOLM, INDIAN AGENT: On M. for Com. of Sup., Mr. *Flint's* remarks *re* declaration ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker* and Rule read, 6147 (iii).
CONCURRENCE: Members' attention directed by Mr. *Speaker* to the Rule that Items must be taken as they are called, 4278 (iii).
EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES B. 11: On 2°, Mr. *Speaker* ruled that the mover of the B. has not the right of reply, the 2° being an Order of the Day and not a substantive motion, 2961 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—*Continued.*
PROCEDURE—*Continued.*
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, PAPERS, &c.: On M. for Com. of Sup., Member's remarks checked on referring to papers and evidence taken before the Pub. Accts. Com., the same not having been reported to the House, 3656; Member ruled not in Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 3658 (ii).
MEMBER SPEAKING TWICE: On M. for 2° of B. 103, Member having spoken his right to make a second speech exhausted. Rule quoted (Mr. *Speaker*) 3306 (ii).
MEMBER'S VOTE CHALLENGED: Must be in the House when the question is put by the Speaker, or vote cannot be recorded (Mr. *Speaker*) 4428 (ii).
PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS: Member not present when motion which stands in his name is called, the same will be dropped, unless it stands at the request of the Government (Mr. *Speaker*) 127 (i).
PROHIBITION, ON ADJNMT.: Criticising conduct of Govt. and interrupting Order of Business can only take place by consent of the House (Mr. *Speaker*) 546 (i).
—— VOTE ON MR. FOSTER'S AMT.: on M. for Com. of Sup., explanation (Mr. *McNeill*) 1543. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) should be made on the Orders of the Day being called, 1544 (i).
READING SPEECHES: Attention of Mr. *Speaker* being called to the fact of Member reading his speech, Mr. *Speaker* ruled that the same is not permissible, the Rule being imperative that written speeches cannot be delivered; extracts may be read, 716 (i).
RESUMING DEBATE ON M. TO ADJN. THE HOUSE: M. to adjn. the deb. having been voted on and negatived, Mr. *Ouimet* (6031) raised the question "That under the cover of a M. of adjnmt. an hon. member is not allowed to speak on a question which is on the Order Paper;" authorities (May and Bourinot) quoted in support. Mr. *Speaker* partly agreed in the question raised, but could not agree that a Member cannot discuss the question which was before the House when the adjnmt. is moved, 6032 (iii).
QUARANTINE (U.S.) REGULATIONS: M. (Mr. *McMullen*) ruled out of Order, and authority quoted *re* making a speech on Calling of Orders (Mr. *Speaker*) 743 (i).
SUBSIDIES (MONEY) TO RYS. RES. IN COM.: Objection taken by Mr. *Mulock* to Member discussing railways not in the resolutions before the Com. Mr. *Deputy Speaker* sustained the objection, 6136 (iii).
SUGAR DUTIES: Order called for House in Com. of Whole on Res. (Mr. *Mulock*). Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) the M. anticipating a discussion on the Order Paper, according to Parliamentary practice, cannot be taken up, 1931 (i).
VOTING ON DIVISIONS: The question being raised as to recording a Member's vote, he entering the House during the reading of a motion, Mr. *Speaker* quoted from Bourinot to the effect that "If a Member was not present in the House when the question was put by the Speaker, he cannot have his vote recorded," 4455. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that Member must be in the House and have heard the question read from the beginning, in either official language, to entitle him to vote, 4462 (iii).

Ordnance Lands. *See* "QUEBEC SKATING CLUB."
—— in Com. of Sup., 5171 (iii).
—— MONTREAL CITY, LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 5409 (iii).
—— RIDEAU CANAL, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).
Oshawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 123 (Mr. *Madill*). 1°*, 1574; 2°*, 1757 (i); in Com. on 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 91.)
OSHAWA RY. AND NAVIGATION CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6137 (iii).
Ottawa and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s, &c., B. No. 96 (Mr. *Jamieson*). 1°*, 600; 2°*, 828; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 93.)
OTTAWA COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).
—— GROUNDS AROUND BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4470 (iii).
—— P. O., ADVERTISING ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF MAILS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 963 (i).
—— IN "LE CANADA": M. for Ret. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2540 (ii).
—— RIVER, CHANNEL THROUGH NARROWS: in Com. of Sup., 4571 (iii).
—— DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 2522 (ii).
—— GATINEAU BOOM: in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iii).
OUILLET, HERMIDAS, ENQUIRY AT STE. FLAVIE: M. for Pet. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1937 (i).
OWEN SOUND HARBOUR, CHANGES IN SPECIFICATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 4565 (iii).
OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i), 6197 (iii).
—— AND PICTOU MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1768 (i).
OYSTER BEDS, LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii), 5157 (iii).
PALMER, LATE CHIEF JUSTICE, ALLOWANCE TO FAMILY: in Com. of Sup., 6276 (iii).
PAIRING OF MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor, &c.*) 331, 386, 631, 742, 800, 1199 (i), 3426 (ii), 4488)iii).
PAPER CONTRACT, CLAIM OF MR. BARBER: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 269 (i).
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, METAL PILLARS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1273 (i).
PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS, DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 5081 (iii).
PARLIAMENT, 7TH, opening, 1 (i).
PAPASHASE INDIAN RESERVE: Remarks (Mr. *Watson*, &c.) on adjnmt., 1403 (i).
PASPASCKASE RESERVE, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3265 (ii).
Patent Act Amt. B. No. 142 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2144; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3244 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)
"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 953 (ii).
Patents. *See* "CORBIN."
PAYMASTER, MIL. DISTS. NOS. 5 AND 6: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 707 (i).
PAYNE, LATE JAS., ALLOWANCE TO HEIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).

PAY ROLL, MIL. CAMP, SOREL AND ST. JOHN'S: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lépine*) 1062 (i).
PELEE ISLAND, SUB-COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i).
——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580, 1980 (i).
PELLETIER, H. H., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Aymot*) 3258 (ii).
Pembroke Lumber Co.'s incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds*). 1°*, 156; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 121.)
PEMBROKE P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 4369 (iii).
PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 242, 882, 1558 (i), 6170 (iii).
——— INSPECTOR'S REP.: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 129 (i).
PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1572, 1729 (i), 3660 (ii).
——— PERMANENT CORPS, &c., SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*) 2908 (ii).
PERLEY, H. F., AND QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 527 (i).
PERMANENT FORCES, BATTERIES AND SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 3737 (i).
PERMITS, LIQUOR, IN N.W.T., REPS., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Charlton*) 545 (i).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Beausoleil*) par. in *Empire* newspaper, 3427 (ii).
——— (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) *re* Minister of Inland Rev., 3947 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Edwards*) *re* Pairs, 3822 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Mackintosh*) *re* par. in *L'Electeur*, 5351.
——— (Mr. *McNeil*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1543; (Mr. *Watson*) 1544 (i).
——— (Mr. *Montague*) *Hansard* Rep., 1991 (i).
——— (Mr. *Scriver*) Speech on Prohibition, 2204 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Stairs*) Speech on Binding Twine, 2936.
——— (Mr. *Wallace*) Orange Influence, par. in Toronto *Mail*, 2962, 2964 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Charlton*) quotation from *Globe*, 1883, read, 1964 (i).
PETERBOROUGH CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4370, 6246 (iii).
——— P. O. CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).
Peterborough, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 72 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 63.)
PETERSON, CAPT., REWARD FOR SAVING LIFE: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).
PETROLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4372.
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 157 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 3426; 2°* and in Com., 3648; 3°*, 3649 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 49.)
PICKFORD & BLACK, MESSRS., PAYMENT OF SUBSIDIES: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 544 (i).
Pictou Bank Winding-up Act Amt. B. No. 76 (Mr. *Macdougald, Pictou*). 1°, 388; 2°, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 111.)
Pictou Harbour Commissioners' Acts Amt. B. No. 150 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 2667; 2° and in Com., 3594; 3°*, 3961 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 54.)
PIERS, WHARVES AND BREAKWATERS, P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3951 (ii).
PINETTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).
PLATE PRESENTED TO MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS, DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2912 (ii).
PLUMMER, M., SERVICES AT SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (i), 2905 (ii).
POLSON MANUFACTURING CO., STEEL PLATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 270 (i).
PONNELL, JOHN, EMPLYMT. BY SOREL HARBOUR BOARD: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5076 (iii).
PORT ARTHUR P. O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4371 (iii).
PORT GEORGE PIER, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 2910 (ii).
PORT MAITLAND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 6254.
PORT MULGRAVE, &c., AND CHETICAMP SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4701 (iii).
PORTNEUF ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
PORTER, DAVID, CLAIM: Remarks (Mr. *Madill*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6229 (iii).
POSTMASTER GENERAL'S DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 254, 440 (i), 6166 (iii).
——— DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 103 (i).
POSTMASTERS OF THE DOMINION, SALARIES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 128 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1275, 1767 (i).
POST OFFICE:
ALLISONVILLE POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2153 (ii).
ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 124 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1765 (i).
BRAMPTON, POSTMASTER, VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 3259 (ii).
B. C. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4294 (iii).
BOURGEOIS, DR. G. A., P. O. INSPECTOR, RETIREMENT: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2935 (ii)
CALGARY AND EDMONTON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3255 (ii).
——— AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3256 (i).
CAMILLA AND WHITTINGTON MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2151 (ii).
CAMPBELLTON P.O., ESTABLISHMENT, PETS., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 544 (i).
CAOUETTE, J. B., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544 (i).
CROSS POINT AND GASPÉ BASIN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (ii).
——— AND PASPEBIAC MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).
DIGBY, POSTAL ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1264 (i).
GALT POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION; Ques. (Mr. *Semple*) 1263 (i).
GALWAY P. O., ESTABLISHMENT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).
GRAHAM, DISMISSAL, ENQUIRY FOR RET. (Mr. *Barron* 3200 (ii).
GREAT BRITAIN AND CAN. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1765 (i).
HASTINGS COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Continued.*

HOLSTEIN POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1766, 1929 (i).

IMPERIAL POSTAL UNION: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 131.

IN COM. OF SUP., 1744 (i), 4705, 6279 (iii).

KENTVILLE, N.S., POSTMASTER, SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 221 (i).

KINGSTON P. O., LESSEE OF BOX 524: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 962 (i).

—— LETTER BOXES, LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1578 (i).

—— REP. OF POSTMASTER, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 2545 (ii).

LABERGE, MR., ASST. POSTMASTER, QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3954 (ii).

"LE CANADA," ADVERTISING OTTAWA MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2540 (ii).

LETTER POSTAGE, CHANGE IN RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 129 (i),

LETTERS, REGISTRATION FEE, REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 143 (i).

LIVERPOOL P.O., ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1768 (i).

LOBO P. O., CHANGE OF POSTMASTER: M. for Pets.* (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1579 (i).

LYSTER POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 3958 (ii).

MONTREAL AND MILE END, &c., MAIL SERVICE CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).

MONTREAL P.O., LETTER CONCERNING CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii).

MCARTHUR, WM., APPOINTMENT AS MAIL CLERK: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 4671 (iii).

MCMAHON, CHAS. W., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

NELSON, B. C., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Fremont*) 2521 (ii).

OTTAWA P.O. ADVERTISING, ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF MAILS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 963 (i).

OTTAWA COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Letters, &c., (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).

OXFORD AND PICTOU MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1768 (i).

POSTMASTERS' SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1275, 1767 (i).

—— SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 128 (i).

QUEBEC P.O., SUNDAY CLOSING; Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1765 (i).

REED AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).

REGISTERED LETTERS, REDUCTION OF FEE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 143 (i).

REGISTRATION STAMPS, REVENUE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 158 (i),

RURAL POST OFFICES, OPENING AND CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2912 (ii).

ST. ANGÉLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).

—— DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) on M, for Com. of Sup., 6233 (iii).

STE. EMILE DE SUFFOLK, &c., POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Rets. (Mr. *Devlin*) 230 (i).

ST. HELEN'S, MAIL SERVICE *viâ* GODERICH: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3262 (ii).

SUMMERSIDE, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3955, 3956 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Continued.*

TRANS-CONTINENTAL MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 6216 (iii).

TWO-CENT LETTER POSTAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 129 (i).

—— UNIFORM RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Denison* 131 (i).)

WELDFORD, N.B., P.O., COMPLAINTS *re* MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 2151 (ii).

WILSON, JAS., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (ii).

YAMASKA, EAST, P.O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2153 (ii).

POTATOES EXPORTED FROM CANADA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 544 (i).

POUND NET LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 142, 198, 223, 529 (i).

POWNAL BAY, PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).

PRINCE ALBERT CROWN LANDS OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4450 (ii).

—— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iii).

"PRINCE EDWARD," DREDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

BELLE CREEK BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Walsh*) 1270 (i).

BRAE BREAKWATER, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr *Perry*) 1274 (i).

BRAE HARBOUR WHARF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208 (i).

—— DUES, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130.

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765, 2151 (i).

FISHERY WARDENS, APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 5409 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii).

FOX, SIR DOUGLAS, ESTIMATES *re* SUBMARINE TUNNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208 (i).

HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

MIMINIGASH BREAKWATER, PET. OF FISHERMEN, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4296 (iii).

—— PET. OF FISHERMEN, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4296 (iii).

—— PROGRESS OF WORK: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3959.

—— WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).

MUTTART, MR., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).

NEW LONDON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

OYSTER BEDS, LEASING: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3958 (ii).

PINETTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

PIERS, WHARVES AND BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr *Perry*) 3951 (ii).

POWNAL BAY, PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4672 (iii).

"PRINCE EDWARD" DREDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765.

RED POINT PIER, EXPEND. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1371 (ii).

SAUNDERS, WM., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).

"STANLEY," STEAMER, AND COM. WITH P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1929 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Continued.*

SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3258 (ii).

—— POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3955 (ii).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).

—— WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 708 (i).

—— HARBOUR MASTER, MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4673 (iii).

—— REFUND OF MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3259 (ii).

TUNNEL BETWEEN P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208 (i).

—— SIR DOUGLAS FOX'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4294 (ii).

WEST POINT WHARF, ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 269 (i).

WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 158 (i).

WOOD ISLANDS BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1271 (i).

WOOD ISLAND HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

P. E. I. AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4701 (iii).

P. E. I. RY., DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYÉS: Enquiry for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 4000 (iii).

—— EMPLOYÉS, DISMISSAL: Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 4087 (ii).

—— DISMISSAL OF SECTION FOREMEN: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1758 (i), 3898 (ii), 6198 (i).

—— ROAD-BED AND RAILS: M. for Reps. &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 228 (i).

—— TRAIN SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1274 (i).

PRINTING, ADVERTISING, INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1756 (i).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 738 (i).

—— DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 243, 442 (i), 6166 (iii).

PRINTING BUREAU, ABSENCE OF SUPERINTENDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2375, 2437 (ii).

—— ADDITIONAL PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 1706, (i), 5346 (iii).

—— BABCOCK FIRE EXTINGUISHERS: in Com. of Sup., 6253 (iii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 4393 (iii).

—— PURCHASE OF TYPE, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3619 (ii).

—— REGULATIONS *re* EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3618 (ii).

—— TYPE-SETTING MACHINES: Ques. (Mr. *Lepine*) 271 (i).

PRINTING, CLAIM OF LATE CONTRACTORS AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 269 (i).

PRINTING COM., JOINT: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 156 (i).

PRINTING, MISCELLANEOUS: conc., 5418 (iii).

PRINTING, PAPER, BINDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 946.

—— CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr *Delisle*) 528 (i).

PRINTING TIME TABLES, &c., GOVT. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 3614 (ii).

PRIVATE BILLS PETS., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 128 (i).

—— PRESENTATION, EXTENSION OF TIME: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 156 (ii).

—— REPS. FROM COM., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 3738 (ii).

—— M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2961 (ii).

—— REP. FROM COMS., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 828, 1483 (i), 2233, 3308 (iii)

—— SUSPENSION OF RULES: M. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 286; M. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 1987 (i).

Private Detective, Financial, &c., Corporations Regulations B. No. 109 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°*, 1011 (i).

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM., MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*, &c.) 983, 1987 (i).

—— PRINTING EVIDENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Armstrong*) 5352 (iii).

—— 1ST REP.: Presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 799 (i).

—— 2ND REP.: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) reducing Quorum, 2360 (ii).

—— 4TH REP.: Presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 3738 (ii).

—— 5TH REP.: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to conc., 4085 (ii)

—— 6TH REP., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to conc., 4825 (iii).

—— 7TH REP.: Presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 5553 (iii).

—— *See* "PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS."

PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF. *See* "ORDER," &c.

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 241, 433, 1556 (i), 6167 (iii).

PROROGATION: Com. from GOV. GEN.'s Sec. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 6309 (iii).

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 271; Amt. (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 344; Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Amt., 355; neg. (Y. 7, N. 185) 1312; M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn. deb., neg. (Y. 65, N. 74) 362; M. (Mr. *Gillies*) to adjn. deb., agreed to (Y. 98, N. 80) 385; Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Amt., 1313; agreed to (Y. 107, N. 88) 1344 (i).

—— COMMISSION, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6276 (iii).

—— Order for further consdn. postponed, 993 (i).

—— Remarks on adjnmt. (Sir *Hector Langevin, &c.*) 545, 736.

Provincial Accounts (Ont. and Que.) Settlement B. No. 99 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 807; 2°*, 1064; in Com. and 3°*, 1065 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 6.)

PROVINCIAL ACTS, TESTING VALIDITY: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 112 (i).

Provincial Courts Judges Act (*Chap.* 138 *Revised Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 153** (Sir *John Thompson*). Res. prop. 1849 (i); in Com., 3100; conc. in and 1°* of B., 3102; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3157 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 27.)

Provincial Govts. Transfer of Property B. No. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 1101 (i); 2°, 3985 (ii); in Com., 5751, 6223; 3°*, 6224 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 7.)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE:
ACCOUNTS *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to ref., 3948 (ii).
BOURCIER & Co.'S ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Somerville*) to ref., 3948 (ii).
BOURGEOIS, G. A., PAYMENT: M. (Mr. *Choquette*) to ref. Accts., 2361, 2437 (ii).
BRADLEY, W. I., ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) to ref., 5013 (iii).
COR., PUBLIC WORKS AND FINANCE: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to produce, 3199 (ii).
DEPT. OF INTERIOR: M. (Mr. *Somerville*) to ref. Accts., 2203 (ii).
EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2516 (ii).
FUNCTIONS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4088 (i).
HAYTER AND GORMAN'S ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) to ref., 2743 (ii).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to ref., 3621 (ii).
P. O. D. ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Barron*) to ref., 2517 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to ref., 2666 (ii).
PRINTING BUREAU ACCTS.&c.: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref., 2905 (ii).
—— PAPER ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref., 3308 (ii).
PRINTING EVIDENCE *re* J. R. ARNOLDI: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref., 3308 (ii).
—— *re* AUDIT OFFICE: M. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 5013 (iii).
—— MS. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2374, 3513 (ii).
—— 21ST REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Sproule*) 4608 (iii).
RET., &c., *re* GRAVING DOCK: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) 3576 (ii).
TÊTU, J. E., ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref., 2517.
TORONTO HARBOUR CONTRACT: M. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) to ref. Accts., 5013 (iii).
WITNESSES' EVIDENCE: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com, of Sup,, 4089 (ii).
WITNESSES ON OATH: M. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1345 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1925 (i).

PUBLIC DEBT AND SINKING FUND, TRUSTEES: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2152 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 103 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 255, 397, 439 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS, CHARGES OF CONSPIRACY: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Tarte*) 146; Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) to ref. to Priv. and Elec. Com., agreed to, 155 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to conc. in 7TH REP. OF COM. ON PRIV. AND ELEC., 5778; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 5919; neg. (Y. 83, N. 104) 6124; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) neg. (Y. 2, N. 184) 6121; Rep. conc. in (Y. 101, N. 86) 6125 (iii).
Deb. (Mr. *Tarte*) 5791, 6122; (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 5824; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 5853; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 5881; Amt., 5919 (iii).
Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Dickey*) 5919; (Mr. *Amyot*) 5999; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 6034; (Mr. *Laurier*) 6043; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 6064; Amt. to Amt., 6085 (iii).
Deb. on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) 6086; (Mr. *Davin*) 6100; (Mr. *Edgar*) 6100; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 6112; (Mr. *McNeill*) 6115; (Mr. *Mulock*) 6119 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CONTRACTS: M. to summon Hon. T. Robitaille (Mr. *Girouard*) 2437 (ii).
—— M. Connolly's Books produced, notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 954 (i).
—— PAPERS: Enquiry (Mr. *Edgar*) 219, 395, 746. [*See* "BANCROFT," "CONNOLLY," "LARKIN;" *also* "ESQUIMALT," "KINGSTON," "LÉVIS."]
—— Rep. of Sub-Com. on Priv. and Elec. *re* M. Connolly read, 895 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., PERMANENT EMPLOYÉS, &c.: M. for Pet.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 1579 (i).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1849 (i).
—— EMPLOYÉS, RET.: Welland Canal employés, enquiry (Mr. *McMullen*) 3200 (ii).
—— RESIGNATION OF MINISTER: Stmnt. read (Sir *John Thompson*) 5074 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3653 (ii).
—— EXPENDITURE SINCE CONFEDN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1061 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS:
AMHERSTBURG DRY DOCK, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 334 (i), 3259 (ii).
—— M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 3287 (ii).
ANNAPOLIS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 544 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 529 (i).
BARRIE P.O., ADVTS. FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Barron*) 2935 (ii).
—— CONTRACTOR'S NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 3255.
BAY OF QUINTÉ, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).
BEAVERTON HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).
—— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 708 (i).
BELLE CREEK BREAKWATER, P.E.I., REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1270 (i).
BIG BAY WHARF REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1929 (i).
—— EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 232 (i).
BLACK RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, ARTHABASKA CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 740 (i).
—— DRUMMOND CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 739 (i).
BONAVENTURE PIER, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 335 (i).
BOUCHERVILLE WHARF, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1265 (i).
BRAE BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CONTRACT. &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1274 (i).
BRAE HARBOUR WHARF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208.
BREAKWATERS, GUYSBOROUGH CO., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).
—— P.E.I., WHARFAGE DUES, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).
—— IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).
BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2912 (ii).
—— SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).
—— QUEBEC AND LÉVIS: M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 104, 1041 (i).
—— M. for Eng.'s Reps. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1053 (i).
BUCKINGHAM P.O.: CONSTRUCTION: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).
CACOUNA TIMBER FOR WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158 (i).
CALEDONIA DAM, GRAND RIVER, RECONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*

CALEDONIA DRILL SHED, REPAIRS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Montague*) 3287 (ii).

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765, 2151 (i),

CEMENT PURCHASES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 4674 (iii).

CENTREVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER, REP. *re* REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 962 (i).

CHATHAM P. O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3951 (ii).

COATICOOK P.O., COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 6216 (ii).

COTEAU LANDING WHARF AND SHEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 222 (i).

DREDGING DU LOUP RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158.

—— EAST RIVER, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1011 (i).

—— KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1267 (i).

—— RETURN *re* DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 600.

—— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 129 (i).

—— LE LIÈVRE AND OTTAWA RIVERS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).

—— OTTAWA RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 2522 (ii),

—— "PRINCE EDWARD" DREDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1765 (i).

—— "ST. LAWRENCE" DREDGE, RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Chateauguay*) 3952.

—— ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS SHOALS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1053 (i).

—— BOUCHIER, GEO. L., AND CAPT. GIGUÈRE, REPS.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

—— SISSIBOO RIVER: Ques (Mr. *Bowers*) 1574 (i).

—— SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3258 (ii).

—— THAMES RIVER, REMOVAL OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1268 (i).

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD: M. for O. Co.'s, &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).

EDGETT'S LANDING, BALLAST WHARF CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *King*) 3956 (i).

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, TENDERS, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1937 (i).

—— TENDERS FOR CAISSON, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i).

—— REP. *re* LENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 530 (i).

—— SUMS PAID ON ACCT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270.

FENELON FALLS, LOCKMASTER'S HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 4673 (iii).

FRASERVILLE P.O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3255 (ii).

GALT P.O., CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).

HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I., IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

HASTINGS CO., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 208 (i).

HULL P.O. CLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).

ISLE BIZARD BRIDGE: Ques. and Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4674, 5014, 5195 (iii).

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK ACCTS.: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to ref. to Public Accts. Com., 3621 (ii).

—— BANCROFT TENDER: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Amyot*) 4158; neg. (Y. 82, N. 99) 4212 (ii).

—— Notice for prop. Res. (Mr. *Tarte*) 635 (i).

—— ORIGINAL PLAN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Amyot*) 1579 (i).

—— PAPERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1764 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1848 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3653 (ii).

—— TENDERS, &C.*: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 127, 128 (i).

KNOWLTON'S LANDING, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1770 (i).

LAKEPORT HARBOUR OF REFUGE: Ques. (Mr. *Hargraft*) 207 (i).

—— CONSTRUCTION: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Hargraft*) 232 (i).

LANGEVIN BLOCK, OTTAWA, ADVTS. FOR TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 531 (i).

—— PAYMENTS TO SEPT. 1, 1891: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 5776 (iii).

—— STONE HAULED OVER I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1768 (i).

—— TOTAL EXPENDITURE, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock* 1267, 1575 (i).

LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK, MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).

LINDSAY PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 268 (i).

—— POST OFFICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).

METEGHAN WHARF, REP. *re* REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 530 (i).

MIMINIGASH BREAKWATER, WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr; *Perry*) 130 (i).

—— PROGRESS OF WORK: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3959 (ii), 4296 (iii).

NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 1272 (i), 2154 (ii).

NEW CARLISLE WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 966 (i).

NEW HARBOUR, &C., N.S., BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1012 (i).

NEW LONDON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Walsh*) 226 (i).

NORTH NATION RIVER, WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).

NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1576 (i).

OWEN SOUND HARBOUR, CHANGES IN SPECIFICATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, METAL PILLARS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1273 (i).

PETERBOROUGH P.O., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 225 (i).

PINETTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

PORT GEORGE PIER, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 2910 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE SINCE CONFEDN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1061 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1668, 1685, 1728, (i), 4314, 4444, 552, 4640, 4663, 6201, 6304 (iii).

—— DEPT., PERMANENT EMPLOYÉS, &C.: (Mr. *McMullen*) 1579 (i).

QUINTÉ, BAY OF, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 201 (i).

QUE. HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, CHIEF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 527 (i).

RAQUETTE PIER, N.S., CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1575 (i).

RED POINT PIER, P. E. I., EXPEND. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1271 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*
RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 336.
—— M. for Engineers Rep. (Mr. *Béchard*) 128 (i).
ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS, REP. *re* DREDGING: Remarks (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2437 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
SAFE IN FINANCE DEPT., TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 130 (i).
SAULT STE. MARIE WHARF, MR. PLUMMER'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (i).
—— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1268 (i).
—— RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2905 (ii).
—— RETURN OF FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3620 (ii).
STRATHROY P. O., BUILDING, TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).
—— CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 3262 (ii).
STONEY ISLAND BREAKWATER, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 5408 (iii).
SOREL HARBOUR WORKS, MEN EMPLOYED, NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).
—— WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 708 (i).
TIGNISH HARBOUR MASTER, MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3259, 4673 (iii).
THREE RIVERS PIER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5776 (iii).
TORONTO DRILL SHED, CONTRACTS FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 964 (i).
TUNNEL, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 203, 227 (i).
—— Explanation (Mr. *Foster*) 227 (i).
—— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1277, 1605 (i).
—— SIR DOUGLAS FOX'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 4294 (ii).
VAUDREUIL WHARF, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Harwood*) 335 (i).
VAUDREUIL AND BOUCHERVILLE WHARVES, EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2548.
VICTORIA, B. C., DRILL HALL: M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).
WALKERTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 1271 (i).
—— BUILDINGS, HEATING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 335 (i).
—— CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2151 (ii)
—— CONTRACT FOR FITTING: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 962 (i).
—— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 267 (i).
WEST POINT WHARF, ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 269 (i).
WIARTON HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).
WOOD ISLAND HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226, 1271 (i).
WOOD SUPPLY, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, JOHN HENEY'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4295 (iii).
[*See* "SUPPLY," &c.]

PUGSLEY, WM., PET.: M. (Mr. *Davin*) to ref. to Standing Orders Com., 799 (i).

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i), 3576, 5336; conc., 5435 (iii).
—— OFFICER AT RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3616 (ii).
QUARANTINE REGULATIONS, U. S.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 960 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *McMullen, &c.*) 742 (i).
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6032; in Com., 6137 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. No. 87 (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*). 1°*, 548; 2°*, 982; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 107.)
QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY, PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Godbout*) 4675 (iii).
—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
QUEBEC COLONIZATION LOTTERY: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2154 (ii).
QUEBEC EASTERN RY. SUBSIDY, PETS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 1934 (i).
QUEBEC GARRISON CLUB, LANDS LEASED: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 527 (i).
QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, CHIEF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 527 (i).
—— INTEREST OWED GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 270.
—— LAFORCE LANGEVIN'S SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).
—— CONTRACTS, REP. OF COM.: presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 799 (i); M. (Sir *John Thompson*) summoning M. Connolly to Bar of House, 806 (i).
QUEBEC LANDSLIDE: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3621 (ii).
QUEBEC P. O., SUNDAY CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1765 (i).
QUEBEC RY. BRIDGE AND NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 525 (i).
Quebec Skating Club, Conveyance of Land B. No. 160 (Sir *John Thompson*). Res. prop., 891 (i); in Com., 3584; 1°* of B., 3649; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3984 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 14.)
QUEBEC WATER POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 3508 (ii).
QUEBEC, WEST, EXPULSION OF MEMBER: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6285 (iii).
—— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Ordering attendance of Member, 3827 (ii).
—— Order for attendance of Member read, 4001 (ii).
—— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) for Arrest, 4001 (ii).
—— SEAT, REP. OF SUB.-COM. ON PRIV. AND ELEC.: presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 4747 (iii).
—— VACANCY, ISSUE OF WRIT: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6286 (iii).
—— Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 4081 (ii), 6309 (iii).
—— ON ISSUE OF WRIT: Res. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4088 (ii).
—— *Supersedeas* WARRANT (Mr. *Speaker*) 5014 (iii).
QUEBEC:
"ADMIRAL" (STEAMBOAT) SUBSIDY, CONTRACT, &C.: M. for O.C.'s* (Mr. *Tarte*) 128 (i).
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5075 (iii).
BEAUDRY, LIEUT. COL. A., CANCELLATION OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1767 (i).
BEDARD, CHAS., REVISING OFFICER FOR NAPIERVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

BELLECHASSE ELECTION, GAZETTING MEMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).

—— RET.: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Amyot*) 187 (i)

BERNIER, CAPT. J. E., REPS. AGAINST BY L. LANGEVIN: M. for copies* (Mr. *Delisle*) 2935 (ii).

BLACK RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, ATHABASKA CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 740 (i).

—— DRUMMOND CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 739 (i).

BOISVERT, GEO., APPMNT. AS FISHERY OFFICER, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leduc*) 2935 (ii).

BONAVENTURE PIER., CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 335 (i).

BOUCHIER, GEO. L., AND CAPT. GIGUERE, REP. *re* DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

BOUCHERVILLE WHARF, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1265 (i).

BOURGEOIS, DR. G. A., P. O. INSPECTOR, RETIREMENT: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2935 (ii)

BRIDGE AT QUEBEC. *See* "PUBLIC WORKS."

BRIGHT, J. R., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 3263 (ii).

BUCKINGHAM P. O., CONSTRUCTION: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).

CACOUNA TIMBER FOR WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158 (i).

CAMP AT ST. JOHN'S AND SOREL, PAY ROLL: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lépine*) 1062 (i).

CAOUETTE, J. B., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544 (i).

CENSUS COMMISSIONER W. E. JONES: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1274 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL, CONTRACT FOR SPREADING STONE: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3959 (ii).

CHEVALIER, DR. E.N., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 527 (i).

COATICOOK P. O., COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 6216 (iii).

COSTELLO, M., MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5406 (iii).

CHICOUTIMI ELECTION RETURN: Ques. (Mr. *Savard*) 142 (i).

COTEAU LANDING WHARF AND SHEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 222 (i).

CROSS POINT AND GASPÉ BASIN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).

—— AND PASPEBIAC MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 113 (i).

DESMARTEAU'S, JOS., CLAIM, PETS. OF RIGHT: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2155 (ii).

DOUCET, LOUIS, DISMISSAL FROM I. C. R. SHOPS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 741 (i).

DREDGING DU LOUP RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 158.

DUGUAY, JOSEPH, EMPLOYMENT AS EXCISEMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 3254 (ii).

EASTERN TOWNSHIPS, GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Fréchette*) 198 (i).

EEL FISHERY, RIMOUSKI, DESTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2907, 2913 (ii).

FRASERVILLE P.O., CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3255 (ii).

FISHING LICENSES. *See* "FISHERIES."

GENEST, SAMUEL, RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. *Fréchette*) 198 (i).

GIGUÉRE, CAPT. CLAUDE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1266 (i).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS (QUE.) INTEREST OWED GOVT.: Ques (Mr. *Tarte*) 270 (i).

HARTLEY, H. E., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Christie*) 144 (i),

HEARN, J. G., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 5078 (iii).

HELBRONNER, JULES, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).

HULL P.O. CLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).

HURTEAU, MR. HILAIRE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 529 (i).

ISLE VERTE P.O., CAOUETTE'S ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 544.

JOCKES AND DELORIMIER, STONE CONTRACTORS, ARREARS OF ROYALTY: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5076:

JONES, W. E., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR QUEBEC. Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1274 (i).

JUDGES IN PROVINCE OF QUEBEC, APPOINTMENTS: (Mr. *Delisle*) 5076 (iii).

—— SALARIES AND APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 5405 (iii).

——MONTREAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 2908.

KNOWLTON'S LANDING, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1770) (i).

LABERGE, MR., ASST. POSTMASTER, QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3954 (ii).

LACHANCE, CAPT., EXAMINATION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2913 (i).

LACHINE CANAL, SPECIFICATIONS, TENDERS, &c., *re* DRAIN: M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2157 (ii).

LAKE ST. PETER FISHING DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2148 (ii).

LANDSLIDE AT QUEBEC: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3621 (i).

LANGEVIN, LAFORCE, CERTIFICATE AS C. E.: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 1769 (i).

—— REPS. AGAINST CAPT. J. E. BERNIER: M. for copies* (Mr. *Delisle*) 2935 (ii).

—— SERVICES *re* LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).

L'AVENIR BRANCH OF C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).

LAVALLÉE, N., FISHING IN RICHELIEU COUNTY, FISHERY OVERSEER, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2148 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145 (ii).

LEDUC, CHARLES, RESIGNATION, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Devlin*) 145 (i).

LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK, MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 2149 (ii).

LICENSES, FISHING. *See* "FISHERIES."

—— Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (ii).

LIQUOR, ILLEGAL SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 208, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).

LOGAN'S FARM AND DESMARTEAU'S CLAIM: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2155 (ii).

LYSTER, POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION; Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 3958 (ii).

"MARIE ELIZA," SCH., SEIZURE AND SALE: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 1578 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 710 (i).

MAURICE, JOS. A., AND JULIE FOURNIER, CLAIMS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2174 (ii).

"MERMERLY," BARQUE, WRECK, REWARDS TO CREW: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fraser*) 712 (i).

MILITARY DISTRICT NO. 7. *See* "MILITIA."

MONTREAL AND MILE END, &c., MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

MONTREAL AND SOREL RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3614 (ii).

—— CUSTOM HOUSE. *See* "CUSTOMS."

—— P. O. LETTER BOX CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3953 (ii).

NAPIERVILLE ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).

—— AND ST. RÉMI RY., SUBSIDY, PETS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Monet*) 2541 (ii).

NAVIGATION, IMPROVEMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).

NEW CARLISLE WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 966 (i).

NORTH SHORE RY. *See* general heading.

NORTH NATION RIVER WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 222 (i).

ORDNANCE LANDS, MONTREAL CITY, LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5409 (iii).

OTTAWA COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE; M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 229 (i).

OUILLET, HERMIDAS, ENQUIRY AT STE. FLAVIE: M. for Pet. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1937 (i).

PELLETIER, H. H., EMPLYMT. BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3258 (ii).

PERLEY, H. F., AND QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS: Ques. (Mr. *Tarte*) 527 (i).

PONNELL, JOHN, EMPLYMT. BY SOREL HARBOUR BOARD: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5076 (iii).

PORTNEUF, ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).

QUARANTINE OFFICER AT RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3616 (ii).

QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. EXTENSION, SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).

QUEEN'S BENCH, APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 5405 (iii).

REVISING OFFICERS FOR RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 741 (i).

RICHELIEU COUNTY FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145 (ii).

RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS: M. for Rep. of Engineers* (Mr. *Béchard*) 128, 336 (i).

ROBITAILLE, C. N., PAYMENT FROM CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4673 (iii).

—— ROULEAU, F. F., FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 2936 (ii).

RURAL POST OFFICES, OPENING AND CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2912 (ii).

STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).

STE. CROIX LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, RESIGNATION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).

STE. EMILE DE SUFFOLK, &C., POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Rets. (Mr. *Devlin*) 230 (i).

ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS SHOALS, DREDGING: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1053 (i).

ST. JOHN'S, P.Q., MEDICAL OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 527 (i).

"ST. LAWRENCE" DREDGE, WORK ON RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Chateauguay*) 3952.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY, SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 2912 (i).

SALMON NET FISHING ON RESTIGOUCHE: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1268 (i).

SALMON FISHERY LICENSES, BONAVENTURE CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (i).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

SCHOOL OF INFANTRY ST. JOHN, SURGEON: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3620 (ii).

SHEPPARD, W. A., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1266 (i).

SMUGGLING IN QUEBEC, SUITS, JUDGMENTS, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Delisle*) 1062 (i).

SOUCY, EUGÉNE, DISMISSAL FROM I.C.R. EMPLYMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1274 (i).

SOREL HARBOUR WORKS, MEN EMPLOYED, NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).

SOULANGES CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mousseau*) 1578 (i).

—— EXPENDITURE, REPS., &C.: M. for Stmnt., &c. (Mr *Mousseau*) 532 (i).

SOUTH EASTERN RY. AND C. P. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).

THREE RIVERS PIER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5776 (i).

THURBER, LIEUT.-COL., RESIGNATION AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: M. for O.C.'s (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).

VAUDREUIL AND BOUCHERVILLE WHARVES, EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2548 (ii).

—— COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Harwood*) 335 (i).

VOTERS, PROVINCE OF QUE., TOTAL NUMBERS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2940 (i).

WALLS OF QUEBEC, EXTENSION OF STREETS: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3957 (ii).

YAMASKA, EAST, P. O., CLOSING: Ques, (Mr. *Mignault*) 2153 (ii).

QUEEN'S BENCH, APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 5405 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Langelier*) 5195 (ii).

—— DEATH OF CHIEF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lepine*) 3620 (ii).

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY, ADJNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 157.

QUEEN'S COUNSEL, CONFERRING TITLE: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3263 (ii).

QUINTÉ, BAY OF, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Burdett*) 201 (i).

RAQUETTE PIER, N.S., CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1575 (i).

RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4107 (ii).

—— TENDERS, &C.: M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. *Murray*) 544 (i).

Rathbun Co.'s B. No. 171 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). Rules suspended, 5012; 1°* of B., 5013; 2°*, 5075; in Com. and 3°*, 5374 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 122.)

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 103 (Mr. *Barron*). 1°*, 891 (i); 2° m., 3303 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 110 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 1062 (i); 2°, 3307 (ii).

Ry. Acts Amt. B. No. 176 (Mr. *Bowell*). 1°*, 6286; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 6287 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

RAILWAY BRIDGE, QUEBEC AND LÉVIS: M. for Engineer's Reps. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1053 (i).

——M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *Langelier*) 1041 (i).

RAILWAY LANDS, VANCOUVER ISLAND, REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

RAILWAYS AND CANALS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 407 (i), 6169 (iii).

RAILWAYS DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 104 (i).
—— COM. : List of Members, 136 (i).
RYS. IN INVERNESS CO., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).
RAILWAYS :
ALBERTA RY., PAYMENT OF LABOURERS : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3956 (ii).
CARAQUET RY., RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3614 (ii).
CAPE BRETON AND N. S. RY. ACCOMMODATION : M. for Cor., &c., (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).
CAPE BRETON RY., STATION MASTERS' DUTIES : Ques. (Mr. *Macdougall, C.B.*) 4677 (iii).
CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. *See* general heading.
CARLETON BRANCH RY., PAPER *re* SALE : Mess. from His Ex., 550 (i).
DOM. AID TO RYS. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1053 (i).
GOVT. RYS., EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCT. : Stmnts. presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 4092 (ii).
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATES : Ques. (Mr. *Daly*) 2144 (i).
IN COM. OF SUP., 1652, 1758 (i), 3857, 4057 (ii), 6197.
INTERCOLONIAL RY. *See* general heading.
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 2522 (ii).
LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 143 (i).
MONTREAL AND SOREL RY., COMPLETION : Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3614 (ii).
P.E.I. RY., DISMISSAL OF SECTION FOREMEN : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (ii).
—— DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYÉS : Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 4000, 4087 (ii).
—— ROAD-BED AND RAILS ; M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 228 (i).
—— TRAIN SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1274 (i).
RYS. IN INVERNESS CO., N.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).
SHORT LINE RY., ACCOMMODATION IN C.B. AND N.S. : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).
—— NEW ROUTE : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3266 (ii).
SOUTH EASTERN RY. AND C.P.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).
WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY CO.'S SHAREHOLDERS : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1852 (i).

See ALSO :
ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.
ATIKOKAN IRON RANGE RY. CO.
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. CO.
BRITISH COLUMBIA SOUTHERN RY. CO.
BRIGHTON, WARKWORTH AND NORWOOD RY. CO.
BUFFALO LAKE AND BATTLEFORD RY., &C., CO.
BURRARD INLET AND WESTMINSTER VALLEY RY. CO.
CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.
CARLETON BRANCH RY.
CENTRAL COUNTIES RY. CO.
CHATSWORTH, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE HURON R. CO.
CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RY. CO.
COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFC RY. CO.
COLLINGWOOD AND BAY OF QUINTÉ RY. CO.
GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.
GREAT EASTERN RY. CO.
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.
GUELPH JUNCTION AND C.P.R.
HARVEY AND SALISBURY RY. CO.
INTERCOLONIAL RY.

RAILWAYS—*Continued.*
INVERNESS RY. AND MINING CO.
KINGSTON AND PONTIAC RY. CO.
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.
LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONIZATION RY. CO.
LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RY. CO.
MANITOBA AND ASSINIBOIA GRAND JUNCTION RY. CO.
MEDICINE HAT RY. AND COAL CO.
MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
NEW BRUNSWICK RY. CO.
ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RY. CO.
OSHAWA RY. CO.
PETERBOROUGH, SUDBURY AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.
RED DEER VALLEY RY. CO.
ROCKY MOUNTAIN RY. CO.
ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.
ST. CLAIR RIVER RY. BRIDGE AND TUNNEL CO.
ST. LAWRENCE AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND MINING CO.
SHUSWAP AND OKANAGON RY. CO.
SOUTH ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. CO.
SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RY. CO.
VICTORIA AND NORTH-AMERICAN RY. CO.
VICTORIA, SAANICH AND NEW WESTMINSTER RY. CO.
WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RY. CO.
[*See* "SUBSIDIES," "SUPPLY," &c.]

REBELLION, N.W.T., 1885, PENSIONS : in Com. of Sup., 3662 (ii).
—— CLAIMS *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iii).
—— OF 1837-38, LAND GRANTS TO VOLUNTEERS : Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 961 (i).
RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE, CONSOLIDATED FUND : M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 135, 213 (i).
Reckoning of Time B. No. 166 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 4237 (ii).
RECOUNTS, LATE ELECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 142, 177 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 68 (Mr. *Prior*). 1°*, 387 ; 2°*, 547 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 76.)
RED POINT PIER, P.E.I., EXPEND. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 1271 (i).
RED RIVER SURVEYS, COST : Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 1012 (i).
REED AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 212 (i).
REGINA COUNCIL CHAMBER : in Com. of Sup., 4450, 6249 (iii).
—— GAOL : in Com. of Sup., 928 (i).
—— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL : in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i).
—— "LEADER," PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 4295 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 4465 (iii).
—— LIEUT. GOV.'S RESIDENCE : in Com. of Sup., 4444 (iii).
REGISTERED LETTERS, REDUCTION OF FEE : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 143 (i).
REGISTRATION STAMPS, REVENUE : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 158 (i).

REPAIRS, FURNITURE, HEATING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4469 (iii).

REPORTS PRESENTED :
AGRICULTURE (Mr. *Haggart*) 103 (i).
AUDITOR GENERAL (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).
CANAL STATISTICS (Mr. *Bowell*) 738 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE LIST (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).
DECK LOADS, REP. OF EVIDENCE (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i)
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (Mr. *Haggart*) 104 (i).
EXPORT CATTLE TRADE, REP. OF EVIDENCE (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
FISHERIES INSPECTORS' REPORTS (Mr. *Chapleau*)738.
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i)
HIGH COMMISSIONER (Mr. *Haggart*) 104 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
INLAND REVENUE (Mr. *Costigan*) 103 (i).
INTERIOR (Mr. *Dewdney*) 103 (i).
MARINE (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 135 (i).
MOUNTED POLICE (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 237 (i).
PENITENTIARIES (Sir *John Thompson*) 129 (i).
POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. *Haggart*) 103 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY (Mr. *Chapleau*) 738 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 103 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Mr. *Foster*) 103 (i).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 104.
SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, &c., &c. (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION (Mr. *Bowell*) 104 (i).
WEIGHTS, MEASURES AND GAS (Mr. *Costigan*) 103 (i)

REPRESENTATION. *See* "N.W.T."

RETURNING OFFICER FOR VICTORIA, N.S., APPOINTMENT : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).

RETURNS (ELECTION) TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 131 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c. :
"ADMIRAL" (STEAMBOAT), SUBSIDY, CONTRACTS, &c.* : Mr. *Tarte*, 128 (i).
—— STR., O. C.'s *re* SERVICES, CONTRACTS : Mr. *Tarte*, 2157 (ii).
ADVERTISING OTTAWA MAIL SERVICE IN "LE CANADA" : Mr. *Beausoleil*, 2540 (ii).
ALBINO POINT, CUSTOMS OFFICER* : Mr. *German*, 1579 (i).
AMERICAN CHEESE SHIPPED THROUGH CAN.* : Mr. *Marshall*, 205 (i).
AMHERSTBURG DRY DOCK* : Mr. *Allan*, 3287 (ii).
ANALYSIS OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS : Mr. *Curran*, 203 (i).
ANNAPOLIS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TENDERS, &c.* ; Mr. *Lister*, 544 (i).
ARNOLDI, J. R., REP. *re* BALLOT BOXES : Mr. *Landerkin*, 201 (i).
ATKINSON, J. H. C., APPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL : Mr. *Allan*, 1580, 1980 (i).
ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE : Mr. *Laurier*, 124 (i).
BALLOT BOXES, J. R. ARONLDI'S REP. : Mr. *Landerkin*, 201 (i).
BARRIE P. O., ADVTS. FOR CONSTRUCTION* : Mr. *Barron*, 2935 (ii).
BAY OF FUNDY FISHERIES ; Mr. *Bowers*, 715 (i).
BEACON HILL PARK (B.C.) MAGAZINE, &c.* : Mr. *Prior*, 736 (i).
BEET-ROOT SUGAR, CULTIVATION AND MANUFACTURE* : Mr. *Beausoleil*, 545 (i).
BELLECHASSE ELECTORAL RET. : Mr. *Amyot*, 187 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
BERNIER, CAPT. J. E., REPS. AGAINST BY L. LANGEVIN* : Mr. *Delisle*, 2935 (ii).
BIG BAY WHARF REPAIRS, EXPENDITURE* : Mr. *Somerville*, 232.
"BLIZZARD," SCHOONER, RESCUE OF CREW, REWARDS : Mr. *Flint*, 735 (i).
BOISVERT, GEO., APPMNT. AS FISHERY OFFICER, &c.* : Mr. *Leduc*, 2935 (ii).
BOUNTIES, FISHERY, PAID IN QUEEN'S, N.S. ; Mr. *Forbes*, 734 (i).
—— PAID IN GUYSBOROUGH CO.* : Mr. *Fraser*, 232.
BOUNTY CHEQUES, FISHERY, COSTS, &c., *re* DISTRIBUTION : Mr. *Flint*, 180 (i).
—— PAYMENTS, FISHING : Mr. *Flint*, 211 (i).
—— CLAIMS, BY PROVINCES, &c., &c. : Mr. *Flint*, 537 (i).
BOURGEOIS, DR. G. A., P. O. INSPECTOR, RETIREMENT* : Mr. *Choquette*, 2935 (ii).
BRIDGE, QUEBEC AND LÉVIS : Mr. *Langelier*, 1041 (i).
—— Mr. *Laurier*, 1053)i).
BUCKINGHAM P. O., CONSTRUCTION : Mr. *Devlin*, 229 (i).
BUREAU OF LABOUR STATISTICS : Mr. *Lépine*, 201 (i).
"C" BATTERY, SERVICES AT WELLINGTON, B.C.* ; Mr. *Gordon*, 146 (i).
—— BARRACKS* : Mr. *Prior*, 736.
CALEDONIA DAM, GRAND RIVER, RECONSTRUCTION* ; Mr. *Montague*, 3287 (ii).
CALEDONIA DRILL SHED, REPAIRS* : Mr. *Montague* 3287 (ii).
CAMP, MILITIA DISTRICT NO, 1 : Mr. *Hyman*, 231 (i).
CAMPBELLTON P. O., INVERNESS CO., ESTABLISHMENT, PETS., &c.* : Mr. *Laurier*, 544 (i).
CAMP AT ST. JOHN'S AND SOREL, PAY ROLL* : Mr. *Lépine*, 1062 (i).
CANADIAN, WEST INDIAN AND SOUTH AMERICAN SS. CO., SUBSIDIES TO* : Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*), 544 (i).
CANAL CONTRACTS, ENLARGEMENT OR CONSTRUCTION : Mr. *Trow*, 1938 (i).
CAOUETTE, J. B., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.* : Mr. *Amyot*, 544 (i).
CAPE BRETON AND N. S. RY. ACCOMMODATION : Mr. *Fraser*, 177 (i).
CENSUS, 1881 AND 1891, VOTERS ACCORDING TO POPULATION, &c.* : Mr. *Landerkin*, 128 (i).
CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM, ENTIRE HORSES* : Mr. *McMillan*, 1579 (i).
—— BULLETINS, &c.* ; Mr. *Devlin*, 1579 (i).
CHEESE, AMERICAN, SHIPPED THROUGH CAN.* : Mr. *Marshall*, 205 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION* : Mr. *Gordon*, 1578 (i).
CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES* : Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 135, 213 (i).
COPYRIGHT LAWS OF CANADA : Mr. *Edgar*, 726 (i).
COSGROVE, JOHN, RESIGNATION, &c.* : Mr. *Devlin*, 145 (i).
COTTON SAIL DUCK, IMPORTS AT HALIFAX* : Mr. *White* (*Shelburne*), 174 (i).
CRYSTAL BEACH AND POINT ALBINO CUSTOMS OFFICERS* : Mr. *German*, 1579 (i).
C. P. R. *See* general heading.
DEBENTURES, NORTH SHORE RY. : Mr. *Langelier*, 974 ; deb. rsmd., 1014 (i).
DEP. ADJUTANT GEN., MIL. DIST. NO. 11* : Mr. *Prior*, 736 (i).
DESMARTEAU'S, JOS., CLAIM, PET. OF RIGHT : Mr. *Laurier*, 2155 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
DISPUTED TERRITORY (ONT.) TIMBER CUT, &c.*: Mr. *Barron*, 128 (i).
DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. ACT *re* INSTITUTIONS, &c., TRANSACTING BUSINESS*: Mr. *Watson*, 544 (i).
—— ACT *re* DISEASES OF ANIMALS*: Mr. *Watson*, 545 (i).
DOM. AID TO RYS.: Mr. *McMullen*, 1053 (i).
DOM. NOTES IN CIRCULATION, &c.*: Mr. *Mulock*, 1578 (i).
DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD: Mr. *Bain*, 1058 (i).
ELECTION (1891) VOTES POLLED, &c.*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 128 (i).
—— RETURNS TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: Mr. *Landerkin*, 131 (i).
—— RET. FOR BELLECHASSE: Mr, *Amyot*, 187.
ELEVATORS BUILT ON INTERCOLONIAL RY.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 135 (i).
ELGIN (EAST) ELECTORAL DIST., RET. OFFICER'S ACCOUNTS*: Mr. *Ingram*, 1579 (i).
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, ADVTS. FOR TENDERS FOR CAISSON: Mr. *Tarte*, 1932 (i).
—— TENDERS, REP. OF H. F. PERLEY, &c.: Mr. *Tarte*, 1937 (i).
EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC WORKS SINCE CONFEDN.: Mr. *Landerkin*, 1061 (i).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS, EXPENDITURE*: Mr. *Mara*, 232 (i).
—— ENTIRE HORSES*: Mr. *McMillan*, 1579 (i).
—— BULLETINS, &c.*: Mr. *Devlin*, 1579 (i).
EXPORT OF POTATOES FROM CANADA*: Mr. *McMullen*, 544 (i).
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 135 (i).
FEDERAL AID TO RYS.: Mr. *McMullen*, 1053 (i).
FINES FOR VIOLATING FISHERY LAWS*: Mr. *Fraser*, 1891 (i).
FISHERIES. *See* general heading.
FORESHORES, &c., OF THE DOM., OWNERSHIP: Mr. *Flint*, 178 (i).
FRENCH LANGUAGE IN MAN., ABOLITION: Mr. *La Rivière*, 114 (i).
GALWAY P. O., ESTABLISHMENT*: Mr. *Barron*, 736.
GENEST, SAMUEL, RESIGNATION, &c.*: Mr. *Devlin*, 145 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, EXPENDITURE IN FIELD WORK*: Mr. *McLeod*, 544 (i).
GOVERNOR GEN.'S WARRANTS, DETAILS OF EXPENDITURE*: Mr. *Mulock*, 232 (i).
GOVT. OFFICIALS AND RECENT ELECTIONS: Mr. *Allan*, 1580 (i).
GOVT. SAVINGS BANKS, DEPOSITS: Mr. *McMullen*, 202, 210 (i).
GRAHAM, J. R., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Barron*, 210 (i).
GRAND RIVER NAVIGATION, ENGINEERS' REPS.: Mr. *Montague*, 2155 (ii).
GRANT, J. J., ENTRY FOR DOM. LANDS, N.W.T.: Mr. *Davin*, 3635 (ii).
GRAVING DOCK, KINGSTON*: Mr. *Tarte*, 127 (i).
HALIFAX COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INCREASE OF SALARY; Mr. *Fraser*, 2547(ii).
HARTLEY, H. E., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Christie*, 144 (i).
HASTINGS COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Burdett*, 212.
HORSES, CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1579 (i).
INDIANS. *See* general heading.
INDIAN DEPTL. ESTIMATES, REGINA*: Mr. *Davin*. 2935 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Contenued.*
INTERCOLONIAL RY. *See* general heading.
INTOXICATING LIQUORS, ANALYSIS: Mr. *Curran*, 203 (i).
—— INTO QUEBEC*: Mr. *Delisle*, 1062 (i).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY.: Mr. *Cameron* (*Inverness*) 2522 (ii).
ISLE VERTE P. O., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS OF LETTERS, &c.*: Mr. *Amyot*, 544 (i).
JOHNSTON, SAML., DISMISSAL FROM CUSTOMS SERVICE*: Mr. *German*, 2935 (ii).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK*: Mr. *Tarte*, 128 (i).
—— ORIGINAL PLAN*: Mr. *Amyot*, 1579 (i).
KINGSTON P. O., LESSEES OF BOXES: Mr. *Amyot*, 1578 (i).
—— REP. OF POSTMASTER, &c.: Mr. *Amyot*, 2545.
LABOUR STATISTICS, ESTABLISHMENT OF BUREAU: Mr. *Lépine*, 201 (i).
LACHINE CANAL, SPECIFICATIONS, TENDERS, &c., *re* DRAIN: Mr. *Préfontaine*, 2157 (ii).
LAHAVE RIVER, N. S., SAWDUST DEPOSITS: Mr. *Kaulbach*, 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).
LAIDLOW, WM. (N.W.M.P.) RESIGNATION, &c.: Mr. *McMullen*, 1048 (i).
LAKEPORT HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION*: Mr. *Hargraft*, 232 (i).
LANDSLIDE AT QUEBEC: Mr. *Frémont*, 3621 (ii).
LANGEVIN BLOCK, OTTAWA, ADVTS. FOR TENDERS, &c.: Mr. *Mulock*, 531 (i).
LANGEVIN, LAFORCE, REPS, AGAINST CAPT. J. E. BERNIER*: Mr. *Delisle*, 2935 (ii).
LEDUC, CHARLES, RESIGNATION, &c.*: Mr. *Devlin*, 145 (i).
"LE CANADA," ADVERTISING OTTAWA MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 2540 (ii).
LEWIS, LIEUT.-COL., VACANCY THROUGH DEATH: Mr. *Burnham*, 733 (i).
LICENSES, FISHING, GRANTED IN QUEBEC*: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 145 (i).
—— RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: Mr. *Fauvel*, 3283 (ii).
"LILY," H.M.S.. RESCUE OF CREW: Mr. *Edgar*, 1059 (i).
LIQUOR PERMITS IN N. W. T., REPS., &c.*: Mr, *Charlton*, 545 (i).
LOBO P. O., CHANGE OF POSTMASTER*: Mr. *Armstrong*, 1579 (i).
LOGAN'S FARM AND DESMARTEAU'S CLAIM, PET. OF RIGHT: Mr. *Laurier*, 2155 (ii).
MANITOBA SEPARATE SCHOOLS: Mr. *LaRivière*, 115; Mr. *Devlin*, 116 (i).
"MARIE ELIZA," SCHOONER, SEIZURE AND SALE*: Mr. *Langelier*, 1578 (i).
MAURICE, JOS. A., AND JULIE FOURNIER, CLAIMS, &c.: Mr. *Préfontaine*, 2174 (ii).
MCCORMICK, F. B., REMOVAL AND REINSTATEMENT: Mr. *Allan*, 1580, 1980 (i).
MCMAHON, CHAS. W., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: Mr. *Barron*, 736 (i).
"MERMERLY," BARQUE, WRECK, REWARDS TO CREW: Mr. *Fraser*, 712 (i).
MILITIA. *See* general heading.
MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY INTO B. C.: Mr. *Mara*, 965 (i).
MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE EMPLOYÉS: Mr. *Lépine*, 3275 (ii).
MUNROE, HUGH, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES: Mr. *Fraser*, 2546 (ii).
MUNRO, THOS., REP. *re* MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL*: Mr. *Mulock*, 1579 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
MUTTART, MR., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Perry*, 2158 (ii).
NAPIERVILLE AND ST. RÉMI RY., SUBSIDY, PETS., &C.: Mr. *Monet*, 2541.
NEW CARLISLE WHARF, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Mr. *Fauvel*, 966 (i).
NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT: Mr. *Kaulbach*, 3267 (ii).
NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: Mr. *Langelier*, 974; deb. rsmd, 1014 (i).
OCEAN MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Laurier*, 124 (i).
OTTAWA COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE: Mr. *Devlin*, 229.
OUILLET, HERMIDAS, ENQUIRY AT STE. FLAVIE *re*: Mr. *Choquette*, 1937 (i).
PAY ROLL, MIL. CAMP, SOREL AND ST. JOHN'S*: Mr. *Lépine*, 1062 (i).
PELEE ISLAND, SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: Mr. *Allan*, 1580, 1980 (i).
P. E. I. RY., ROAD-BED AND RAILS: Mr. *Davies*, (*P.E.I.*) 228 (i).
—— DISMISSAL OF SECTION FOREMEN: Mr. *Perry*, 2158 (ii).
PERMITS, LIQUOR, IN N.W.T., REPS., &C.*: Mr. *Charlton*, 545 (i).
PICKFORD & BLACK, MESSRS., PAYMENT OF SUBSIDIES TO*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 544 (i).
POSTMASTERS OF THE DOM., SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES*: Mr. *McMullen*, 128 (i).
POTATOES EXPORTED FROM CANADA*: Mr. *McMullen*, 544 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE SINCE CONFEDN.: Mr. *Landerkin*, 1061 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS, DEPTL. PERMANENT EMPLOYÉS, &C.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 1579 (ii).
QUEBEC EASTERN RY., SUBSIDY, PETS., &C.: Mr. *Vaillancourt*, 1934 (i).
QUEBEC LANDSLIDE: Mr. *Frémont*, 3621 (ii).
RAILWAY BRIDGE, QUEBEC AND LÉVIS: Mr. *Langelier*, 1041 (i).
—— Mr. *Laurier*, 1053 (i).
RAILWAYS, DOM. AID TO: Mr. *McMullen*, 1053 (i).
RAILWAY LANDS, VANCOUVER ISLAND, REPS.: Mr. *Laurier*, 1051 (i).
RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, TENDERS, &C.*: Mr. *Murray*, 544 (i).
RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, CONSOLIDATED FUND*: Sir *Richard Cartwright* 135, 213 (i).
REED AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE: Mr. *Burdett*, 212 (i).
RETURNING OFFICER FOR VICTORIA, N.S., APPMNT.*: Mr. *Flint*, 2935 (ii).
RETURNS (ELECTION) TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: Mr. *Landerkin*, 131 (i).
RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS*: Mr. *Béchard*, 128 (i).
RIDEAU CANAL, KINGSTON AND JONES' FALLS: Mr. *Kirkpatrick*, 711 (i).
ROULEAU, F. F., FISHING RIGHTS*: Mr. *Choquette*, 2936 (ii).
STE. CROIX LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, RESIGNATION: Mr. *Rinfret*, 173 (i).
STE. EMILE DE SUFFOLK, &C., POSTAL SERVICE: Mr. *Derlin*, 230 (i).
ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS SHOALS, DREDGING: Mr. *Rinfret*, 1053 (i).
ST. JOHN, N.B., INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I. C.R.*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 1578 (i).
ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS, ACCIDENT ON I.C.R.: Mr. *Carroll*, 177 (i).
SAUNDERS, WM., DISMISSAL: Mr. *Perry*, 2158 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &C.—*Continued.*
SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS WITH GOVT.: Mr. *McMullen*, 202, 210 (i).
SAWDUST DEPOSITS IN LAHAVE RIVER: Mr. *Kaulbach*, 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).
SCHOOL ACTS OF MAN.: Mr. *Devlin*, 116 (i).
"SEIGFREID," SCHOONER, REWARDS TO CAPTAIN, &C.: Mr. *Flint*, 735 (i).
SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MAN., ABOLITION: Mr. *La Rivière*, 115 (i).
SESSIONAL CLERKS EMPLOYED BY HOUSE*: Mr. *Joncas*, 544 (i).
SHORT LINE RY., ACCOMMODATION IN C. B. AND N.S.: Mr. *Fraser*, 177 (i).
SMUGGLING IN QUEBEC, SUITS, JUDGMENTS, &C.*: Mr. *Delisle*, 1062 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, EXPENDITURE, REPS., &C.: Mr. *Mousseau*, 532 (i).
—— ENGINEERS' REPS.*: Mr. *Mousseau*, 1578 (i).
SOURIS BRANCH, C.P.R., O.C.'S GRANTING AID*: Mr. *Daly*, 1938 (i).
STANDARD TIME, LEGALIZATION, &C.: Mr. *Kirkpatrick*, 209 (i).
"STANLEY," STR., TRIPS BETWEEN P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Mr. *Perry*, 158 (i).
STEEL RAILS AND ROAD-BED, P. E. I. RY.: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 228 (i).
STRATHROY P. O. BUILDING, TENDERS, &C.*: Mr. *Flint*, 2035 (ii).
SUBMARINE TUNNEL, P.E.I., AND MAINLAND: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 1277, 1605 (i).
SUBSIDY TO QUEBEC EASTERN RY., PETS., &C.: Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 1934 (i).
—— NAPIERVILLE AND ST. RÉMI RY., PETS., &C.: Mr. *Monet*, 2541 (ii).
—— WEST INDIES SS. SERVICE*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 205 (i).
SUPPLIES, &C., PURCHASED FOR INDIANS IN N.S.*: Mr. *Fraser*, 232 (i).
SUTTON WEST, INDIAN AGENT, COST OF INVESTIGATION*: Mr. *Mulock*, 145 (i).
TENDERS FOR CAISSON, ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, ADVTS.: Mr. *Turte*, 1932 (i).
THURBER, LIEUT.-COL., RESIGNATION AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Mr. *Rinfret*, 173 (i).
TIMBER CUT, &C., IN DISPUTED TERRITORY: Mr. *Barron*, 128 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND RY., LAND RESERVE, REPS., &C.: Mr. *Laurier*, 1051 (i).
VAUDREUIL AND BOUCHERVILLE WHARVES, EXPENDITURE, &C.: Mr. *Préfontaine*, 2548 (ii).
VICTORIA (B.C) DRILL HALL*: Mr. *Prior*, 736 (i).
VICTORIA (N.S.) APPMNT. OF RETURNING OFFICER*: Mr. *Flint*, 2935 (ii).
VOTERS ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1881 AND 1891*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 128 (i).
VOTES POLLED AT ELECTION, 1891*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 128 (i)
WALKER, DR., CLAIM: Mr. *Bain*, 1058 (i).
WELLAND CANAL EMPLOYÉS: Mr. *German*, 220 (i).
—— USE OF SURPLUS WATER: Mr. *Gibson*, 963 (i).
WELLINGTON, B.C., MILITARY AID TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES*: Mr. *Gordon*, 146 (i).
WEST INDIES, STEAMSHIP SERVICE, SUBSIDY*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*), 205 (i).
WILSON, JAS., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT*: Mr. *Barron*, 736 (i).
WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P E.I.: Mr. *Perry*, 158.
RETURNS, PREPARATION: in Com. of Sup., 5107 (iii).

Revenue and Audit. *See* "CONSOLIDATED."
REVENUE CRUISER, NEW: in Com. of Sup., 6277 (iii).
REVISING OFFICERS AND ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
REVISING OFFICERS FOR RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 741 (i).
RICHELIEU COUNTY FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2145 (ii).
RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS: M. for Rep. of Engineers* (Mr. *Béchard*) 128 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 336 (i).
RIDEAU CANAL, BRIDGE AT MERRICKVILLE: conc., 6304 (iii).
——— DAMAGES TO LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3618.
——— in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i), 5222, 6304 (iii).
——— KINGSTON AND JONES' FALLS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 711 (i).
——— ORDNANCE LANDS, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 5408 (iii).
——— RESERVE, LOTS OCCUPIED BY JOHN HENEY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4296 (iii).
——— TOLLS COLLECTED AND REFUNDED: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4675 (iii).
RIDEAU HALL, FUEL AND LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 4515 (iii).
RIVER ST. LOUIS IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4556 (iii).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP P. O., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4357.
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 4606 (iii).
ROBINSON TREATIES, PAYMENTS UNDER: in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
ROBITAILLE, C. N., PAYMENT FROM CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4673 (iii).
Rocky Mountain Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 125 (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*). 1°*, 1757; 2° m., 1848; 2°*, 1964 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)
ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1654 (i), 3882 (ii).
RONDEAU HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4583.
ROULEAU, F. F.: Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1.
——— FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 2936 (i).
ROYAL COMMISSIONS ISSUED SINCE CONFEDN.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4297(iii).
ROYAL SOCIETY, PUBLICATION OF PROCEEDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (iii).
ROY, OVIDE, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iii).
RURAL POST OFFICES, OPENING AND CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2912 (ii).
Russworm, Adam. *See* "DIVORCE."
STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6233 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).
STE. ANNE'S LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 4149 (ii).
STE. CROIX LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, RESIGNATON: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*)) 173 (i).
STE. EMILE DE SUFFOLK, &C., POSTAL SERVICE: M. for Rets. (Mr. *Devlin*) 230 (i).
STE. HELEN'S MAIL SERVICE *vid* GODERICH: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3262 (ii).
ST. BONIFACE INDIAN SCHOOLS, ADDITIONAL PUPILS: in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iii).
St. Catharines and Merritton Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 88 (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°*, 548; 2°*, 601; in Com. and 3°*, 1756 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 104.)
St. Catharines and Niagara Ry. Co.'s B. No. 61 (Mr. *Carpenter*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 546; in Com. and 3°*, 1964 (i). (54-55 *Vic.* *c.* 87.)
ST. CATHARINES WATER POWER: in Com. of Sup., 4145 (ii).
ST. CHARLES BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i), 3884 (ii).
St. Clair River Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 17 (Mr. *Montague*). 1°*, 155; 2°*, 189; in Com. and 3°*, 546 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 102 (i).
ST. HENRI P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 4359 (iii).
ST. JEAN DESCHAILLONS SHOALS, DREDGING: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1053 (i).
——— REP. *re* DREDGING: Remarks (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2437 (ii).
ST. JOHN'S GATE, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1573 (i).
ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX AND WEST INDIES, &C., SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 5450 (iii).
ST. JOHN, N.B., INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1578 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i), 3883 (ii).
ST. JOHN'S P. Q., MEDICAL OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 527 (i).
ST. JOHN STATION, I.C.R., ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 739 (i).
ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS, ACCIDENT ON I.C.R.: M. for Letters, &c. (Mr. *Carroll*) 177 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 209 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (i).
St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 20 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 155; 2°, 189 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, DEEPENING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1927 (i).
"ST. LAWRENCE," DREDGE, WORK ON RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Brown, Chateauguay*) 3952.
ST. LAWRENCE, LOWER LAURENTIAN AND SAGUENAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 4107 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 4523 (ii).
ST. OURS LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 4148 (ii).
ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5223 (iii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 907 (i), 4362, 6170 (iii).
——— SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 2912 (ii).
SADDLERY, 1ST REGT. OF CAVALRY: Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 198 (i).
SAFE IN FINANCE DEPT., TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 130 (i).
SCHOOL ACTS OF MAN.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Devlin*) 116 (i).

SCHOOL LANDS, MAN., SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1766 (i).
SCHOOL OF INFANTRY, ST. JOHN, SURGEON: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 3620 (ii).
SCOTCH GRANITE, INCREASE OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 335 (i).
SALARIES FOR POSTMASTERS: Ques. (Mr. *German*) 1767 (i).
SALMON FISHERY LICENSES, BONAVENTURE CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2152 (i).
SALMON NET FISHING ON RESTIGOUCHE: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1268 (i).
Salisbury and Harvey Ry. Co.'s B. No. 120 (Mr. *Skinner*). 1°*, 1483; 2°*, 1757 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2174 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 100.)
SANDSTONE FOR LANGEVIN BLOCK, FREIGHT RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1575 (i).
SAN FRANCISCO AND VICTORIA, B.C., SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4703 (ii).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s B. No. 84 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°*, 524; 2°*, 579 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2321 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 78.)
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4102 (ii), 5210, 6254 (iii).
—— WHARF, MR. PLUMMER'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1575 (i).
—— RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2905 (ii).
—— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1268 (i).
—— RETURN OF FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3620 (i).
SAUNDERS, WM., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 2158 (i).
SAVARD, MR. PAUL V., MEMBER FOR CHICOUTIMI: Notification of Ret., 7 (i).
SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS WITH GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 202 (i).
SAWDUST DEPOSITS IN LAHAVE RIVER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1942 (i), 2175 (ii).
Deb. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 1944; (Mr. *Flint*) 1946; (Mr. *Devlin*) 1948; (Mr. *Forbes*) 1950; (Mr. *Borden*) 1951; (Mr. *Fraser*) 1952; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1953.
Deb. rsmd. (Mr. *Tupper*) 2175; (Mr. *Flint*) 2189; (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 2197; (Mr. *Kenny*) 2198; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 2201 (ii).
SEA-BIRD ISLAND INDIAN RESERVATION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 709 (i).
Sea Fisheries Development, &c. (*Chap.* 96, *Rev. Statutes*) **B. No. 152** (Mr. *Tupper*). Res. prop., 549; in Com., 1095 (i); conc. in and 1°* of B., 3100; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3593 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 42.)
SEALING IN BEHRING SEA: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 959.
SECRETARY OF STATE:
BÉDARD, CHAS., REVISING OFFICER FOR NAPIERVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).
BALLOT BOXES., J. R ARNOLDI'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 201 (i).
BARBER, MR., CLAIM re PAPER CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 269 (i).
BELLECHASSE ELECTION, GAZETTING MEMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).
—— RET.: M. for Cor. &c, (Mr. *Amyot*) 187 (i).
SECRETARY OF STATE—*Continued.*
BRANDON "MAIL" IN PUBLIC DEPTS., NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 3257 (ii).
CHICOUTIMI ELECTION RET.: Ques. (Mr. *Savard*) 142.
CIVIL SERVANTS AND ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 221, 1765 (i).
—— RECESS FOR LUNCH, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 3258 (ii).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, TIME LIMIT Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 112 (i).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 103 (i).
ELECTION (1891) RECOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 142, 177 (i).
—— RETURNS TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 131 (i).
—— VOTES POLLED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).
ELECTORAL DIVISIONS IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 221 (i).
—— LISTS (DOM.) REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i),
ELECTIONS, SENATORS AS CANDIDATES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1578 (i).
ELECTION RETURNS TO CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 131 (i).
ELGIN (EAST) ELECTORAL DIST., RET. OF OFFICER'S ACCOUNTS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1579.
FRANCHISE ACT, 1885: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 961, 1267 (i).
GOVT. OFFICIALS AND RECENT ELECTIONS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Allan*) 1580 (i).
HELBRONNER, JULES, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 5407 (iii).
IN COM. OF SUP., 6167 (iii).
LABOUR, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 4674 (iii).
—— STATISTICAL BUREAU: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lépine*) 201 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3615 (i).
MCLEAN, ROGER & CO.'S CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 269 (i).
NAPIERVILLE ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1577 (i).
NEW ENGLAND PAPER CO., PURCHASES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1767 (i).
PORTNEUF ELECTION AND REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).
PAPER CONTRACT, CLAIM OF MR. BARBER: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 269 (i).
PRINTING PAPER CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 528 (i).
PRINTING BUREAU, ABSENCE OF SUPERINTENDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2375, 3437 (ii).
—— PURCHASE OF TYPE, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3619 (ii).
—— REGULATIONS *re* EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3618 (ii).
PRINTING TIME TABLES, &C., GOVT. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Joncas*) 3614 (ii).
RECOUNTS, LATE ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 142, 177 (i).
REGINA "LEADER," PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 4295 (iii).
—— PRINTING AND ADVERTISING: Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 4465 (iii).
RETURNING OFFICER FOR VICTORIA, N.S., APPOINTMENT: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).
REVISING OFFICERS AND ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 207 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Continued.*
REVISING OFFICERS FOR RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 741 (i).
ROYAL COMMISSIONS ISSUED SINCE CONFEDN.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4297 (i).
SENATORS AS CANDIDATES AT ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1577 (i).
SMITH & RIPLEY AND SEC. OF STATE: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 5403 (iii).
TYPE-SETTING MACHINES, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 271 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS (DOM.) REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 268 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2912 (ii).
VOTES POLLED AT ELECTION, 1891, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).

Seed and Grain. *See* "FRAUDS."

SEED GRAIN, ACCOUNTS DUE FOR PURCHASE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).
"SEIGFREID," SCHOONER, REWARDS TO CAPTAIN, &C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flint*) 735 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 224 (i).
SEIZURES OF LIQUORS, ILLEGAL: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 208, 741 (i), 2148 (ii).
SELDEN, MR. S., STATISTICAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).
SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. *See* "COMMITTEES."

Senate and H. of C. further Act Amt. B. No. 43 (Mr. *McMullen*). 1°, 217; 2°, 1029; in Com. and 3°*, 1297 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 21).

SENATE: in Com. of Sup., 929 (i).
SENATORS AND MEMBERS, INDEMNITY: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 6290 (iii).
SENATORS AS CANDIDATES AT ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1577 (i).
SENÉCAL, ANDRÉ: M. (Mr. *Lister*) Ordering attendance at Bar of Hse. 4533 (iii).
—— *See* "PRINTING BUREAU."
—— Order for attendance before Bar read, 4747 (iii).
SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN MAN., ABOLITION: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 115 (i).

Septennial Benevolent Society's B. No. 83 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 524; 2°*, 579 (i).

SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, DEP., APPMNT. ANNOUNCED (Mr. *Speaker*) 3995 (ii).
SESSIONAL CLERKS EMPLOYED BY HOUSE: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Joncas*) 544 (i).
SETTLERS' GRIEVANCES IN B.C.: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4016; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 4056 (ii).
SHAWANAKISKIC INDIANS, BOUNTY UNDER TREATY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 269 (i).
SHAW & SHAW, LEGAL SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2907 (ii).
SHEPPARD, W. A., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1266 (i).
SHIP CHANNEL, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1668 (i).

Ships' Inspection B. No. 149 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 2666; 2°* and in Com., 3600, 4310 (ii); M. to conc. in Amts., 4466; conc. in and 3°*, 4467 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 37.)

Ships' Safety Act (*Chap.* 77 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 44** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 217; 2°*, 1087; in Com., 1088 (i); Order for 3° dschgd., in Com. and 3°*, 3099 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

SHIPS' SAFETY, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 218 (i).
SHORT LINE RY. ACCOMMODATION IN C.B. AND N.S.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Fraser*) 177 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
—— NEW ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3266 (ii).
SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS, RELIEF: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
SINKING FUND AND PUBLIC DEBT, TRUSTEES: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2152 (i).
SIOUX INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 4747; conc., 4515.
SISSIBOO RIVER, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 1574.
SLIDE AND BOOM DUES, COLLECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4645, 4663 (iii).
SMITH & RIPLEY AND SECRETARY OF STATE: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 5403 (iii).
SMITH, DR. W. F., INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANT: in Com. of Sup., 1696 (i).
SMITH, RONALD, EXPROPRIATION OF LAND: in Com. of Sup., 6198 (iii).
SMITH'S FALLS PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4372 (iii).
SMUGGLING IN QUEBEC, SUITS, JUDGMENTS, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Delisle*) 1062 (i).
SNOW, REMOVAL, BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4474 (iii).
SOUCY, EUGÈNE, CONDUCTOR ON I. C. R., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*), 1274, 1927 (i).
SOREL HARBOUR WORKS, MEN EMPLOYED, NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 5077 (iii).
SOULANGES CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mousseau*) 1578 (i).
—— EXPENDITURE, REPS., &C.: M. for Stmnt., &c. (Mr. *Mousseau*) 532 (i).
SOURIS BRANCH, C. P. R., O.C.'s GRANTING AID: M. for copies* (Mr. *Daly*) 1938 (i).
SOUTH-EASTERN RY. AND C. P. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 197, 220 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i), 4573 (iii).

South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 73 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 92.)
—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).

South-Westsrn Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1°*, 238; 2°*, 294; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)

SPANISH AMERICAN TREATY: Cor. presented (Mr. *Foster*) 5852 (iii).
SPEAKER, ELECTION: M. (Sir *John Macdonald*) 1 (i).
—— DEP., ELECTION: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 388 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 5 (i); Prorogation, 6330 (i).
STALLIONS AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Millan*) 739 (i).

STANDARD TIME LEGALIZATION, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 209 (i).
"STANLEY," STEAMER, AND COM. WITH P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1929 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 158 (i).
STATISTICS. *See* "ARTS."
Steam Boiler and Plate Glass Ins. Co. of Can. B. No. 50 (Mr. *Hyman*). 1°*, 266; 2°*, 412; in Com. and 3°*, 1963 (i). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 118.)
STEAM FANS ON CATTLE VESSELS : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1275 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 85 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 524; 2°* and in Com., 1093 (i); 3°*, 3100; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 3901 (ii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 39.)
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, &c., &c., REPS. : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 103 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS. *See* "SUPPLY."
STEEL PLATES, &c., FREE IMPORTS : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 270 (i).
STEEL RAILS AND ROAD-BED, P.E.I. RY. : M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 228 (i).
STONEY ISLAND BREAKWATER, AMOUNTS PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 5408 (iii).
STRATHROY P.O. BUILDING, TENDERS, &c. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).
——— CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hyman*) 3262 (ii).
STRATFORD, EXCISE COLLECTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 5078 (iii).
STRIKE IN OTTAWA AND VICINITY, CALLING OUT MILITIA : Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 5555 (ii).
STROMNESS CULVERT AND BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 4145 (ii).
STRONG, LATE W. O., GRATUITY TO WIDOW : in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iii).
SWING BRIDGE, &c., AT HASTINGS : in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
SUBMARINE TUNNEL, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1277, 1605 (i).
Subsidies. *See* "LAND GRANTS."
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. Authorization B. No. 175 (Mr. *Bowell*). Res. prop., 6032; in Com., 6135; conc. in and 1° of B., 6142; 2°* and in Com., 6185, 6217; 3°*, 6223 (iii). (54-55 *Vic., c.* 8.)
SUBSIDIES :
"ADMIRAL" (STEAMBOAT) CONTRACT, &c. : M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Tarte*) 128 (i), 2157 (ii).
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5075.
BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 6185 (iii).
C. P. R. Co.'S ADDITIONAL LAND : prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3308 (ii).
CANADIAN, WEST INDIAN AND SOUTH AMERICAN SS. Co. : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 544 (i).
GREAT EASTERN RY. Co. : prop. Res. Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
GREAT NORTHERN RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6032; in Com., 6136 (iii).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2911 (ii).
SUBSIDIES—*Continued.*
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
MAN. SOUTH-WESTERN COLONIZATION RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
NAPIERVILLE AND ST. RÉMI RY., PETS, &c. : M. for copies (Mr. *Monet*) 2541 (ii).
NOVA SOCTIA CENTRAL RY. Co. : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3960 (ii).
OSHAWA RY. AND NAVIGATION Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6137 (iii).
PICKFORD & BLACK, MESSRS., PAYMENTS : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 544 (i).
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY., EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 2145 (ii).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6032; in Com., 6137.
QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. Co., PAYMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Godbout*) 4675 (iii).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033 (iii).
QUEBEC EASTERN RY., PETS., &c. : M. for copies (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 1934 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE, LOWER LAURENTIAN AND SAGUENAY RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
SOUTH ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6138 (iii).
TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. Co. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6139 (iii).
WEST INDIES SS. SERVICE : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 205 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4373; neg. (Y. 82, N. 107) 4427 (iii.)
——— Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 195 (i).
SUGAR DUTIES : prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1931 (i).
——— *See* "CUSTOMS ACT AMT. B."
——— (RAW) IN BOND : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 740.
SULLIVAN, HON. W. W. : in Com. of Sup., 1556 (i).
SUMMERSIDE, CHARLOTTETOWN, &c., BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 6201; conc., 6305 (iii).
SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR, DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3258 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3955 (ii).
——— STATION, REMOVAL : in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
Sunday Observance. *See* "LORD'S DAY."
SUPERANNUATION : in Com. of Sup., 3670 (ii).
SUPERINTENDENT OF MINES, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 5187 (iii).
SUPPLIES, DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1928 (i).
SUPPLIES, &c., PURCHASED FOR INDIANS IN N. S. : M. for List, &c.* (Mr. *Fraser*) 232 (i).
SUPPLY :
[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion [noted under this head.]
AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM. : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*, &c.) Treaty Papers, 238. Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*, &c.) Papers *re* Tarte-Mc Greevy Enquiry, 393. Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) The High Commissioner, 570; deb. rsmd., 636, 807; neg. (Y. 79, N. 100) 881. Remarks (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) Indian Affairs, 1484. Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) Fishery Laws, Enforcement, 1513. Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*, &c.) Dominion Day, adjmnt., 1536.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Personal Explanations (Mr. *McNeill*) 1543; (Mr. *Watson*) 1544 (i). Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) Trade Policy of Govt., 3309; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 77) 3425. Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) Timber Licenses, &c., 3428; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 3507. Remarks (Mr. *Amyot*, &c.) Kingston Graving Dock Papers, 3653. Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) Tay Canal, construction, 3738; neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779. Remarks (Messrs. *Weldon*, Sir *John Thompson*, &c.) Intercolonial Ry. Management, 3780. Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Testimonials to Ministers, 3827. Remarks (Messrs. *Borden, Foster*, &c.) U.S. Treaty with Cuba, 4008. Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) Settlers' Grievances, B. C., 4016; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 4056. Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Rights of Pub. Accts. Com., 4088; (Mr. *Prior*) Progress of B. C., 4093. Amt. (Mr. *Amyot*) Bancroft's Tender *re* Graving Dock. 4158; neg. (Y. 82, N. 99) 4212 (ii). Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) West Indies SS. Service, 4373; neg. (Y. 82, N. 107) 4428. Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Gov. General's Warrants, 4467; Amt., 4537; neg. (Y. 82, N. 97) 4551. Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) Trent Valley Canal, 4467; (Mr. *O'Brien*) American Cattle in Can., slaughter, 4468; (Mr. *McMillan*) 5209. Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) Trent Valley Canal, 4773. Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) The Census, 4829; neg. (Y. 81, N. 103) 5010. Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) Copyright, 5014.; (Mr. *Hargraft*) Cobourg Harbour, 5335; (Mr. *Delisle*) Montreal Pilots, 6144; (Mr. *Flint*) Indian Agent Chisholm, 6147; (Mr. *Flint*) Walrond Ranche, &c., 6148; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) Newfoundland Bait Act, 6188; (Mr. *Laurier*) Disallowance of Provincial Acts, 6296 (iii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Transmitting Estimates for 1891-92, 227; Suppl., 1890-91, 799 (i); Suppl., 1891-92, 5589: further Suppl., 6289 (iii).

RES. (Mr. *Foster*) FOR COM., 102; Ms. for Com., 238, 393, 442, 570, 906, 1484 (i), 3309, 3428, 3653, 3738, 3827, 4008, 4088, 4092, 4158 (ii), 4373, 4467, 4537, 4640, 4677, 4773, 4830, 5014, 5209, 5335, 6144, 6188 (iii).

IN COM.: 240, 397, 442, 842, 907, 1544, 1651, 1732 (i), 3309, 3508, 3660, 3821, 3856, 4057, 4101, 4214 (ii), 4313, 4429, 4469, 4552, 4640, 4678, 4800, 5011, 5023, 5081, 5159, 5210, 5336, 6166, 6197, 6239, 6296 (iii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. See "Justice."

Agriculture:

Barley, Two-rowed, distribution, 1564 (i).
Dairying Interests and Experimental Farms, 1562 (i), 3574 (ii), 6174 (iii).
Experimental Farms, 1566 (i), 3552 (ii).
Haras National Co., 6179 (iii).
Patent Record, 953 (i).

Arts and Statistics:

Brown, Mr. Adam, honorarium, 6174 (iii).
Census, 1569 (i), 3531 (ii).
Jamaica Exhibition, 1568 (i).
Selden, Mr. S., statistical services, 1569 (i).

Canals. See "Collection of Revenues" and "Railways."

Charges of Management:

Country Savings Banks, N.B., N.S., P.E.I., 1748.
Dominion Notes, issue and redemption, 1754 (i).
—— printing, 1755 (i).
Interest, 1 per cent. commission, 1748 (i).
Printing, Advertising, Inspection, &c., 1756 (i).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Civil Government:

Agriculture Dept., 254 (i), 6169 (iii).
Auditor General's Office, 6167 (iii).
Contingencies, Deptl.:
Advertising subscriptions, outside printing, 478, 488 (i).
Auditor General's Office, 1544 (1).
Civil Service Examiners, 481, 483 (i).
Fisheries, 1547 (i).
Governor Gen.'s Secretary's Office, 433 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 431, 442, 486, 490, 1555, 1732 (i), 6167 (iii).
Indian Affairs, 1547 (i).
Interior, 433 (i).
Justice, 433, 1547 (i).
Marine, 440 (i).
Post Office, 440 (1).
Printing Bureau, cleaning, &c., 442 (i).
Privy Council Office, 433, 1556 (i).
Public Works, 439 (i).
Telegrams, 498 (i).
Customs Dept., 254 (i).
Finance and Treasury Board, 250 (i).
Fisheries Dept., 255 (i).
Geological Survey, 410 (i).
Governor Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 240 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 411 (i), 6167 (iii).
Indian Affairs, 249, 1552 (i).
Inland Revenue Dept., 253 (i).
Interior Dept., 247 (i), 6169 (iii).
Justice Dept., 241 (i).
Penitentiaries Branch, 242 (i).
Marine Dept., 255 (i), 6166 (iii).
Postmaster General's Dept., 254 (i), 6166 (iii).
Computing Interest, 432 (i).
Printing and Stationery Dept., 243 (i), 6166 (iii).
Privy Council Office, 241 (i), 6167 (iii).
Public Works Dept., 255, 397 (i).
Railways and Canals Dept., 407 (i), 6169 (iii).
Secretary of State Dept., 6167 (iii).

Collection of Revenues:

Adulteration of Food:
General Vote, 5166 (iii).
Canals:
Murray Canal Staff, 1728 (i).
Williamsburg Canal Staff, 1728 (i).
Culling Timber:
Contingencies, 5160 (iii).
Cullers' Salaries, 1725 (i), 5159 (iii).
Customs:
Board of Customs, conc., 5419 (iii).
British Columbia, 5051 (iii).
Chinese Immigration, 5056; conc., 5419 (iii).
Cruiser, Maintenance and Repairs, 1714, 1721.
Detective Service, 5053 (iii).
Douglas, Jas., Acting Collector, Toronto, 1714.
Inspectors of Ports, 5052; conc., 5418 (iii).
Laboratory, 5054 (iii).
New Brunswick, 5023 (iii).
Nova Scotia, 5023 (iii).
Ontario, 5042 (iii).
O'Meara, D. D., Acting Collector, Que., 1714.
Prince Edward Island, 5024; conc., 5418 (iii).
Quebec, 5030 (iii).
Revenue Cruiser, new, 6277 (iii).
Vacuum Oil Co., Refund, Law Costs, &c., 1714, 1721 (i).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues—Continued.
Dominion Lands:
Commissioner's Salary, 5179 (iii).
Crown Timber Agent, New Westminster, 5189.
Extra Clerks at Head Office, Ottawa, 5194 (iii).
Homesteads Inspectors' Salaries, conc., 5433.
Mason, Jno., Carpenter, Salary, 6279 (iii).
Outside Service, Salaries, 5189 (iii).
Superintendents of Mines, Salary, 5187 (iii).
Travelling Expenses, 5191 (iii.)
Excise, 1724 (i).
Collectors of Customs, Payments, 5137.
Distilleries, &c., Extra Duty Pay, 5136.
Methylated Spirits, Cost of Supply, 5138 (iii).
Salaries, Officers and Inspectors, 5125 (iii).
Inspection of Staples:
General Vote, 5165.
Minor Revenues:
Ordnance Lands, 5171 (iii).
Post Office:
Bartlett, J. H., Clock services, Ottawa, 6279.
Case, H.N., late Postmaster at Hamilton, 6279.
General Vote, 4705 (iii).
Hamilton Post Office, additional Carriers, 6279,
Mail Service, C.P.R., deficiency, 1890-91, 1744.
Miscellaneous, 4725 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances, 4719 (iii).
Public Works:
Agency, B.C., 4669 (iii).
Chaudière Rents, Collection, 1728 (i).
Harbours, Docks and Slides, Repairs, 4665.
Land and Cable Telegraph Lines, 4668 (iii).
Slide and Boom Dues, collection, 4663 (iii).
Telegraph Line, P.E.I. and Mainland, 4668 (iii).
Telegraph and Signal Service, 4669 (iii).
Telegraph Lines, N.W.T., 4668 (iii).
—— B C., 4669 (iii).
Railways:
Intercolonial Ry., &c., 4057 (ii).
Weights and Measures and Gas:
Contingencies, 1725 (i).
Salaries, Officers, Inspectors, &c., 5161 (iii).
Rent, Fuel, &c., for Gas, 5162 (iii).
Weights and Measures, 5163.
Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Lands—See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Police:
General Vote, 511; suppl., 1557 (i).
Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."
Fisheries:
Behring Sea Seal Fisheries, Cost of Experts, 6268 (ii).
British Columbia, 3527 (ii).
Fish-Breeding, 3529 (ii).
Manitoba, 3524 (ii).
New Brunswick, 3522 (ii).
Ontario, Salaries, &c., of Officers, 3514 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 3524 (ii).
Quebec, Salaries, &c., of Officers, 3514 (ii).
Geological Survey:
General Vote, 4725; conc., 5411 (iii).
Government of N. W. T.:
Books for Library, 6277 (iii).
Caretakers, &c., Legislative Hall, 5067 (iii).
Clerical assistance, 5066 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Government of N. W. T.—Continued.
Clerk of Council, Statutory increase, 6276 (iii).
Contingencies, 1709 (i); conc., 5426 (iii).
Elections, probable Cost, 5066 (iii).
General Vote, 5066 (iii).
Light and Fuel, Govt. House, 5072 (iii).
Manitoba Insane Asylum, 5072 (iii).
Schools, 1711 (i).
Subscriptions to Newspapers, 5067 (iii).
Translating *Gazette*, 1710 (i).
Well-boring Machines, 5073; conc., 5424 (iii).
Government Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."
Immigration:
General Vote, 3579 (ii), 5224 (iii).
Indians:
Agricultural Societies, aid to, conc., 5413 (iii).
British Columbia:
Schools, Day and Industrial, 4800; conc., 4514 (iii).
Steam Launch, 4809; conc., 4514 (iii).
Surveys, 4810.
Manitoba and North-West Territories:
Allowance to Heirs of late James Payne, 1695.
Annuities and Commutations, 4736 (iii).
General Expenses, 4810 (iii).
Live Stock and Supplies, 4738 (iii).
Mackenzie River and Peace River Treaty, 1695.
Schools, Day, Boarding, &c., 4739 (iii).
Sioux Indians, 4747; conc., 4515 (iii).
St. Boniface Schools, additional Pupils, 6274.
Supplies for Farmers, 4746 (iii).
Surveys, 4744 (iii).
Triennial Clothing, 4739 (iii).
Nova Scotia:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 4729 (iii).
Indian Chapel, Chapel Island, C.B., 6273 (iii).
Smith, Dr. W. F., Medical attendance, 1696 (i).
New Brunswick:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 4732, 5059; conc., 5419.
Medical attendance, 4735; conc., 5423 (iii).
Oka Indians, removal to Gibson, 4728; conc., 5411 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec, &c., 1694 (i), 4727 (iii).
Prince Edward Island:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 4735 (iii).
Robinson Treaties, Payments under, 4728 (iii).
Roy, Ovide, increase of salary, 6272 (iii).
Schools, Ont., Que., N.S. and N.B., 4727 (iii).
Surveys, Ont., Que. and Mar. Provs., conc., 5413.
Justice, Administration of:
Exchequer Court of Canada, 507, 1557 (i).
Miscellaneous Expenditure, including N.W.T., 506, 1556 (i); conc., 6169, 6303 (iii).
Salaries of Judges, 511 (i).
Sullivan, Hon. W. W., 1556 (i).
Vice-Admiralty and Maritime Courts, 510 (i).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 6172 (iii).
Committees, extra Expenses, 6173 (iii).
Contingencies, 941 (i).
Debates, Official Publication, 942 (i).
Dingwell, J., prof. services, &c., 1559 (i).
Election Expenses, 1734 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revision, 946 (i).

SUPPLY——*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Legislation—Continued.
House of Commons—*Continued.*
Leather Trunks for Members, 1562 (i).
Macdonell, Mr., Sessional Indemnity, 6172.
Masters, C. H., Drafting Criminal Law, &c., 1559 (i).
Printing, paper, binding, 946 (i).
Salaries, &c., Serjeant-at-Arms Estimate, 943.
Salaries, per Clerk's Estimate, 941 (i).
Voters' Lists, Printing, 1559, 1734 (i).
Library:
Salaries of Officers and Grant, 945 (i).
Senate:
Salaries and Contingencies, 929 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction, &c., 3512 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 3510 (ii).
Salaries, &c., Lighthouse Keepers, 3509 (ii), 6266.
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Campbellton and Gaspé, 4700, 5349 (iii).
Canso, Arichat, &c., and Port Mulgrave, 4702.
Grand Manan, N.B., and Mainland, 4678 (iii).
Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax, 4679 (iii).
Magdalen Islands, 4678 (iii).
P.E.I. and Mainland, 4701 (iii).
Port Mulgrave, &c., and Cheticamp, 4701 (iii).
San Francisco and Victoria, B.C., 4703 (iii).
St. John and Halifax and West Indies, &c., 5450 (iii).
Militia:
Armouries, care of Arms, &c., 3720 (ii).
Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., 3699 (ii).
Clothing and Great Coats, 3700 (ii).
Contingencies, conc., 5417 (iii).
Drill Instruction, 3729, 4214 (ii).
Drill Pay, &c., 3730 (i).
Kilted Battalion, Toronto, 6182 (iii).
Military Stores, 3717 (ii).
Military Properties, care, maintenance, &c., 3734 (ii).
Permanent Forces, Batteries and Schools, 3737.
Royal Military College, 4236 (ii).
St. John's Gate, Quebec, 1573 (i).
Mounted Police:
Arms, Ammunition, Repairs, &c., 4823; conc., 5416 (ii).
Books, Stationery, &c., conc., 5417 (iii).
Clothing, 4822; conc., 5416 (iii).
Contingencies, conc., 5417 (iii).
General Vote, 4817; conc., 5415 (iii).
Rebellion, 1885, Claims *re*, 6274 (iii).
Suppl. Vote, 1697 (i).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitration *re* Provincial Accounts, 6275 (iii).
Army and Navy, Imports for Use, 5084 (iii).
Banff Hot Springs, Survey, &c., 5108 (iii).
Burrard Inlet Survey, 1705 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co., Funeral Train, 6276.
Canada Gazette, conc., 5417 (iii).
Commercial Agencies, 5108 (iii).
Canada Temperance Act, 5086; conc., 5426 (iii),
Dufresne, Mr. J. L., compensation for Injuries, 1706 (i).
Fabre, Hector, Salary, &c., 5086 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Miscellaneous—Continued.
Gliddon, Wm., Special Services, 1705 (i).
Govt. of Keewatin, Expenses, 5084 (iii).
Historical and Topographical Map of Dom., 6261 (iii).
Litigation Expenses, 1707 (i).
Litigated Matters, Costs, 5107 (iii).
Lunatics in Keewatin support, 1709 (i), 5085 (iii).
Mounted Police, compensation to Members, 5086; conc., 5427 (iii).
Old Records, classification, 5084, 5124 (iii).
Palmer, late Chief Justice, allowance to Family 6276 (ii).
Parliamentary Documents, distribution, 5081.
Printing Bureau, additional Plant, 1706 (i), 5346 (iii).
Printing, Miscellaneous, 5418 (iii).
Prohibition Commission, Expenses, 6276 (iii).
Returns, preparation, 5107 (iii).
Royal Society, publication of Proceedings, 5123 (iii).
Strong, late W. O., Gratuity to Widow, 6264 (iii).
North-West Territories. See "Government."
Ocean and River Service:
Alert and schooner *Scylla*, Claims *re* Collision, 6265 (iii).
Government Steamers, 3513 (ii).
Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, 3508 (ii).
Quebec Water Police, 3508 (ii).
Tidal Observations, 3508 (ii).
Open Account:
Seed Grain, Accounts due for purchase, &c., 1729 (i).
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 919 (i).
Dorchester, 910, 1558 (i).
Kingston, 882, 908 (i).
Manitoba, 913 (i), 6171 (ii).
Regina Gaol, 928 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul, 907 (i), 6170 (ii).
Pensions:
Frankum, J., late Gunner "A" Battery, 1729.
Fenian Raid, 3660 (ii).
Harpur, G. H., Rebellion of 1885, 1572 (i).
Rebellion, N. W. T., 1885, 3662 (ii).
Veterans of 1812, 3661 (ii).
Police. See "Dominion" and "Mounted."
Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."
Public Works—Capital:*
Kingston Graving Dock, 1669 (i).
Ship Channel, Montreal and Quebec, 1668 (i).
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Vancouver Post Office, &c., 4451 (iii).
Victoria Drill Hall, 4453 (iii).
Victoria Military Buildings, conc., 6304 (iii).
Manitoba:
Brandon Post Office, 4429, 5348 (iii).
Military Buildings, Winnipeg, 4441 (iii).
Winnipeg Immigrant Buildings, 1687 (i) 4444.
North-West Territories:
Court House, Lock-up, &c., 4450, 6248 (iii).
Lethbridge Custom House, &c., 6248 (iii).

**See* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Public Works—Income—Continued.

Buildings—*Continued.*

North-West Territories—*Continued.*

Medicine Hat Immigrant Building, 6549 (iii).
Mounted Police Buildings, &c., 4448 (iii).
Prince Albert Crown Lands Office, 4450 (iii).
Regina, Council Chamber, &c., 4450, 6249 (iii).
Regina Industrial School, 1687 (i).
Regina, Lieut. Gov.'s Residence, 4444 (iii).
Prince Albert Immigration Building, 6251 (iii).

New Brunswick:

Chatham Post Office, 4331 (iii).
Lunenburg Post Office, &c,, 6201 (iii).

Nova Scotia, 4314 (iii),

Ontario:

Brantford Drill Shed, 4362 (iii).
Carleton Place Post Office, 4362 (iii).
Cobourg Post Office, 1687 (i), 4363 (iii).
Military College. Kingston, 6245 (iii).
Napanee Post Office, 6242 (iii).
Pembroke Post Office, 4369 (iii).
Peterborough Custom House, 4370, 6246 (iii).
Petrolia Public Building, 4372 (iii).
Port Arthur Post Office, &c., 4371 (iii).
Printing Bureau, 4363 (iii).
Smith's Falls Public Building, 4372 (iii).
Toronto Drill Hall, 4372 (iii).
Walkerton Post Office, 1686 (i), 4372 (iii).

Prince Edward Island:

Summerside, Charlottetown, &c., Buildings, 6201; conc., 6305 (iii).

Quebec:

Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, 4332 (iii).
Hull Post Office, 1685 (i).
Lachine Post Office, &c., 4332 (iii).
Lapriarie Post Office, 4338 (iii)
Montreal Post Office, Electric Light, 4347 (iii).
Rivière du Loup Post Office, &c., 4357 (iii).
St. Henri Post Office, 4359 (iii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, 4362 (iii).
West Farnham Post Office, 6201, 6239 (iii).

Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c.:

Dom. Buildings, Petty Repairs, 4521 (iii).
Gas, Electric Light, Ottawa, 4512 (iii).
Heating Buildings, Ottawa, 4474 (iii).
Major's Hill Park, Ottawa, 4520 (iii).
Ottawa, Grounds around Buildings, 4470.
Printing Bureau, Babcock Fire Extinguishers, 6253 (iii).
Repairs, Furniture, &c., 4469 (iii.)
Rideau Hall, Fuel and Light, 4515 (iii).
Snow, Removal, Buildings, Ottawa, 4474.
Supplies, Sundry, for Caretakers, &c., 4521.
Telephone Service, Buildings, Ottawa, 4517.
Vault for Finance Dept., 1686 (i).
Ventilation and Lighting, Buildings, Ottawa, 4521 (iii).
Water, Buildings, Ottawa, 4514 (iii).
Wellington St. Building, Ottawa, 4522 (iii).

Dredging:

British Columbia, 4649 (iii).
Dredge Vessels, Repairs, 4640 (iii).
General services, 4650 (iii).
Manitoba, 4647 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Public Works—Income—Continued.

Dredging—*Continued.*

New Plant, 1690 (i).
Quebec and Ontario, 4646 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Buildings, &c., 4652 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers generally, 4595 (iii).

Harbours and Rivers:

British Columbia:

Fraser River, 4594 (iii).
General Repairs, 4594 (iii).
Victoria Harbour, 4592 (iii).

Manitoba:

General Repairs and Improvements, 4591 (iii).

Nova Scotia:

Bayfield Harbour, 6254 (iii).
Cribbin's Point Wharf, 4530 (iii).
Digby, new Pier at Raquette, 4532 (iii).
L'Ardoise Breakwater, 4530 (iii).
Port Maitland Breakwater, 6254 (iii).

Ontario:

Beaverton Wharf, 4575 (iii).
Belleville Harbour Works, 4572 (iii).
Cobourg Harbour, 4559 (iii).
General Repairs, 1688 (i).
Georgian Bay, Removal of Rocks, 4574 (iii).
Kingston Harbour, 4559 (ii).
Little Current Improvements, 4573 (iii).
Little Nation River, 6261 (iii).
Ottawa River, channel through Narrows, 4571 (iii).
Ottawa River, Gatineau Boom, 6261 (iii).
Owen Sound Harbour, 4565 (iii).
Rondeau Harbour, Repairs, 4583 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie, 6254 (iii).
Southampton Breakwater, 1688 (i), 4573 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Works, 4572, 5438 (iii).

Prince Edward Island:

Miminigash Breakwater, 4532 (iii).
Negro Point Breakwater, 4533 (iii).
Repairs to Piers, &c., 4532 (iii).

Quebec:

Coteau Landing Pier, 4557 (iii).
General Repairs, 4557 (iii).
Lévis Graving Dock, 1687 (i), 4552 (iii).
River St. Louis Improvements, 4556 (iii).
Three Rivers Harbour, 1687 (i), 4552 (iii).

Miscellaneous Works, 4645 (iii).
National Art Gallery, 4663 (iii).
Surveys and Inspection, 4662 (iii).

Roads and Bridges:

Grand River, Iron Bridge, 4606 (iii).
Old Man's River, Fort Macleod, Free Bridge, 4607 (iii).

Slides and Booms, 4645* (iii).
Petewawa River, 4651 (iii).

Quarantine:

Cattle Diseases and Sheep Scab, 5336; conc., 5435 (iii).
Suppl. Vote, 1570 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 3576 (ii).

* *See* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Territorial Accounts:
Bergin, Dr., Surgeon General, balance of salary, 6280; conc., 6305 (iii).
Claims, clerical work *re* Settlement, 6280 (iii).
Railways and Canals—Capital:*
Canals:
Galops, 4107 (ii).
Grenville, 4141 (ii).
Goodwin, late Jas., Claims of Heirs, 6198, 6296 (iii).
Lachine, 4102 (ii).
Murray, 4125 (ii).
Rapide Plat, 4107 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, 4102 (ii), 5210 (iii).
St. Lawrence River and Canals, 4107 (ii).
Tay, 4144 (ii), 5219 (iii).
Trent, 4126 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers:
Cape Tormentine Harbour, 4522 (ii).
Kaministiquia River, Turning Basin, 4523.
St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, 4523 (ii).
Railways:
Annapolis and Digby Ry.:
Construction, 1659 (i),
Canadian Pacific Ry.:
Construction, 1652 (i), 3821 (ii).
Cape Breton Ry.:
Construction and Equipment, 1656 (i), 3898.
Grand Narrows Bridge, 1658 (i).
Train Ferry, Mulgrave and Point Tupper, 3898 (ii).
Intercolonial Ry.:
General Vote, 1736; conc., 1758 (i).
Halifax, increased accommodation, 3857 (ii).
—— sufferance warehouse, 3894 (ii).
Indiantown Branch, 3884 (ii).
Moncton, increased accommodation, 1653 (i), 3882 (ii).
New Glasgow, increased accommodation, 3882 (ii), 6197 (iii).
Rolling Stock, 1654 (i), 3882 (ii).
St. Charles Branch, 1655 (i), 3884 (ii).
St. John, increased accommodation, 1655 (i).
—— additional property, 3884 (ii).
—— extension on front of city, 3883 (ii).
"Y" at Truro, 1655 (i).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry.:
Construction and Equipment, 1658 (i).
Revote, 6197 (iii).
Prince Edward Island Ry.:
Cape Traverse Wharf, extension, 1758 (i).
Smith, Ronald, Expropriation of Land, 6198.
Summerside Station, removal, 3898 (ii).
Short Line Ry.:
Judgment of Court, 1658 (i).
Railways and Canals—Income:
Canals:
Carillon and Grenville, 4150 (ii), 5222 (iii).
Chambly:
Raising Banks, lowering bottom, &c., 4146.
Lamoureaux Bros.' Claim, 4147 (ii).
Rebuilding part of East Wall, Lock No. 7, 6200 (iii).
Yule Estate Claim, 4148 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Gratuities, 1667 (j).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Railways and Canals—Income—Continued.
Canals—*Continued.*
Rideau Canal:
Bridge at Merrickville, conc., 6304 (iii).
Deepening Basin at Ottawa, 1666 (i), 5222.
Dredging plant, 5222 (iii).
Land Damages, 1666 (i), 5223 (iii).
Survey above Kingston Mills, 1666 (i).
Ste. Anne's Lock:
Strengthening old Pier, 4149 (ii).
St. Ours Lock:
Overhauling Foundation, 4148 (ii).
St. Peter's Canal, 5223 (iii).
Trent Valley Canal:
Hall, W. H., Claim, 4151 (ii).
Swing Bridge, &c., at Hastings, 1665 (i).
Welland Canal:
Filling pond at St. Catharines, 1666 (i).
Port Dalhousie, overhauling superstructure, 4145 (ii).
St. Catharines Water Power Co., 4145 (ii).
Stromness culvert and bridge, 4145 (ii).
Statistics. See "Arts," "Agriculture."
Steamship Subventions. See "Mail Subsidies."
Superannuation:
Wallace, W., extra allowance, 3670 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection:
General Vote, 3513 (ii).
Unprovided Items:
Per Auditor Gen.'s Rep., 1889-90, 1745 (i).
CONCURRENCE:
Canada Gazette, 5417 (iii).
Cattle Quarantine, 5435 (iii).
Commercial Agencies, 5427 (iii).
Customs, P.E.I., 5418 (iii).
Fabre, Mr., salary, &c., 5427 (iii).
Geological Survey, 5411 (iii).
Govt. of N.W.T., 5424 (iii).
Homestead Inspectors' salaries, 5433 (iii).
Indians, 5411, 5419 (iii).
Intercolonial Ry., 1758 (i).
Justice, Miscellaneous, 6303 (iii).
Mounted Police, 5416, 5427 (iii).
Printing, Miscellaneous, 5418 (iii).
Rideau Canal, Bridge at Merrickville, 6304 (iii).
Surgeon General's salary, balance, 6301 (iii).
Victoria, B.C., Military Buildings, 6304 (iii).
Winnipeg General Hospital, 6304 (iii).

Supply B. No. 127 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. in Com., rep., conc. in and 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1853 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)

Supply B. No. 167 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 4297; 2°* and 3°*, 4373 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 2.)

Supply B. No. 177 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. in Com., rep., conc. in and 1°*, 2°* and 3°* of B., 6307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (*Chap.* 135 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 138** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 1990 (i); 2°, 3584; in Com., 3588; 3° m., 3649; 3°*, 3984 (ii); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 5079; conc. in, 5590 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

SURGEON GENERAL'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6280; conc., 6305 (iii).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTION, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4662 (iii).
SUTTON WEST, INDIAN AGENT, COST OF INVESTIGATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 145 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 961 (i).
Tapley, Isabel. *See* "DIVORCE."
TARIFF, THE. *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."
TARTE-MCGREEVY INVESTIGATION, COUNSEL: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1575, 1930 (i).
——— ENQUIRY *re* PAPERS: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 393 (i).
TAY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3738 (ii); neg. (Y. 82, N. 100) 3779 (ii).
Deb. (Mr. *Bowell*) 3745; (Mr. *Gibson*) 3750; (Mr. *Watson*) 3751; (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) 3755; (Mr. *Fraser*) 3756; (Mr. *Haggart*) 3759; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3763; (Mr. *Mulock*) 3769; (Mr. *Campbell*) 3773; (Mr. *McMullen*) 3776 (ii).
——— *See* "CANALS."
TELEGRAPH AND SIGNAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4669 (iii).
TELEGRAPH COMPANIES, LEGISLATION *re* DIRECTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 144 (i).
Telegraph Lines. *See* "C.P.R."
TELEGRAPH LINES, LAND AND CABLE: in Com., of Sup., 4668 (iii).
TELEPHONE SERVICE, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4517 (iii).
TENDER FOR CAISSON, ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, ADVTS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1932 (i).
TERRITORIAL ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 6280 (iii).
TESTIMONIALS TO MINISTERS: Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3827; agreed to, 3853 (ii).
THAMES RIVER, REMOVAL OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1268 (i).
THREE RIVERS HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4552 (iii).
——— PIER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 5776 (iii).
THURBER, LIEUT-COL., RESIGNATION AS LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: M. for O.C.'s (Mr. *Rinfret*) 173 (i).
TIDAL OBSERVATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3508 (ii).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 130 (i).
——— WHARFAGE DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 708 (i).
——— HARBOUR MASTER, REFUND OF MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3259 (ii).
——— MONEYS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 4673.
TIMBER LICENSES, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3428; neg. (Y. 81, N. 100) 3507.
Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3438; (Mr. *Barron*) 3439; (Mr. *Robillard*) 3445; (Mr. *Casey*) 3446; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3447; (Mr. *McMullen*) 3452; (Mr. *Davin*) 3455; (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 3458; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3461; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3472; (Mr. *Macdowall*) 3477; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3480; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 3484; (Sir *John Thompson*) 3488; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3497; (Mr. *Bowell*) 3501; (Mr. *Watson*) 3505 (ii).
TIMBER CUT, &C., IN DISPUTED TERRITORY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 128 (i).
——— ON INDIAN RESERVE NO. 6: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 111 (i).
TOBACCO AND CIGARS, LAW *re* CULTIVATORS: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).
TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 6033; in Com., 6139 (iii).
TORONTO DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4372 (iii).
——— CONTRACTS FOR ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 964 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co,'s B. No. 80 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 524; 2°*, 579; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 86.)
TORONTO HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4572, 5438 (iii).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 3576 (iii).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: Presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 104 (i).
Trade Combinations Prevention Act Amt. B. No. 15 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°, 142; 2° m., 2552; 2°, 2576; in Com., 2577 (ii).
Trade Marks and Industrial Designs Act Amt. B. No. 101 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 807; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1099 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 35.)
TRADE POLICY OF THE GOVT.: Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3309; agreed to (Y. 99, N. 77) 3425 (ii).
Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3313; (Mr. *Tupper*) 3333; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3358; (Mr. *Foster*) 3376; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3401; (Mr. *Casey*) 3413; (Mr. *Scriver*) 3424 (ii).
TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE EMPIRE: M. (Mr. *Foster*) Address to Her Majesty, 6309 (iii).
TRAIN SERVICE, P.E.I. RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1274.
TRANS-ATLANTIC STEAMERS, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2906 (ii).
TRANSLATING N.W.T. "GAZETTE": in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).
TREATIES, &C.:
COMMERCIAL TREATY, ENGLAND AND FRANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3950 (ii), 4670 (iii).
SPANISH AMERICAN TREATY COR.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 5852 (iii).
TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE EMPIRE: Mess. from the Senate read (Mr. *Speaker*) 6216 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. *Foster*) Address to Her Majesty, 6309 (iii).
——— WITH U.S.: Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 1199 (i).
——— WITH WEST INDIES: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2289 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4608 (iii).
TREATY PAPERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 238, 906 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 600 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 550 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 238, 906 (i).
U.S. TREATY WITH CUBA: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4008 (ii).
WASHINGTON CONFERENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2375 (ii).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

Trinity House. *See* "MONTREAL HARBOUR."

TUNNEL, P. E. I. AND MAINLAND RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Perry*) 1413 (i).

——— SIR DOUGLAS FOX'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 4294 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 208, 227 (i).

——— Explanation (Mr. *Foster*) 227 (i).

——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1277. Deb. (Mr. *Haggart*) 1290; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1291, 1645; (Mr. *McLean*) 1605; (Mr. *Perry*) 1618; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1629; (Mr. *Choquette*) 1632; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1633; (Mr. *Yeo*) 1634; (Mr. *Welsh*) 1638; (Mr. *Macdonald, P. E. I.*) 1644; (Mr. *Foster*) 1647 (i).

TURNING BASIN, WELLAND CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 270 (i).

TWO-CENT LETTER POSTAGE, UNIFORM RATE: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 131 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 129 (i).

TYPE-SETTING MACHINES, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 271 (i).

U.S. Fishing Vessels B. No. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 108; 2° and in Com., 206; 3°, 232 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)

U.S. QUARANTINE REGULATIONS *re* LAMBS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 960 (i).

U.S. TREATY WITH CUBA: Remarks (Messrs. *Borden, Foster, &c.*) on M. for Com. of Sup,, 4008 (ii).

UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 1745 (i).

VACUUM OIL CO., REFUND, LAW COSTS, &C.: in Com. Sup., 1714, 1721 (i).

Vancouver Dock and Ship Building Co.'s incorp. B. No. 51 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 266; 2°*, 412; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 129.)

VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. RESERVE, REPS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1051 (i).

VANCOUVER P. O., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4451 (ii).

VAUDREUIL AND BOUCHERVILLE WHARVES, EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2548 (ii).

——— COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Harwood*) 335 (i).

VAULT IN FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1686 (i).

VENTILATION AND LIGHTING, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4521 (iii).

VETERANS OF 1812, PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3661 (ii).

——— 1837-38, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2923; deb. rsmd., 3287 (ii).

VICE-ADMIRALTY AND MARITIME COURTS: in Com. of Sup., 510 (i).

Victoria and North American Ry. Co.'s Ferry B. No. 62 (Mr. *Earle*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1087 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 101.)

VICTORIA, B.C., DRILL HALL: M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Prior*) 736 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 4453 (iii).

——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4592 (iii).

——— MILITARY BUILDINGS; conc., 6304 (iii).

Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Ry. Co.'s B. No. 67 (Mr. *Prior*). 1°*, 387; 2°*, 547; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 75.)

VICTORIA, N.S., APPOINTMENT OF RETURNING OFFICER: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Flint*) 2935 (ii).

Volunteers. *See* "LAND GRANTS."

VOLUNTEERS OF 1837-38, GRANT OF LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Allison*) 961 (i).

VOTES ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1881 AND 1891: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Chapleau*) 389 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Lavergne*) 199, 391 (i).

VOTES POLLED AT ELECTION, 1891, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 128 (i).

Voting. *See* "COMPULSORY."

VOTERS' LISTS, REVISION, PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 946, 1559, 1734 (i).

——— REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 143 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 268 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2912 (ii).

VOTERS, PROVINCE OF QUE., TOTAL NUMBERS: Ques (Mr. *Choquette*) 2910 (i).

WALKER, DR., CLAIM: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Bain*) 1058 (i).

WALKERTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 1271 (i).

——— CLERK OF WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 2151.

——— CONTRACT FOR FITTING: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 962 (i).

——— HEATING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 335 (i).

——— P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 1686 (i), 4372 (ii).

——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 267 (i).

——— CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266.

——— SEIZURE OF IRON BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3619 (ii).

——— SHARE OF CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3959.

——— SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Truax*) 3266 (ii).

WALLACE, W., EXTRA ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3670 (ii).

WALLS OF QUEBEC, EXTENSION OF STREETS: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3957 (ii).

WALROND RANCHE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Flint*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

WASHINGTON CONFERENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2375 (ii).

WATER, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4514 (ii).

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET: Annual Stmnt. (Mr. *Foster*) 1200; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1252 (i); neg. (Y. 88, N. 114) 3081. Deb. (Mr. *Weldon*) 1435; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1458; (Mr. *Montague*) 1854; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1892; (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) 1995; Amt. to Amt., 2020 (i). Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2021, 2664; (Mr. *Foster*) 2021, 2065; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2023; (Sir *John Thompson*) 2023, 2063; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2025, 2067; (Mr. *Bowell*) 2027: (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2029; (Mr. *Edgar*) 2031; (Mr. *Curran*) 2032; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2033; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 2034; (Mr. *Casey*) 2037; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2039; (Mr. *Stairs*) 2040; (Mr. *Amyot*) 2060; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 2061; wthdn., 2069.

WAYS AND MEANS—*Continued.*

Deb. on Amt. rsmd. (Mr. *McDonald, Huron*) 2070; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2107; (Mr. *King*) 2122; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 2260; (Mr. *Borden*) 2290; (Mr. *Masson*) 2305; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2336; (Mr. *Ives*) 2376; (Mr. *McMillan*) 2400; (Mr. *Corby*) 2421; (Mr. *Campbell*) 2425; (Mr. *McLennan*) 2438; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2461; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2479; (Mr. *Dawson*) 2485; (Mr. *Moncrieff*) 2497; (Mr. *Hyman*) 2581; (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 2596; (Mr. *Rider*) 2610; (Mr. *Craig*) 2617; (Mr. *Flint*) 2626; (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 2669; (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2680; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2687; (Mr. *Lavergne*) 2713; (Mr. *Davin*) 2719; (Mr. *Semple*) 2731; (Mr. *Adams*) 2743; (Mr. *Devlin*) 2763; (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 2773; (Mr. *Bowers*) 2781; (Mr. *McDonald, Victoria*) 2787: (Mr. *Béchard*) 2792; (Mr. *McNeill*) 2802; (Mr. *Edwards*) 2813; (Mr. *Kenny*) 2822; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2842; (Mr. *Skinner*) 2860; (Mr. *Monet*) 2872; (Mr. *Leduc*) 2875; (Mr. *Brown, Chateauguay*) 2880; (Mr. *Ryckman*) 2882; (Mr. *Forbes*) 2884; (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 2896; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 2965; (Mr. *Allan*) 2981; (Mr. *Spohn*) 3002; (Mr. *Henderson*) 3013; (Mr. *Murray*) 3030; (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) 3040; (Mr. *Legris*) 3051; (Mr. *Watson*) 3057; (Mr. *Fréchette*) 3070; (Mr. *Proulx*) 3076 (ii).

——— prop. Res. for Com. (Mr. *Foster*) 103; in Com., 1853 (i), 4297 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. *Foster*) further consdn. of Res., 3201.

——— Res. (Ale, Beer, &c.) in Com., 4001 (ii).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AND GAS, REP.: Presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 103 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i), 5161 (iii).

——— FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 194 (i).

Weighers of Grain Provision B. No. 164 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 3983 (ii); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4307 (iii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 47.)

WELLAND CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

WELDFORD, N.B., P. O., COMPLAINTS *re* MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 2151 (ii).

WELL-BORING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 5073; conc., 5424 (iii).

WELLINGTON, B.C., MILITARY AID TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Gordon*) 146 (i).

——— PAYMENTS FOR ACTIVE SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 2146 (ii).

WELLINGTON ST. BUILDING, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4522 (ii).

Western Life Ass. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 48 (Mr. *Macdonald Winnipeg*). 1°*, 238; 2°, 295; in Com. and 3°*, 1434 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 115.)

WEST FARNHAM P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 6201, 6239.

WEST INDIES SS. SERVICE: Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4373; neg. (Y. 82, N. 107) 4427 (ii).

——— SUBSIDY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 205 (i).

——— SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 195 (i).

WEST POINT WHARF, ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 269 (i).

Whirlpool Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 58 (Mr. *German*). 1°*, 334; 2°*, 413; in Com. and 3°*, 1296 (i).

WHITE, MR. FRED., REP. *re* COMMISSIONER HERCHMER: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1574 (i).

WHITE, PETER, ESQ., ELECTION AS SPEAKER: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1 (i).

WHITMAN, CAPT., C. W. S., APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 268 (i).

WIARTON HARBOUR WORKS, CONTRACTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 226 (i).

WILD FOWL, PROHIBITION OF EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. *McKay*) 1769 (i).

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 1728.

WILSON, JAS., POSTMASTER AT KINMOUNT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Barron*) 736 (i).

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 119 (Mr. *Dewdney*). Res. prop., 549; Order for Com. read, 1253; in Com., 1347; conc. in and 1°* of B., 1414; 2° m., 1994 (i); 2°*, and in Com., 2205; Amts. conc. in and 3°*, 2289; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 3984 (ii). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 81.)

Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1347, 1398; (Mr. *Spohn*) 1349; (Mr. *Daly*) 1363, 1379; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1368 (i), 2238, 2253 (ii); (Mr. *Watson*) 1371 (i), 2221 (ii); (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*) 1374; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1375 (i), 2215, 2250 (ii); (Mr. *Sproule*) 1380; (Mr. *Denison*) 1381; (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) 1383; (Mr. *Forbes*) 1384; (Mr. *Davin*) 1386; (Mr. *Fraser*) 1390; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1392 (i), 2225 (ii); (Mr. *Welsh*) 1397; (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1398; (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 1400 (i); (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 2206; (Mr. *Casey*) 2209, 2245, 2252; (Mr. *Macdowall*) 2218; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2229; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2235; (Mr. *McMillan*) 2242; (Mr. *Lister*) 2252; (Mr. *Campbell*) 2255 (ii).

WINNIPEG AND H. B. CO.'S SHAREHOLDERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1852 (i).

WINNIPEG GENERAL HOSPITAL: conc., 6304 (iii).

——— IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i), 4441 (iii).

Winnipeg Water Power Act Amt. B. No. 91 (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*). 1°*, 549; 2°*, 983; in Com. and 3°*, 1761 (i). (54-55 *Vic.*, *c.* 108.)

WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 158 (i).

WOOD ISLANDS BREAKWATER, P.E.I., REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 121 (i).

——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 226 (i).

WOOD SUPPLY, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, JOHN HENEY'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4295 (iii).

YAMASKA, EAST, P.O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2153 (ii).

"Y" AT TRURO: in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i).

YULE ESTATE CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 4148 (ii).